DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THIRD SESSION—NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT

---

6 GEORGE VI, 1942

VOLUME I, 1942

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-SECOND DAY OF JANUARY, 1942,
TO THE FOURTH DAY OF MARCH, 1942, INCLUSIVE

BEING

VOLUME CCXXIX FOR THE PERIOD 1875-1942

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

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

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Thursday, January 22, 1942

THIRD SESSION—NINETEENTH PARLIAMENT—OPENING

The parliament which had been prorogued on the twenty-first day of January, 1942, met this day at Ottawa for the dispatch of business.

The house met at three o'clock, the Speaker, the Honourable James Allison Glen, in the chair.

Mr. Speaker read a communication from the Governor General's secretary, announcing that His Excellency the Governor General would proceed to the Senate chamber at three p.m. on this day, for the purpose of formally opening the session of the dominion parliament.

A message was delivered by Major A. R. Thompson, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, 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 chamber.

And the house having returned to the Commons chamber:

OATHS OF OFFICE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 1, respecting the administration of oaths of office.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that when the house did attend His Excellency the Governor General this day in the Senate chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a speech to both houses of parliament. To prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy, which is as follows:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

There no longer can be any question as to the character and scope of the present war. It is a world-wide conflict between irreconcilable forces. On every continent, including the confines of our own, and on all oceans, forces that aim at world domination oppose forces that seek the preservation of freedom. In every quarter of the globe, civilization is confronted by savagery.

The conflict can have but one of two outcomes. Either tyranny, based on terror and brutality, must be overthrown; or the free peoples of the world, one and all, slowly but eventually, will be reduced to a state of bondage. Upon the outcome depends, for generations, the future well-being of mankind.

There are strong reasons for belief in the overthrow of tyranny, and the ultimate triumph of freedom. The axis powers: Germany, Italy and Japan, now fight as one. So do the peoples of the British commonwealth, of the United States, Russia, China and the many other nations that, on the first day of this new year, united in a pact to fight together until victory is achieved. The marshalling of the free forces of the greatest industrial nations in the world makes clear the scale upon which the conflict will now be waged on many fronts.

During the present session, opportunity will be afforded for the fullest consideration and discussion of Canada's war effort, actual and prospective. My advisers will submit to you the measures deemed essential to our national security, and for the prosecution of the war to the utmost of our strength.

In accordance with the government's policy of a total national effort for total war, you will be asked to approve a balanced programme for further increases in the armed forces and in the production of munitions of war and of foodstuffs. The increase in the armed forces will involve an expansion of the establishment of the Canadian army overseas. You will also be asked, as an integral part of Canada's direct war effort, to approve a contribution to Britain of vast quantities of munitions, foodstuffs and supplies.

The government's policy of national selective service will be extended, as generally and rapidly as may be necessary, to effect the orderly and efficient employment of the men and women of Canada for the varied purposes of war. You will be advised of the means the government proposes to adopt, to effect as complete as possible a mobilization of the material resources and man-power of the country in direct furtherance of a total national effort.

My advisers believe that the magnitude and balanced nature of Canada's war effort is being obscured and impaired by controversy concerning commitments with respect to the methods of raising men for military service which were made prior to the spread of the war to all parts of the world.

The government is of the opinion that, at this time of gravest crisis in the world's history, the administration, subject only to its responsibility

to parliament, should in this connection and irrespective of any previous commitments, possess complete freedom to act in accordance with its judgment of the needs of the situation as they may arise.

My ministers accordingly will seek, from the people, by means of a plebiscite, release from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service.

Members of the House of Commons:

You will be asked to make financial provision on an unprecedented scale for the expansion and maintenance of Canada's armed forces and for war production.

You will be asked to make financial provision for implementing agreements with the provinces to facilitate the orderly and equitable mobilization of the financial resources of the country to the utmost limit of its capacity.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

I am confident that in no particular will the Canadian people fail in the full discharge of any of their great responsibilities. At this time, when vision and wisdom are so greatly needed in the affairs of the world, I pray that Almighty God may guide and bless your deliberations.

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

That the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both houses of parliament be taken into consideration on Friday next, and that this order have precedence over all other business, except the introduction of bills, government notices of motion and government orders, until disposed of.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING COMMITTEES

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

That a special committee be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the standing committees of this house, under standing order 63, said committee to be composed of Messrs. Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre), Michaud, Casselman (Grenville-Dundas), Taylor, and Coldwell.

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. Ilsley, Minister of Finance, the Honourable J. E. Michaud, Minister of Fisheries, 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 purposes and under the provisions of chapter 145 of the revised statutes of Canada, 1927, intituled An Act Respecting the House of Commons.

[Mr. Speaker.]

THE WAR

DECLARATION BY UNITED NATIONS AT WASHINGTON, JANUARY 1, 1942, AND RELATED DOCUMENTS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should like to table a copy of the declaration by United Nations, done at Washington, January 1, 1942, and the following related documents: Declaration of principles, known as the Atlantic Charter, by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and the President of the United States of America, August 14, 1941; resolutions approving the Atlantic Charter and providing for the reprovisioning of Europe after the war, adopted at the inter-allied meeting held in London, September 24, 1941, and with reference to these, the tripartite pact signed at Berlin, September 27, 1940, and referred to in the above declaration by the United Nations.

Mr. COLDWELL: Will the document tabled by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) be printed as part of the *Votes and Proceedings* so that we may all have it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They are printed in both English and French in pamphlet form and will be distributed in that form to all hon. members.

LEGATIONS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): At the last sitting of the last session my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) spoke to me about my having omitted to answer a question which was upon the order paper with reference to the French legation at Ottawa, and also one with reference to Canadian representation in Eire. Unfortunately I did not have with me at the moment the answers which had been prepared in the department, but I have them with me now and I should like to have them recorded on *Hansard* in to-day's proceedings.

REPRESENTATION OF VICHY GOVERNMENT IN CANADA

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has the Vichy government of France an ambassador or envoy in Canada?

2. If so, where is he located, who are the members of his staff; is there any inspection of the same, or regulation of the embassy?

3. Is it intended to close this legation?

4. Has the government received any request from His Majesty's government of Great Britain to keep it open? If so, from whom?

5. Does this Vichy office in Ottawa conduct any dominion or empire business with Vichy?

6. If so, what is the amount of such business and of what nature is it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. The French government is represented in Canada by a minister, Mr. Ristelhueber.

2. His office is in the French Legation on Sussex street in Ottawa. The members of his staff are Mr. de Lageneste, First Secretary, Mr. Treuil, Commercial Attache and Mr. du Boisberranger, Secretary. The French Legation is subject to the same regime and obligations as legations of other countries in Canada.

3. No.

4. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom has expressed the view that it was desirable to continue the existing arrangements with regard to diplomatic representation as between France and Canada.

5. Yes.

6. It is not in the public interest to answer this question.

REPRESENTATION OF CANADIAN GOVERNMENT IN EIRE

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Does the government maintain an envoy or minister in Eire?

2. If so, who is he, who are the members of his staff and what are their respective salaries and other allowances?

3. What is the annual cost to Canada?

4. Do Australia and New Zealand maintain similar offices in Eire, and where are they located?

5. Has Canada trade commissioners in Dublin?

6. If so, are these envoys not duplications of services rendered by trade agents?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. There is a Canadian High Commissioner accredited to Ireland.

2. Mr. John Doherty Kearney, high commissioner, salary, $7,500, allowance, $8,000; Mr. E. J. Garland, secretary, salary, $3,540, allowance, $2,000; Miss E. O'Malley, stenographer grade 3, salary, $1,620, allowance, $250; Mr. B. Chambers, clerk messenger, salary, $465.

3. 1940-41—$30,281.49.

4. Australia and New Zealand do not maintain similar offices in Ireland.

5. There is a Canadian trade commissioner in Dublin.

6. There is no duplication of services.

CLERK ASSISTANT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to lay before the house a copy of order in council, P.C. 454, dated January 21, 1942, concerning the superannuation of Mr. T. M. Fraser, Assistant Clerk of the House.

I have assigned Mr. C. W. Boyce, Chief of English Journals, to act as Assistant Clerk of the House pending a permanent appointment to be made by the governor in council.

ACTING DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have assigned J. Laundy to be acting Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms during the present session.

THE WAR

CANADIAN REGIMENTS AT HONG KONG

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if the routine business of this afternoon has now been completed I desire the indulgence of the house while I make a brief statement, somewhat in the nature of a matter of privilege. After careful perusal and intensive study of the statement made yesterday by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) regarding the Hong Kong expedition, I have now come to the conclusion that a very serious situation is revealed and one with which I feel bound to deal. When I made my statement yesterday I was not dealing specifically with the question of man-power.

I do not believe that anyone who reviews the minister's statement will find in it a satisfactory answer to the questions which have been asked by the public about Hong Kong in particular, and the man-power situation in Canada generally. A thorough study of the minister's statement has revealed to me certain facts which, as a non-military man, I did not fully appreciate at the time that very technical and, may I add, subtle statement was made. Having since reviewed it carefully, I am impelled to make a further statement, and I crave the indulgence of this house while I do so.

In my opinion the country is entitled to further information and I propose to indicate the method by which I believe that information should be made available. The fact that from 138 to 148 men with less than minimum training were sent to Hong Kong definitely and inescapably establishes the serious lack of trained man-power in Canada. It must be assumed that if trained man-power was available, they would have been sent. One cannot easily believe that the Minister of National Defence, or the military officials, took untrained men if trained men were available.

This fact raises squarely the question of the state of reserves of trained man-power which we have in Canada. The matter is one of such vital importance that I do not believe it can be properly settled without an open and immediate investigation by a committee of this house. How can we as members of parliament, and how can the people of this country pass upon the question of compulsory service and kindred subjects until we and they have full,

exact and precise information regarding the present standing of trained man-power in Canada?

The second fact made evident by the minister's statement is that the failure to provide universal carriers, which are fighting vehicles, and other transport at the port of embarkation at the proper time rests with the Canadian authorities. The direct responsibility for this failure must be determined and those responsible must be disciplined. The third fact revealed by the minister's statement is that the commander of the expedition, Brigadier Lawson, was disappointed at the lack of mechanical transports which he should have had. His cable from the boat leads to no other conclusion.

Having regard to all these factors, the country is entitled to know why the expedition was not recalled until such time as the transport and equipment could be provided to go along with the expedition. These are questions upon which the country is entitled to receive specific and factual information, and the only manner in which such information can be provided satisfactorily is by a searching public investigation by a committee of this house. I think the minister himself should welcome a public investigation. A departmental investigation will not satisfy public opinion. Therefore I invite him to set up a special committee of this house to investigate the factual and exact situation regarding what happened in connection with sending these men to Hong Kong.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to say a word as there is some responsibility on the part of the government as a whole in a matter of this kind. As a matter of special privilege my hon. friend has asked for permission to make a statement. I took no exception to my hon. friend so doing, but I wish he had been careful to refrain from using words in his statement that I do not think were at all justified. He referred to the statement made yesterday by my colleague, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), as a subtle statement. I am sure that any hon. members of the house who listened to the statement of the Minister of Defence regarded it as a very straightforward, honest and frank statement, and I would add that my hon. friend in his reply yesterday, unless I misunderstood him, more or less so designated it, but since that time he has evidently been receiving information from outside sources and to-day has presented us with the result of his further communications with others. May I say to my hon. friend that the government will certainly grant, and grant immediately, a committee of investigation into this matter. We welcome the opportunity of so doing, and the committee will be granted just as soon as opportunity permits.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, we welcome the committee which the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) has asked for and which the Prime Minister so readily granted, but may I ask that the order of reference be wide enough to permit the committee to inquire how the force was asked for, who decided it should go, and under what conditions it went. I suggest that there is something involved in that which should be looked into by a committee of this house.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my hon. friend and colleague (Mr. Ralston) in his statement yesterday made all these points clear, but I can assure my hon. friend that there will be no desire on the part of the government to limit the investigation in any essential particular.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, and referring to page 4476 of *Hansard* of last session, the *Hansard* of yesterday, where I said that: "the Minister of National Defence should resign on account of the Hong Kong affair," the record is not complete because immediately after I had said that, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) shouted "Order" to prevent my saying anything further. That was, as always, a complete contradiction; he does not know what he wants.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 4.15 p.m.

Friday, January 23, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

TAXATION

AGREEMENTS WITH PROVINCES RESPECTING INCOME AND CORPORATION TAXES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the last day of the last session, I asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) to table the agreements proposed to be entered into with the provinces respecting the vacating of certain fields of taxation. On that occasion he said he would like to

have time to consider the request—which I thought fair; but in a subsequent statement, as I recall it, he stated:

I am not just sure how far the government should go in submitting draft documents to the house before signature. However, they have been given to the press and I shall give consideration to—

And then I interrupted him. If these documents have been given to the press before they have been given to parliament, I think that is an astonishing circumstance; and I would ask that they be tabled forthwith, without any further consideration on the part of the minister.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I was interrupted by the hon. gentleman very abruptly when I was making what I thought—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am sorry if I was discourteous.

Mr. ILSLEY: Well, the hon. gentleman is interrupting again. We are at the beginning of a session, and I would request him not to interrupt me as much as he did last session, or as he has started to do this session.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I shall be guided by my own sense of fitness.

Mr. ILSLEY: I am requesting him not to interrupt.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am renewing my request. Are we to have these agreements tabled?

Mr. ILSLEY: I think the agreements should be tabled. As I have said, I was interrupted the other day. One agreement, the proposed agreement with Ontario, was handed to the press in accordance with an arrangement which was made with the provinces at a joint meeting of the treasurers and myself which was held here in December. The other agreements were not handed to the press in their entirety but certain portions of them were. I think it is quite reasonable to ask that anything which was handed to the press should be put on the table, but I want to look at it and see just what it was. I have not yet had an opportunity to do that. As I pointed out the other day, these are merely drafts, and it may be that when the correspondence or certain letters which are explanatory of them are added, it will be a different thing. I have to table just the amount of correspondence and drafts and clauses that will make the whole matter intelligible at this stage. That is a matter to which I want to give consideration.

THE WAR

JAPANESE NATIONALS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—EMPLOYMENT IN THE PROVINCE AND REMOVAL FROM DEFENCE AREAS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): May I ask the Minister of Pensions and National Health whether he can make any statement with regard to the government's intentions as to the use of Japanese labour in the interior of British Columbia?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): My only direct connection with the situation was, first of all, as a member of the government; second, as minister from British Columbia, and also by way of being chairman of the conference which sat in Ottawa for two days discussing the entire problem. As a result, that conference made certain recommendations to the government, and a press release in regard to government policy was given by the Prime Minister's office. The actual negotiations with regard to placements, accommodation and employment are under the direction of the Minister of Labour, who is not in the house at the present time. The negotiations with regard to actual evacuation will be under the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

With reference to where they will be accommodated, there is no definite conclusion, but I understand that a committee was sitting this morning on that very problem, and I shall be glad to get in touch with the Minister of Labour or to arrange that my hon. friend get in touch with him, to give him information with reference to the Okanagan. Representations were received by me from the board of trade of Vernon, recommending that 1,500 or so of these men could be used in fruit picking in the Okanagan. I am not sure as to what is the attitude of public opinion in that district regarding that question. That is all the information I can offer my hon. friend at the present time.

Mr. STIRLING: May I ask just another question with regard to removals? The government proposes to move Japanese residents from defence areas. Does that cover males only, or females and children?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): That is not definitely determined. The recommendation made by the conference to the government was that every able-bodied adult male be removed, and most likely the first to be removed will be able-bodied adult males who are Japanese nationals, and whose numbers would be roughly two thousand. There are

some 1,714 able-bodied Japanese nationals between the ages of eighteen and forty-five —what we call the military age—but it may be necessary to remove those over forty-five who are able-bodied.

CANADIAN ARMY—REVISION OF MEDICAL STANDARDS GOVERNING ENLISTMENTS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): May I inquire of the Minister of National Defence whether the medical categories have been revised so as to admit men now for service in the army who were formerly rejected as medically unfit?

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend was good enough to send me a copy of the question. The physical standards were revised, and the changes appear in routine order No. 1350 dated October 4, 1941. To give an indication of changes which have been called to my attention, one revision applies to the visual acuity standards; another applies to those who had suffered from a radical mastoid operation; and a third applies to those who had suffered from some infection from a dry perforation of the ear drum. The routine order itself, as my hon. friend will see, because I am going to send him a copy, contains the clause:

> Those rejected under the old standards for defective vision, radical mastoid, one side, or dry perforation of the ear drum, one side, should be encouraged to present themselves for reexamination and possible enlistment under these reduced standards.

That revision was made after a study of the United Kingdom and the United States regulations and standards in these respects, and after consultation with our eye-and-ear specialists. I am sending my hon. friend a copy of the order. It is very long, and I do not imagine hon. members will want this long order printed in the answers to questions. I shall be glad to table a copy of it if anyone wants it.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

KIRKLAND LAKE STRIKE—PROPOSALS FOR SETTLEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I would like to direct a question to the acting Minister of Labour or, if there is no acting Minister of Labour, to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). Some time ago the minister announced that he had made a submission to the parties in the Kirkland Lake dispute of a proposal of settlement of the strike by referring the matter to the national war labour board for arbitration.

Later the minister announced the acceptance of the proposal by the workers' union on Sunday last; the matter then awaited the acceptance of the proposal by the mine owners. Can the acting Minister of Labour or the Prime Minister tell the house whether the reply of the mine owners has yet been received by the Department of Labour, and whether the proposals submitted by the Minister of Labour for arbitration have been accepted or rejected, or where the matter now stands?

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): As the hon. member is aware, the Minister of Labour is not in the house at the present time. I would ask that the question stand as notice and be replied to on Monday. The information I have is that the submission made by the minister has been accepted by the miners, but I have not now at hand information as to whether it has been accepted by the operators. I know that the Minister of Labour is very actively engaged in this matter and has been for some time. I will endeavour to furnish the hon. member with the information in answer to his question on Monday.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE

BONUS PAYMENTS UNDER THE ACT AND IN RESPECT OF WHEAT ACREAGE REDUCTION AND GENERAL RELIEF

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): May I ask the Minister of Agriculture when the farmers may expect payment of bonus under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, the wheat acreage reduction regulations, and the general relief bonus? Some of these are now nearly six months overdue, and the farmers are getting uneasy.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Payments under the Wheat Acreage Reduction Act are practically all made. By the end of November last approximately $25,000,000 had been paid out. Payments under the income regulations are in course of being made. I am not in a position to state just what part of them are out, but the greater part. Payments under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act were of course not to be made until the month of December. I am not sure of the figures with regard to the other two provinces, but in Saskatchewan $7,500,000 had been passed through P.F.A. for payment by the end of the first week in January. Those payments will be made, of course, on the basis of 60 per cent following December 1 and 40 per cent following March 1. In other words, the payments are either made or in course of being made under all the different plans.

PENSIONS

WIDOWS OF SOLDIERS WHO HAD DRAWN LESS THAN FIFTY PER CENT PENSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): May I ask the Minister of Pensions and National Health a question along the lines I have asked before? I have had quite a number of letters during the last few days from non-pensioned widows' associations across Canada asking me to inquire—that is, if the minister is able to take the house into his confidence at this time—whether it is the intention to bring down legislation at this session, should such legislation be necessary, in order to make it possible to grant pensions to the widows of soldiers who in their lifetime drew less than fifty per cent pension.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): During the last session I made a definite announcement on this subject. The hon. member for Davenport is aware that the parliamentary committee on pensions recommended at the last session that the government give consideration to the question which he now mentions. The government considered it very carefully and came to the decision that no legislation would be introduced during the remaining part of last session or during this session to deal with the subject. I have also expressed my own opinion, namely, that the objects aimed at by this organization are more related to a national system of social security than they are to any statutes within my jurisdiction for administration.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The answer is no.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

ADDRESS IN REPLY, MOVED BY MR. ALPHONSE FOURNIER AND SECONDED BY MR. W. R. MACDONALD (BRANTFORD CITY)

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

Mr. ALPHONSE FOURNIER (Hull) (Translation) moved:

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

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Earl of Athlone, Knight of Our Most Noble Order of the Garter, a member of Our Most Honourable Privy Council, Knight Grand Cross of Our Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Grand Master of Our Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Governor General and Commander in Chief of Our 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.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to present this motion, I wish to convey to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) on behalf of the people of the county of Hull the gratitude they feel towards him for the honour done to their representative. This honour is all the greater for having been unexpected. I welcome it, because the people of Hull are very sensitive to this mark of esteem on the part of the head of the government.

I wish all the hon. members of this house were as well acquainted as I am with the people of my constituency. All of them, whether workers in the city or tillers of the soil, are excellent Canadians and good Christians. The vast majority of them are of French descent, but nowhere else is there to be found more harmony, more collaboration, more cooperation between the two races. The present conflict has imbued them with a single will, a single spirit, a single aim—to make all the sacrifices necessary to bring about the defeat of the enemies of liberty. I am proud of them and I want to be worthy of their confidence.

On Wednesday last the leaders of the political parties and a number of hon. members paid tribute to the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. I wish to add my tribute to theirs. Scarcely two months ago there died a great Canadian, one of the most illustrious sons of his race. The news of his grave illness greatly affected us and it is with deep sorrow that we learned of his death. One of the best known figures of this parliament is no longer in his place. Our country has lost a devoted and faithful servant. His dying in harness was but the crowning of his career, the completion of his life. For nearly thirty-eight years he gave the best of himself to his country and his people.

Difficulties, contests or illness did not prevent him from doing his duty to the end. What the Canadian nation owes to him cannot, at this time, be appreciated at its true value. History will rank him in his rightful place, alongside, and on an equal footing with, the greatest men of our country. But even to-day, his opponents as well as his friends recognize him as an outstanding statesman. His qualities, his talent, and his work have been eulogized by voices more authoritative than mine, but I wish to join them in saying to Madame Lapointe, to my friend Hugues and to Madame Ouimet how deep is my sorrow

and how much I sympathize with them in their grief. I have lost a friend, a model and a counsellor. The Prime Minister has no longer at his side the man who has so long been his loyal and faithful friend. He will miss the sound advice of the man who always supported him with his eloquent, sincere and ringing voice. In associating myself with his grief, I wish to tell him that we also will ever cherish the memory of the great Canadian who has departed.

Mr. Chairman, I entertain no illusion about the difficulty of the task I have undertaken this afternoon.

We are, with the rest of the world, passing through a terrible crisis. The world is divided into two thoroughly armed camps set on imposing on the universe their ideologies and opinions concerning methods of government. In our own country, we have to deal with a situation, as set out in the speech from the throne, which will upset, especially in my province, many of the opinions for which we have been struggling in past years. I wish to remain calm in the course of my remarks. The great respect I entertain for our adversaries precludes me from saying anything derogatory. I shall not forget, in the course of my speech, that I am a Canadian, living in a north American country which is a part of the British Commonwealth, a country with a population of 12 million inhabitants, that is less than 5 per cent of the total population of the allied countries waging war on the Axis. I repeat: I shall speak as a French-Canadian. We are members of a free parliament and we owe this freedom to British institutions; no one may prevent a representative of the people from expressing, with due respect for other peoples' opinions, his views with conviction or his opinions with sincerity.

I intend to speak on the war effort of Canada from 1937 to this day. I had the honour and pleasure of visiting England in October and November last. The impressions I gathered from this trip, I shall expound to you in English. Then, I shall review both the successes and reverses of the allies.

I shall dwell on the most important part of the speech from the throne, that which deals with the request of the government to be released of its promises and commitments in connection with the enlistment of our citizens for overseas service; I shall attempt to express the views at least of the French-Canadians I know and who have set their faith in me.

Canada, as well as all democratic countries, was and remains a peace-loving nation. Democracies do not prepare for war. This would be against the spirit of their institutions. The debates during the session of 1937 are proof enough of the aversion of free and democratic peoples for any war of territorial or economic conquest. Only when their way of life and their liberty are endangered will they take the fatal step. In 1937, when it had become evident that a part of the world was endeavouring to apply military pressure to impose its ideologies and opinions on the world, the Canadian government asked parliament to increase its military appropriations by 35 million dollars; it succeeded in securing this amount only after a struggle of many weeks.

In 1938, after having witnessed the plundering of Austria, the seizure of parts of Czechoslovakia and the Munich drama, our population began to understand that danger was getting nearer and that it had become necessary to spend money for equipping our army if we wished to defend our own territory and our own lives.

And from 1937 to the fall of 1939, the government organized this country's defences. We entered this war at the outbreak of hostilities. Our defence estimates then amounted to no more than $64,500,000. To-day, there is no limit. The last budget called for an expenditure of $1,500,000,000 and the speech from the throne informed us that our war effort will grow still larger. There is but little criticism of the present war effort on the part of the people and I refer here to the province of Quebec. There is no criticism of our country's present war effort. If you take its population and its limited means into account, you will see that our war effort is comparable to that of any one of our allies. In a moment I shall refer to what Mr. Churchill said in this house, barely three weeks ago

We entered this war with France as an ally. Trusting Hitler's word and promises, believing that he would protect the rights of minorities, the small nations thought they were secure behind the ideas of neutrality which then prevailed in the world. Events have shown that this doctrine of neutrality cannot subsist in a modern world, organized as it is to-day. There are no neutral countries left. Still less so is Canada by reason of its situation, of its ideas and by reason of the love of freedom which actuates its people. The events of 1940 have shown that our former motherland was not prepared to enter this conflict, no more so, incidentally, than was England. France witnessed the invasion of its territory and the downfall of its government. It is not for me to discuss the motives of the French generals in disregarding the advice received at the time but I wish to repeat

to-day, unhappy France has all my admiration. I am French and of French ancestry. I hold a place in this parliament where Frenchmen must be respected and honoured, whatever opinion or opinions may be held or expressed about present-day France and, especially, about the Free French.

In the course of those events, we saw months go by while our war effort increased steadily.

Our army was composed of 4,500 men in 1939; to-day—I am speaking of the active army—it includes 250,000 men who enlisted voluntarily, and a large proportion of those volunteers come from the province of Quebec and from my city. There are 125,000 in England, in Newfoundland, in Nova Scotia, in the West Indies or in other parts of the world, and we have lost over 2,000 of them in Hong Kong. Our recruits continue to appear at the voluntary recruiting offices. And I admit that they are not always given encouragement by those who should extend the greatest measure of help and cooperation to the government.

Our air force was almost non-existent before the war. After the lapse of two years, we have had 100,000 men in one hundred air training schools maintained in this country. No nation in the world has an air training system like the training plan which is now carried out in our own country. That fact is stated over and over again even in Great Britain; we can hear a similar comment voiced in the United States. That training system is a model. Our airmen are to be found in every part of the world, and they are known for their bravery, their courage and their attainments. They also enlisted voluntarily.

Before the war our navy had only 1,800 men and scarcely fifteen ships. Today we have in the Canadian navy 28,000 men and over 300 ships. On every sea lane and over all the oceans are to be met Canadians who help Great Britain in the most useful way. But what I have just stated refers merely to the manpower supplied by us in the great conflict that is now raging. As regards our expenditure, it behooves me to quote some figures—I am not fond of them, but they are helpful for purposes of comparison. I shall have to quote some figures from official documents in order to show the expansion of our industrial and economic effort. Great changes have occurred in our national economy since the beginning of the war. Industry has taken a wonderful development and our commercial activity has constantly increased. National income also shows a huge increase. I know that figures are not very interesting. However, I feel that I am in duty bound to quote some. The most recent figures show that industrial production in the first six months of 1941 has increased by 12·3 per cent as compared with the same period of the preceding year, while production of manufactured goods has increased by 11 per cent. The volume of business has increased by 12·9 per cent; mining production, by 2·2 per cent; exports, excluding gold movement, by 30·1 per cent, and imports, by 30·1 per cent. The total amount of building contracts awarded represents an increase of 71·8 per cent over the same period of last year. Car loadings have improved by 15 per cent and the gross earnings of the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific have increased by 28·8 per cent. The employment index has risen by 21·2 per cent, while employment in the manufacturing industries has soared to a level 24·8 per cent higher. The national revenue has increased by 11·5 per cent.

It has been necessary for the Canadian government to help and finance private industries towards the equipment and expansion of plants and the purchase of materials. Our government, together with that of Great Britain, have guaranteed capital advances amounting to more than 520 million dollars. Twelve war industries are owned and operated by the government. Through the supply board, we buy and ship our agricultural products to Great Britain. Our most important exports are wheat, bacon and cheese, three products that are of first necessity for the overseas population. Our own people have decreased their domestic consumption of bacon by 25 per cent to enable the government to increase the quantities shipped. At the present moment almost all our Canadian plants are busy on war production. Many new factories have been built; others have been expanded. On September 30 last, the total value of war contracts awarded by the government through the Department of Munitions, amounted to $2,600,000,000. A large number of keels have been laid and the number of ships being built will increase as the necessary skilled workers become available.

To-day, we are producing guns, small arms, search-lights, munitions, aeroplanes, trucks and tanks.

Every month, every week, every day, we witness the growth of our war industries. Our efforts in this field will be limited only by the available supply of men and materials.

Our pre-war budget totalled $500,000,000. To-day it is five times higher and the speech from the throne indicates that our future expenditures will be still more important.

In our own country, rather harsh criticism is at times levelled at the government in connection with the war effort. I would like to read here certain excerpts taken, some from Mr. Churchill's speech, others from various sources, in order to ascertain the opinion of the British empire's chief on the Canadian war effort. Here is what Mr. Churchill said in his speech before this house concerning our war effort. I quote from the Ottawa *Journal* of December 31, 1941:

The contribution of Canada to the imperial war effort in troops, in ships, in aircraft, in food and in finance has been magnificent.

This statement was not made by a Canadian, but by the Prime Minister of Britain.

The Canadian army now stationed in Britain has chafed not to have been in contact with the enemy and I am here to tell you that it has stood and still stands in the key position to strike at the invader should he land upon our shores.

A little farther, in the same speech:

Sir, the Canadian government have imposed no limitation upon the use of the Canadian army, whether upon the continent of Europe or elsewhere . . . at Hong Kong, Canadian soldiers of the Royal Rifles of Canada and the Winnipeg Grenadiers, under a brave officer whose loss we mourn, have played a valuable part in gaining precious days and have crowned with honour, with military honour, the reputation of their native land.

And still further:

Another major contribution made by Canada to the world war effort is the wonderful and gigantic empire training scheme for pilots for the royal and imperial air force.

Read further and this is what you will find:

I could, sir, speak also on the naval production of corvettes, and above all of the merchant ships, which is proceeding on a scale almost equal to the building of the United Kingdom; all of which Canada has set on foot. I could speak of many other activities; of tanks, of the special forms of modern high-velocity cannon; of the great supplies of raw materials and many other elements essential to our war effort, on which your labours are ceaselessly and tirelessly engaged.

These words were uttered by one of our allies, indeed, by the leader of our allies. Did he come here to flatter the people of Canada or to recognize the true extent of the effort we are making? I believe he is too sincere and too much interested in the maintenance of the British commonwealth to talk nonsense regarding our war effort. The criticism of our effort comes not from outside, but from inside and from a class of people who never feel at ease when they are out of power.

(Text) In October and November, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of visiting Great Britain on the invitation of the Empire Parliamentary Association. I wish to thank the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) most sincerely for designating me as a member of that delegation, which consisted of six members of the House of Commons—the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore), leaders of their parties in this house; the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman), and three Liberal members, my neighbour the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald), the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght), and myself.

We spent three weeks in Britain. I may not tell you everything we saw during that trip, but I do wish to say a few words about the audience which was granted us by Their Majesties the King and Queen at Buckingham Palace. After touring Britain we were received by their majesties. For forty-five minutes we were in intimate conversation with them, and when we left we were under the charm of their simplicity, their naturalness and their interest in what was going on in our country. They spoke to us of their personal experiences; and as a French-Canadian I must state that nearly all the time I was there Her Majesty the Queen spoke to me in French. I recall that she mentioned her visits to Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa. She referred to her speech at the laying of the corner-stone of the Supreme Court building, in which she compared the laws of Scotland, her own country, to those of the province of Quebec. The last thing I remember about that meeting was the statement that after this war was over it would be a pleasure for them to come back and visit the Canadian people again, this time bringing the children.

We saw the damage that has been done to the cities over there. It is extensive, very extensive. We met the people going on with their ordinary work—grim, determined, ready to meet the foe. We saw something of the preparation that has been made for the defence of the island. We saw the conditions under which the people live, and what particularly struck me was the food situation. I may not give the details, but perhaps we do not always remember that they are rationed over there, and rationed most severely. In our country we are just talking now about making sacrifices, about depriving ourselves of some luxuries, or perhaps some necessities. Well, over there they are living under a rationing system, and that is not the most pleasant or agreeable experience. The blackouts are terrible things. Perhaps I could stand not eating so much, but to be unable to go out after dark; to be closed in—in London, where I wanted to see everything—had a bad effect on my morale. I was surprised to find that

Englishmen were glad to endure the black-out, but they endure it because they were told, and it is true, that it was good for the safety of all.

I came back from Britain with some impressions, the strongest of which was the love of king, flag and country shown by those people. They do not speak about aggression. They speak about preparing their own defences, right there. One cannot find anyone in Britain who has not uppermost in his mind the defence of the island. That was quite an example for Canadians, and especially French-Canadians. Loving one's country, being ready to sacrifice one's life and fortune to help the community as a whole—this, applied in my country and my province, would be a great thing. In this country we may be of different races and religions, but we all believe in the freedom of British institutions. We believe, too, that in this parliament we may speak freely.

The second impression I gained was the tolerance shown by public men for each other. They criticize one another, of course, but one public man never doubts the loyalty of another. They do not impute motives; they do not doubt the sincerity of their opponents in public life.

Another point which struck me was their familiarity with the situation in Canada. That is why we read and hear from Britishers words of praise of our war effort. Lastly, I found that the history of French-Canadians and the people of Quebec is well known in Britain. They know exactly our past history. They know what we think of the British system. They know that we believe in their fair play. They know that in my province many people do not want to have our constitution amended in this parliament, but prefer going over the seas, where questions may be discussed far away from the seat of trouble. They know all those facts. Moreover, to my surprise, I did not attend one function where those sitting to my right and left did not speak to me in French. They insisted on doing so. I tried to speak English to them, but they always came back with French.

I reached England in the company of my good friend the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. He was born there, and upon arrival went home to see his own people. In our party also there was the hon. member for Brantford City, who travelled through Scotland, where the name of Macdonald is well known. Then there was the hon. member for Lethbridge, whose father was born in England, and the hon. member for Rosedale, who had been in England on many occasions. In the party was also the hon. member for Parry Sound who has made part of his fortune in Great Britain, through his appearances before the privy council. These men seemed to know everybody over there, while I expected to be a stranger. After a few days, however, I saw that all these people were my friends, and I have come back to Canada with another opinion of the English-speaking people. Do not think that they showed us the things they did not want us to see. The trip was well organized; they told us what they wanted us to hear. But they did it so nicely that we came back elated with the trip.

What are the chief criticisms against the government with regard to Canada's war effort? I read the papers while in England, and I know the criticisms made over there, against their government. Sometimes I thought they were worse than the criticisms made against this government. But I say this: In this country, do not sneer at national unity. It is the greatest need of our time. People who do not believe in national unity are not working for the best interests of their country. Have hon. members ever visualized this country invaded by the foe? We have read the papers. We read a statement made two days ago by Mr. LaGuardia to the effect that air raids on coastal towns were imminent. Four ships have been sunk off the Atlantic coast of the United States. Two ships have been sunk off our own Canadian coast.

Why, we are in danger—imminent danger—if we believe what we read in the papers, and the statements made by people. I can think of some day when we may be fighting on our own soil against the foe. When that day comes, do you want a united country? Do you want the French and English peoples going forward hand in hand against the foe, or do you want machine guns pointed against one part of the population by the other part? Just think: if you are working in the interests of Canada, you work for national unity.

In a moment or two I shall revert to the French language, but before concluding my observations in English, I wish to state from my place in the House of Commons that the 3,500,000 French-Canadians in my province are asked to make one of the greatest sacrifices they have ever been called upon by their country to make. In the speech from the throne we are asked for national unity and we are asked to consent to releasing the government from its pledges made to the country in the last election. We are asked to say to the government: "If in your judgment necessity arises, you may be free of the promise you made to the people of this country"—one which was not contradicted even by our opponents—"that there would not be compulsory selective service for overseas."

So that there may be no misunderstanding among my English- or French-speaking friends, let me say that my stand in the house, in my own riding and in my province, is that I am supporting the policy of the government. I will say to the people of my province, "If you want national unity now, make this sacrifice." I do not know whether those who have spoken against the French-speaking people in Canada would make the same sacrifice.

Our second reason for favouring the new policy is that when we in our province become friendly with somebody we stick to him through thick and thin. In Quebec we have been supporting the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) for the last twenty years. Just look at the membership of the house and see where the largest number of his supporters come from. Well, we are going to see him through in this fight, and we are going to support him. We are going to ask our people to forget the past and to rely on the judgment and the patriotism of the man who is now leading the destinies of our country.

(Translation) Since the opening of hostilities, the postion of this country has certainly changed. At the beginnig we had on our side our powerful ally, France, which has since fallen by the wayside. We had with us all the small nations surrounding France—Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway—which, in spite of their policy of neutrality were invaded and conquered. For a time England had to carry on the war against Germany and Italy all alone with the support of the dominions and colonies. Until the 22nd of June, 1941, Great Britain's position, if not desperate, was at least extremely dangerous. Germany's attack upon Russia gave the British a few moments of respite. There was a let-up in bombing. Great Britain was able to develop her war industries, train her soldiers, manufacture munitions and prepare the defences which I saw myself when I was there in October and November last.

On the 7th of December last the war spread to the entire world. Without warning, Japan attacked American possessions in the Pacific. She also attacked Great Britain, and to-day, except for a few small nations, the whole world is at war. In what position do we find ourselves? A small nation of twelve million souls, we need allies in order to protect our lives, in order to ensure our survival on this north American continent. We need to make all the efforts and sacrifices which patriotism dictates.

I am aware that the speech from the throne contains a reversal of policy concerning which the people's representatives cannot lightly adopt a definite position. I admit that in the minds of my colleagues from the province of Quebec various arguments may arise to justify their attitude one way or the other. Personally, I have adopted a position, and my chief reason is that I am in favour of the doctrine preached for so many years by the late leader of the French Canadians, Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. He has appealed to us, from one end of the country to the other, to be united in the face of danger. He has pointed out to us the need of national unity if we wish to preserve our institutions, our religion and our language, because in the event of defeat all these privileges, all these rights would vanish. I say to my colleagues from the province of Quebec that the teachings we have received from honest men, who for years have preached in my province a certain doctrine, were given openly, sincerely and above-board. These men were not contradicted even in 1940, by our opponents from the other side of the house. Everyone was against conscription. The people voted as a whole against conscription.

To-day the government is asking to be relieved from its commitments and promises.

The government requests a free hand, if this should become necessary, in order to be in a position to send some of our men abroad. They do not say that, to-day or to-morrow, conscription will be imposed on this country. They ask to be released of the obligation they had assumed and their present attitude is that of honest men. They have made promises. Now circumstances prevent, or will prevent their keeping them. They want to be released from them. They again appeal to the people who have placed them in power. If I am in this house, I owe it to the people, to those who supported my candidature in past elections. If the Prime Minister occupies his seat and represents the people to-day, he owes it to the members of this house and, ultimately, to the people. He has no wish to follow the advice of those who say: "Yours is the responsibility of establishing your government's policy. It is your duty, with no regard for the people, to pass a law of conscription." No, as an honest man, he says: "I shall again go to those who sent us to this house and ask them to be relieved of our promises." Circumstances have changed or may change later. We are in peril, our country is in danger. I could adduce in support of this policy, the opinion of many people from my province. In the face of imminent danger, who will refuse to give his all for his country's salvation? I have said in English, and I now repeat, that I will support in this house as I will outside the house, in my constituency as anywhere in the province of Quebec, the government's request embodied in the speech from

the throne. I shall lose no friends. In remaining honest, one never loses one's supporters.

(Translation) I shall go back and tell my constituents: "You have repeatedly sent me to the House of Commons. I made a promise to you; I ask your leave to disregard it whenever the situation is deemed such that extreme measures become imperative. Please, therefore, grant us permission to enact the extreme measure which is requested." There is nothing illogical about my attitude. It is easily accountable.

Before closing, I must discuss an issue which I had long believed dead: that of union government. In the last few weeks, some people have been roaming about beseeching in Heaven's name for a voice in the government. They offer their services. They are eager to sit on ministerial benches but, at the same time, vehemently condemn all that the government has done to this day. They say: "You are mistaken." They use language that is far from parliamentary. Read this morning's papers. You will find in them such words as "cowardly," "dastardly," and "indignantly." And those are the men who would calmly lead the destinies of the nation. Their language denotes no self respect. How then can they claim to command the respect of the people?

In the province of Quebec, the idea of a union government is distasteful to us. The French Canadian people were never so unhappy since confederation as they were during 1917, 1918 and 1919.

At no time since confederation have machine guns been trained on French Canadians, except under a union government. Never have bayonets threatened French Canadians as happened when, under a union government, some of them crossed the Interprovincial bridge in 1917 to voice their protest, at Ottawa. And can it be believed that we would support the movement in favour of a union government? Well, I pray Providence, I pray God that our country be spared that misfortune, and I ask, not only for myself but on behalf of the French Canadians that such a calamity should not befall us.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that in the course of my remarks I have not forgotten myself and used language which I might have to regret. I have expressed my sincere opinion. The stand I have taken is that of a free man. I believe that my attitude is logical and necessary if we Canadians of various extraction, creed and race, do not wish to suffer the fate of the European countries overrun by the Germans, and become the slaves of Hitler.

Mr. W. R. MACDONALD (Brantford City): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great honour for me to be privileged to second the motion which has been moved so eloquently by my very dear friend and colleague the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier), that an address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, offering the humble thanks of this house to his excellency for the gracious speech which he has been pleased to make to both houses of parliament. Would that I had sufficient knowledge of the French language to understand fully the hon. member's words. Unfortunately, we who understand but one language must be content only to listen with rapture to the music which always flows whenever French is spoken.

The honour which has come to me in seconding the address is in truth an honour to the great industrial city of Brantford which I represent. Brantford is famous for many things and more particularly for the fact that the telephone, which is the basic principle on which wireless and radio has since been developed, was invented in the city of Brantford. Doctor Graham Bell made his home on the banks of the noble Grand on the outskirts of our city, which is therefore aptly known as the "telephone city."

In days of peace Brantford, with a population of thirty-two thousand, made up mostly of loyal, honest, thrifty, law-abiding workingmen and women, was the fourth export city in this dominion. To-day, with commercial exports at a minimum, Brantford is sending to all the battlefields large quantities of armaments of all kinds, and I would particularly call the attention of hon. members to the fact that a very substantial percentage of the motor equipment used in the recent victorious campaign in Libya was manufactured by Brantford workingmen in Brantford factories.

Recently it was my privilege, along with my hon. friend the member for Hull, who has just spoken, the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght), the hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman), the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group, and the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore), leader of the Social Credit group, to visit Great Britain at the invitation of the United Kingdom branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association. My very good companions, when we left Canada, were known to one another as little more than acquaintances; but after flying the ocean, after being in Britain and mingling with the British people, after being received by their gracious majesties and spending the greater part of an hour in easy conversation with them, and after

being in Portugal and visiting or flying over other foreign lands, we have established friendships with one another which will be as enduring as life itself.

Shortly after my return to Canada I, along with every other Canadian, learned with deep regret of the passing of one of the most gifted and tolerant, broad-minded and understanding men who ever sat in this house, the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. He loved Canada more than life itself and gave his very life for that great love. He in turn was loved by most and respected by all. He was proud to call himself a French-Canadian, and truly indeed might he be proud of that great race who now number almost one-third of our total population, who were the first settlers in this great dominion, and who during the wars of 1775 and 1812 gave of their very lifeblood in order to save Canada for the British crown. Ernest Lapointe loved peace, and with an enthusiasm born of conviction he joined with our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in giving leadership to Canada in order to secure peace for the world and to keep war from our shores.

Canada has contributed greatly to the forces which have kept war from our shores. The total number now serving in Canada's armed forces who have volunteered to serve anywhere in the defence of Canada has reached nearly 400,000. Actually more than 150,000 of these are now serving overseas. May I be permitted to make a comparison between this war and the last war? At no time during the last war did we have more than four divisions in France, which would total something less than 100,000 men, so that to-day we have more men outside Canada, trained and ready to serve, than we had in France at any time during the last war.

May I be permitted to make another comparison? I have stated that nearly 400,000 men are enrolled in the active army, the navy and the air force for service in any part of the world. There are some 360,000 in the active army and the air force, without counting the navy. I mention this figure because it affords a basis of comparison with the projected military effort of the United States. The United States Secretary of War has recently announced that it was planned to increase the strength of the United States army in 1942 up to 3,600,000 men. It should be remembered that the United States has no separate air force. The greater part of its fighting airmen are enrolled in the army air corps. In other words, Mr. Stimson's figure of 3,600,000 for the end of 1942 includes both the army strength and the greater part of the air strength planned for the United States a year hence. This is only ten times the present strength of the Canadian Army and air force, although the population of the United States is almost twelve times the population of Canada. What does this mean? It means that so far as military and air strength goes, Canada actually has to-day a greater strength in proportion to its population than the United States expects to have at the beginning of 1943—and we are not stopping at the point which has been reached to-day.

I could carry the comparison a stage further. Canada has some 130,000 men already serving in the army outside Canada. We do not know how many Canadian airmen are overseas, but we know the numbers are reckoned in thousands. The present strength of the United States army and army air corps was given by Mr. Stimson at 1,700,000. In other words, in proportion to our population, we have as many men serving outside Canada to-day as the United States has altogether in its army and army air corps, and it should not be forgotten that the greater part of the United States army is still in the United States, and that much of it is in a less advanced stage of training than the Canadian Army—the Canadian Army which is still in Canada. It is perfectly natural that Canada, after more than two years of war, should be farther advanced than the United States after less than two months of war, but at the rate of progress Canada has made, and is still making, it is going to take a long time for the United States to overtake us.

These comparisons are made in no unfriendly spirit. Every Canadian welcomed the entry of the United States into the war. Every Canadian will welcome every increase in the armed strength of the United States. Every Canadian will be happy to see the day come when the effort of the United States is proportionate to Canada's effort. But those Canadians who, in an attempt to discredit the government of their own country, are ready to belittle the magnificent effort of Canada, should at least get their facts straight. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is about time that Canadians stopped belittling their own country, and began taking some pride in its military achievement.

When this war started, our air force consisted of very few aeroplanes and a small but valiant personnel. To-day the British commonwealth air training plan is an accomplished fact. There are ninety-two airports actually in operation, with an enlistment of over 100,000 men. What was originally a trickle of pilots has already developed into a great stream. Many of them are serving with the

Royal Air Force, and in addition we shall shortly have in operation in England twenty-eight all-Canadian squadrons of our own air force. It is unnecessary for me to tell of the heroism and devotion to duty of these pilots, observers, air gunners, radio men and other aircrew, of whom many have already given their lives in the service of their country.

Our navy has grown from fifteen ships, with a personnel of 1,800, to approximately 350 ships with a personnel of 27,000, and these Canadian seamen on these Canadian ships have assisted in convoying more than 7,000 ships across the Atlantic carrying 42,500,000 tons of cargo to the British isles. Our navy is engaged in active operations against the enemy wherever he can be found upon the high seas. Unfortunately we have lost ships on account of enemy action, but in all encounters the Canadian navy has proven itself more than a match for the enemy, and that enemy now has the same respect for the white ensign which flies on the ships of the Royal Canadian Navy as it always had for that same ensign when it was flying on the ships of the British fleet.

At home our factories are working night and day, turning out great quantities of field guns, anti-aircraft guns and naval guns. Bren guns are being produced at the rate of thousands a month. Our shipyards are busy turning out combat ships and cargo ships. Our aircraft factories are to-day turning out fifteen different types of aircraft, while other factories are making tanks and motor vehicles of all kinds. It is impossible for me to mention our complete line of production, but I must not fail to state that one of our greatest achievements is the production of explosives of all kinds. Numerous arsenals costing millions of dollars have been built in Canada, and to-day are manufacturing a continuous supply of the most deadly explosives.

We have also made a great contribution from our farms. In spite of difficulties, farmers have been able to produce foodstuffs so urgently needed in Britain, and when the history of this war is written it will be recorded that the farmers of Canada, in spite of great scarcity of labour and other difficulties, produced the food which fed the men who won the war. This contribution made by Canada to the allied cause has been, to use the words of the great Churchill, "magnificent". Some have suggested that we should be at the top of our production now. They forget that it takes years to start from nothing and attain the maximum of munition production. Winston Churchill himself, speaking on that subject in the British House of Commons, on December 2, 1941, stated, "first year, nothing at all, second year, very little, third year, quite a lot, fourth year, all you want."

Canada, when one considers that at the beginning of this war we had very few dies, tools, or blue prints, can scarcely be said to be beyond the second year. Nevertheless, instead of producing "very little" we are producing "quite a lot". Credit for that rapid expansion and that great accomplishment must be given to the ministers directly responsible, to their officers, to the many officials who head the various boards, together with their associates and subordinates, and to the executives, directors, and managers of our industrial plants; also, and more especially, to that great body of working men and women who have toiled long hours to make that production possible.

But without leadership all this would have been impossible. There is one man who has given this leadership, one man who has co-ordinated the activities of the various departments, one man who has kept Canada united. That man sits in parliament to-day. He is one whom I am proud to call my leader, and whom all Canadians, in this testing time of our history, are fortunate to be able to call our Prime Minister. History will record that, at the commencement of this war, he called parliament in the shortest possible time, and in two days parliament, under his leadership, voted unanimously to march side by side with Britain in the defence of world freedom. Under his leadership this parliament passed the National Resources Mobilization Act, which placed all the wealth of Canada, human and material, at the disposal of the government. With a boldness required of a war-time leader he announced regulations which controlled industry and fixed prices, and thereby saved Canada from a disastrous era of inflation. On December 7, 1941, Japan treacherously attacked the United States. On that same day, before the United States or Great Britain had taken action, Canada asked His Majesty's approval of a proclamation declaring that a state of war existed between Canada and Japan. Throughout his public life the Prime Minister has advocated measures which would tend toward bringing about a feeling of friendship between our empire and the United States. Within the last few weeks he has seen the culmination of his efforts in the visit of a British Prime Minister from Westminster to the President of the United States at Washington.

With the entry of Japan into the war, new problems have arisen. We are fighting not only on the Atlantic but also on the Pacific. All the world is now involved in this war, and Canada is fighting for its very existence. We

are fighting beside the other freedom-loving democracies. We have a definite part to play in this struggle. We know that we cannot win without the proper equipment; man-power alone will not do.

Churchill has said, "Give us the tools and we will finish the job." Our own Canadian soldiers, sailors and airmen are now saying to us, "Give us the tools and we will help to finish the job." Our first task, therefore, is to turn out armaments of all kinds. Those armaments will to a large extent, for the time being, be sent to our gallant allies the great Russian people, who by their devotion and courage have taken a tremendous toll of the nazi hordes. More and more ships must be built, not only for our own defence, but also because our responsibility in the north Atlantic is to-day greater than ever before. It is obvious that unless the Atlantic passage is kept open, Canada will not be in a position to bring her armies and air force to grips with the enemy.

I cannot stress too strongly the necessity of producing as many aircraft as possible, and training men to operate those aeroplanes. No battle in this war has yet been won without air superiority. Three factors contributed most to the successful evacuation from Dunkirk: The English channel was calm; the British people who manned the small ships, and the sailors and soldiers, showed undaunted courage; but had it not been for our temporary air superiority, all this would have been in vain. The allied powers are depending to a large extent upon Canada to bring about, through the commonwealth air training plan, permanent air superiority.

Britain, likewise, as I have already said, has cast a great responsibility on Canada to supply food not only for the forces but for all the millions of brave people on that island fortress.

In order to carry out our gigantic task, the total wealth of our country, that is everything we have—our wealth, our natural resources, our man-power and woman-power—must be mobilized as rapidly as can be accomplished in an orderly fashion. We are already regulating industry, and are telling manufacturers what they may or may not make. We must now go one step further and organize our human resources so that each one, in so far as it is possible, will be placed where he or she can serve best. Those men who can contribute best to the defence of Canada in the factories must be kept in those factories. In many instances it will be found that women can replace men and that both men and women doing non-essential work can be transferred to industries working on essential war contracts.

[Mr. W. R. Macdonald.]

Our farms must be worked to provide food for our people, our armed forces and our allies; and man-power and woman-power must be provided to produce these foodstuffs. All this will be controlled through complete mobilization.

In my earlier remarks I stated that most of our armaments must in large part, for the time being, go to equip our gallant allies. When, however, we are in full production we should have a surplus with which to equip our armies in Canada. Some have suggested that we immediately call up large numbers of men for our army. By large numbers I mean tens or twenties or hundreds of thousands, as has been suggested. That, in my opinion, would be fatal to our war effort. It would necessarily take men from war-equipment manufacturing plants and, if the men are to be trained, it would take equipment in which the allies now are so woefully weak. Man-power for our army is not now our most pressing need. It must be remembered that if no battle has been won without air superiority, no battle has been lost from a lack of men, but rather from a shortage of equipment. Canada's place to-day in the allied plan for victory is primarily the providing of mechanized equipment, ships properly manned, aeroplanes with trained crews and large quantities of food. Some may take exception to that statement and say that we now have the equipment; and, as the British Prime Minister has stated, the crisis of man-power and woman-power is at hand, and will dominate the year 1942. By that statement he did not mean that Britain would recruit larger armies but that more men and women will be needed for replacements and to turn out armaments. Here are his words:

> The crisis of equipment is largely over and an ever-broadening flow is now assured. The crisis of man-power and woman-power is at hand and will dominate the year 1942. This crisis comes upon us for the following reasons: The great supply plants have largely been constructed; they are finished; they must be staffed, and they must be fully staffed. We must maintain the powerful mobile army we have created with so much pains both for home defence and foreign expedition. We must maintain our armies in the east and be prepared for a continuance and an extension of heavy fighting there. We must provide for the expansion of the air force in 1942 and the far greater expansion which it will take in 1943. We must face a continuous growth of the navy to man the great numbers of warships of all kinds coming steadily into service. We must provide modern equipment for the large armies which are being raised and trained in India.
>
> Apart from our own needs, we must keep our engagements to send a substantial supply of tanks, aeroplanes and other war weapons or war commodities to Russia in order to help

make good the loss of munition making capacity which Russia has sustained by the German invasion. We have had also to forego very important supplies we had expected from the United States but which have now, with our consent, been diverted to Russia.

In 1940, this parliament passed the National Resources Mobilization Act. This act gave the government full power to conscript all the wealth of the country whether owned by individuals or companies. Therefore our government now has, what few people realize, full power to conscript wealth and send it in whatever form it is deemed advisable anywhere in order to defend Canada. Under that act, however, we cannot send our man-power beyond the shores of Canada unless they volunteer to go even if it is necessary to do so in order to defend Canada.

But events are happening very rapidly and to-morrow we may be living under entirely changed circumstances. Who can tell but that it may be imperative for the defence of Canada to send large forces of men to fight nazism wherever it may be found? Personally, I feel the government should be empowered to do so. This government, however, and every hon. member who supports it, and in fact most if not all members of this house, gave their solemn promise to the electorate that they would not require men under any circumstances to go beyond the shores of Canada unless they should go of their own free will and accord. Under nazism, the promise of a leader is nothing but a scrap of paper, but under our democratic system of government it is as binding as any bond under seal.

Some may argue that we should ignore our pledge given to the people and change the law without consultation with them. I greatly fear that such a course would result in tearing Canada asunder, and surely it is patent that we cannot fight one another at home and hope at the same time to defeat the enemy abroad. If the government, if hon. members themselves are to be released from their pledge, only the people themselves can do the releasing. We must trust the people or the people will not trust us. We shall have kept faith with the people, we shall accept the verdict of the people, and democracy, holding high its head, will drive nazism with its broken promises into the abyss of shame and defeat.

One more thought and I am through. During this session, as in the past, the Prime Minister will doubtless receive many suggestions as to how Canada can best contribute to the winning of the war. It will doubtless be suggested that we should form a national government. It will doubtless be pointed out that Mr. Roosevelt has taken into his cabinet two republicans, Mr. Stimson and Mr. Knox, and is considering taking Mr. Wendell Willkie into his cabinet. Why should Mr. Roosevelt not take these men into his cabinet? For months before Mr. Stimson and Mr. Knox went into the cabinet they were openly opposed to all those who were objecting to the national defence policy of the president, and we all remember that immediately after the last election in the United States Mr. Wendell Willkie forgot partisanship and gave his full support to the president. If there are those, within or without this house, belonging to opposing parties, who would serve, let them follow the example of Mr. Wendell Willkie and give our Prime Minister the support which he so justly deserves. I cannot do better than admonish critics of this government to follow the example set by that great statesman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who, while leader of the opposition during the last war, said:

> Let us here and now sink passions, prejudices, vain and idle recriminations. Let us, when criticism is needed, criticize without bitterness, only by appeals to reason, and above all, let us bend our energies towards making Canada an effective factor in the struggle.

Mr. Speaker, let us be proud of our great country, of our leaders and of our people; and let each one of us, irrespective of party, creed or race, resolve that until this war is won we will support our leaders, support our workers and support our fighters, and that as individuals we will give unstintingly of our best to make Canada's mighty war effort mightier yet.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the adjournment of the debate, may I offer my personal congratulations to the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) for the manner in which they have acquitted themselves this afternoon. I expected good speeches from both of them. Both belong to the legal profession; both have had a long training in public speaking; both are leaders of the bar in their own communities; both have had long experience in this parliament. The manner of their performance this afternoon was in keeping with the training which they have both had over a long period of years. I offer them very sincerely my personal congratulations.

I was greatly interested in that part of the speech of the hon. member for Hull which I was able to follow. My regret is that I could

not follow his whole speech, because I have not sufficient familiarity with the French tongue to catch more than phrases here and there. I was especially interested in his references to his visit to England, and the impressions he formed of the British people. I should like to suggest to him that he could perform no more useful mission as a public man than to repeat in his own province and elsewhere in Canada a statement of the impressions which he formed of the magnanimity of the British people. I commend that suggestion to him.

May I also say this to him, that the part of his speech in which he discarded his notes was the better part. I make the same suggestion to many hon. members of this house, and apply it also to myself: I pray that they throw away their manuscripts. If the hon. member for Hull had thrown away his notes his speech would have been a still better speech.

To the Prime Minister I especially commend that portion of these two speeches which was, to say the least, most flattering to himself. I say this in no spirit of satire at all. Surely those two speeches should commend themselves to the Prime Minister, and the reward should be, shall I say, a seat in the cabinet, or at least a judgeship, or at the very least a senatorship.

On motion of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 4.50 p.m.

Monday, January 26, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

PETROLEUM

REPEAL OF PETROLEUM AND NAPHTHA INSPECTION ACT

Hon. C. W. G. GIBSON (Minister of National Revenue) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 2, to repeal the Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act.

He said: The Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act was originally passed in 1877, at a time when gasoline was a by-product. The main purpose of the act was to safeguard users of coal oil from the adulteration of coal oil with gasoline. Owing to the greatly increased demand for and use of gasoline, the provisions of this act are no longer necessary and are a needless expense.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

NATIONAL FLAG

PROVISION FOR AUTHORIZATION AND APPROVAL

Mr. WILFRID LACROIX (Quebec-Montmorency) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 3, to provide for the flags of Canada.

Some. hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. LACROIX (Quebec-Montmorency): The purpose of this bill is to empower the governor in council to create a national flag for Canada, the only nation in the world which does not possess or fly a distinctive national flag. Our country is voluntarily doing its full share in this war, and doing so as an independent and sovereign nation; therefore the time has come for a flag that will express the sovereignty of the Canadian people and the Canadian parliament, just as the union jack represents the sovereignty of the United Kingdom—in other words, of the parliament at Westminster.

A Canadian flag will stand for national freedom, commonwealth fellowship and national unity, and be a rallying force in the defence of the nation. Furthermore, it is a natural consequence of the adoption of the statute of Westminster ten years ago, by which Canada was designated a sovereign nation.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SUGAR

RATIONING IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES —BEET SUGAR CAPACITY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Why has the sugar ration in Canada been set at three-quarters of a pound per person while in the United States it is fixed at one pound? Again, have any steps been taken or has any plan been made to increase Canada's beet sugar productive capacity by the building of factories? If not, why not?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The question is one which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) would wish to answer. It is also a question that might best stand on the order paper to be answered at a subsequent sitting of the house.

JAPANESE NATIONALS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT AS TO REMOVALS FROM PACIFIC COAST

On the orders of the day:

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): May I ask the Prime Minister a question? In view of the many statements appearing in

the press in British Columbia in connection with the removal of Japanese from the coast, I was wondering if, some day soon, the Prime Minister would make an official statement regarding the matter, as many of us, many of the people of British Columbia, are in doubt as to what is going to happen.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I will try to meet the wishes of the people of British Columbia by giving the fullest possible information with respect to the working out of the government's policy in relation to the Japanese in the province. What may be the best moment to make the statement I am unable to say offhand. Perhaps, meanwhile I shall have a chance to confer with my hon. friend. I will see that the statement is made in due course.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

KIRKLAND LAKE STRIKE—PROPOSALS FOR SETTLEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): On Friday the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) made inquiry with reference to the situation at Kirkland Lake. The acting minister said that he would have some information on the question on Monday. I wonder if he is prepared to give the house that information.

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): Yes. As suggested by the hon. member for Cape Breton South, I did make inquiries, and the Minister of Labour did furnish me with the information desired by the hon. member for Vancouver East. I am advised that the minister has received various communications from union officials which at first he regarded as accepting the proposals, but more recent advices indicate that certain qualifications of the procedure are requested. No formal reply has been received from the mine operators.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Friday, January 23, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we are met here again, at the beginning of the third session of this parliament, under conditions which stagger and appal our thoughts and imagination. Literally the whole world is at war, and we as Canadians are, by free choice and inclination, belligerents in the most momentous conflict in the world's history.

Since we parted in November last, the world has moved on from one tragic event to another in such quick succession as to well-nigh appal the most stout-hearted, and to cause all of us to search our minds and our hearts in an effort to comprehend the meaning and the implications of total war, which now has involved not only the western world but the eastern as well, and threatens to engulf us all.

On a quiet Sunday in December, while most of us were endeavouring to enjoy a day of rest after a week of anxiety over the situation in Russia and Libya, came the treacherous and shattering attack on Pearl Harbour. What an hour of crisis in the world's history! What an hour of crisis for the people of the United States, their government still dealing in good faith with the government of Japan, in an earnest effort to avoid the extension of hostilities to the far east! And what an hour of crisis for this Canada of ours! Living side by side with the United States, we are conscious that every step taken on the part of the axis powers brings the war that much nearer to this nation.

The government acted promptly in the formal matter of declaring war. It did not wait to call parliament. It pursued the correct constitutional practice and assumed the responsibility for its action. That is responsible government under our system and practice.

Did the government have a mandate to declare war on Japan? It did not. It did not require a mandate. Knowing the situation, it assumed the responsibility which, by every principle of responsible government, belongs to representative government, and went through the formality of declaring war on Japan, trusting that parliament and public opinion would sustain its action.

Now that the whole world is at war, now that Canada is at war with all the axis powers, now that we are endangered along with our neighbour on the west coast, this country must face the whole position realistically, and begin for the first time to wage total war with total effort. We have professed to be waging total war. We have accomplished much since September, 1939. But we have never even up to this minute really waged total war. The Prime Minister has on many occasions preached the doctrine of total war, but, he, more than any other man in Canada, has found himself cabin'd, cribb'd, confined, by his own commitments.

The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) not so many months ago, uttered a stirring challenge in these eloquent words:

I believe we shall win, not simply because we say so, but because Canada, along with the other democracies, will stop at nothing which

can be effectively done to ensure that the forces of evil shall be stamped out, that the menace of slavery shall be banished, and that free men and their families may enjoy the liberty which, until this struggle began, we in this dominion had somehow taken for granted. We cannot take it for granted any longer. The menace is against Canada, as well as against the rest of the world.

Noble words those, my countrymen! But the minister is fettered by the commitments of the ministry, which prevent the fulfilment of the aims so eloquently portrayed by him in the quotation I have just read. And because everyone in this house and every thinking citizen in this country knows that in this hour of grave national crisis we must, each for himself, determine that we shall have total war, come what may, I call upon parliament to deal, and deal at once, with that crisis.

What happened at Pearl Harbour may happen at Esquimalt. What happened 160 miles off Halifax may happen at Halifax. What happened 60 miles off Long island may happen at Sydney, Saint John or Quebec. To-day the fate of Canada, of Australia, of the British empire, of all the democracies and of democratic civilization is being determined in Malaya, in the Philippines, in Libya and in the snows of Russia, and shortly it may be in Britain itself, if invasion is attempted in the spring.

And what must our contribution be? I give the answer in the words of Mr. Churchill, spoken in this very chamber less than a month ago in the hearing of most of us:

> The enemy ranged against us . . . have asked for total war. Let us make sure they get it.

And speaking in Washington to the congress of that great democracy Mr. Churchill said:

> Provided that every effort is made, that nothing is kept back, that the whole man-power, brain-power, virility, valour and virtue of the English-speaking world, with all its galaxy of loyal friends, are associated in a common community or state, we can be reunited by the simple but supreme good.

Again, in this chamber, Mr. Churchill summed up in these eloquent words the duty of each and all of us:

> There is no room now for the dilettante, for the weakling, for the shirker or the sluggard; the mine, the factory, the dockyard, the salt sea waves, the fields to till, the home, the hospital, the chair of the scientist, the pulpit of the preacher—from the highest to the humblest, the tasks all are of equal honour. All have their part to play.

The enemy, Mr. Churchill said, have asked for total war: let us make sure they get it. And what is Canada doing to make sure they get it? The Prime Minister has stated, not once but a dozen times, that total war must be waged by total effort. But have we

total effort? Are we not shackled by dangerous and paralyzing restrictions, restrictions which are of the government's own making, restrictions which were imposed by the government without any mandate from the people, restrictions which would not be imposed to-day in the light of present-day conditions, restrictions which are impeding the fulfilment of the government's own pledges, made after we had concluded the first comfortable period of our war effort, which was to be a moderate contribution, a moderate participation?

During the past few months I have travelled from Halifax to Victoria, and have to the best of my ability sounded public opinion. I listened as intelligently and as intently as it was possible for me to do. During this period events have happened with tragic rapidity. There has been Hong Kong; there has been Pearl Harbour. These tragic events have brought about a tremendous change in public opinion in every part of Canada. Months ago, when the Prime Minister first preached total effort for total war, it was not interpreted by each of us as having a personal application; the total effort was to be for the other fellow, not for us as individuals. But I am convinced that to-day, without a full mobilization, a full marshalling, a full pooling of the complete resources, both of man-power and of materials, of this nation and of all the democracies, we cannot wage total war, and victory may elude us.

I desire to ask this house and the country two questions: Has Canada fully mobilized her material resources? Has Canada fully mobilized her man and woman power to wage total war? These are, I repeat, two vital questions which face parliament to-day. We as the elected representatives of the people must face these two questions man-fashion. It will not do to leave them to the government. If we do so we abdicate our functions as the elected representatives of the people, and we may as well declare that we are no longer a democracy. No. Parliament must face these two questions. We must no longer tolerate the making of government policy by order in council. I appeal to every hon. member in this house to join with me in urging that parliament, that this House of Commons, assume the responsibility of seeing that the supreme objective of waging total war by total effort is attained.

These two questions face us, and what is the answer? We all know in our hearts that the answer is in the negative. If we are honest with ourselves we can give no other answer. That being so, we must then determine what further steps must and shall be taken.

Now, what are the requisites of total war as applied to Canada at this critical juncture of our history? I have given considerable thought to this problem, and here is my blueprint of the principles underlying a total war effort for Canada to-day. It may not be complete, but such as it is I offer it to the house and to the country.

1. To muster, equip and train as many and as strong forces as possible to meet and defeat the enemy in whatever threatre of war he may be found.

2. To defend Canada and to prevent the invasion of Canada. And I point out, without arguing the question, that there is a distinction between the two.

3. To mobilize by any and every necessary means the wealth and material resources of the nation in order to provide the implements of war for our armed forces and to provide for the other services which are necessary for the carrying out of total war.

4. To mobilize and organize Canadian agriculture to produce and supply to our armed forces and to our allies as much food as it is possible to transport to them, as well as to supply our civilian population.

5. To mobilize and organize Canadian industry to produce as great quantities of armament and munitions as our facilities and available materials will permit.

6. To build and man transport ships and more ships to carry our products of food, munitions and armament to the scene of conflict.

7. Finally, and perhaps not so important, to mobilize and organize the material wealth and resources of the nation, and such of the personnel of its civilian population as are not immediately required for the armed forces and other war services, to ensure the continuance, under restricted conditions, of such peace-time activities and supplies as are reasonably necessary to maintain the physical and mental health of our own people.

Nothing less than these seven propositions will fulfil that theory and practice, if we are serious and mean what we say when we pledge ourselves to total war. In order to accomplish this the man and woman power and the total material resources of the nation, without any limitation, must be marshalled—pooled, if necessary—and put to work. It must be done on a selective basis if the best results are to flow from the effort. It may be that someone else will put these requisites in a different order. That does not matter.

In June, 1940, under great pressure, this government caused to be introduced and enacted the National Resources Mobilization Act. I accept full responsibility and the onus, if any there be, for the position which I took on that occasion when, in company with my colleague the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling), I went to the Prime Minister that June morning after the fall of France and demanded that action be taken. Under that authority, patterned after the British act of May, 1940, the government is empowered, with one limitation, to do anything and everything required for the "efficient prosecution of the war." Let me repeat those words—to do anything and everything for the "efficient prosecution of the war." That is the underlying principle of the National Resources Mobilization Act.

With the exception of one limitation the government has full and complete power and authority to mobilize and utilize every resource of the nation, except man-power, for use in a theatre of war "outside of Canada and the territorial waters thereof." Therefore, with respect to man-power, the power of mobilization is strictly confined to use within the territorial limitation of the nation.

At the time I accepted that limitation on the theory that half a loaf was better than no bread. And it was a distinct step forward, having regard to the theory of moderate participation which had been government policy up to that time. It imported the principle of compulsion; let there be no mistake about that. This government thus committed itself to the principle of compulsion. It was accepted without reserve by the great mass of the Canadian people.

Did the government have any direct mandate from the people of Canada to introduce and pass the mobilization act? Most assuredly it did not. But it did have a mandate from the people of Canada to efficiently prosecute the war, and it also had the responsibility of defending the nation. At that time, and right up to this present moment, where has been the defence of the nation? The defence of the nation lies in Britain, in the English channel, in the North sea, in Russia, in the near east, in the far east; wherever the enemy may be found. There, overseas, lies Canada's defence, her first line of defence. I think we are all agreed on that principle; at least I hope we are.

May I pause here, sir, to offer a constructive concrete suggestion arising out of the rapidly changing events in the far east. Those of us who have been listening to the news have heard with quickening hearts the urgent appeals of our kinsmen in Australia, the appeals to the United States and Britain for assistance and more assistance. I am sure each of us must have been impressed by the serious situation which has developed there. Every able-bodied man in Australia has been called to the

colours. I pray to God that it is not too late. I am afraid that it may be; for how can these men be trained in time for the defence of their shores, men who have never had previous training?

Now I come to my proposal. Why should not this dominion send a division of trained men to Australia? It would be more than a gesture of good will. It would be a demonstration of support and help and solidarity which would grip the imagination of the whole world, and especially of our own people, who have been thrilled by the exploits of the gallant Australians in Libya, in Greece, in Malaya and in every theatre of war. If we have not a division of trained men in Canada—and apparently we have not, I do not know; the minister can answer that—then send one of our trained divisions now in England, and replace it with men from Canada. Those men over there would welcome the opportunity for active service. I earnestly commend this proposal to my right hon. friend and his cabinet.

If we are to defeat the common enemy we must seek him out and defeat him in every theatre of war and wherever he may be found. That is one of the first principles of military strategy, the soundness of which has never been questioned. On no other hypothesis shall we win this war. To me that is fundamental. And if we are to seek out and defeat the enemy; if we are, in the words of the Minister of National Defence, to "stop at nothing which can be effectively done to ensure that the forces of evil shall be stamped out"; in a word, if we are to wage total war, how can we do so when we continue to impose a strangling restriction on our ability to mobilize our man-power for active service in any theatre of war?

That is the problem to which I implore the close attention of hon. gentlemen. Up to date the answer is the voluntary system, and it alone is relied upon. I do not intend to decry out of hand the voluntary system. The loyalty and patriotism of our young men was beyond question, although we were told in September, 1940, that some of them had to be taught their national obligations. Up to a certain point of time the voluntary system produced results. But because of the extended character of the struggle; because of its gigantic nature; because of all the factors which have developed in the course of more than two years of war; because man-power is so vital to any total war effort, I am quite sure that the time has now arrived when the voluntary system is no longer adequate to the necessities of the occasion.

By a reference to recruiting statistics I am quite certain that I can prove this premise.

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

Further, the figures on recruiting prove beyond a shadow of doubt that some communities are doing far more than others, that there is no equality of sacrifice as between the component parts of the nation. That the voluntary system has failed may be proved not only by statistics but also by the evidence of credible witnesses, those charged with the responsibility of making the system work.

The first witness I call is the Minister of National Defence himself. Speaking in this house on November 5 last as appears at page 4115 of *Hansard*, he admitted that the army was deficient by 13,000 in the number of recruits sought for the preceding four-months period. That surely is some evidence; to me it is very convincing evidence. Is it not striking and convincing evidence that in the mind of the minister at least the system is not yielding the results desired?

I pause here to say that, so far as my information goes, the defects in the voluntary system are not, up to date, reflected in the enlistments for the air and naval services. I am referring only to the active army. Our men, especially our younger men, are air-minded.

To cover the situation, the department has set up special recruiting committees. One such was established in New Brunswick—a province which, in my view, has done wonderfully well in voluntary recruiting—due, in part at least, to economic conditions; we have no war industry there. I now warn the government and the minister that the consensus among those most active in promoting voluntary enlistment in that area is that the limit has been reached. I offer that in the utmost good faith, believing it to be true. At a recruiting meeting held in my own city within the last few days, addressed by the premier of the province and by the president of the university, there was hardly a man of military age present, and that fact called for some pointed remarks from at least one of the speakers, himself a veteran of the last war.

In the city of Montreal, as long ago as August 27, W. B. Scott, K.C., co-chairman of the special recruiting committee of that city, stated:

> It is time for the public to know and realize that we are not getting the recruits we need for the active army.

On October 16, Brigadier Georges Vanier, the D.O.C. for military district No. 5, Quebec City, who is charged with responsibility for making the voluntary system in his district produce results, is reported to have stated:

> We are not getting enough men; we must have more.

And, according to a news report, he stated, on or about November 20, in a public address, that Canada's present system of recruiting for the armed forces "does not meet our needs".

On August 21, Brigadier Panet stated:

Acceptable recruits have not been coming forward in sufficient numbers to meet the quota.

On November 25, Brigadier Panet stated at a press conference that recruiting was lagging badly throughout most of the country. This is what he is reported to have said:

The recruiting campaign which drew many men into the armed forces during the summer has slowed down to a walk and there is now nothing like the required number of men signing up for service.

Surely the evidence which I have submitted is the best evidence anyone can have that the voluntary system has not provided and is not providing the number of men required.

But if anything more is desired, may I call the attention of the government and the house to a speech made by the premier of New Brunswick, at the city of Saint John, as recently as the 12th of January. Speaking at a meeting of the Engineering Institute of Canada, he went out of his way to make several declarations on this question of man-power; and there is no uncertainty about what he said. Among other things, he said this:

In the United Kingdom, in other portions of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and in the United States unrestricted military service is provided for. Can we afford, as a nation, to apply a lesser measure to our contribution?

At the close of his remarks, speaking on the duty of Canada and the question of national unity, he made use of this language, which I commend to the Prime Minister and the membership of the house:

If national unity means anything it should mean that we are united in our determination to stand wholeheartedly behind our Canadian boys who are committed to bear the brunt and heat of battle. They it is who are making, or will make, the real sacrifices in this war. And as Canadians they are entitled to adequate support in every theatre of war where they may be engaged. They are entitled to our assurance that, come what may, they will receive the fullest measure of assistance that it is within the power of this country to provide. Anything less than that is not enough.

On December 16, the legislature of Manitoba adopted a resolution calling for five specific things:

1. Immediate mobilization and utilization of all resources;

2. Employment of all men and women in the most useful way, according to age, training, physical capacity and ability;

3. Elimination of provisions restricting conscription of man-power for service in Canada only;

4. Equitable division of the burden of service; and

5. Dedication of total effort to the single purpose of destroying the enemy.

This is an important declaration by an important representative body. It follows in substance the stand of the Canadian Legion, as presented to this government in November last. Surely this is evidence of a change in public opinion.

And now I put this question to the government and to the house and to the country. Are men needed for the army? There may be some who will still say, as many believed at the outbreak of war, that a large armed force is unnecessary. Let me call some further witnesses and see what they have to say on this point.

The first witness I shall call is again the Minister of National Defence. Speaking over the radio on April 8, 1941, he said:

Man-power and morale are the paramount factors in this war. . . . If anyone has had an idea that men are not needed, I want to say very emphatically that that idea is wrong. Men are needed now, and will be needed in large numbers from month to month.

Again, speaking in this house on November 5, as reported at page 4114 of Hansard, the minister stated:

There has been an idea that the army will play some sort of minor role, that this is really a navy and air force war. Let me say to you that from the views which were given to me—

I assume he is referring to his recent visit to England—

—it was made quite clear that the role of the army in this war is and will be no minor one. . . . But there is no illusion that this war can be finished without an army to meet and, with the cooperation of ships and planes, eventually beat Hitler's land forces. . . . The army supported by the other services must eventually strike the decisive blow.

This is the considered opinion of the Minister of National Defence. Who is there to challenge it?

A further witness is the former adjutant general. Speaking over the radio on September 7, 1941, he said:

There is only one power on earth that will beat Hitler—man-power. Never let it be said that our men were of the best but our numbers too few.

Surely this is sufficient evidence from high authority to demonstrate the need for man-power and more man-power. And where is that man-power needed? Is it needed within Canada, or is it needed outside Canada? Where should the enemy be faced? Should

we wait until he bombs Halifax, until he scales the plains of Abraham, until Esquimalt has been converted into another Pearl Harbour? Or should we go forward to meet him in theatres of war outside our own domain? In other words, where does the defence of Canada lie?

Let us see what the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) has to say on this subject. Speaking, appropriately enough, at the Laurier Centennial at McGill university on November 20, 1941, the minister stated:

> The spirit of Canada could not survive in a world dominated by racial tyranny and given over to racial slavery. That is why every young Canadian, whether he watches the shores of Labrador, patrols the waters of the Pacific, guards the cliffs of Dover or the fortress of Hong Kong, or fights above the sands of Libya or the steppes of Russia, is defending Canada. He is not merely helping to keep the invader from our shores; he is helping, too, to preserve the kind of world—a free world—which is the only kind of world in which the Canada of Laurier or, indeed, any nation worth preserving, could survive.

Speaking, again, at the annual dinner of the Dominion commercial travellers' association in the city of Montreal, the minister is reported to have used the following words:

> The source of the most insidious, most destructive evil which the world has ever known is wherever the hordes of Hitler, the slaves of Mussolini, the murderers of Japan, are to be found. We can only exterminate, we can only destroy it at its source.

Perhaps the best witness one can call in proof of the point is Lieutenant-General Kenneth Stuart, present chief of the general staff, who stated on December 19, as reported in the press, as follows:

> One of the objectives of the enemy is to create confusion in Canada and bring about a diversion to home defence of troops that would otherwise be sent overseas. We must not forget that this war will be won outside Canada and we must send our main forces to the place where they will be needed most.

That is the testimony of a professional soldier charged with the responsibility of running this war under the government. But I go even higher than that; I go to the words of the Prime Minister himself. I quote from a speech which he delivered at the Lord Mayor's luncheon at the Mansion House in London on September 4 last. These are solemn words, and he made a solemn pledge when he said:

> I cannot make too clear that the policy of the Canadian government is to have our troops serve in those theatres where, viewing the war as a whole, it is believed their services will count most.

If, then, it is the clear policy of the Canadian government to have our troops serve in those theatres of war where their services will count most, why have we the restriction contained in the mobilization act? Why do we continue the subterfuge of two armies? Why do we not face the issue frankly, squarely and courageously, recognizing that the defence of Canada best lies beyond our shores and that our armed forces should be sent to meet the challenge?

Now, what are the reasons why we in Canada are circumscribed and unable to implement the pledge of the Prime Minister to meet total war with total effort? The reason in my view is political. It is political because the Prime Minister and his party attained office in 1921, and retained it for nine years, by capitalizing the situation which arose out of the last great conflict. The people of Canada in 1940 were made promises which, it has developed, cannot, in the light of present-day facts, be kept if we are to do our full duty.

The one most potent implement in war is man and woman power. Let no one argue otherwise. It can never be disregarded or eliminated. It is the one vital factor which must be present, no matter how highly developed our war mechanism may be. If you grant me that, and I think you all will, then I come to examine the principle of compulsion. I hope to do so objectively; I hope to do so judicially; I hope to do so without rancour.

In a democratic, self-governing country, the theory of compulsion is, in ordinary peacetimes, anathema to all our instincts. Most of us are individualists. But in war time the situation is entirely reversed. Then, not the individual rights and material comforts of the individual citizen are predominant, but the safety of the state is paramount.

Let me put this question to hon. members of this house and to the people of Canada: Is it consistent with the principles of democracy that the state, when its life is in peril, when its very existence is at stake, should have the right to demand the services and help of all its nationals? All history cries out in the affirmative. In the words of Lloyd George in 1916, on the second reading of the military service bill in England when they were putting compulsion into effect:

> There never yet has been a country faced with a great military peril that has ever saved itself without resort to compulsion. Never! It is true of autocracy; it is even more true of democracy. Every healthy body has demanded the help of its members to defend itself. Thank God Britain is not a paralytic that cannot command the services of every citizen. . . . Every great democracy which has been challenged, which has had its liberties menaced, has defended itself by resort to compulsion, from

Greece downwards. Washington won independence for America by compulsory measures; they defended it in 1812 by compulsory measures. Lincoln was not merely a great democrat, but his career was in itself the greatest triumph that democracy has ever achieved in the sphere of government. He proclaimed the principle of, "government of the people, by the people, for the people," and he kept it alive by conscription. In the French revolution the French people defended their newly-obtained liberties against every effort of the monarchists by compulsion and by conscriptionary levies.

A further important statement is that which is attributed to Abraham Lincoln in an article in the Vancouver *Province* which just came to my attention this morning. When the Union army of volunteers was in desperate condition, President Lincoln is reported to have said:

Voluntarism is the unprincipled dodge of cowardly politicians. It has ground up the choicest seed of the nation. It has consumed the young, the generous, the patriotic, the intelligent, and the brave, and it has wasted the best moral, social, and political elements of the republic, and left the cowards, the shirkers, and the money makers to stay at home and procreate their kind.

But if we are to survive this gigantic struggle, the disciplinary and plenary powers which the government must exercise should not be limited to man-power. Man-power is of great importance. Equally important is the complete mobilization of the wealth and material resources of the nation. Some people argue that this should come first. That is a matter of opinion. My own view is that the one is complementary to the other.

Let me say at once that since July, 1940, the government has taken steps to mobilize the industry of the country and turn it in the direction of production suited to our war needs. Industry and labour alike have cooperated, and to-day I feel sure that we need not hang our heads at the record of production of Canadian labour and industry. Since July, 1940, we have been in the organization stage. To-day we have reached the production stage. Whatever part the government has played in that endeavour, certainly at the outset much was left undone. My own view is that the major credit is due to industry and labour. But it is a gigantic task to convert the peace-time activity of a peaceful agricultural and semi-industrial country like Canada into a war-time economy. It takes time and effort and leadership and good will on the part of all to accomplish this; and, while much has been accomplished, much remains to be done. To that end I advocate the principle of complete mobilization of industry, so that this country shall supply to our armed forces the necessary equipment so essential in a total war.

In the speech from the throne, the advisers of his excellency have asked his excellency to say that this parliament will be invited as an integral part of Canada's direct war effort, to approve a contribution to Britain of vast quantities of munitions, foodstuffs and supplies. We are now part of a gigantic struggle. Production of munitions and foodstuffs is an important element in this effort. Our contribution in mechanical transport has been important and impressive. Our munitions industry had to start from scratch, and, while we had a slow take-off, we have now, owing to the cooperation of industry and labour, backed by the financial resources of the nation as contributed to the government, advanced to a stage of production which is creditable to those who have been entrusted with this important task.

To make a contribution to Britain of our production of food, munitions and supplies is in line and in keeping with the policies which we have advocated since the outbreak of the war. I am glad to see that the government has now recognized the desirability of such a policy. We shall support it.

Our agricultural population has always stood ready to do its part. All it needed was to be told what to do, to be given leadership. More than a year ago I pleaded with the government to give, out of our abundance, a substantial gift of wheat. It will be recalled that this proposal did not even meet with the courtesy of any comment or reply. But I would impress upon the ministry that agriculture in Canada was, for the first two years of the war, producing in many instances below the cost of production; and so much of that situation as still obtains should be remedied.

You cannot expect agriculture to produce for less than the cost of production. For ten years they have been doing it, and agriculture is bankrupt—in my part of the country at all events. And what has happened since the war began? Owing to the fact that our agriculturists are hardly getting a new dollar for an old, men are leaving the farms for the munitions factories. There is no doubt about that. Wherever there is war industry, men, particularly young men, are leaving the farms for the munitions factories. The growth of the munitions industry has drained from many of our agricultural communities a large amount of agricultural man-power which it is absolutely essential should be maintained on the farms if we are to have not only a prosperous and contented agricultural population, but, over and above all that, the quantity and quality of production which is essential to victory.

I propose now, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the government's proposals as revealed in the speech from the throne.

The speech from the throne states that we will be advised of the —

. . . means the government proposes to adopt, to effect as complete as possible a mobilization of the material resources and man-power of the country in direct furtherance of a total national effort.

Presumably this is in fulfilment of the statement made by the Minister of National Defence for Air on December 13, when he said:

These powers—

That is, those under the National Resources Mobilization Act—

—we propose to use in this emergency which confronts us, and in an endeavour to see to it that every man and woman in this country carries on the work which will be of the greatest possible benefit to the state as a whole.

If these announcements are carried out in their literal interpretation, the results will be welcomed by the country. Unfortunately there is too much ground for believing that there is in these statements little more than a pious expression of opinion. The statements do not differ from statements which were made by the Minister of National Defence for Air at the time the mobilization act was passed. Speaking in the House of Commons on June 18, 1940, as reported at page 862 of Hansard, with reference to the mobilization act, the Minister of National Defence for Air said:

It should be said that anyone who is physically fit and is below the age of 45 years may, and in fact will, have not only the opportunity but the obligation to join the militia service of Canada.

In a national broadcast on July 10, 1940, in which he was explaining the principles of the mobilization act, the Minister of National Defence for Air spoke as follows:

Every able-bodied man must be and will be trained in the use of arms to defend his home, his loved ones, his liberty, his life.

From these latter two statements of policy came the farce of the thirty-day training plan. Instead of every able-bodied man being trained in the use of arms, twenty-one, twenty-two, twenty-three and twenty-four-year-olds were given elementary training and then posted to the reserve units where many of them probably have been lost sight of. Only 15,000 have been retained in the army, to be used in accordance with the limitation of the mobilization act, solely for the defence of Canada, within Canada.

The only criterion we have of the government's sincerity with regard to its proposals for the future is the means by which it has carried out similar pledges in the past. Must we assume that the policy enunciated in the speech from the throne will be fulfilled only to the same extent as the policy announced by the Minister of National Defence for Air in connection with the mobilization act?

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

I turn now to the question of a plebiscite. Let me say at the outset that the loyal people of Canada will and do feel deeply humiliated by the declaration that we are to hold a plebiscite to ascertain if the people will relieve the ministry and, in particular, the Prime Minister, from the position in which he finds himself and which he took prior to the last election, by his own volition and initiative.

We are, in the words of Premier Bracken, to have "this crowning indignity". We are to be asked to take money needed for the war and spend it in order to relieve our elected representatives from a responsibility that goes with responsible government.

I wish to mention in passing the words of Premier Hepburn of Ontario. They speak for themselves:

One of the most dastardly, contemptible and cowardly things ever perpetrated on a dignified and respected country by any government.

Those are not my words. They are the words of a man who helped put the right hon. gentleman opposite into power.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER: When?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In 1935; and let me add that a good many hon. members also are here by reason of that fact.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am sorry; it is true just the same. My own view is that, "at this time of gravest crisis in the world's history"—to use the words of the speech from the throne—the course suggested by the government is the greatest exhibition of lack of national leadership this country has ever witnessed. It is a masterstroke of bad publicity for Canada among the allied nations. As one newspaper has said, "never were so many people humiliated by so few."

It is a deliberate attempt to evade responsibility and save the face of the ministry, and particularly the face of the Prime Minister. It is the negation of responsible government as we know it and practise it.

We cannot win this war by a plebiscite. Germany does not carry on war by plebiscites. The first function of government is to secure the safety of the state, and the government that fails in that duty commits the cardinal, the unpardonable sin. Let this government rise to the level of its duty; let it not be afraid to lead. A plebiscite is not a policy; it is the negation, it is the avoidance of a policy. It is merely an unworthy expedient to avoid facing a vital issue. Its purpose is to avoid rather than to face responsibility; it is

to avoid rather than to enforce the performance of a duty. It is not a declaration of faith; it is a declaration of impotence.

What is the position? The government knows better than anyone else the position in relation to man-power. It knows better than we can know that the maximum must be done and done quickly. This government knows the responsibility which we assumed when we declared for total war, when we sent men overseas, when we undertook to stand by them with adequate reserves and reinforcements. Now we propose to abandon these undertakings to the shadow of a plebiscite.

This government, by this lack of action, has failed these men and it knows it has failed them. History will hold it responsible if disaster comes. In effect, the government admits that we are not a united nation, and we are not a united nation because of commitments made by this government previous to March, 1940, based on the situation then existing, which has little no relation to the known facts of to-day—facts better known to the government than to any of us. And yet it will not move along the only honourable path open to it.

What are these commitments? Briefly, that we shall not have compulsory military service for overseas, in those theatres of war where the conflict is to be fought and won, or, God forbid, lost. The Prime Minister doubtless will argue that because he, unasked, made that commitment, he has a mandate from the people not to use compulsion for overseas service. That will, I assume, be his position. In fact, I believe he has so stated.

Let us examine this question of mandate. Did the Prime Minister, elected to power in 1935, have a mandate to declare war in 1939? Most assuredly he did not. Did the Prime Minister have a mandate from the people of Canada to adopt the principle of compulsion for military service in Canada in June 1940? Most assuredly he did not. Did the ministry have a mandate from the people to put a ceiling on prices at a time when the price level of agricultural products, for instance, was low and uneven? Most assuredly it did not. Did the ministry have a mandate—and I want hon. gentlemen to direct their attention to this, because we are going to meet with it sooner or later—to take from the war appropriation bill millions of dollars, perhaps hundreds of millions, voted by this parliament, taxed from the people of the country of all classes, poor and rich alike, to prosecute the war with the utmost vigour, and switch those hundreds of millions of dollars to the purposes of the new Commodity Prices Stabilization corporation to help maintain the price ceiling on imports from abroad? Assuredly it did not.

I deny that the ministry had a mandate from the people against compulsory military service for overseas. It was not an issue. The Prime Minister himself made a pledge, which was accepted. He now seeks to be relieved from that pledge, but that is a very different thing from a mandate. If I interpret aright the vote of the last election, it was a mandate to prosecute the war—interpreted as moderate in some quarters, middle-of-the-road in others, but undoubtedly a mandate to prosecute the war.

We entered upon a leisurely prosecution of the war for the first nine months. There is no doubt about that. Then came the tragedy of Dunkirk, and things began to happen. The government under pressure stepped up the tempo of the war. We had the mobilization act, a long step forward, but with a limitation self-imposed by the ministry. It contained the very principle of compulsion which the Prime Minister has proclaimed against. The country accepted it without protest. It was the first real sign of leadership the country had been given. Now we have reached a time properly described in the speech from the throne as "the gravest crisis in the world's history", a time which demands the utmost effort, and instead of the situation being met man-fashion we are offered a plebiscite.

Could anything be more fantastic? Could anything be more futile? Let us examine this question of mandate a little further.

In 1916 Woodrow Wilson was elected President of the United States on a cry that he kept the nation out of war. I remember it, and so do you. Yet within twelve months he sent a strong, stirring message to congress, and the United States declared war on Germany. That is history. Did he have a mandate? Most assuredly he did not. He had a mandate to keep the nation out of war.

In 1938 Mr. Chamberlain, valiantly striving to preserve the peace of Europe, brought down in the British House of Commons, long before war came, but in anticipation of war, a measure designed to conscript the man-power of Britain. Previously he had vigorously opposed the idea. Did he have a mandate for that decision? Most assuredly he did not. His action in doing so was an outstanding illustration, however, of the application of the principles of responsible representative government.

In 1914 Sir Robert Borden gave an assurance to the British government that if war came his government was prepared to stand by Britain, and he immediately called parliament together to sanction his undertaking. He

staked the life and existence of his ministry on that undertaking. That was responsible government under the British system, and under the British practice which we follow here; that is the principle which this government should invoke.

Did Mr. Roosevelt have a mandate to put into operation the compulsory principle when he started his training plan before the United States went into war? Most assuredly he did not.

This government should have a policy either for or against complete national service in an all-out effort for total war, and by that policy it should stand. That is the leadership which the nation is looking for. And what are we getting? A plebiscite. A plebiscite on what? Not on a concrete proposal for total war—nothing of the sort; a plebiscite seeking a release from an obligation arising out of a commitment made by the Prime Minister, unasked for, and long anterior to the happening of the tragic events with which this nation and the world are at present confronted.

Again, could anything be more fantastic, more humiliating to a self-respecting people? The Prime Minister asks to be relieved from a pledge, made voluntarily, without any mandate. And yet his government has placed on the statute books, in the Dominion Elections Act, a prohibition against any candidate for parliament signing any pledge to his constituents. Why is that prohibition there? Because the government of the day, the government and parliament, decided as a matter of principle that such a thing was improper and should not be done. Yet we have this spectacle before us to-day.

I have a proposal to make to the Prime Minister. If the Prime Minister feels bound by his self-imposed vow; if his conscience bothers him and he now wishes to be relieved of that vow; if he desires, in the light of reason and world events, to change his position and pursue a total war effort by all means open to him as the leader of the state; if he wishes, in the light of the situation now confronting him and this nation and this war-torn world, to give a new lead to the nation, there is a well-defined and well-established constitutional position and practice open to him. That is to say, he may come to this house and say to us that, "notwithstanding my self-imposed vow, for which I had no mandate, I now find that, in the circumstances which confront this nation as a result of this gravest moment of world crisis, another course must be followed, another and more vigorous policy must be pursued." It is his duty and his privilege to come to parliament in this way, to state his new policy, and to ask for the endorsation of the people's elected representatives. That is the British way of responsible government. That is the Canadian system of responsible government. That is the course the Prime Minister should pursue under the pressure of to-day's situation.

Is there anyone so bold as to say that is not the right and proper course? Who is there in this house who will say that that course should not be pursued or cannot be pursued? I venture to say that he would get the consent of the house almost unanimously.

Why have the people delegated to us, their elected representatives, the power to speak for them, and what are our obligations? Surely we have some obligations in the premises. Let those who seek to answer peruse once more the classic declaration of Edmund Burke to the electors of Bristol in 1774. The words he uttered then are in principle as true to-day as they were 170 years ago. In order to refresh the memory of all of us I propose to read a major portion of that address:

> Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfactions, to theirs; and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own. But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion.
>
> My worthy colleague says his will ought to be subservient to yours. If that be all, the thing is innocent. If government were a matter of will upon any side, yours, without question, ought to be superior. But government and legislation are matters of reason and judgment, and not of inclination; and, what sort of reason is that in which the determination precedes the discussion, in which one set of men deliberate and another decide; and where those who form the conclusion are perhaps three hundred miles distant from those who hear the arguments?
>
> To deliver an opinion is the right of all men; that of constituents is a weighty and respectable opinion, which a representative ought always to rejoice to hear, and which he ought always most seriously to consider. But authoritative instructions; mandates issued, which the member is bound blindly and implicitly to obey, to vote and to argue for, though contrary to the clearest conviction of his judgment and conscience, these are things utterly unknown to the laws of this land and which arise from a fundamental mistake of the whole order and tenor of our constitution.
>
> Parliament is not a congress of ambassadors from different and hostile interests; which interests each must maintain, as an agent and

advocate against other agents and advocates; but parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest that of the whole; where not local purposes, not local prejudices ought to guide, but the general good resulting from the general reason of the whole. You choose a member indeed; but when you have chosen him he is not a member of Bristol, but he is a member of parliament.

I beseech the Prime Minister to alter his purpose while yet it is not too late, to adopt a manly course, to give to the country that measure of national leadership for which it is so earnestly looking and seeking at this time of gravest crisis in the world's history. This house will support him. The nation will support him.

What is to be the form of this plebiscite? What question or questions will it carry? Will it merely ask approval of a release of the government from a past commitment restricting the method of raising men for military service, as indicated in the speech from the throne, or what? Who is to vote? When will the vote be taken? What machinery will be used? Will our soldiers, sailors and airmen, at home and overseas, have the opportunity of voting—that privilege which at present is denied them in by-elections? What list will be used? Will there be a new registration? There should be.

What is the estimated cost of the plebiscite? When will it be held? Time is an all-important factor under conditions as they are to-day. And I ask this question seriously: What effect will the announcement of this plebiscite have upon the pending war loan? I venture to think, disastrous. Has the government considered the risk to our war effort involved by the delay in having to hold this plebiscite before any major change in policy can be effected? Will it take two months, or three months, or how long? The enemy may have won a decisive victory before then, while we indulge in a plebiscite. What a tragedy! Mr. Roosevelt, that master of epigram, recently said: "Lost ground can always be regained; lost time never." All these and kindred questions the Prime Minister should make plain when he speaks, and I invite him to do so.

What will the government do if the plebiscite is indecisive, if the majority is small? That is a possibility. Will the government then claim that it has a mandate to pursue its present policies? Or will it say that, that expedient having failed, we shall try another course? Meantime, while Nero fiddles, Rome burns! The whole thing is fantastic.

If the plebiscite carries, what then? We have no commitment from the ministry as to what they will do. The speech from the throne indicates that the administration will then take the position that, subject only to its responsibility to parliament—and I am glad to learn that the administration admits that it has responsibility to parliament—the administration shall, irrespective of any previous commitment, possess complete freedom to act in accordance with its judgment of the needs of the situation as they may arise. They do not ask for a mandate under this plebiscite; they ask for a blank cheque. We do not know what will be done. What is to be done under that blank cheque? Will it be, as it has been in the past, a matter of political expediency and not of vital reality? I fear so. That, Mr. Speaker, is altogether too narrow an undertaking. Rather, it is no undertaking at all. It will not satisfy the public demand. It will not constitute a policy which will meet the gravest crisis in the world's history. It is no policy at all. It is merely a palliative.

And what if this plebiscite is rejected by the people of Canada? What then is to be the position? Will the government resign? Or will the Prime Minister endeavour to carry on, cabin'd, cribb'd, confined, by a self-imposed vow which renders it impossible to carry out his other pledge to the people of Canada that he will meet total war with total effort, that he will prosecute total war with total effort? What of the pledge of the Minister of National Defence that Canada, along with the other democracies, will stop at nothing—these are the minister's words; do they mean anything? —which can be effectively done to ensure that the forces of evil shall be stamped out? Will the minister resign if this plebiscite does not carry? Knowing him as I do, I believe he will.

But what of the Prime Minister? Surely if this proposal fails, his position will be impossible. Will he resign, or will he, no matter what the cost in lack of total war, continue to see his duty, as he stated in Winnipeg on July 10 last, "to seek above all else to preserve national unity?" That was his supreme objective then. That was why he did not propose to go to Britain; he must remain here to preserve national unity! Well, he went to Britain, and I think he did right. Did we have national unity in Canada? Have we had it all along? The answer comes back in a thousand tongues, that we have not national unity. We have something quite different; we only have unity of the Liberal party, and we shall never have national unity under a party government in war time. The two are incompatible.

Does the Prime Minister think that this subterfuge of a plebiscite to relieve his personal position and save his face makes for national

unity? I leave to public opinion the answer to that query. I know what the answer is among the loyal people of this country, who feel nothing but humiliation and disgust at this lack of leadership. For, mark you well, you cannot have national unity without leadership, leadership of a type which only a Churchill and a Roosevelt are giving to the democracies. National unity will come to Canada only when we have in this country a truly national government representative of all the people and backed by all the people. Then you will have national unity; then you will achieve a total war effort. You will never achieve it under a party government.

I am done, Mr. Speaker. I and those who think as I do cannot accept the government's proposal of a plebiscite as a solution of the problems confronting this nation at a time of gravest crisis in the world's history. It is not even a palliative. It is a subterfuge to help the Prime Minister out of an impossible position, created by himself, and with the sole desire to perpetuate his political power.

The people have asked this government, this parliament, for real leadership. In this proposal they have been given nothing. They have asked for bread; they have been given a stone. Frankly, it leaves the country with a feeling of frustration. Verily, never were so many people humiliated by so few!

I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling), the following amendment to the motion now before the house:

That the following words be added to the address:

"This house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers, instead of giving to the country the leadership so essential at a time properly described in the speech from the throne as the greatest crisis in the world's history, on the contrary, have sought to evade their responsibility by holding a plebiscite, which, in the view of this house, is the negation of responsible government.

And this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers have not seen fit to recommend to parliament without delay additional measures designed to

(a) completely mobilize the wealth and material resources and, on a selective basis, the full man and woman power of the nation, to the end that the nation may wage total war in any theatre of war;

(b) supply the imperative needs of agriculture, industry, and the fighting forces of the nation; and

(c) prepare for the post-war period."

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) rose on Friday last to begin his remarks in this debate on the address, he very properly and very courteously extended his congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the address. I should like to join with him in those congratulations. I noticed that my hon. friend was somewhat careful to stress the manner of the presentation and said very little about the substance of what was said. I should like to extend congratulations not only upon the excellence of the delivery of both hon. gentlemen but also upon the excellence of the remarks themselves. The hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) have made a most important contribution to this debate, which, I think I am right in assuming, may prove to be one of the most important in the history of this parliament.

It was of interest and of significance, I am sure, to all present that both hon. members, one coming from the province of Quebec and the other from the province of Ontario, held identical views in regard to Canada's war effort and the policies which should govern in the prosecution of that effort. Both were equally concerned that all the policies of the government should seek first and foremost to preserve national unity in this country. It was fortunate, as well as a matter of interest, that both hon. members had had the privilege last year of visiting Great Britain and of giving to this house during the course of their remarks their impressions of the effects of war on the British isles, and particularly their impressions of the courage and endurance of the brave people of Britain.

It is not without interest that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), who is the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party, and the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore), the leader of the Social Credit party, who I understand are to follow me in this debate, were at the same time afforded the same opportunity. And perhaps I may be pardoned if I remind the house that the leader of the opposition and myself each had an opportunity last year of visiting Great Britain, of conferring there with members of the administration and others, and of seeing conditions first hand for ourselves. It is, I believe, a matter of satisfaction and pleasure to all six of us that we had the opportunity of making the trip to Britain by air, and returning to Canada in the same way. I hope the experience gained as a result of those visits will, as I believe they will, be

reflected increasingly in the views we may express in the house in respect of the prosecution of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to congratulate my hon. friend the leader of the opposition on the presentation of his address to the house. I thought his remarks presented the position of his party very fairly. I am sure I shall not be expected to agree with some of the things he has said, but with much of what he said I can agree with him most cordially. I believe it would have been better for this country if some of the controversy which has taken place with such acrimony and violence in a section of the press of the country had awaited the more reasonable and reasoned form of discussion, which I hope will be followed in this parliament.

With regard to what my hon. friend has said concerning the necessity of a total war effort, I believe it will be found that he and I hold similar views. What I take exception to in his remarks, and with respect to the controversy which has taken place outside the house, is that most of what has been said has related exclusively to only one aspect of the war effort. That aspect, I believe I shall be able to show, is a much narrower aspect than is generally assumed. All that Canada has done in addition has been more or less completely ignored.

I must say that I am surprised to find that, after having spent so large a portion of his time telling myself and the house that the government should have brought forward a policy of conscription for service in the military forces overseas, my hon. friend has not had a single word to say about conscription for military service overseas in the amendment he has just moved to the address in reply to the speech from the throne—no, Mr. Speaker, not a single word. My hon. friend is now so concerned about it that he is looking at his amendment to see if that is really so—to see if there is anything in the amendment which will give him sufficient ground to stand on in any reply to what I have just said.

The amendment is in the nature of a want of confidence motion in this administration. I had not expected my hon. friend to extend congratulations to the administration on all of its effort, but I had expected him to stand up for the policy which he led us at all events to assume is the policy of his party at the present time.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is right there, in paragraph (a). Read it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend will have every chance to read his own policy later. But on a matter of so great importance as the one we are now discussing I do not think one should be obliged to search with the aid of a microscope to discover the purport of an amendment which has been moved at a time like the present.

As I have already said, there has been a little too much controversy in the press concerning this matter, prior to the discussion in parliament itself. That controversy has gone very far to confuse in the public mind the real significance of many matters which should receive more careful consideration and discussion in this House of Commons. I believe, as I proceed with what I intend to say this afternoon, it will be seen that with respect to some of the matters on which there is an impression throughout the country that the government and the opposition differ, that not only are we closer together than the public has been led to assume, but that on many matters our views with respect to policies which should prevail are very, very much the same. I believe that is true with respect to the views of all parties in the house. I am speaking now of views concerning an effort for total war, with respect to selective service, and with respect to compulsion where it is necessary, in the application of selective service, and in connection with other points to which I shall make reference later.

But what I do wish at once emphatically to suggest is that hon. members seek to get the true picture of Canada's war effort as a whole, and not be misled into misjudging that effort or misjudging the ministry by singling out one particular aspect and seeking by controversy to obscure the larger and really magnificent effort of the country as a whole.

I cannot agree with my hon. friend, either, in his views with respect to what in the truest sense of the word constitutes responsible representative government. To my mind responsible representative government is related very closely to the will of the people, and particularly to the will of the people as expressed at the time of a general election. If I were to accept what my hon. friend has said, and what some of his followers have applauded him in saying, then I should be obliged to ignore altogether the will of the people as expressed at the last general election. And not only that; but after its having been given also the interpretation which my hon. friend time and again has placed upon it, namely that this government was returned to power with the vast majority it has, in virtue of the fact that it was so often stated that if this government were returned to power, conscription for overseas would not be applied. Notwithstanding that he has said such was a

fact, he now wishes me to turn round and ignore the expressed will of the people altogether.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there may to-day be reasons—and I hope this afternoon to make it clear that there are strong reasons—why the people of this country should be told that any commitments made in the past which in any way restrict the government in the exercise of its best judgment with respect to all phases of the war should be removed. That being the case, the people should be told that the government is of opinion that not only the government but all hon. members should be released from any past obligations which may bind their freedom of discussion in any particular at the present time.

When my hon. friend goes on to ask me what I am going to do with respect to any expression of view which may be made by the people in connection with any reference which will be made to them, may I say to him that in seeking to get relief from past commitments I am not going to begin by making new and fresh commitments. In seeking freedom on the part of the ministry I am not going to start in by seeking to tie my own hands. I know the kind of lecture I might have to expect from my hon. friend were I to do anything of the kind.

In the political controversy which, unfortunately, has become so acute of late; which is obscuring the magnitude and balanced nature of Canada's war effort, and which, moreover, threatens to impair its efficiency, attempts are being made to confuse in the public mind three things which should be kept separate and distinct. With respect to each of these the government's position is being misrepresented:

The first relates to total effort to meet total war.

The second relates to national selective service as a means to this end.

The third relates to the application of compulsion without restriction of any kind; in other words, to conscription for service in the armed forces overseas.

As respects total effort to meet total war, that is and has been right along the policy of the present administration. As regards national selective service as a method of achieving a total effort, that, too, is and has been the policy of the government. As respects the use of compulsion in applying the principle of national selective service, that, also, is a part of government policy. In the case of compulsion only one definite limitation has been recognized, and that is the limitation of the use of compulsion as a method of raising men for military service overseas.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Whether or not the government, all circumstances considered, has gone as far in achieving a total effort as it might have gone or should have gone, is a fair subject for debate. Whether the government, all circumstances considered, has applied the principle of national selective service as rapidly and as extensively as it should have been applied, is also a fair subject for debate. Whether, with the single limitation referred to, the government has, all circumstances considered, made sufficient use of compulsion in applying the selective principle is also a fair subject for debate. So far, however, as policy itself is concerned, whether it relates to total effort, to national selective service, or to the use of compulsion, with the single limitation mentioned, there exists no difference, so far as I am aware, between the government and its opponents. I propose to substantiate these statements by reference to the government's record.

What, then, is the difference with respect to policy between those who to-day support the administration, and those who, by every means in their power, are seeking to create opposition to the government in its war effort?

Freed from the emotions and passions aroused by the storm of controversy, it will be seen that the only difference that does exist is a difference with respect to the application of compulsion in raising men for military service overseas.

An examination of the facts will show that the difference of which the government's opponents are seeking to make a national issue is a much smaller difference than even the existing limitation on the use of compulsion would seem to imply.

The limitation, as I have stated, relates solely to the application of conscription to the raising of military forces for service overseas. These forces, as hon. members are well aware, are, in the present war, not confined to one single service, as in the last war was almost entirely the case. They include the men enlisted in the Canadian navy and in the Canadian air force, as well as those enlisted in the Canadian active army. I shall later on have something to say about the total numbers already enlisted for services anywhere, in the three branches of the armed forces. So far as the navy and the air force are concerned, it is well known that the numbers who have volunteered have considerably exceeded the number it has been possible to accept for immediate service. Moreover, it is worth noting that in Britain

as in Canada compulsion is not used as a method of raising fighting men for the navy and the air force.

The issue, therefore, between the government and its opponents narrows down solely to the question of the application of compulsion in raising men for the army. The issue is narrower even than that, since compulsion is already being employed, to raise men for service in the army in Canada. It should be added that the issue thus narrowed to conscription for overseas service in the army relates only to a possible future contingency, since up to the present the active army has secured the necessary recruits on a voluntary basis.

Notwithstanding all that has been done and is being done by the armed forces, and in war production of all kinds, and in finance, the government's opponents are seeking to make of conscription for the single purpose mentioned, a symbol of Canada's total war effort.

As I have said already, the policy of the government is, and from the outset has been, the achievement of a total national effort for total war. I propose, now, to explain exactly what I understand by the total effort of a nation. It involves two fundamentals.

The first of these is the devotion to the prosecution of the war of all the available energies and resources of the nation in excess of those required to maintain the health and efficiency of the people.

The second—and it is of equal importance—is a proper balance in the use of these energies and resources for the manifold needs of war. A total effort, for example, would not be achieved if so many men were enlisted in the armed forces, at sea, on land, and in the air, that there were not enough men left on the farms to feed them. In the same way, a total effort would not be achieved if so many men were enlisted that not enough were left in the factories to provide them with the necessary ships, planes, tanks, guns and ammunition. Moreover, modern war has shown that an army, and equally a navy, is dependent upon adequate air support. A total effort, therefore, cannot be made unless the right balance is achieved between all branches of the armed forces. These examples could be multiplied indefinitely. Indeed, the most difficult task in total war is the decision of the correct balance between different aspects of the war effort.

Moreover, the appropriate balance of one country would seldom, if ever, be appropriate for another. Germany, for example, is able to raise an exceptionally large army because she can draw on the enslaved populations for war production and food. Britain, likewise, is in a position proportionately to increase her armed forces to a greater degree than Canada, because Canada requires men to help feed and arm Britain, as well as to feed and arm our own country.

The foundation of the total effort of any country is a correct decision as to the minimum requirements of the civilian population. Once that is determined, production and consumption except for war, must be steadily and progressively cut down to the minimum. Waste must be eliminated; the manufacture of all luxuries and many comforts must cease. The surplus of man-power and resources thus secured must be used to make war.

In using this surplus, it is vital that it be developed in the right way. It is not enough to create a navy, an army, and an air force; the sailors, soldiers and airmen must be fed, clothed and armed; they must be moved to the area of combat, and communications must be maintained; reinforcements of men and supplies must be kept flowing. All this requires the most careful planning and detailed organization.

In reviewing the organization of a total effort for Canada, I shall begin by outlining the nature of Canada's war-time responsibilities; in other words, the various aspects of our total effort.

At the very outset of the war, the Canadian government considered with the British government the broad lines of development and of our war effort. We tried to envisage all the possibilities of a conflict, which we realized might last for years, and which might spread throughout the world. From time to time, since 1939, there have been shifts of emphasis, but anyone who cares to refer to the broadcast I made on October 31, 1939, will find in it the outlines of every aspect of our effort as it has developed since the outbreak of war.

For convenience, Canada's war effort may be divided into six main aspects. All of them are vital to a total effort. The achievement of a total effort depends upon keeping them in proper balance.

A necessary foundation of our whole effort is the maintenance of the security of our own Canadian territory and territories like Newfoundland and Labrador immediately adjacent to our shores. I know some of our citizens were impatient with the government for insisting, from the outbreak of war, upon our responsibilities for the coastal and territorial defence of Canada. We did not find similar impatience in London, where potential dangers, from all quarters of the world, were clearly perceived. Recent events in the Pacific, and the sinking of ships off Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, should serve to dispel any lingering belief that

Canada is immune from attack. What we must guard against now is the opposite tendency. Happily, Canadian territory is geographically more secure than the territory of most of the belligerents. We all know, too, that the best defence of our territory is the defeat of the enemy before he arrives. But we must not neglect necessary defences. We must be prepared to meet sudden raids from sea or air in certain strategic areas. The most elementary rule of warfare is the maintenance of the security of the base of operations. This aspect of our effort necessarily includes Canada's share of our joint responsibility with the United States for the defence of North America.

The Canadian navy has a share in this primary responsibility for our territorial defence. Our navy has also a great and growing responsibility in the North Atlantic. Its part in the battle of the Atlantic is already important. We are all aware of the great strain which has been thrown on the British navy, and, more recently, on the United States navy, by the existence of warfare in every ocean. We know, too, that the possibility of finally crushing Hitler depends upon keeping open the sea lanes from North America to Britain and Europe. From the outset, the government has placed no limit on the expansion of Canada's navy. We have manned ships as fast as the navy has been able to acquire them. Not only is the greatest possible Canadian naval strength needed in the North Atlantic, but so are merchant ships to carry men and supplies to Britain. Canada is providing and will continue to provide and to man both, to the very limit of our capacity.

All this is very different from Canada's task at sea in the last war. Then, we relied, in the early stages of the war, not upon ourselves, but on the British navy for the protection of our coasts on the Atlantic, and the Japanese navy for our protection on the Pacific, and, in the later stages of the war, upon ships of the United States navy.

The army shares with the navy the responsibility for our territorial defence. It shares also with the navy in the defence of Newfoundland and other islands in the Atlantic. Its main task, however, has been its contribution to the defence of Britain. Every Canadian will remember with pride what Mr. Churchill has said on more than one occasion, of the sense of security which the presence of our troops has given to the government and people of Britain.

It is natural for Canadians, remembering the last war, to judge our war effort in terms of the size of our army. In the last war, Canada's war effort was essentially and almost entirely an army effort. This, however, is a very different kind of war, and its successful prosecution demands very different methods. This war has been well described as a war of machines, of science and of psychology. I think those are Mr. Churchill's own words.

While prepared to send overseas as large an army as Canada can support, without failing in other directions, the government is even more anxious to see that every man, every unit, and the army as a whole, will have the greatest possible striking power. More important to-day than the size of an army is its striking power.

The Royal Canadian Air Force, like the navy and the army, has its part in our territorial defence and the defence of Newfoundland. Its responsibilities on the Pacific coast have been increased by the outbreak of war with Japan. But its main task is the administration of the British commonwealth air training plan. The battle of Britain in 1940 completely justified the emphasis which, from the opening days of the war, Britain and Canada alike placed upon the achievement of air superiority.

Every campaign in the present war has equally shown that, without adequate strength in the air, an offensive action and even prolonged resistance on land or at sea is foredoomed to failure.

The safety of Britain, and Britain's capacity to strike back at the enemy, depend alike upon the air strength concentrated in Britain. That strength is being developed largely on Canadian soil, both in the British commonwealth air training plan, and in the schools of the Royal Air Force. The air training plan is the greatest and the most vital of all Canada's military commitments in this war. No effort has been spared and no effort will be spared to assure its continuing success.

Canada's concentration on air training has inevitably reduced the number of Canadian squadrons in operations overseas. Unlike the army which serves overseas as a unit, a large and growing proportion of the trained personnel of the Canadian air force serves with the Royal Air Force. The claims of national pride have been subordinated to a total effort.

In nothing could the difference between the present war and the last, and the nature and extent of Canada's effort be more marked than in the country's contribution to aerial warfare.

A vital aspect of Canada's war effort is our contribution to the food supply of Great Britain. This contribution has grown steadily in importance. Britain cannot feed herself, and her own great and growing armed forces. Still less can she feed the ever-increasing

numbers of men we are sending from Canada to add to her armed strength. In the present war, unlike the last, her sources of food on the continent of Europe have all been closed off by enemy occupation. Canada is the nearest source of food left open. Without our food, the people of Britain might starve. Without our food, the Canadian army in Britain would be a handicap instead of a help. In a literal sense the very lives of the British people and our own armed forces overseas depend upon the exertions of Canadian farmers and fishermen. In prosecuting the war, theirs is no secondary role. As time goes on, the demands upon Canada for supplies of food for the allied forces and, later, for the peoples of the now subjugated countries are certain to increase.

I have mentioned food production separately because I doubt whether the country is fully aware of the vital importance of food regarded as a munition of war. Otherwise, it might well have been included as a phase of the productive aspect of our total effort. It is not in food alone that Canada's war production extends far beyond our own needs. Canada's production of the machines and munitions of war is already developed on a scale which would have been considered impossible two years ago. The other day, the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) stated that Canadian munitions were being used against the axis on every battlefront and on every ocean. That, surely, is cause for pride, though not for self-satisfaction. It is well to remember that every battle which has been lost in this war has been lost because of the lack of machines; of planes, or tanks, or guns, or ships. The cry we continue to hear from every front is not so much for numbers of men as it is for tanks, for planes and for ships.

In making the machines of war, Canada's productive task has only begun when our own armed forces have been supplied. Except for planes, Canada has been a main source of British supplies, outside Britain herself. Only recently has the United States begun to overtake us. And now the United States has many other urgent demands to meet. Canadian weapons and munitions must help fill the gap made larger than ever by Japan's entry into the war.

Our mines and forests, our foundries and factories, are also helping to supply the other nations of the British commonwealth, Russia, the forces of the other allies, and even the United States. In September of 1939, the government assured parliament that every effort would be made to avoid the useless sacrifice of men because of the lack of modern weapons. Every campaign has gone to prove how highly mechanized and how heavily armoured an army must become before it can hold its own in present day combat.

While it cannot be said too often that total war demands total effort, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that total effort means using men and resources, where each will count for most, not where their employment will fit in with individual wishes or the wishes of those who have failed to see the needs of our effort as a whole. Too many of those who are talking of total war are measuring Canada's effort, as I have said, in terms of one aspect only.

Both in the short run and in the long run, Canada would weaken the cause of the United Nations by failure to give adequate protection to vulnerable areas in our own territory; or by failure to contribute adequately to the naval protection of the Atlantic passage; or by failure to maintain a formidable striking force in Britain or in whatever theatre of war Canadian troops may serve; or by failure to keep up the air training on which the air strength of the British commonwealth so largely depends; or by failure to provide adequate food supplies and to produce weapons and munitions in adequate volume. All are essential to Canada's war effort. What is equally essential is that our effort shall be in the truest sense a balanced effort. We must not fail in any of these directions. It is only by keeping all these demands upon our man-power and resources in proper balance that our utmost effort will be achieved. It might be added that all this depends upon the satisfactory financing of the entire effort.

In the light of what I have just set forth, I desire briefly to review Canada's record of achievement in the present war. It will be seen that we have developed our effort in all its aspects simultaneously. Equally, we have sought to maintain the proper balance between production and the armed forces and, among the armed forces themselves, between the needs of the navy, the army and the air force. The foundations of Canada's war effort along these lines were laid in the closing months of 1939. At that time, I stressed the importance of preparing for a long and terrible struggle in which staying power, the power to hold out to the end, might well be decisive.

Knowing the importance that, in the minds of many, would be given to an expeditionary force, I pointed out the vital importance as well of an adequate naval and air contribution by Canada. I said that our effort would be concerned in equal measure with the fighting forces at sea, on land, and in the air; that our economic contribution might well prove to be the most important of all; that,

in addition to being the granary of the British commonwealth, Canada might also become its arsenal. From the very outset, we took a broad view of Canada's tasks in this war and organized our national effort on all fronts. I turn now to what has been achieved.

First, as respects the navy: At the outbreak of war, there were some 20 ships and less than 2,000 men in the Royal Canadian Navy.

At the beginning of 1940 the navy had grown to 80 ships, and over 5,000 men; at the beginning of 1941 the numbers had risen to 175 ships, and 14,800 men. At the beginning of this year the navy comprised over 350 ships and 27,600 men.

From the beginning of the war, the navy has assumed a steadily growing share of convoy work in the North Atlantic. Canadian ships of war have shared in the protection of Britain from the threat of invasion. Sailors of the Canadian navy have served and are serving in all the seven seas, either in Canadian or in British ships. Canada's pride in the navy is reflected in the long waiting list of young men seeking to join the service.

As respects the army: At the outbreak of war the permanent active militia, as Canada's regular army was then called, included about 4,500 men. By the end of 1939, the Canadian Active Service Force, to give the army its name at that date, had increased to 64,000 men. The first Canadian division had just arrived in Britain.

At the close of 1940, the active army included almost 170,000 men. A Canadian corps of two divisions had already been formed in Britain. Canadian troops were also on active service in Newfoundland, the British West Indies and Iceland.

At the close of 1941, there were more than 260,000 men in the Canadian active army, enlisted for service in any part of the world. About half this number were on active service outside Canada. A third infantry division, an armoured division, an army tank brigade, forestry troops, and other specialized units, and thousands of reinforcements were in Britain, in addition to the original corps of two divisions.

Canadian troops continued to serve in Newfoundland and the West Indies. Two Canadian regiments recently added a new chapter of valour in the heroic defence of Hong Kong.

In addition to the active army, several thousand young men had, during 1941, been called up for military training and service in Canada under the National Resources Mobilization Act. Of this number, a considerable proportion had enlisted in the active army, the navy, and the air force. Some thousands more had been assigned to duties in Canada, thus relieving enlisted men for service elsewhere.

Mention should also be made of the reserve army, in which at the end of 1941, some 140,000 men were enrolled.

As respects the air force: At the outbreak of war the active strength of the Royal Canadian Air Force was some 4,000, all ranks. By the close of 1939, the strength had risen to over 8,000; by the close of 1940, it had reached 43,000; by the close of 1941, it exceeded 100,000 men.

In addition to the home defence duties which began with the outbreak of war, the air force was engaged, in the closing months of 1939, in planning and arranging the organizational details of the gigantic British commonwealth air training plan.

The year 1940 was a year of construction development for the plan. But, in spite of the strain which was then placed upon the force, Canada's three squadrons which were sent overseas did valiant service in the Battle of Britain.

In 1941, responsibilities of the home war establishment for patrol work in the Atlantic area and Newfoundland steadily increased. The outbreak of war with Japan added seriously to its tasks on the Pacific coast.

The duty of providing a trained air crew for the active theatres of war through the air training plan continued throughout 1941 to be the heaviest responsibility of Canada's air force. The magnitude of the air training plan was still further enlarged during the year, and the output of trained men accelerated.

The growing part of the Royal Canadian Air Force in air operations over Britain and the continent of Europe has found sombre reflection in the casualty lists. At the close of the year, from the original three, Canada's own force in the field was expanded to twenty-eight squadrons which had already been formed or were in the final stages of formation in Britain. Thousands more of the Canadian pilots and air crew, trained in the commonwealth air training plan, were serving as individuals with the Royal Air Force, not only in Britain but also in the western desert and other theatres of war.

Over and above any commitment under the commonwealth training plan, the call for highly qualified and scientifically trained personnel for very special duties, such as radio location, has been responded to by the dispatch overseas of thousands to fill this immediate and important need. Canada's share in the war in the air has reached a stage where Canadian airmen have become a major factor in the armed strength of the British commonwealth.

At the outbreak of war, the production of war materials in Canada was on an exceedingly small scale and was confined to a very limited range of equipment.

Throughout the closing months of 1939 and the early months of 1940 Canada passed through the stage of organization. Plants were established; tools and raw materials and labour mobilized; and the ground work of production laid. But apart from a few lines, such as personal equipment for our fighting men, there was little to show for our manufacturing efforts, except a steadily rising total of orders placed, and contracts let. We did, however, achieve a vast expansion of the output of essential raw materials both for our own and for British production.

Throughout 1940, there was constant criticism of the inadequacy of Canada's war production. No allowance was made for the length of time required to organize the production of complicated machines, most of which had never been made in Canada before. Today, however, the self-same critics are obliged to admit that Canada's production has reached immense proportions. They now are giving exaggerated and disproportionate emphasis to another single aspect of our war effort. Indeed, not a few of the government's critics have become altogether too indifferent to war production. They do not seem to realize, as the government realizes, that, if Canadian production is to be pushed to the limit, many of the most difficult problems are still ahead of us.

It should be remembered that Canada has undertaken, in addition to equipping her own divisions, to help equip British divisions, Australian divisions, New Zealand divisions, yes, and Russian divisions. If there is to be a united allied effort, Canadian weapons and munitions, as well as those of other countries, must be sent where they will be of the greatest service to the common cause.

In two years of war, Canada has experienced an industrial revolution. Our country is now producing almost every type of machine and equipment called for in our munitions programme. In some directions, this production has reached staggering proportions. In others it is mounting steadily.

Let me cite a few details: Our present shipbuilding programme involves a total expenditure of over $500,000,000. We have built and are building large numbers of corvettes, minesweepers, patrol boats and motor torpedo boats. We are engaged in a merchant ship building programme of considerable proportions, so great in fact as nearly to equal Britain's own programme. Canada is also engaged upon the construction of destroyers.

We are making guns of all kinds: anti-aircraft guns, field guns, naval guns, tank and anti-tank guns, several types of machine guns, anti-tank rifles, sub-machine guns, rifles, trench mortars, bomb throwers, and smoke projectors.

In the production of aircraft, Canada's experience has not differed from that of other countries. We have had our full share of problems, delays and disappointments. At one time or another, since the war began, fifteen types of aircraft have been produced in Canada. Production is now going to be concentrated on seven modern types: an elementary trainer, two advanced trainers, two bombing and gunnery trainers, a flying boat, a twin-engine fighter and a long-range bomber. In addition to the production of new planes, some thirty plants distributed across Canada from Halifax to Vancouver are engaged in the overhaul and repair of planes. In order to meet the growing need, these facilities will require to be doubled during the next twelve months.

One of the most spectacular achievements has been the production of army vehicles. Nearly 200,000 of all types have already been delivered. Army vehicles made in Canada are in use on every battlefield of this world-wide war. A large number of tanks and universal carriers have also been delivered. Canadian tanks have already been in action in Russia.

I shall not attempt to catalogue the whole range of Canadian war production, but special mention should be made of the hundreds of thousands of bombs; the millions of shells; the hundreds of millions of rounds of small arms ammunition; and the hundreds of millions of pounds of explosives and chemicals already made in Canada. Not only are we making these munitions for our own forces and for Britain, but vast quantities have been made available to the United States.

The United States, as well as Britain, look to Canada for a part of their supply of essential base metals. Canadian production of aluminum, copper, nickel, lead and zinc has grown steadily in volume. Our steel production—the foundation of our industrial war effort—is still expanding. Since the invasion of Norway cut off all European supply, Canadian timber has been vital to Britain's war effort.

A most striking fact about our war production is that the value of the supplies we have provided for Britain since the war began has been at least as great as the cost of raising, equipping and maintaining Canada's own armed forces. In the first two years of war their value exceeded $1,000,000,000. Britain's need for these supplies has been so urgent

that, in some cases, our own forces have gone short in order to fill more pressing requirements for the armed forces of Britain.

In the whole field of war production Canada has become a major factor. Among the United Nations, we share with the United States alone the capacity to produce substantially more than the requirements of our own armed forces. It is true that, in order to supply Russia, Britain has valiantly suffered a shortage in recent months. It is to North America that Britain looks to meet the deficiency, and in North America to Canada no less than to the United States.

The record would not be complete without a reference to foodstuffs for Britain. In times of war, wheat, bacon and milk products are munitions of war quite as much as planes or tanks or guns or ships or shells or explosives or chemicals.

Canada has sent to Britain vast quantities of wheat and flour; bacon and other pork products; cheese and eggs and honey. The range and quantity of Canadian food required by Britain is steadily increasing as the hazards of war make access to other sources of supply difficult or impossible.

For Britain, for many of the other nations fighting for freedom, Canada is an arsenal, a shipyard and a storehouse of food, as well as a full partner on the fighting front.

One measure of Canada's approach toward a total war effort will be found in the record of our financial achievements. The financial burden the war effort has imposed upon the Canadian people is enormous. The cost of raising, equipping and maintaining our own armed forces and of building up the country's defences has reached almost incredible heights.

From the outbreak of war in September, 1939, until March 31, 1940, during the planning and organizational phase, these direct war expenditures amounted to some $118,000,000.

In the fiscal year April 1, 1940, to March 31, 1941, these expenditures totalled approximately $752,000,000.

The estimate of direct war expenditures for the present fiscal year (April 1, 1941—March 31, 1942) was $1,450,000,000. Of this huge sum $851,000,000 had been expended by the end of 1941.

Our direct war expenditure from the beginning of the war until December 31, 1941, had accordingly reached a total of $1,721,000,000. The magnitude of our direct war effort may be illustrated by a comparison of this figure with the cost of Canada's effort in the last war. War expenditures, from August, 1914, to March 31, 1920, including demobilization after the war, totalled $1,670,000,000. In other words, by the end of 1941, a period of two years and four months, our direct war expenditures in this present war already exceeded the whole expenditure on the last war over a period of six years less four months. Even more striking is the fact that Canada's direct war expenditures in the present fiscal year will not fall far short of the total cost to Canada of the last war.

In addition to providing for our direct war expenditure, the government also undertook to provide whatever Canadian dollars were necessary to pay the Canadian producers of war supplies for Britain. For this purpose, it has been necessary, since the outbreak of war, for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) to provide an additional $1,219,000,000.

Every effort has been made to distribute the huge financial burden as fairly as possible. By December 31, 1941, some $2,000,000,000 had, since the outbreak of war, been raised from taxes alone. To achieve this what amounts practically to a peaceful revolution in our national tax structure has been necessary. The government has relied mainly on direct and steeply progressive taxes on the incomes of individuals; and drastic taxation of corporation income and excess profits. Succession duties have been included among the permanent features of the national taxing system. Agreements are being negotiated with the provinces to facilitate the orderly and equitable mobilization of the financial resources of the country to the utmost limit of its capacity.

Taxation, war savings, and war loans, while necessary to provide the vast sums required to meet huge war expenditures, also serve a further essential war-time objective. They act as an automatic check on civilian consumption and thus free material resources and man-power for war purposes.

The curtailment of civilian consumption, as I have already pointed out, is absolutely vital to a total war effort. Financial measures such as increased taxation and greater saving contribute to this end; but all the curtailment required cannot be accomplished by financial means. I shall say a word later about other methods used by the government to make additional resources available for the war effort.

One method the government has not been willing to use as a means of reducing consumption. That is the easy method of allowing prices to rise unchecked. That would, of course, have reduced consumption drastically. But it is a method which would be unfair and unjust in the present, and perilous for the future. That is why, in October last, the government decided to halt the rise when prices began to rise rapidly. It was in order

to spread the burdens of war as fairly as possible that the government undertook to control all prices, and, where necessary, to take other steps to control civilian consumption in fair and equitable ways.

In undertaking to control the cost of living, the government was following, on the economic side, the policy, adopted at the outset of the war, of a progressive and orderly advance towards the goal of a full-out effort. It was realized that the stage would ultimately be reached when the problem of a general rise in prices would have to be faced. We felt it was advisable to postpone action to control all prices until such action was really necessary. Complete control of prices, as all are coming to understand, involves many complications, and restrictions. Moreover, like all compulsory measures, it requires a large staff to administer the machinery of enforcement. It was clearly undesirable to take men's services from other tasks one moment before they were needed. Price control became necessary, late in 1941, if our people were to be spared the fears, the sense of insecurity, the suffering and the profiteering which the inflation of prices inevitably produces. The successful operation of price control and the ancillary measures to control wages and salaries will help in the winning of the war. After the war, they will aid our country on the road to recovery and reconstruction.

From this brief review, it will be seen that Canada's war programme has been a balanced programme. The record of achievement is a balanced record. What is more, this effort has been achieved by methods which have kept our country united. Indeed, without unity of purpose and effort as a nation, it could never have been achieved.

Let me come now to the programme for the present year, which has been prepared in reference to the fiscal year ending March 31, 1943.

The navy already has 350 ships and over 27,000 men in the service. The programme of expansion for 1942 can be expressed very simply. Our shipbuilding capacity is being used to build ships for Britain and for Canada. Apart from the naval craft built for Britain, the navy will take all the ships Canada can build, and it will enlist and train the men required to man the ships. No limitation has been placed upon the number either of ships or of men, save in so far as the number of available ships necessarily sets a limit to the numbers of men who can be enlisted for training.

The Canadian active army now consists of the corps of three infantry divisions, divisional and corps troops, an armoured division, and an army tank brigade in Britain. In addition, there are, in Britain, in reinforcement units, thousands of reinforcements. A fourth infantry division, and the brigade groups of a sixth division, have been mobilized in Canada. In addition, there are the troops on home defence duties on our coasts and in vulnerable areas, and troops in training as reinforcements.

During 1942, that is this year, up to March 31 next, it is proposed to create overseas a Canadian army of two army corps: one army corps to comprise three infantry divisions and two army tank brigades; the other to consist of two armoured divisions. In addition, all necessary ancillary units to serve these two corps will be provided. To reach this objective it will be necessary: first, to convert the present fourth division into an armoured division and train and equip it for this special role and dispatch it overseas in due course; second, to raise, equip, train and dispatch overseas another army tank brigade for use with the infantry divisions of the Canadian corps; third, to raise, equip, train and dispatch additional ancillary troops for both the infantry corps and the new armoured corps; fourth, to maintain and reinforce these two corps; fifth, to provide headquarters staff organizations for an army and an armoured corps.

It will, however, be recognized that the ultimate disposition of all troops necessarily depends upon circumstances which determine the course of the war.

As for the territorial defence of Canada, special dispositions have been made where that seemed to be required, as a result of the outbreak of war with Japan. The garrisons of coast defences have been strengthened. Reserves have been allotted to deal with any likely emergency.

A special reorganization and regrouping of reserve formations is under way right across Canada, and an emergency organization of active service personnel in training centres or elsewhere is being established.

Whether it will be necessary to mobilize another division for Canadian defence when the fourth armoured division is dispatched overseas will, of course, depend on developments in the intervening period.

The situation in Canada in respect to anti-aircraft defence is improving each month as more equipment becomes available. New units are being mobilized in accordance with anticipated deliveries of equipment.

The 1942 army programme will create a thoroughly modern, well balanced and hard-hitting Canadian overseas army. This army will be complete and self-contained. It will be capable of operating in any theatre, and can be effectively maintained in respect to both man-power and equipment.

It should be noted that the outstanding feature of the army programme for 1942 is the proposed increase in the armoured strength of the army overseas. This development is in line with military experience in the present war and with the policy of the British army.

I have already pointed out that the Royal Canadian Air Force at the end of the year mustered well over 100,000 men, without counting civilians. The air training plan is in full operation; the responsibilities and duties for coastal defence particularly on the Pacific have greatly increased; and the complete establishment of twenty-eight Canadian operational squadrons overseas is to be fully achieved, not only with a full complement of flying personnel, but also with all necessary ground and maintenance crews.

Until such time as arrangements may have been concluded with the government of the United Kingdom to increase the number of Royal Canadian Air Force squadrons beyond twenty-eight, the Canadian pilots and other air crew sent overseas, in excess of the numbers needed to maintain these Canadian squadrons at full strength, will serve with the Royal Air Force where thousands of their comrades are already in active service.

Some increase in the home war establishment must be anticipated. Of this, for obvious reasons, I cannot be expected to give details.

Thousands of young Canadians are now engaged in active operations, and the augmentation of these numbers by air training will continue to be the heaviest work of the Royal Canadian Air Force in Canada. In the long run, as the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) has repeatedly warned, no more acute man-power problem faces the government than that of assuring the supply of recruits for training as air crew, not in the immediate future but some months or a year hence. There is no question of reluctance to serve; on the contrary, young men are eager for the opportunity; but the numbers available with the necessary high qualifications are limited by our small population. Looking ahead, this question looms larger than the needs of the navy or the army, or of industry.

To the solution of this problem by means of the development of air cadets, pre-entry education, physical training and conditioning and other means, the government is directing intensive study.

The effectiveness of Canada's own armed forces depends upon the effort put forth on the farms, in the mines, in the forests, in the workshops and factories, on the railways and the merchant ships of Canada. Canadian production since the war began has been essential as well to the effort of Britain and, indeed, of every nation fighting the axis powers. The dependence on Canadian productive efforts of what are now called the United Nations will be greater than ever in 1942; that is, this year.

I have already pointed out that the government has set no limits to war production. The only limits are those imposed by the growing scarcity of management, tools, raw materials, and skilled labour. Although the Minister of Munitions and Supply told parliament in November that practically all available establishments in Canada were already engaged in war production, he recently stated that he was "raising the sights again". More production can be achieved only by the conversion of existing establishments from unessential production, and by the transfer of labour. There is no slack left in our industrial economy. But I shall be surprised indeed if we do not find, when the year ends, that Canadian industry and Canadian labour have once again amazed us all.

The productive increases already achieved by Canadian agriculture have been little short of miraculous. Cheese production has increased by one-fifth, concentrated milk output by two-thirds, hog production has doubled, and egg production will soon be at an all-time high. For this third year of the war dairy farmers, hog producers and poultry men have been asked to produce the maximum quantities possible.

Canada has contracts with Great Britain for bacon, hams and other pork products amounting to 618,000,000 pounds. The forthcoming agreement for cheese is expected to be for at least 125,000,000 pounds. Then, 675,000 cases of evaporated milk will probably, again this year, be required by Britain. The present contract for eggs is for 30,000,000 dozen. Further large contracts for summer and fall delivery are anticipated. Canada has also undertaken to supply Britain with 4,500,000 pounds of honey; 510,000 barrels of fresh apples; 425,000 cases of processed apples; 300,000 cases of canned tomatoes; and other fruit and vegetable products in substantial quantities. Altogether, the value of the exports of the above commodities will be at least $180,000,000. Exports of the same products in the year before the war were valued at about $50,000,000.

If we do all in our power to help them meet their labour problems, we can, I know, count on Canadian farmers to do the rest. But the goal which is set for them for 1942 will demand their utmost effort.

In his speech at the Mansion House during my visit to Britain, and again in this chamber on December 31, the Prime Minister of Great

Britain made particular reference to the financial assistance which Canada had extended to Britain in the present war.

The extent to which Canada has been furnishing supplies to Britain is, I am sure, not fully realized by our own people. Canada has supplied weapons and munitions to Britain for the use of Britain's armed forces, and for other allied forces for which Britain has undertaken to provide equipment. Canada has also supplied to Britain raw materials required in British war production, and foodstuffs required to feed the armed forces and the people of Britain. In other words, Canada is, at one and the same time, a full partner in the war in her own right, and one of the principal arsenals, granaries and shipyards for Britain, other parts of the commonwealth and other of the allied nations. The total volume of Canadian shipments to Britain since the commencement of the war compares favourably with the volume which, thus far, has moved from the United States.

Canadian financial assistance to Britain has been necessary in connection with the provision of these vast quantities of war supplies. The financial assistance which Canada has extended to Britain is, of course, not what is ordinarily understood by the use of that term. Canada does not ship money across the Atlantic; the money itself never, in fact, leaves Canada. Canadian financial assistance has been extended to Britain in the following manner. The British government has purchased war supplies from Canadian producers. Britain, however, has not had enough Canadian dollars with which to make payment for the greater part of these supplies. Payment has accordingly been made in pounds sterling. This English money has remained on deposit in London, because it cannot, of course, be used in Canada. Most of the Canadian money required to pay the producers of guns and copper and bacon and other commodities has been supplied by the Canadian government. This Canadian money has had to be raised from the Canadian people in taxes, war savings or war loans.

Canada's financial aid to Britain has, in other words, amounted to this: the Minister of Finance has raised money in taxes and loans from the Canadian people to pay Canadian producers for ships and tanks and guns and planes and other munitions shipped overseas for the British army, navy, and air force; also, to pay Canadian producers for aluminum, copper, steel, timber and other raw materials needed for British war industry; and, as well, to pay Canadian farmers and fishermen for the food Canada has sent overseas to feed the British people.

The British government has been able to acquire some Canadian money as a result of ordinary business transactions, such as the sale of British exports to Canada, and receipts from interest and dividends on Canadian securities. This money has been used to pay for a part of the British purchases. But British exports to Canada are necessarily on a diminishing scale.

In the early months of the war, the British government had a considerable accumulation of gold and was able to use some gold to pay for war supplies received from Canada. The British government acquired some additional Canadian money by an arrangement to have Canada buy back from Britain certain Canadian government and government guaranteed securities held in Britain. For the most part, however, payment for Canadian supplies has, of necessity, been made in pounds sterling.

For the past year, Britain has urgently required from Canada vast quantities of munitions and supplies. These Canada has created the capacity to produce. The Canadian producers have been paid in Canadian money by the Canadian government. Canada, in turn, has been credited on the books of Britain with English money, which, however, cannot be spent in Canada. In this way, Canada's surplus store of English money has been assuming larger and larger proportions. What, in effect, all this really means, is that Britain has a steadily growing war debt to Canada.

We all remember the international problems and difficulties caused, after the last war, by the existence of huge war debts owed by one government to another. We recall how reluctant nations were to accept payment from other nations in the only way in which a huge external debt can really be settled, that is by removing tariffs and accepting payment in goods. We know that huge external debts created suspicion and bitterness between nations. The government is anxious to avoid the creation of similar difficulties in the post-war relations between Britain and Canada. We believe that difficulties would be avoided and, at the same time, the real extent of Canada's war-time contribution would be more fully comprehended, if Canada's financial arrangements with the United Kingdom, both for the past and for the reasonably foreseeable future, were duly clarified. We believe that the time has come for this clarification.

The government, accordingly, is proposing to the British government that the financial arrangements between Canada and Britain should be placed on a new footing. The offer

which is being made is one which we have reason to believe will be warmly welcomed by the British government.

In so far as past transactions are concerned, the proposal is to convert the major portion of the pounds sterling which have accumulated to Canada's credit in London into a loan to the United Kingdom of seven hundred million dollars, in Canadian money. It is proposed that, during the war, the loan will be reduced by the proceeds of any sales made to persons outside the United Kingdom, of Canadian dollar securities now held by residents of the United Kingdom, and also by the proceeds of the redemption or repayment of any Canadian securities held in the United Kingdom. The new loan would not bear interest during the war. As soon as practicable after the war, it is proposed, however, that the governments of the two countries should arrange an appropriate rate of interest to apply from that time forward, and make appropriate provisions for retiring the loan.

Since the beginning of the war, approximately $400,000,000 in Canadian money has been made available to Britain through the purchase by our government of Canadian government securities held in Britain. In other words, our government, during the war, has been paying off a part of the dominion's external debt. Under the arrangement now proposed, the Canadian government will purchase outright the remaining dominion government and Canadian National Railway securities owned by residents of Britain, estimated in amount at some $295,000,000. This means that the Canadian government will, before it becomes due, pay off its own remaining debt in Britain. The British government will pay the present owners of these securities in pounds sterling. The Canadian government, in turn, will pay the British government for the securities in Canadian dollars.

For the future, in addition to the financial provision for raising and maintaining Canada's own armed forces, the government will, as a part of Canada's direct contribution to the defeat of the axis, ask parliament to make provision for meeting Britain's shortage of Canadian dollars by supplying, free of charge and without obligation, to Britain, munitions of war, raw materials, and foodstuffs up to an amount of one billion dollars. Such provision would mean that thereafter Canada's direct war effort would include, in addition to her armed forces, an outright contribution of war supplies on a vast scale.

The proposals I have outlined will, it is anticipated, suffice to meet the requirements of the United Kingdom for Canadian war supplies until early in 1943.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

In announcing this offer, I wish to draw particular attention to the fact that the financial burden of war now being borne by the Canadian people will not be increased by the proposed financial arrangements with the United Kingdom. Canada has already undertaken to supply the Canadian money required by Britain to pay for Canadian war supplies. Whether this money is provided in the form of a loan to Britain, or of a direct contribution to the defeat of Hitler, will not change the number of dollars which the Canadian people are already committed to raise for the prosecution of the war.

The advantages of the proposed financial plan are that it will avoid the growth to huge and unmanageable proportions of a war debt which might breed serious misunderstandings and bitterness in the future; that it will definitely relieve Britain of any financial anxiety which might arise in connection with its Canadian sources of supply; and, finally, that it will bring our working arrangements into accord with the realities of the war situation.

The adoption of the new plan will mean that Canada, at this time of intensified crisis, is giving unmistakable evidence of the determination of our people to put forth their utmost effort in the preservation of our own liberties and in the common cause of freedom.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, before I resume my remarks at the place at which I left off just before recess, I might say a word in reference to the request which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition made, that the government should consider the advisability of sending a division from Canada to Australia. As my hon. friend is aware, whatever assistance it may be possible for any one country of the United Nations to give to any other country of the United Nations, or any one part of the empire to give to any other part, must necessarily be a matter of consideration with all the countries and parts of the commonwealth concerned. The government is anxious, as the government of every other part of the British commonwealth would be, and as the United States and other of the United Nations would be, I am sure, to cooperate in every possible way in affording such assistance as can be effectively given to our friends and brothers in Australia. But what form that assistance will take, what it may be best to

do, can only be determined after there has been an opportunity of complete and careful conference with all the parts concerned. My hon. friend will have noticed that the particular request which our friends in Australia are making, is at the present time, for planes and tanks; and I am not without grounds for believing that they may be receiving some assistance of the kind from Canada at present, and that we shall be able to add considerable assistance to them in those particulars, and possibly in other ways, as time goes on.

I had been outlining, Mr. Speaker, our programme for the coming year. In that outline I showed, I think, that in every aspect of Canada's war effort we planned to move forward to the limit of the country's capacity. It remains for me to give some indication of the total financial burden which the programme will involve.

Little more than a rough estimate of the cost can be given at this stage. The Minister of Finance will be somewhat more precise when he introduces the war appropriations. But the provisional estimate at this stage is $3,000,000,000.

The financial advisers of the government believe that this huge sum and the additional sums required for civil government can be raised by taxation, war loans, and war savings, but they equally regard this as a full-out financial effort.

In preparing its war programme for 1942, the government has had but one objective. It is the objective we have had from the outset, namely, the achievement of a total national war effort. It is not, however, an effort exaggerated in any one aspect at the expense of other aspects. It is, as it has been from the beginning, a balanced effort. It seeks to take account of all demands and all eventualities, as far as it is humanly possible to foresee them. Moreover, it is so planned as to fall into its appropriate place in the united effort of all the nations arrayed against the axis.

The most searching and careful study has been given to the extent to which it is possible to expand each aspect of the national effort without weakening some other aspect just as important to the whole.

Equally careful consideration has been given to the methods by which the desired ends can best be attained. A balanced total national war effort requires the mobilization through taxation, loans and savings of the necessary financial resources, and the most careful decisions with respect to the means by which this is to be accomplished. It also requires the mobilization of material resources, and the mobilization of man-power, and like care with respect to the best means by which both of these can be accomplished. I shall leave to the Minister of Finance the question of the means to be employed in mobilizing the financial resources. That matter will have to await the presentation of the budget.

In the case alike of the mobilization of material resources and of man-power, some measure of compulsion is necessary, just as it is in the case of the mobilization of financial resources. The use of compulsion, or if you prefer the word "conscription", for the mobilization of material resources and man-power is, as I have said, not new. It has been approved by this parliament. The principle of compulsion is embodied in the National Resources Mobilization Act, which was enacted on June 20, 1940. This act gives the government very wide powers to mobilize, for war purposes, both the material resources and the man-power of the country. Since of the two the mobilization of material resources is much less a subject of controversy, I shall speak of it first.

In the early stages of the war, the mobilization of material resources presented few problems. Production was in the stage of organization. The demand for raw materials was small. Shortages of Canadian supplies could readily be met by purchase in the United States. In other words, all our other shortages boiled down to a shortage of United States dollars. The government lost no time in facing this problem. Foreign exchange control was established on September 15, 1939, and increasingly stringent measures were taken through the prohibition of pleasure travel in the United States, and the restriction of unessential imports to ensure the supply of American dollars needed to buy war materials in the United States. Fortunately, at the very moment when these drastic measures threatened to prove insufficient, the whole problem was vastly simplified by the reciprocal arrangements embodied in the Hyde Park declaration. The problem has been further simplified by the establishment of joint committees on war production, and by recent agreement between the United States and Canada to remove all obstructions to the free flow of war materials between the two countries.

Means have also been taken to stimulate the production in Canada of strategic raw materials and to prevent the export of raw materials of which a shortage might be anticipated. Stock-piles of imported raw materials have been accumulated.

Steps have been taken to discourage waste, and to salvage waste products. By severe taxation and the encouragement of war savings, civilian consumption has been curtailed.

In recent months, the manufacture of non-essential goods has been curtailed or eliminated entirely. The compulsory mobilization of material resources has been progressively and selectively effected by a highly efficient though exceedingly complex system of economic controls. I might cite the curtailment in the production of motor vehicles and a great variety of other articles in which metals are used, as for example, stoves, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, refrigerators and radios. I might also mention the drastic limitations placed upon the use of silk and rubber.

These and many other measures have been taken progressively, in order to make materials available to our war industries as they have been expanded. Already, the rationing of some commodities for civilian use has begun. If we are to achieve a total effort, far more drastic curtailments will follow.

The whole business of mobilizing material resources is not spectacular; it is far from pleasant; but it is the real foundation of a total war effort. The government has never hesitated to take any of the necessary steps at the moment it was believed they were essential.

I turn now to the question of the mobilizing of "man-power", which term, by the way, when it is used without definite restriction, is intended to comprehend "woman-power" as well. I wish to speak more particularly of the means of mobilizing the additional man-power and woman-power required to maintain the existing effort, and to develop the enlarged programme.

National selective service is the method by which the government proposes to accomplish the mobilization of man-power on an extended scale. Let me define national service as it is understood by the government. By national service is meant any form of service, either voluntary or compulsory, which contributes directly to Canada's war effort. By national selective service is meant the selection of men and women for the various forms of national service according to the method or methods calculated to produce the most satisfactory results. In order to be selective, national service does not necessarily need to be compulsory. Voluntary service is also selective. The army, for example, does not accept every man who offers to enlist. In finding the right place for a man, no quality is likely to count for more than willingness to serve. Compulsion is only of value where it serves to ensure a greater total effort. Wherever necessary and of value in increasing Canada's war effort, the government is prepared to employ compulsion. It would, however, be a waste of effort to engage a small army of officials to compel people to do what they are perfectly ready and willing to do without compulsion.

In announcing that national selective service is the method by which the government proposes to accomplish the mobilization of man-power on an extended scale, the government is not announcing a new policy. What we propose to do is to extend what, in fact, we have been doing right along, that is, to apply the principle progressively. In other words, we intend to continue to extend the application of national selective service to meet new needs as they arise.

As I have already said, this policy, too, is not new, nor is it being advanced to-day for the first time, or as a consequence of high-pressure methods employed to influence the independence of members of parliament. The principle itself, as I have already explained, was approved by this parliament in June, 1940. It has already been applied to some extent. On November 12 last, I made it very plain to parliament that, with respect to the mobilization of man-power, the government's policy was one of national selective service; and, also, that an extension of the application of compulsory selective service—conscription, if you will—was a part of that policy. Let me repeat my exact words as reported in Hansard of 1941, page 4321:

> So far as conscription stands for compulsory selective national service, that is a principle which this government has embodied in its National Resources Mobilization Act passed at a previous session of this parliament. As to how rapidly that principle should be applied, and how far it should be extended, is a matter which the government must decide and will decide in the light of all the knowledge which it has with respect to the needs of our war effort and the position of the country in meeting them.
>
> I want it to be distinctly understood that so far as the principle of compulsory selective national service is concerned for Canada, in Canada, I stand for that principle. I have never taken any other stand. It is the position that I have held all along. It has been applied in connection with military training, and applied in a number of other directions I might mention. How much further it will be applied the house will learn as the government takes its decisions on that matter.

I did not, at that time, announce any decisions as to its further application. Such announcement would hardly have been appropriate at the close of a session which had already completed all its major business. I felt that, in fairness to parliament, announcements on such an important matter should be reserved for a new session, when members would have adequate opportunity for the fullest consideration and debate.

The extended application of compulsion to national selective service is a highly complicated matter. It is, in itself, a selective process. The use of compulsion selectively is no less complicated in the mobilization of man-power than in the mobilization of material resources. However, the fact that further decisions were not announced in November has not delayed the further application of the principle. Indeed, it has rather facilitated the very careful planning and organization which is so essential before the extended application of selective service, whether on a voluntary or a compulsory basis, can be brought into effective operation.

Everyone will recognize that the effective use of the man-power—and the woman-power—of a nation is essential to the achievement of a total war effort. But it is not the total. It is, as I have already stated, only one factor in the total. In considering any extension of the application of selective service as a means of promoting a total war effort, it is important to remember that national selective service is not an end in itself, but is only a means to an end, that end being a total war effort.

The problems of mobilizing resources, and mobilizing man-power, are inseparable from one another and like all other aspects of our war effort must be kept in proper balance. Material resources cannot be mobilized without man-power to mobilize them, and no good purpose is served by mobilizing men unless they are provided with the necessary materials and tools to work with, and the necessary equipment and arms to fight with.

Under the authority of the National Resources Mobilization Act, a limited measure of national selective service on a compulsory basis has been applied since October, 1940, in the selection of young men for military training. The principles of selection have been age and marital status, with adequate safeguards, through postponements, for other essential forms of national service.

The government now proposes to apply the compulsory powers of national selective service to other aspects of the war effort as well as to military service. These powers will be applied selectively and progressively to those activities where it is considered by the government that their application will contribute to the goal of a total effort. It has not been necessary, nor would it, indeed, have been helpful at an earlier stage to make demands upon the nation such as the government has in contemplation, and as will be set forth as the session proceeds. In this connection I invite your attention particularly to what I am now about to say.

These demands will intimately affect the lives of many men and women. They will also effect the life of the nation in the following way: there will be a further very definite curtailment of the amenities we have hitherto been able to preserve. These demands will not affect physical health or that contentment of spirit that comes from serving great causes, but they will make further inroads upon the comfort and convenience of very large numbers, and upon the character and aspect of our daily life.

It must not be supposed that there are large reserves of idle people leading a leisurely existence who can now be called to the national ranks. The entire adult Canadian population, with very few exceptions, gets up in the morning, works all day, and goes to bed tired out at night. In our form of society people have been accustomed to find their own jobs to a very large extent, thus saving vast government machinery.

If all the efforts of everyone were really devoted solely to making war, there would be no food, or fuel, no transport, or clothes. We have to recognize the fact that a very large proportion of the population, particularly women, is occupied in ministering to the needs of the more actively engaged population, and that that number has increased since the last war with the increase of population who have to be ministered to.

The process which is now to be applied—and has, indeed, been continuously applied—much more vigorously, is not the calling of idle people to work, but the sharpening and shifting forward of a proportion of their effort into work which is more directly related to the war.

Here I end the portion of the remarks to which I invited special attention.

It may surprise hon. members to learn that the words I have just used are not my own words. With the exception of the two words "Canadian population", which I have substituted for the words "British race", the statement is not mine. It is a statement by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. After all that has been said in Canada in recent months about all-out conscription in Britain, and its application to women as well as to men, it may occasion still more surprise that this statement was made, not at the beginning of the war, nor at the end of the first year of war, nor even of the second year of war, but as recently as December 2 last.

The explanation of the timing is simple. In war, correct timing is vital. Some steps must be completed, before others can be taken. The time of application of measures is quite as important as the extent of their application. No mechanical rule or order can be followed. The appropriate measures for one country will

never exactly suit another country. In the case of each, local conditions must be considered; the nature of the tasks undertaken by each country, and their relative importance in the total effort of all, must be the decisive factor.

To achieve a total national effort everyone must contribute to the effort either directly or indirectly. All cannot do the same work. As far as possible, each must be fitted into the appropriate task. Many, perhaps the majority, can find the appropriate place for themselves, and, as Mr. Churchill said, save "vast government machinery". Certainly no government is wise enough to decide the appropriate task for every individual in the nation. And, even if governments were all-knowing, the war would not wait while this stupendous job was being performed. What the government can do, and what we propose to undertake to do, is to meet the urgent needs by the best means we can devise.

I shall not attempt at this time to outline the measures which are contemplated in order to extend the scope of national selective service. I shall confine myself to saying that the extended policy of selective service will comprehend measures to increase the supply of man-power available for war industry and for the armed forces; also measures to safeguard and, where necessary, to assist in providing agricultural labour required to expand war production on the farm. These objects it is proposed to achieve by positive action to increase the mobility of available man-power, to add to the number of women available for employment, and to facilitate the transfer of labour from non-essential occupations to direct employment in the furtherance of the war effort. The policy also envisages improvements in the method of selecting men for compulsory military training and service.

The administrative machinery required to carry out the proposed measures equitably and efficiently will necessarily be intricate and complicated. The capacities of men and women cannot be weighed and measured and graded with the same certainty as the qualities of wheat or cement or steel can be determined. To perform the complicated task of selection with success will demand both time and skill.

The government, moreover, has no desire to add unduly—which means wastefully—to governmental machinery. It is imperative that we avoid using men and women for unnecessary tasks. In those aspects of our war effort in which voluntary methods are working satisfactorily, voluntary selection, including a measure of choice by the individual of the appropriate field of service, will be continued. The use of the more expensive and complicated methods of compulsion will be confined to those branches of our war effort where it is felt that compulsory selection will increase its efficiency.

While the government, in its policies, has sought a total effort, it has never ceased to believe that only by a united effort could total effort be achieved. In every step the government has taken from the moment the threat of war appeared on the European horizon, we have sought so to direct our policies and the course of public affairs that the country would remain united in its support of the national effort.

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 this 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.

When, three months later, the direction of the war effort of Canada by the present administration was challenged—though from an opposite extreme—by a resolution of the legislature of the province of Ontario, and the administration appealed to the people of Canada in a general election, the government gave the assurance that, if returned to power, it would continue to maintain the policy of no conscription for service overseas. Not only the government, but the then leader of the Conservative party—a party disguised it is true, for the time being, as the National Government party—took an equally strong stand in opposition to conscription for overseas service. The candidates, not

of one political party only, but the vast majority of candidates in the general election gave their constituents to understand that they were opposed to a policy of conscription for overseas service. In so doing, reference was continually made to the effect of the adoption of conscription in the last war, and the serious wound which, at the time, its application had inflicted in the side of our country.

As I look at the membership of this house which represents the will of the nation as expressed in the general elections, held during this very war, I say there are not a dozen members,—if, indeed, there are that many—regardless of party, who could rise in their places and truthfully say that, in the last general election, they had advocated a policy of conscription for military service overseas.

Time and again it has been said by hon. members opposite—and I think my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has said it oftener than anyone else—that the present government would not have had the enormous majority it has in this present parliament if it had not given the explicit assurance that, if returned to power, it would not adopt conscription for military service overseas. Others have held that it is unfair to say that any one issue should be singled out as the decisive issue in a general election. They maintain that many factors were in the minds of the people. It is said, for example, and I believe it to be true, that the present administration owes its vast majority to the belief so generally held that at this time of war no better administration could be found to administer Canada's war effort and to conduct the country's affairs. Not the least of the reasons for this belief was the view that the present administration might be expected to harmonize differences more effectively and thereby to avoid disunity at a time of war when, above all else, unity is vital.

In accordance with the general consensus of view as respects the mandate given by the people themselves, the government, throughout 1940 and 1941, proceeded to develop an all-out war effort. Might I pause here to say a word in reference to what my hon. friend the leader of the opposition said this afternoon with respect to mandates. If I recall aright, he said that this government took immediate action when Japan declared war, though we had no mandate from the people. He referred to a number of other acts performed by the government for which he said the government had no special mandate. He referred to Abraham Lincoln and some of his actions at the time of the civil war, for which my hon. friend said Lincoln had no mandate. That is all perfectly true; but of all the instances mentioned by my hon. friend there was not one in which, when the possibility of action of the kind mentioned had been placed before the people themselves, any subsequent action on the part of the government was restricted by a specific pledge or commitment with respect thereto. Of all the instances he mentioned there was not one in which the people themselves had been given the assurance, before the event itself took place, that if it did take place the government, while it would do all in its power to meet the situation, would not in one particular go counter to what it believed at the time to be the will of the people, and had expressly set forth the limitation that was to be respected. Therefore there is a great difference between what my hon. friend has put forward with respect to actions where there were no commitments in advance and the action of this government respecting a commitment that was definitely made with regard to a definite situation.

In this connection might I commend to my hon. friend, as I continue with what I have to say, the words by Abraham Lincoln which he quoted, that government was or ought to be "of the people, by the people and for the people." I hope my hon. friend will keep that thought in mind in reference to the criticism he has been offering with respect to myself, that I have been paying too much attention to the people and not enough attention to some of the things that at the present time are being said by a vociferous press.

As I was saying, in accord with the general consensus of view as respects the mandate given by the people themselves, the government, throughout 1940 and 1941, proceeded to develop an all-out war effort. Until parliament was in session in November last, the government continued to carry on that effort, not without criticism, but certainly without the issue of conscription for overseas service being raised, in any authoritative manner, by any party or party leader in this house.

At the time of my tour of western Canada, prior to my visit to Britain, an attempt was made to raise the issue of conscription. A cloud no larger than a man's hand appeared in the political sky at Calgary and in some other of the western cities. I at once recognized that this was not due to a spontaneous movement on the part of the people themselves, but was rather the manifestation of a political movement carefully organized by opponents of the government, to force conscription to the fore as a political issue. I accordingly sought to meet this threat to our national unity in the only way in which I believed it could and should be met, if unity throughout Canada was to be maintained.

Speaking in the city of Vancouver before a very large audience, I said:

The policy of the government regarding conscription has been made abundantly clear. We have taken the position that every young man who is physically fit should be liable for military training and service in Canada for the defence of Canada. This policy is designed to provide our country with a second line of defence should the country be subject to direct attack. In the same way, parliament has put at the disposal of the nation, all the material resources of the country.

My colleagues and I, expressing, as we believe, the will of the Canadian people as expressed by themselves in a war-time election, have made it equally clear that service outside Canada in the armed forces of Canada at sea, on land and in the air—service undertaken in the cause of freedom—shall be freely undertaken.

Before war came, the government gave a solemn pledge that in the event of war, we would follow that policy. When war came the pledge was solemnly reaffirmed. At the general elections during the war itself, that policy received the overwhelming approval of the people of Canada. Indeed, no political party can be said to have advocated conscription for overseas service. The leader of the official opposition could scarcely have been more emphatic than he was in declaring that conscription was not an issue; that, having regard to the memories of the past, and experiences in the last war, anyone who might raise that issue was not true to the highest interest of his country.

The present unhappy state of the world is in large part the result of broken pledges. Nazi Germany has erected bad faith and the broken pledge into a principle of action. Bad faith, broken pledges, and disregard of the popular will are the very forces against which Canada is fighting to-day. That being so, I wish the more emphatically to affirm the government's intention to keep the pledge repeatedly given to the people of Canada.

This statement is representative of the views I everywhere expressed in the course of my western tour, and which everywhere met, if not with unanimous, certainly with general approval. With the people of Canada thus reassured, there was little, if any, agitation on the matter during my absence in Britain and immediately after my return. In parliament there was little or no question or discussion raised concerning conscription until, while parliament was in session in November, it was announced that the leader of the Conservative party in the senate was to replace the present leader of the opposition in the leadership of his party, and would also replace him in the leadership of the official opposition in this House of Commons.

Prior to this announcement, I had restated in this House of Commons the government's position with respect to national selective service, as I have already quoted it to the house. At the same time, as leader of the government, I made clear by own position with respect to the application of conscription to service in the armed forces overseas, in the following words:

But so far as conscription for service overseas is concerned in the armed forces of Canada, that question was submitted to the people of Canada at the last general election, an election which was held in war time, and in which the leaders of all political parties made their statements to the electorate, and the people of Canada decided against conscription for overseas service. So far as I am concerned, without any consultation of the people on that subject, I do not intend to take the responsibility of supporting any policy of conscription for service overseas.

These words are to be found in *Hansard* for November 12, 1941, at page 4321. This statement was made during the afternoon of November 12. On the evening of that day, the new leader of the Conservative party, without any previous attempt at consultation or conference with myself, or any member of the government, and before he himself had become a member of this House of Commons, issued a statement announcing his acceptance of the leadership of the Conservative party, in which he set forth as his policy "compulsory selective service over the whole field of war". In view of the position of the government with respect to national selective service, this statement narrows down simply to a demand for conscription for overseas service. It thereby made the single question of the application of conscription for military service overseas into a political issue of the first magnitude.

Outside parliament altogether, the political skies have now become so overcast with controversy, promoted by high-pressure methods and highly financed publicity, that the nature and extent of Canada's war effort is not only being obscured, but is in danger of being seriously impaired.

If the issue of conscription for service overseas is to be fought out, the place for it to be fought out is on the floor of this parliament. If, however, members of the government and, indeed, members of this House of Commons generally, are to be free to express their views irrespective of any previous commitments, it is necessary that all members be released from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service.

Quite apart from the controversy which has arisen, there are the strongest of reasons why the government should, at this time of gravest crisis in the world's history, possess complete freedom to act in accordance with its judgment of the needs of the situation as they may arise, subject only to its responsibility to parliament.

When, prior to its outbreak, the possibility of war in Europe was discussed in Canada, it was thought of in terms of another European war, the scene of which would be confined for the most part to Europe. The last war was still much in mind. The incidents connected with conscription and the results which flowed from its application remained vivid memories. The mere thought of the repetition of anything of the kind was abhorrent to the minds of most people in Canada. Few, if any, even dreamed at the time that war might so spread as to bring into the orbit of actual hostilities, any part of the western hemisphere. When people on this side of the Atlantic thought of war during the autumn and winter months of 1938 and the early spring of 1939, they thought first of the protecting power of the British fleet. The war between Japan and China, though it had been in existence for some years, seemed so remote as to have little or no bearing upon the security of the Pacific coast of this continent.

When the general elections were held during the month of March in 1940, the recollections of 1917 were still vividly in mind. Also in the mind of the people were commitments made in and out of parliament respecting no conscription for service in the armed forces overseas. The relatively greater part which the air and naval forces would play in the present war, in comparison with the last; the obligation which Canada had assumed with respect to the commonwealth air training plan; the need for the immediate development of the navy, the importance of developing the manufacture of munitions on a large scale, all pointed to the unwisdom of raising any issue with respect to conscription.

It was not until the intent and might of nazi aggression had become apparent by the subjugation of Denmark, Norway, The Netherlands, Belgium and France, that its danger to all free countries began to be appreciated. When Italy entered the war, concern was still mostly with what might happen around the shores of the Mediterranean and in Africa. It was difficult for many to believe that the enemy might, some day, be battering our own shores on the Atlantic, and even on the Pacific.

During the past year, however, the bombardment of Britain from the air, the varying fortunes of her armies in a continuously increasing number of areas; the vast additions in resources and man-power gained by Germany through the countries she had overrun; the unrest in the far east; all this, and much else, helped, during the past year, to change the picture vastly as viewed from this side.

On the other hand, Russia's entry into the war on the side of the allies served to lessen anxiety with respect to the need for men needed for the army.

Japan's declaration of war against the United States and the British commonwealth, the consequences flowing from her treacherous attack upon United States' possessions in the Pacific, and upon British and Dutch possessions in Asia and the Indies; the present menace of her armed forces to the island dominions of Australia and New Zealand; all these have given rise to fresh anxiety throughout Canada.

The declaration of war by Germany and Italy, as well as Japan, against the United States has brought the United States into the conflict against the combined axis powers. This, in turn, has given rise to problems which the government is facing in meeting its obligations with respect to the joint defence of the two countries. The declaration signed at Washington on January 1 by 26 nations to combine their efforts against the axis powers, has still further emphasized Canada's responsibilities.

In a world situation so involved, with enemies on every front, with no one able to say what the outcome of battle in other parts of the world may bring of immediate and increased danger to our own land, the government feels strongly that it should be perfectly free to recommend to parliament whatever course of action it deems essential to the security of our own country, and to the preservation of freedom in our own and other lands.

Such freedom the government does not possess at the present time, not because of any limitations upon the powers of parliament —parliament is at all times supreme—but because of past commitments made by the government and, regardless of party, by most members of this house.

If, then, it is desirable that the government subject only to its responsibility to parliament, should possess complete freedom to act in accordance with its judgment, irrespective of any previous commitments, it is clear that means must be found of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service.

There are, as I see it, three means by which this release could be obtained:

The first would be by means of a general election. In a general election at this time the issue of conscription for service overseas would become one of the issues and, in existing circumstances, would almost certainly be the main issue.

The second would be by means of a referendum solely with reference to the question of conscription for service overseas.

The third would be by means of a plebiscite, not to obtain a decision with respect to conscription, but solely with the object of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service.

These three means have been considered by the government with relation particularly to which of the three would occasion the least interference with the war effort of the country.

The government is of the opinion that neither a general election nor a referendum on the question of conscription is either advisable or necessary.

As for a general election, apart from the fact that the government has every reason to believe it continues to possess the confidence of the country, it would not, we believe, be in the interest of the people themselves, in the existing crisis, to leave the country without a parliament for the time which it would take to hold a general election. Moreover, other issues entering in, it would not be possible to say that the verdict of the people, whatever it might be, had related solely to the issue of the application of conscription for overseas service.

The objection to a referendum on conscription is that far from freeing the hands of the government it would be a specific request to the people to make a decision with respect to conscription. As I have already said, the proper place to debate the question as to the extent to which conscription should be applied is on the floor of parliament.

The strongest of reasons why the government should be given a free hand to take, subject to its responsibility to parliament, any course of action which it may believe to be necessary at a time of war is that the government itself alone can know all the circumstances and reasons which necessitate a particular course of action. These reasons cannot all be made public, linked as they are with the combined plans of other countries, with questions of military strategy, and the necessity of such matters being carefully concealed from the enemy.

A plebiscite differs from a referendum in that a plebiscite is taken to ascertain the views of the people, whereas a referendum is a request for a decision by the people on a specific plan or project. The government does not believe that it would be fair to the people to ask them to make military decisions. It is, as I already have said, not possible, in war time, to make public adequate information on which wise judgments can be made.

In consulting the people by plebiscite, the government is not throwing on the people the responsibility of making a military decision. It is asking the people to give the government full power and full responsibility to take whatever military decisions the government, in the light of all its knowledge, believes to be necessary. In consulting the people, therefore, we are not shirking responsibility, we are asking for full responsibility.

A course completely different from any one of the three I have mentioned has been suggested. It is that the government should ignore commitments altogether, refrain from any consultation with or reference to the people, and here and now immediately put in force conscription for service overseas.

I am perfectly sure that were any government to proceed in any such arbitrary manner, completely disregarding the will of the people as expressed in the past, or as it might be expressed in the present, it would find any such attempt effectively thwarted by the people's representatives in parliament.

Personally, I reject as unworthy of consideration, any course of action by this or any parliament which ignores the authority from which parliament and the government alike derive their power. I reject as still more unworthy the suggestion that the government should break the solemn pledges given and repeated time and again to the electorate. Let me repeat what I said at Vancouver:

> The present unhappy state of the world is, in large part, the result of broken pledges. Nazi Germany has erected bad faith and the broken pledge into a principle of action. Bad faith, broken pledges, and disregard of the popular will, are the forces against which Canada is fighting to-day.

I do not propose to erect bad faith and the broken pledge into a principle of action. I propose at all times to do all in my power to see that the will of the people, not that of any particular section or group or interest, however powerful or vociferous, shall prevail in the government of this country.

Perhaps I should add that yet another course of action has been suggested. It is that I should resign and advise His Excellency the Governor General—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I hear some of them opposite; I hope they listen to what I am going to say. It is that I should resign and advise His Excellency the Governor General to call on some other person to form a government which would ignore all past

commitments and undertake to enforce conscription without any prior consultation with the people. In other words, I am being asked to sell my birthright for their mess of pottage, and to destroy whatever confidence the people of Canada may possess in my honour as a public man, and, in doing so, also to destroy the confidence the people possess in the honour and integrity of the government.

Those who speak and write in that way might be prepared so to act, but I am not. If we wish to destroy, not at this time of war alone, but for all time, the last vestige of confidence which the people of Canada have in their free political institutions and in their public men, that would be the most effective way to go about it.

The government, having, for the reasons I have mentioned, decided to seek from the people, by means of a plebiscite, release from any obligation arising out of any past commitments, proposes, without delay, to introduce legislation to set up the required machinery for conducting the plebiscite at the earliest possible date. The plebiscite will be taken with the minimum of expense consistent with equitable and efficient provision for a full and honest expression of the views of the people.

I need scarcely say that in the machinery which may be necessary for the conduct of the plebiscite, special provision will be made for ascertaining the views of the men on active service in the armed forces.

I shall not go into detail regarding the procedure to be followed in holding the proposed plebiscite. The question which the government proposes to submit to the people is the simple and straightforward question:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

It will be seen that in seeking freedom for itself to act on all matters pertaining to war in accordance with its judgment, the government is taking a course which will remove all legitimate excuse for controversy, and the course best calculated to maintain the unity of the country in this time of war.

Mr. HOMUTH: Then what will they do?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That will depend in part upon what my hon. friend and those who are round him will do.

Mr. HOMUTH: Do not worry about us.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am quite prepared to trust the people; my hon. friend certainly is not. Just here may I pause to say that if my hon. friend is afraid that the people will pronounce against conscription, for that is what he has in his mind, and he is still prepared to have conscription put into force without any reference to the people, then I should like to know how he expects that the unity of this country is going to be maintained.

In the presentation of the plebiscite to the electorate the desire of the administration to possess complete freedom of action will, of course, receive the vigorous and whole-hearted support of all members of the government. It will, I hope, receive the support of every member of parliament, and will, I believe, receive the support of the Canadian people.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I could not begin my remarks this evening without first congratulating the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, who were our good companions on a recent trip to Great Britain. They acquitted themselves in a manner which, I believe, won the congratulations of hon. members on all sides of the house. I thought that perhaps at times their praise of the government was a bit extravagant; shorn of these superlatives, their speeches were admirable.

I want to take this opportunity of expressing my own appreciation for the extensive tour of Great Britain so generously provided by the British branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association, and to express particularly my thanks to Sir Howard d'Egville, who supervised the arrangements on this side, to Sir Drummond Shiels, to Mr. Spencer-Hess, and to the British Ministry of Information, who combined to pilot us around Great Britain. Nor must we forget to thank, too, the Hon. Vincent Massey and Mrs. Massey and our splendid staff in the city of London. Every one of them did everything possible so that we might see all those things which visiting parliamentarians ought to see, and to make our stay in Great Britain as pleasant as it could possibly be under the grim circumstances of war. And Britain was grim. I knew from past experiences the British seashore and countryside. I would scarcely have recognized some of the places that I had known in my boyhood days. But in spite of the grimness we found a cool, courageous people engaged in a people's war and determined that when this conflict ended, there would be a people's peace and that the British people would build a new Britain in which the people might find security and peace.

But I should like to say more about those things at another time. To-day we are at the beginning of a new session of parliament. We

meet within the shadows of dark and threatening skies. This is no time for discussions of relatively inconsequential matters. We are faced with more widespread threats to human freedom than, perhaps, the world has ever known and let us not blind ourselves with undue optimism. All is not well with the war or with our efforts to win it. Except in Russia, north Africa, and China, the axis powers have retained the initiative and have forced the allied powers to retreat from one position to another. This is not because our armed forces are inferior to those arrayed against them, but because we have failed, I believe, so far to realize that this is a war of machines as well as of men. Our steel, copper, nickel and other resources which should have been going into tanks, planes and guns have been going, instead, into automobiles, refrigerators and the luxuries of modern life, and some, indeed, in the early stages of this war found their way to Japan. Our industrialists insisted on business as usual, and until quite recently the government did little to turn those major factories into plants for the production of war material. Indeed, propaganda throughout the country has been directed towards the more glamorous and the more spectacular course of placing men in uniform, when events have proven that the provision of modern equipment should not only have kept pace with enlistments but have outrun them.

Then, too, there has been no real challenge to all our people to put forth every effort. In Britain the people believe most fervently that they are fighting, not to safeguard their present way of life, but to build a finer, nobler Britain, in which there will be larger measures of social security and economic justice. No such dynamic yet touches the lives of our people. They see business as usual, profits much as usual, and the representatives of monopolistic trusts in key positions in the Department of Munitions and Supply and controlling many phases of our war effort. The wheat producers of the west try to make ends meet at prices that were far too low before the war began, while workers in industry see barriers erected against their right to organize in associations of their own choice. Thus our national effort falls short of what it should be, because it lacks the proper dynamic.

I said that the bright spots in the present situation were north Africa, Russia and China; in north Africa because, so Mr. Churchill told us, we have concentrated most of our new equipment there, and so at last a British army meets an axis force on nearly equal terms. The reason for the stubborn resistance of the Chinese is that they fight for a China that had begun to make progress towards a greater measure of economic security, more than old imperial China ever knew. This, too, is the secret of Russian courage and Russian success. Whatever criticism we might have of their methods of government, the Russian people believe firmly that they are fighting to prevent the destruction of those economic and social advances which they themselves have made during the last twenty years. That these advances have been real and marvellously efficient, the effectiveness of the Russian army, the quantity and quality of their equipment, and the magnitude of their industrial reserves, amply demonstrate. Surely we can learn some lessons from these facts. Laboriously, for over two years, we have been mobilizing our war effort, and in spite of our boasted industrial strength we have failed to provide the tools to get on with the job. It is true that Russia had built great war industries before the war. But she was also able to build new cities, new homes, new universities, new standards of life, while we did neither the one nor the other. When the test came, there were no private monopolies, no trusts, no vested interests, no contractors who refused to accept war contracts except on their own terms, no business men who needed the incentive of gain or the acquisition of wealth, to slow up her war effort and bring her to the brink of defeat. In a few weeks she was geared for total war, with the full support of a people with a future to defend. Give our people assurances of a brighter future, remove the hand of selfish gain from our war effort, and in our own way and under our own social institutions Canada can do at least as well.

Thus we can build the hope of a future upon which alone sacrifice for victory will depend. But this hope must be based on something more than fine speeches and attractive promises. As long as people see our aged folk trying to make their meagre pensions meet the increased cost of living, or pensioners, or dependents of those who perished in the last great war, or who are fighting in this one, coping with increasing poverty while industry is prosperous and its total dividends increase, social discontent will act like a canker at the very core of our war effort; for the morale of the nation is the core of resistance, the foundation of victory.

To-day our people see the owners and directors of prosperous industries in charge of our war effort. I know that among them are conscientious and patriotic citizens who are giving of their very best. But even these are human, and sometimes some confuse the welfare of the organizations they have served with

the welfare of the nation, while others identify the welfare of their enterprises with the welfare of the nation itself.

No parliamentary committee has yet delved into the activities of the Department of Munitions and Supply, with which most of the dollar-a-year-men have been associated; but that should be done at this session of parliament. In the United States the office of production management corresponds fairly closely to our Department of Munitions and Supply. There, a committee under the chairmanship of Senator Truman investigated its activities. Its report, submitted to congress on January 15, 1942, was most interesting. It recommended that the office should be drastically reorganized. The report stated that there were 255 dollar-a-year-men and 631 who received no government pay, but many of whom retained remunerative connections with the companies which lent them to the government. These men, the report said, had a tendency to favour big business, whether they were conscious of the fact or not. The committee declared that it was opposed to the government taking free services—and I quote —"from persons with axes to grind"—and recommended that if they were needed by the department they should be given salaries and required to relinquish their private business connections, and salaries.

In parts, the Truman report reads like criticisms that have been made in this house. For example, I quote:

> Apparently there never has been any real and coordinated procurement of aircraft.

Again:

> There is a tendency throughout to place everything on order wherever possible and put the sole responsibility for delivery on a few large producers.

Again:

> "Big business" has had its lobbyists in the form of dollar-a-year-men and men without compensation. Small and intermediate business men have sought to obtain the same benefits by hiring those who they think have influence. In some cases the persons are hired to render legitimate services and are paid so handsomely as to lead many to think their employers must have expected to receive added benefits. In others no legitimate services are rendered and payments that are made can be treated only as compensation for influence. In most instances the "Washington connections" are non-existent and the pedlars of influence are relying on the chance that the business man can obtain a contract without help if he made a serious and determined effort.

Are we free from these abuses, with much the same type of establishment? Well, prosecutions now going on in the Ottawa courts should make us suspect that we may not be. There is unrest in Great Britain, too, on another phase of the same problem. The *Labour Discussion Notes* for December, a publication of some of the members of the British Labour party, contained a careful survey of the matter. It said:

> The feeling that excess profits are being made must lead to cynicism and lack of a feeling of personal responsibility among the workers in factories from whom a more intensive effort is demanded; while at the same time many employers are putting forth the argument that the inability to make high profits owing to the action of the excess profits tax is itself a brake on production.

The publication goes on to express alarm at the growing economic power of the big monopolies and states a fact of which we should take the most careful warning when it says:

> There is one other important factor which requires careful watching—that is the future of the vast capital equipment provided by the government to increase output. . . . It could form the basis of, for instance, a sizeable national munitions industry or it could become a gift handed over at a nominal charge to the present owners. In the latter case, all the effects of the excess profits tax would disappear overnight.

With these warnings before us we should go into the whole problem of munitions and supply, or some day we may find that a few trusts and corporations have so increased their power over the economic life of Canada that the individual, unorganized consumer is entirely at their mercy. Indeed, I would go as far as to say that unless the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) himself is alert to this situation, he will find that the present trends in Canada will shatter every economic and social policy which he has preached and professed throughout his whole career in public life.

To achieve an enthusiastic response from the people of Canada there must be a greater approach to economic justice and equality of sacrifice. In spite of the excess profits tax, total dividends last year were greater than in the previous year. The *Globe and Mail* reported J. R. Timmins and Company as saying that 1941 dividends exceeded $285,000,000 as against $280,000,000 for 1940. These are not my figures, but the figures published by the *Globe and Mail* of the city of Toronto on December 22, 1941.

Our people are not satisfied with our war effort. They look at the personnel of our various war boards and they see representatives of big business in control almost exclusively. To regain the confidence of the people, representatives of farmers and of labour, in the widest sense of these terms, must be given adequate control. By adequate control I do not mean the appointment of the odd farmer

or labour representative chosen by the government on the recommendation of some member of this house, but representatives, according to their importance in the country, chosen by their own representative organizations.

Everywhere we went in industrial Britain we found labour representatives sharing public responsibility with the owners of industry and wealth. I was told that in the rural districts farmers and their labourers shared similar responsibilities. Such, of course, are essential links in an all-out war effort. Canada has been called in this house the arsenal of the British commonwealth; yet we have not equipped our own soldiers adequately. The story told by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) of the gallant defenders of Hong Kong reflects little credit on those responsible for the sending of that expeditionary force.

I hope that the committee which the Prime Minister has promised will investigate all the circumstances with great thoroughness. In Montreal on January 6, addressing the Women's Canadian club there, I made a brief and passing reference of concern regarding the equipment and training of our troops at Hong Kong. Newspapers immediately designated those who expressed such sentiments as undermining our war effort. I wonder what those newspapers think now about that, or what they think of the harsh epithets applied by British speakers and British papers, including Lord Beaverbrook's own *Daily Express*, to those responsible for the lack of preparation in the far east. In my opinion the military and naval authorities who allowed our men to proceed to Hong Kong without anti-tank guns and adequate equipment and training, with the situation in the far east as tense as it was in late October, were guilty of negligence or ignorance. Had they read Lord Gort's report, the official dispatches on the battle of France? That report was published in Canada two weeks before the ill-fated Hong Kong expeditionary force sailed. Of that battle of France Lord Gort wrote:

> So ended a campaign of twenty-two days which has proved that the offensive once more gained ascendancy in modern war when undertaken with an army equipped with greatly superior material power in the shape of air force and fighting vehicles.

After giving some examples of lack of equipment, Lord Gort continued:

> These instances among many others serve to indicate the vital necessity for an expeditionary force, if it is to be used in a first class war, being equipped on a scale commensurate with the task it is called upon to fulfil. The day is past when armies can be hurriedly raised, equipped and placed in the field, for modern war demands the ever-increasing use of complicated material.

But it is equally important to inquire under what circumstances a Hong Kong force was asked for, and under what considerations and agreements it was sent. Who took the responsibility for neglecting Brigadier Lawson's expressions of uneasiness on leaving without complete equipment? Did those who decided that the force was to be sent satisfy themselves that in the event of war the island of Hong Kong could be defended? Did they inquire as to its air defences, its artillery equipment, its water and other vital supplies? Or are we to infer that Canadian troops are being placed at the disposal of the imperial general staff without adequate control or inquiry on the part of our own Department of National Defence? If so, then the government has reversed the policy so vehemently maintained in the last war by Sir Robert Borden, and have relegated Canada to the position of colonial days.

It is clear that Canada, Australia and the dominions should be properly and of themselves represented on an allied council dealing with all matters of war stategy. This is most essential. The Minister of National Defence excuses the failure to send adequate equipment with the Hong Kong force on several grounds, one of which was that Japan suddenly and without warning struck in the Pacific. On Saturday last—and the report can be found in full in yesterday's New York *Times*—the Roberts commission in Washington reported the facts in connection with the attack on Pearl Harbour. The report shows that as early as January 24, 1941, the secretaries of the United States navy and of the United States army were discussing the gravity of the Pacific situation; that on October 16, 1941, twelve days before our men left Canada:

> The commanding general, Hawaiian department, and the commander in chief of the fleet were advised by the war and navy departments . . . of the probability of hostilities between Japan and Russia and the possibility of an attack by Japan on Great Britain and the United States.

No doubt this view was also held in London, and I assume it was transmitted to Canada.

Then why, in the face of this information, and in view of Lord Gort's report, our experiences in Greece and in Crete and our difficulties in north Africa a year ago, were our troops, even such as were trained, allowed to proceed without equipment to an island which the public now knows could not possibly have been defended successfully?

The leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) said last Wednesday that there would be other Hong Kongs—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I did not say that. I said there may be.

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes; I stand corrected. The duty of this house is clearly to see that there are no repetitions of the Hong Kong episode. It is our duty to see that our men are given at least a chance to defend themselves properly.

The government proposes to ask the people of Canada for, to use its own words, "by means of a plebiscite, release from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service." That being so, the people of Canada have a right to ask that those responsible for the sending of partly trained, improperly equipped men to Hong Kong, and who failed to satisfy themselves that the island was in a condition which made its defence a possibility, should be relieved of any further responsibilities in the dispatch of our men to any war zone. This is no time to condone carelessness or inefficiency. These delinquencies have brought Britain, the United States and our allies to the brinks of several disasters. Britain, and recently the United States, appear to have acted promptly to deal with such situations. The people have a right to know that no more ill-equipped partly trained men will be sent to places impossible to defend.

As to the plebiscite itself, we are always prepared to support a proper and democratic reference to the people of a clearly defined policy. All that the government intends to ask in the present instance is release from its promise not to conscript for overseas service. That is not enough. The government should tell the people exactly what the war situation really needs. Does it or does it not require conscription of men for overseas service? I hope that in this debate the discussion will not centre round the minor matter of taking a plebiscite. The government has decided to take it; then let it be taken with the least possible delay, and in the meantime let the government take the country into its confidence and tell us why release from its commitments is necessary. This is no time for political strategists to wrangle for party advantage. Obviously the need for equipment and supplies is as great, indeed, judging by the lack of equipment for men already in training, the need is greater. The Canadian people, I believe, demand that industry and finance shall be subjected to national selective service to the same extent as man-power, at the same time and on the same terms. Of course that is not what the new leader of the Conservative party wants. Mr. Meighen said quite explicitly at Weston town hall last Thursday:

> I have offered to support the government without stint or reserve in a policy of compulsory selective service for all our forces, our farms and our factories.

No mention here of compulsory service of finance and industry. In commenting, the Montreal *Gazette* said:

> This policy is broad enough and comprehensive enough to cover the whole man-power issue.

Quite so, but it reveals the real aim of the people who engineered the new leadership; the newspapers who support him and the so-called committee of two hundred, who failed to secure control of Canada several years ago through their defunct Leadership League and who now, in the midst of war, are trying a war stunt of confusion and division. These people are not advocating the policy urged by the Canadian Legion, which asked for an all-round mobilization of man-power, industry and wealth, though they have pretended to do so; or the policies urged by farmer and labour groups calling for the conscription of industry and wealth before further measures for the conscription of man-power are proceeded with. Neither are these policies involved in the amendment that was moved this afternoon. Beginning with the War Measures Act, right through to the National Resources Mobilization Act, the government has had full power to place this country on a total war footing, with one exception, which government spokesmen have claimed to be of minor importance. Yet, as I have pointed out, our industrial and war effort has been carried forward on the business-as-usual basis, with profits and big business control the governing considerations. Let us know, then, what the government proposes to do, and the needs which make these proposals necessary. None will give more support to an all-out war effort than we will give, but we demand that it be based on equality of sacrifice and not be made merely an opportunity for the regimentation of the Canadian people in the interests of a few monopolistic trusts and their beneficiaries.

In order to place our point of view clearly before the house, I am going to move an amendment to the amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) in these words:

> That all the words after the words "this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:
>
> "have used the sweeping powers conferred by the National Resources Mobilization Act mainly for the conscription of men for home defence, and in the opinion of this house no total effort

adequate to meet the present needs of the war, domestic problems and the preparation for post-war conditions is possible without total mobilization of wealth, industry and finance, as well as human resources.

"Therefore this house respectfully requests that the forthcoming plebiscite should seek the support of the people of Canada for the complete and effective conscription of war industries, accumulated wealth and financial institutions, at the same time and on the same basis of sacrifice as the suggested extension of the conscription of man-power."

Such a plebiscite would give our people an opportunity to give proper expression to their views and guide this house regarding what is in effect a new policy to which a large majority in this house gave no support, or, in whole or part, as the Prime Minister said, opposed in the general elections of 1940. In this way the vote would be an expression of the people's approval of a policy and not merely a plebiscite caused by the government's resort to political expediency. For some time attempts have been made to divide the people of Canada artificially on a question which should be decided not on the basis of partisan controversy but on the basis of the nation's need in a great crisis. This need, I repeat, involves more, much more, than a discussion of the use of man-power, though man-power is necessarily involved in it.

I repeat that the present critical war situation at home demands a complete mobilization of the total resources of our country. The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group will support such total mobilization, but demands that accumulated wealth and war industries be conscripted at the same time, in the same manner and upon the same terms as man-power. If we are to have this all-out war effort, it must be on the basis of national unity. Every discussion of these matters in this house and in the country ought to be undertaken with due regard to the unity of our people of all races, creeds, and tongues. Had the nature and objective of our war effort been clearly placed before the people, our unity would not be endangered. This house has failed to realize that the greatest danger to our unity in war is exactly the same danger we face in peace, the danger from inequality of sacrifice and opportunity. In any part of Canada where profitable industry is found side by side with low standards of living on our farms, and low wage levels with high prices in the cities, there in peace and war disunity arises. If those who live well on the proceeds of profitable industry are of a different race or tongue, the situation is aggravated because the depressed people can find no basis of unity or understanding with those whom they regard as their exploiters.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Thus an all-out united war effort requires much more than provision for our armed forces, important as that certainly is.

At least some sources of disagreement have been removed since December 7. There were some people who before that date thought of the struggle as one not touching directly the vital interests of this country. But the attack on Pearl Harbour, the outbreak of war between the United States and Japan, as well as the declarations of war upon the United States by Germany and Italy, have brought the war to our shores. The danger of attack has been real in Victoria and Vancouver, while we know that submarines have been operating near our own Atlantic shores. The whole American continent is now in the war zone and our Latin-American friends have, therefore, recognized the need for hemispheric solidarity. There can now be no doubt in any part of this country as to the need for Canada's all-out and united support of the allied effort to defeat the aggressor powers. It is clear now that we are not in this war merely to help Great Britain, or to help Russia, or to assist the United States; we are in it, in a very real sense, to defend ourselves and our future paths to progress. That being so, we dare not do less than organize our country for an all-out, supreme effort. This we have not had, nor can we have it as long as we operate our economic life on the basis of business as usual. In other words, we must accompany any mobilization of our human resources with a thorough mobilization of industry and finance.

There are some who claim that Canadian industry and finance have already been adequately mobilized. That this is not true is shown by our output, by the lack of planning and by the huge profits and dividends which still continue to be made. Real conscription of our material and financial resources must include the following, and I want to place these points before the house in order that we may understand exactly what we mean when we speak of total mobilization and the conscription of wealth and industry:

1. The national ownership or, at least, control of all our war industries to produce everything we require to maintain civilian health and morale and to provide our fighting forces with adequate equipment.

2. An integrated production plan which utilizes every available plant and facility in its proper place without regard to the demands of big corporations and trusts.

3. A complete reversal of the present dollar-a-year-men control policy and the substitution of proportionate representatives of organized farmer and labour bodies on all control

agencies, so that the pressure of big business could be effectively curbed and democratic direction of the war effort achieved.

4. Direct national control of all our financial institutions so that without inflation and without unnecessary future burdens of debt, we can finance our national effort.

5. There must be, at least, a one hundred per cent excess profits tax, and, indeed, on all profits a low maximum rate should be set and the excess taken by the government for our war effort.

6. The present loan policy should be replaced by one of compulsory, interest-free loans imposed on the accumulated wealth of rich individuals and corporations, and based on ability to contribute. Indeed, the fairest method would be to establish a fair maximum income for all and to tax back to the country every dollar above that maximum.

In view of the outline of the financial aid the government proposes—and quite properly—to give at this time to those who are fighting our battles across the sea, I should like to see a policy of that kind adopted. It may, indeed, become quite necessary. If we did all this, we would still be doing less to industry, to wealth and to those of us who are not called upon to surrender our futures and our lives to Canada than we propose to do to those who are being called upon to surrender themselves to fight in this terrific war.

I know that as yet we in Canada have scarcely been touched by war. When I flew from Canada to Great Britain last autumn, and when I returned again in the same quick manner, it seemed as if I had stepped from one world into another. Apart altogether from the black-outs, apart altogether from the evidences of destruction and devastation we saw round us in the great cities; apart altogether from the scarring of the countryside we noticed as we passed through; apart from the fact that to-day the people of Britain are living on rations which, despite efforts to make them healthy and adequate, are nevertheless monotonous, and insufficient to maintain that amount of energy required to carry on under the circumstances under which the people in Great Britain are living—I say that despite all these things we noticed the will of the people to carry through to victory.

I might at this point make one reference which will be familiar to those who were with me. One day we saw an aged woman outside a little corner store. I asked her if she did not wish that the government might do something to end the war to-morrow. In spite of her poverty and in spite of the fact she with many others had been bombed out of her home, she said, "No, sir, not until we have licked him."

We saw the courage of the people over there, and we realized the grimness of the struggle. We in this country have not yet begun to understand the grimness of the situation across the seas.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to leave this thought, that in addition to the provision of men to take part in the battles raging throughout the world to-day, there is something which we in Canada must be prepared to do to a greater extent than we have done before, and that is to provide the people of Great Britain with those concentrated foods which they lack and which are so greatly needed to maintain the health of their working force and their morale. Surely out of our bounty we can deny ourselves pork, bacon, ham, cheese, butter and other foods of the concentrated type so that we may send more and more across the seas to maintain the health of the women, children, workers and soldiers on that beleaguered island. When we left Great Britain that was one of the things they said: "Tell your people in Canada to send us more things—more food, more supplies. Those are the things we need."

I had not intended to say that to-night; I had intended to reserve that suggestion for some other occasion. But, Mr. Speaker, I could not let this occasion go by without saying that if it is necessary for our government to restrict the consumption of those things needed across the seas—for, out of our bounty we could substitute many other things—then I say to the government: "Restrict those supplies, and ration the country." I know the people will respond to the greatest extent to such an appeal.

On motion of Mr. Blackmore the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 9.50 p.m.

Tuesday, January 27, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

THE WAR

IMPERIAL WAR CABINET—SUPREME ALLIED WAR COUNCIL—CANADA'S POSITION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct one or two questions to the Prime Minister, arising out of a bulletin received from London to-day in Ottawa, in which it is stated that Prime Minister Churchill announced to-day that the British government has acceded to Australia's request for representa-

tion on an imperial war cabinet. It will be recalled that yesterday Prime Minister Curtin is reported to have stated over the radio:

> We claim representation in an imperial war cabinet so that Australia's voice and counsel may be heard directly.

The bulletin to which I have already referred quotes Mr. Churchill as having said:

> We have, of course, agreed that the same facilities will be accorded to New Zealand, Canada and South Africa.

I now ask the Prime Minister if Mr. Churchill has communicated with Canada offering facilities to Canada for representation in an imperial war cabinet; and if so, will Canada be represented in an imperial war cabinet. I further ask the Prime Minister to inform the house and the country what is the government's position in relation to this important question. Perhaps I may be pardoned for recalling that I have repeatedly urged in this house the formation of an imperial war cabinet.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Is my hon. friend asking a question, or is he seeking—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No, I am making just a brief statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Might I ask my hon. friend if he is asking a question on the orders of the day? If so, perhaps he would allow me to reply to it.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am not quite through. If the Prime Minister will be good enough to be patient I shall be through in a moment, and then he will have all the time he requires. Before the Prime Minister answers these questions I would ask him another question. Would he indicate the position which he took in consultations which occurred at Washington with reference to the formation of a supreme allied war council? Press reports at that time indicated that the Prime Minister was insisting upon separate representation for Canada rather than representation through a united British commonwealth delegation. I suggest to him and to the house that we are entitled to clear and specific information about the attitude which the Prime Minister took on that occasion, and I invite him to give it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has asked me two questions—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Three, I think.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Three, possibly; and they are fairly long ones, so that perhaps I may be excused if I do not answer them categorically. However, the first question had reference to a statement which appears in the press, to the effect that Mr. Churchill had stated this morning that an imperial war cabinet was to be formed on which Australia would be represented. He asked me if I had had any communication from the Prime Minister of Great Britain in reference to the matter.

I have had a communication, which I happen to have before me. It was received this morning. The substance of it is that the government of the United Kingdom has been thinking over machinery for consultation between themselves and other members of the British commonwealth on matters of urgency connected with the war in the light of the new position resulting from United States entry into the war, and recent developments in the Pacific; that they had received communications from Australia making certain requests, and that these also were being considered. There is an indication of the form in which the request was made and a reference to the fact that, in the form indicated, it would be acceded to; but I have not seen as yet precisely what the Prime Minister has said in the British House of Commons, nor do I know exactly what the position is that has been reached by the British government. I am not therefore in a position to discuss at the moment what action Canada may be expected to take or will be invited to take. However, I promise my hon. friend that as soon as it is possible to do so, I will give the house particulars as to the exact nature of the proposed representation to be accorded dominion governments in the cabinet of Britain, and will certainly be very happy to indicate Canada's position in reference thereto. That, I think, goes as far in answering my hon. friend's question at the moment as I can go. I have asked to be advised of the exact statement made by the Prime Minister so that I may have it before me in answering any question officially.

The other question related to the attitude I had taken at Washington in consultation with reference to a supreme allied war council and to a statement in the press to the effect that I had pressed for separate representation of Canada at that time rather than adopting the position that Canada would be prepared to cooperate with Britain and the United States in whatever arrangements might be thought most advisable. May I say to my hon. friend at once that I made no representation at Washington with respect to separate representation of Canada in the matter of allied direction of war effort, and that my whole aim at Washington, as it has been in the past in Britain and in the United States,

and will be in the future in both those countries, was one of endeavouring to take the position that would best serve to bring about cooperation among all the governments concerned, in the way which would help most to further the effectiveness of the common war effort.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Might I ask the Prime Minister a question? In view of what the Prime Minister has said about north and south America in Washington, can any action be taken by Canada now without consulting Britain and the other dominions? We have a duty to the other dominions and to the empire, and I think they should be consulted before any action is taken.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend says something about what I said in Washington about south America. May I say that to my recollection I never uttered a single word with respect to south America while I was in Washington. The trouble with my hon. friend and many others who come from Toronto is that they often take too literally everything that appears in a certain section of the press.

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

STATEMENT OF MR. GODBOUT IN MONTREAL ON JANUARY 26

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to direct a question to the Prime Minister, based upon a report of an important and significant speech delivered last night by the premier of Quebec at Montreal, in which he is reported to have said:

> We have Mr. King, who has always been against conscription.
>
> And again
>
> We have at the head of the Liberal party Mr. King, who is an anti-conscriptionist.
>
> And again
>
> Mr. King is against conscription.

Is the statement of Mr. Godbout correct? Is there any undertaking, understanding or commitment, express or implied, existing between himself and Mr. Godbout, or between himself and any other person, to the effect that no action will be taken to provide for compulsory military service overseas, even if the plebiscite is answered in the affirmative and he is released from his commitment?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): May I say to my hon. friend, in the first place, that I have nothing before me and he has nothing before him with respect to what Mr. Godbout is alleged to have said last night. I am therefore not in a position to say whether or not any remarks attributed to the premier of Quebec have been correctly reported.

That, however, is not as important as a direct answer to the question with respect to my position in regard to conscription both within Canada and for service overseas, in relation to the past, to the present and to the future.

I tried yesterday to make that position quite plain in my remarks, which now appear in *Hansard*. I then repeated what, in part, I had previously said in this house on those matters. I now give to my hon. friend as reply to the question which he has asked what I said yesterday, which appears in *Hansard* at page 44, restating what I said in this house on November 12 last:

> So far as conscription stands for compulsory selective national service, that is a principle which this government has embodied in its National Resources Mobilization Act passed at a previous session of this parliament. As to how rapidly that principle should be applied, and how far it should be extended, is a matter which the government must decide and will decide in the light of all the knowledge which it has with respect to the needs of our war effort and the position of the country in meeting them.
>
> I want it to be distinctly understood that so far as the principle of compulsory selective national service is concerned for Canada, in Canada, I stand for that principle. I have never taken any other stand. It is the position that I have held all along. It has been applied in connection with military training, and applied in a number of other directions I might mention. How much further it will be applied the house will learn as the government takes its decisions on that matter.

And the further quotation also from what I said on November 12 last which appears on page 48 of yesterday's *Hansard:*

> But so far as conscription for service overseas is concerned in the armed forces of Canada, that question was submitted to the people of Canada at the last general election, an election which was held in war time, and in which the leaders of all political parties made their statements to the electorate, and the people of Canada decided against conscription for overseas service. So far as I am concerned, without any consultation of the people on that subject, I do not intend to take the responsibility of supporting any policy of conscription for service overseas.

That is my position—as stated, I might say, repeatedly in this house, but certainly most clearly and emphatically on November 12 last and again yesterday in this house.

Replying further to my hon. friend's question as to what I intend to do as a result of the plebiscite, I thought I had also anticipated the answer to that question in my remarks yesterday afternoon, which will be found on page 32 of yesterday's *Hansard*, when I said:

When my hon. friend goes on to ask me what I am going to do with respect to any expression of view which may be made by the people in connection with any reference which will be made to them, may I say to him that in seeking to get relief from past commitments I am not going to begin by making new and fresh commitments. In seeking freedom on the part of the ministry I am not going to start in by seeking to tie my own hands.

That is the answer to that part of the question.

My hon. friend asked a further question, whether there was any understanding between myself and Mr. Godbout, express or implied, as to the position which I would take as a result of any plebiscite that would be presented to the people. May I say to him that there is no understanding, express or implied, with Mr. Godbout or with any other person on earth with respect to the attitude that I propose to take after the people have expressed their views with regard to giving the government a free hand.

May I add that such attitude as I shall take at the time will be taken in the light of all the circumstances as I may know them as a member of the government, and of all conditions as I know them in regard to this country and, as far as I am able to know something about them, conditions in other countries as well.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO BRITAIN

WAR SUPPLIES, FOOD, AND LOAN WITHOUT INTEREST—ACKNOWLEDGMENT BY MR. CHURCHILL

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): May I be permitted to give the house a little information which I have received this morning. Yesterday, as the house will recall, I made known an offer which the Canadian government was making to the British government with respect to materials, munitions, food and other supplies during the year, and the assumption on the part of Canada of the financial obligations which that offer would involve.

I have received to-day through the High Commissioner of the United Kingdom a statement of the exact words used by Prime Minister Churchill in the House of Commons this morning accepting that offer. I wish to read to the house the Prime Minister's statement. Mr. Churchill said:

Having crossed the Atlantic it was plainly my duty to visit the great dominion of Canada. The house will have read with admiration and deep interest the speech made by the Prime Minister of Canada yesterday on Canada's great and growing contribution to the common cause in men, in money and in materials. A notable part of the contribution is the financial offer which the Canadian government have made to this country. The sum involved is one billion Canadian dollars, about £225,000,000. I know the house will wish me to convey to the government of Canada our lively appreciation of their kind and most generous offer, unequalled in its scale in the whole history of the British empire, and it is a convincing proof of the determination of Canada to make her maximum contribution to the successful prosecution of the war.

I also received this morning from the Prime Minister of Great Britain a cable directed to myself, to which I have been informed publicity may also be given. I shall therefore read this cabled message, which is from Mr. Churchill to myself as from Prime Minister to Prime Minister:

Reports have just reached me of the most generous and far reaching financial proposals which you have outlined to-day in the House of Commons at Ottawa. I recall your memorable words at the Mansion House when you said, "We in Canada are proud to share your burdens. We are determined to share them to the utmost of our strength." Canada under your leadership has given many proofs of that determination in every field of our common endeavour, and I have recently been fortunate enough to see for myself the spirit that inspires you all. Parliament and the people of this country will share my feelings of profound gratitude and encouragement. At this time when the utmost efforts of every nation are required for victory you have again made plain to the world that all the resources and energies of Canada are to be counted upon in support of the fight for freedom.

PAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

PROPOSED CREATION OF FREE INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE CURRENCY—CANADA'S POSITION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): On January 21, 1942, there appeared in the Edmonton *Journal* an account of the scheme to be submitted to the Rio conference. Section 2 of the proposal, as outlined in the article reads:

Creation of a free international exchange currency to facilitate flow of goods and prevent delay in transactions. It would be on a gold basis and in addition to the American nations, Great Britain, China, the Netherlands, India and all British dominions would enter into the agreement. A pool of allied gold holdings would be created. The Latin American countries would agree to peg their national currencies into the free international exchange currency.

I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether the Canadian government has made any commitments in this regard. If the answer is in the negative, then I would ask: has the Canadian government directly or indirectly

given the government of the United States reason to believe that they favour such a proposal?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The answer to the first question is in the negative. The answer to the second is that as far as I am aware the government has had no communication with the government of the United States with respect to the matter. Perhaps I should qualify that remark by saying that the government had no knowledge of any such statement being made until, like my hon. friend, its attention was directed to the reference to the statement which appeared in the press. After seeing what was set forth in the statement, the government did make inquiries concerning the statement, simply to ascertain whether or not it was authentic. I am not aware that anything more than this has passed in the way of correspondence between the two countries on this matter.

SOLDIERS' DEPENDENTS

INQUIRY AS TO OPERATIONS OF DEPENDENTS' ALLOWANCES BOARD OF TRUSTEES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): May I ask the Minister of National Defence whether the government have come to any new decision about paying a cost of living war bonus to soldiers' dependents. Both the minister and the Prime Minister on November 14 told me in the house that during the recess regional boards to consider cases of hardship would be set up in military districts, which is of no use whatever. Surely something should be done about it. What is the new policy about bonuses to soldiers' dependents? There is considerable suffering in Toronto already this winter and nothing is done.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): Perhaps my hon. friend uses an inappropriate term. I think he is referring to the dependents' allowances board of trustees, which was announced by my colleague the Minister of Finance last November. The board has been appointed and is being set up. For the information of my hon. friend I may add that the chairmen have been selected already in the larger centres, and the committees are now being organized. If my hon. friend has not seen it already I should be glad to send him a copy of the order in council under which the board is set up, giving the powers and general principles under which they act.

Mr. CHURCH: Has any regional board met in Toronto, and how many cases has it reviewed?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think regional boards have met in Toronto, so far as I know. I happened to be talking to the chairman yesterday on the telephone.

Mr. CHURCH: Money would be better spent in that way than on the referendum.

INTERNMENTS

PETITION OF CERTAIN PERSONS INTERNED IN HULL, QUE.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): On November 14 the hon. member for North Battleford (Mrs. Nielsen) presented a petition on behalf of certain interned persons. According to the *Votes and Proceedings* of January 21, the petition has been examined and found in order. According to paragraph 713 of standing order 68 it is now in order to ask for the reading of the petition. I suggest that this be done, possibly at the next sitting of the house if it is not available now.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): There is in my mind at the moment a question as to whether this is not a matter that properly relates to the last session of parliament rather than to the present session, and I should like to consult the Clerk of the House in the first instance as to whether a matter relating to the last session might not have to be renewed in a formal way before it could be taken up anew in the house.

JOINT DEFENCE

POSSIBILITY OF SENDING CANADIAN SOLDIERS TO ASSISTANCE OF UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): In view of our joint defence commitments with the United States I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether units of the sixth division would be available to be sent to the assistance of the United States in the event of an attack on the coast of that country.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I think the appropriate persons to make reply to a question of this kind would be the military authorities, who no doubt have given every consideration to the matter. They may regard it as advisable not to make any public statement at the moment, but certainly this matter is one that should be referred to them in the first instance.

WAGE CEILING

SETTING UP OF REGIONAL BOARDS UNDER NATIONAL WAR LABOUR BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. KARL K. HOMUTH (Waterloo North): Could the acting Minister of Labour give the house any information as to when the several boards dealing with the ceiling on wages will be set up in the various districts throughout the country?

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): I wonder if the hon. member is referring to the regional boards?

Mr. HOMUTH: Yes.

Mr. McLARTY: Then may I say, without having had any further information within the last few days, that it is my understanding that not only the national war labour board but also the regional boards have been completely set up throughout the country. However, I shall make inquiries into the matter and advise the hon. member to-morrow.

TAXATION

AGREEMENTS WITH PROVINCES RESPECTING INCOME AND CORPORATION TAXES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) asked me to table copies of the draft agreements between the dominion and the various provincial governments. I am tabling those copies to-day, but in doing so I should like to make the following statement:

A list of the particular taxes which the provinces and their municipalities are to give up will be attached to the agreements as appendix A. Similar lists of the taxes which the provinces and the municipalities will continue to levy will be attached as appendices B and C. Except in the case of British Columbia, these lists have not yet been completed and are not, therefore, attached to the draft agreements which I propose to table.

The proposed agreements are now being gone over and checked by the provincial authorities. Before they are finally signed there may be some minor changes, either in the wording or in the amounts. I have no reason to expect that this will be so, but it is conceivable that some new situation which we do not know of at the present time may make some changes desirable. For example, some province may dispute the accuracy of the figures or some other question of fact. I do not expect so, but if there should be some minor errors in the figures, we would wish to correct them. Certainly any changes which may be made will be relatively unimportant, but until the draft agreements have been checked by the provinces I cannot say definitely that they are in their final form.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Do I understand that none of the appendices are attached to the agreement, except in the case of British Columbia?

Mr. ILSLEY: No; there are certain appendices attached to certain ones.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In all cases?

Mr. ILSLEY: In all cases, yes. I believe all appendices are attached in respect of British Columbia.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And in respect to others the appendices are not quite complete?

Mr. ILSLEY: Correct.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Will they be tabled at a later stage, when complete?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes. I shall certainly table the agreements when they are completed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is of course after the event.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Monday, January 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, may I first congratulate the hon. members for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald), the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). I believe that yesterday the leader of the opposition did the finest job of speaking he has ever done in his life. I thought it a great pity that he is not going to go right on in the capacity in which he is now labouring. Probably he is the victim of a machinating gang, of an outworn philosophy or of reactionary thinkers.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar did his usual good job of speaking. The Prime Minister has done superbly in the two speeches he has thus far delivered at this

session. His speech in honour of the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe was a model of beauty and eloquence. His speech delivered yesterday was, I thought, altogether an admirable performance for a gentleman who has been in life's battles as many years as he has been. It was remarkable for its length and comprehensiveness, and for the endurance, organization, strength, political skill, idealism, democracy and courage exhibited by the speaker. I believe I have not gone too far in expressing myself in those words.

When he was dealing with new things his courage was obvious. Ordinarily it is said that a man who is beyond fifty-five years is hardly fit to deal with new things. Our Prime Minister has proved that idea to be quite fallacious. He dealt with the tremendous loan to Great Britain—an altogether new thing, this tremendous gift to Great Britain. He told us of the vast expenditures on these big and new things, and he showed a disposition, one which I must say I quite admired in him, to face the facts. He faced courageously the fact that Great Britain cannot pay, and that Canada can pay.

I presume there are in the house a good many who are wondering how in the world that can be. To the orthodox thinker it is impossible to say how it could be, but to a monetary reformer its possibility is quite obvious. By the mere impact of realities that fact is being pounded, if I may use the word, into the heads of even the most reactionary. I wonder how many will continue to ask themselves, as glibly as they have asked so often in the past: Where does the money come from? I wonder how many will remember how that money was obtained when the time comes to apply this simple source of money to the well-being of the Canadian people.

The Prime Minister faced the fact that there should be a balance in Canada, and with that I entirely agree. He pointed out that Canadians should be healthy in mind, body and spirit. Strange, is it not, that Canada has forgotten that for so long?

However, there were two facts he did not face. No doubt he would have faced them had he thought it necessary. He neglected to mention them, but not through lack of courage. The first of these is Canada's war aims. It is high time we began to develop some sort of notion as to what our war aims may be, so that we as the members of the House of Commons and the people in our constituencies may have something to say about them. Obviously the war will end some time, and when it does it is possible that the end will be as it was at the conclusion of the last war—all of a rush. Then someone will spring from somewhere, upon whose initiation no one will know, and form the peace.

The next point he did not set forth was as to whether and how after the war, economic security is to be guaranteed to all the people in Canada. The Prime Minister would have relieved us greatly had he assured us that he knew how that was to be done.

These are points exercising the people of Canada from coast to coast. Down in their hearts, these are matters which are troubling each mother and father. The Prime Minister will need all his courage—and he has plenty of it, and I commend him for it. The common dangers encountered by a leader are, I fear, gathering around him. There are in his war structure of public servants too many who are convincing the Canadian people that dangerously many public servants consist of antiquated egotists, bewildered theorists—witness our price structure—or pious-faced self-seekers, often the servile agents of anti-social interests, masquerading behind the cloak of public service and the mask of Canada's war effort, the unwholesome company of them permitting, aiding and abetting or actively prosecuting iniquitous designs behind the backs of those noble millions who are yielding up their blood, sweat, substance and tears.

The Prime Minister, using discernment, vigour and courage must set about an early spring housecleaning to rid Canada either of these harmful men or their harmful ideas. He must set about to rid Canada not only of $50 brains in $5,000 jobs, but also of certain $500,000 brains now smugly but eagerly in $50 jobs.

The very sight of the hon. members for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald), for Hull (Mr. Fournier), for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght) or for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman) will throughout my days warm my being with a flood of appreciation, sympathy and friendship which will, I think, forever spring to greet each of the five who with me as members of the Empire Parliamentary Association delegation were privileged to take that wonderful trip to Britain. It was a trip matchless for the sights we beheld, for the number and quality of the people we met, for the wealth of the experiences which filled every day of the journey; experiences enlightening, enriching, edifying. The Scriptures advise, "With all thy getting get understanding." As none of us could have done in any other way, we got understanding, got it when most it was needed.

My constituency, my province, my country, along with myself, will from now on owe,

to Sir Drummond Shiels, and Mr. A. C. Spencer-Hess, British parliamentary representatives, whose foresight, industry, devotion and solicitude on the British side, joined with Sir Howard d'Egville's ever-active efficiency on the American side, packed our every day with great worth, and to Doctor Beauchesne whose tireless and scrupulous efficiency took care of each of the needful essential details from Ottawa, and to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) whose foresight, understanding, thoroughness and patience at length effected the organization of the delegation, a real debt of gratitude. To acknowledge, and in some small measure to discharge my share of that debt, may I here in public thank these gentlemen and assure them that I believe the result of that visit, both for Canada and for the commonwealth, will prove to be worth all that it cost.

Many a time as we sped through hundreds of miles of rich British countryside and got acquainted with afflicted British towns such as Portsmouth, Glasgow, Liverpool and Coventry; many a time as we inspected great war industries, as we saw amazing processes or chatted with war workers; many a time as we reviewed our fighting forces and talked with our soldiers, sailors and airmen, I wished that all Canadians could have been with us. Our well-to-do people all would know then, as we do, something of what it means to be without, or very short of, eggs, milk, beef, pork, cheese, butter, sugar, jams and fruits, all things that Canadians so much enjoy and feel that they need. Perhaps they would sense how it feels to be in a land that is producing all that its resources will allow of such foods and still cannot have enough to live on without importing these commodities across an enemy-infested ocean. Our more fortunate folk would perhaps understand that we depend for our very lives upon common people who live and feel, desire and earn, deserve and should receive what too many even in Canada do not now receive.

But I must turn from our British experiences to consider the speech from the throne. Two things caught my attention. The first was the plebiscite proposal, and the second was the suggestion of a balanced programme for the production of foodstuffs.

The Prime Minister's attitude on the plebiscite perplexes me, in spite of his fine detailed explanation. In the first place he shows that we need conscription, not for the air force, not for the navy, but only for the army. Then he details how tremendous has been Canada's war effort in the production of all kinds of goods, as great, it would seem, as our man-power can sustain. He promises an almost limitless expansion of every kind of production without showing where the man-power exists. Then when he has demonstrated that our labour is quite inadequate for these other activities, he proposes presumably to conscript part of this inadequate labour to build a yet greater army. In other words, having demonstrated that the need for conscription for fighting is all but non-existent, having convinced us that to take away more of our men would jeopardize the necessary development of our production projects, he implies that conscription for the army is vital to our war effort and he risks Canadian unity, through the holding of a plebiscite, to free his hands, ostensibly to introduce a policy which he seemingly does not need and which he can use only at the expense of impairment of our war effort.

Since before Canada declared war, Social Crediters have maintained that recruits for any branch of the armed forces could most likely be obtained in sufficient numbers at any time by using the national credit to pay the soldiers, the sailors or the airmen more attractive incomes and to guarantee them and their dependents real security after the war. Raise the pay, increase pensions and allowances, insure employment and your ranks will fill rapidly. These are the things Social Crediters would do. Also your sacrifices will be more equal. On September 5, 1939, was issued from a caucus of Social Credit members of parliament and Alberta cabinet ministers held in Edmonton a statement in which appeared the following excerpts:

> We believe that Canada should finance its share in this war not by the creation of huge debts but in the following manner;
>
> (a) By the creation by the government of the necessary credit and currency combined with definite price regulations to prevent any serious inflationary rise in prices;

May I pause to point out that Social Crediters foresaw that all these prices would have to be adjusted. I continue:

> (b) By borrowing abroad only for the purpose of obtaining needed goods and services beyond the capacity of our people to furnish.
>
> We strongly support the just demands of our people for the greatest possible equalization of sacrifice by—
>
> (a) Placing an embargo on capital and capital assets as at the date of declaration of war;
>
> (b) Requiring that financial institutions and corporations reveal all undisclosed reserves as at the date of declaration of war, and that these be forthwith conscripted by the dominion government;
>
> (c) Introducing a more steeply graded income and profit tax.
>
> We hereby resolve that conscription of material and financial resources for the purpose of securing the greatest possible equalization of sacrifice as outlined above shall be introduced before the conscription of individual man-power.

It is regrettable that the Prime Minister should have so managed as to put himself in such a position that he should feel obliged to hold a plebiscite. But it is the opinion of many that, having done so, apparently the only logical way out for his party would seem to be a plebiscite.

So much having been said about the plebiscite, let us consider the balanced programme of production, which was the second point that attracted me. By that expression the Prime Minister means, I presume, either (a) having the whole Canadian economy in balance, or (b) producing a balanced amount of each necessity in our war effort. Whatever the meaning, agriculture must be our first concern. It is the most important of all industries. Our farmers now operate at a loss. There may be some exceptions in some provinces, but I affirm without fear of successful contradiction that the farmers of Canada are now operating at a loss; and whereas the producers of war munitions are said to be operating on a basis of cost plus ten per cent, it will be found that the farmers of Canada are operating practically on a basis of cost minus ten per cent.

What is the government doing to bring about an increase in natural production? By what machinery does the government get out to the province, to the county, the municipality, the school district and the farmer: first, just what it wishes that area or that farmer to produce; second, just what the government will help him to produce and how it will help him; third, just what the government will take when it is produced; fourth, just what protection the government will give the farmer in producing it, and how? Does the government know just what it wants each of the above units, each province, each county, each municipality, to produce, and why? How many eggs does the government want? We hear reports of 30,000,000 dozen being required or as many as we can produce. Why not find out how many we think the country can produce and then apportion that number among the various provinces and get down to a businesslike campaign in seeking to increase production?

How much bacon does the government want? How much could it use? How much will it take? The government should plan for the production of a certain amount of bacon and of the various other farm commodities. Mr. Speaker, do you know that the farmers are getting so fed up with the general blundering and mismanagement everywhere apparent in everything pertaining to the agricultural policy of this country that they are threatening to go away and enlist or do anything to get out of agriculture.

Has the government let the individual farmer know what it expects him to produce? If so, by what means has it done this? And how does it know that the farmer knows? Does the government have any definite idea what the farmer is going to do about it, and if so, how?

As an illustration there is in a certain area in my constituency a company which has for some years engaged in the production of beet sugar. This company knows by this time of year just how many acres of beets it wants produced and delivered and it sends out its agents to the farmers all over the area and signs up the required acreage to within half an acre. The result is that it knows exactly how many acres of beets will be planted, and the farmer knows how many beets he will be allowed to sell and what the price is going to be, to within a dollar—yes, better than that. If that sort of planning were followed by the government in the various provinces and counties of Canada with respect to other commodities, what a wonderful difference it would make and what a tremendous addition there would be to the security, happiness and peace of the farmer.

What has the government done to supply the farmer with labour to replace the farmer's boy who has joined the army? Does the farmer know what the government is going to do? Has the government told him individually?

Mr. CHURCH: The government is going to hold a referendum.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Does the government know that the farmer may sell his breeding cows, sell his chickens, sell his equipment, and sell his farm or give it up for taxes, and that after that occurs in a very large percentage of the areas in Canada the effect upon our productive capacity within the next two years is going to be disastrous? What is the matter with the men in charge of the Department of Agriculture that they are unable to foresee these things? What we are going to have, the first thing we know, is a sort of agricultural repetition of Hong Kong. Some government member will say: who was able to foresee for us at a certain time that such a thing was going to happen? With respect to Hong Kong I say that ninety-five per cent of the people of Canada could foresee what was bound to happen before very long. Apparently the exceptions were all in the cabinet. Ninety-five per cent of farmers can see catastrophe ahead with regard to agriculture. Why cannot the government see it?

What is the government doing with respect to reserving electricity for the farmer? There

are restrictions on electricity, and how in the world are the farmers going to carry on without sufficient electrical power?

What is the government going to do about money for the farmer? Is the government going to see that the bankers lend money to farmers for the production of certain commodities, and that if they neglect to do so some other agency will lend it to them, and on terms on which the farmers can pay for the use of the money? Is the government going to protect the farmers in case of mishap? Why have we not an agricultural committee on priorities for farming? Everybody else seems to be looked after—there are priorities with respect to rubber, machinery, chemicals, electricity, gas, oil and man-power. The one person who is supposed to be able to look after himself, apparently, is the unfortunate, isolated, scattered, unorganized farmer—the very person whom the government should be looking after with the utmost solicitude.

What was the basis of price fixing of various farm products? No intelligent man so far as I know can conceive on what basis these prices are fixed. Granted that prices were frozen with respect to a certain period; but no one can say that that period was suitable to choose as a basis for protecting the future of this country for years and years of war. The Prime Minister said in October that something would have to be done for agriculture. What has he done? Does he know what ought to be done? If not, who is going to find out? Does the Prime Minister know what is happening to farm production costs? If not, who does, and what is the Prime Minister doing about it? Is he sure that anyone knows or has he taken the trouble to find out?

I am going to refer to the Searle index letter of January 22, according to which I find that the cost of 147 things which the western farmer buys is 151·2 per cent of what it was in 1913-14, while the price of wheat is fourteen per cent lower than it was in 1913-14. I leave that without comment.

Canada simply must have a real agricultural policy which recognizes that we need farmers—all of them—to-day, that we shall need them to-morrow, and that our children's children and their neighbours will need them. Just now, sir, Canada is not crucifying her farmers, she is torturing them to death with a wide variety of forms of torment. May I read a statement which, I think, should be sufficient to establish that? I am reading from "What Share of the National Income Does the Farmer Get?" prepared by Professor Coote, of McGill university, in the spring of 1941:

People living on farms drawing their support from agriculture comprise just about one-third of the population of Canada. Their share of the national income of Canada for the years 1926 to 1929 averaged just one-sixth of the total and the average total income per farm for the period was $1,007 per year. The average cash income for the same period was $791 per year. . . .

In the eleven years, 1930 to 1940, the average income per farm family dropped to $468 per year and the average share of the national income dropped to 9·8 per cent. In the same period the average cash income per farm family dropped to $329 per year. In other words the average total farm family income dropped by 53 per cent and the average cash income decreased by 58 per cent.

If we compare these figures with those for manufacturing industry—

I hasten to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have no complaint against the manufacturing industry.

—we find that the average annual wages per worker for the years 1926 to 1929 were $1,017, and for the succeeding nine years to 1937 they averaged $902, a drop of 12 per cent as contrasted with the 53 per cent in the case of the farmer. In the same period the average salaries paid in industry were $1,894 and $1,724 respectively, a drop of only 10 per cent. No one has envied the position of the worker in industry during the past decade with his short time and low income but in comparison the position of the farmer is desperate.

According to the figures of the last census the average investment in a Canadian farm was $7,000 in round figures. In spite of this fact the average income for the "good" years 1926-1929 was slightly less than the average wages of a worker in industry with no personal investment whatsoever. And the drop in the income of the farmer was four or five times the drop in the income of the worker in industry.

The government must have a plan which appreciates the importance of food and of people. First, Canada must know what she wants. Second, she must get the knowledge out to the farmers—not by means of a random vague leaflet telling the people that "we want a flock on every farm." What the farmer wants to know is: Shall I be able to get my money back if I fill my coop with chickens this year? Am I going to get enough to pay for anything like the time it takes me to go out and look after the hens? We should have, for example, a full coop on half the town and city lots; and why have we not? Simply because we are mismanaging the matter of production of goods.

Third, Canada must guarantee the farmer the means of production. She must guarantee him goods and services and money. Finally, Canada must protect the farmer. First, with respect to price; that is the all important thing. He must be guaranteed his costs plus a just profit. Secondly, with respect to markets: he must know that, if anyone has to absorb the shock if there are too many

goods produced, he is not going to be the unfortunate. We must guarantee the farmer that if he happens to be fairly well off and puts his life savings or borrowed money into cattle, and then when the war closes the price drops out of cattle, he will not have to bear the total loss, as he did last time. This anxiety concerning what will happen after the war is deterring thousands upon thousands of farmers from producing beef and pork and milk and on through almost the whole list of agricultural products. I know that from first-hand contact.

We must guarantee the farmer against his creditors. The Canadian courts are eager enough to declare ultra vires the laws which a province might pass for the protection of the farmer. I wonder why some dominion body is not equally eager to bring into being laws which will protect the farmer. In saying that the farmer must be guaranteed against creditors, I am not suggesting that the creditors should lose their money. But if we can have such a tremendous amount of money as it now becomes apparent we are getting, surely some of it can be used to protect the people who advanced the farmer credit.

It may be asked where the money is coming from. That is a question with which I am always glad to deal, and to-day I have a little assistance. May I read a statement which appeared in the report of a speech, published in the Ottawa *Citizen* of November 13, 1941, by H. T. Jaffray, President of the Canadian Bankers' association. He—

—told the 50th annual meeting to-day that Canada's vast expansion of wartime manufacturing, and large increase in commerce had been "so well, so simply, and so smoothly" financed by the chartered banks, that the financing has "never been a problem in Canada's war effort." The chartered banks "maintain a very strong position and stand ready to continue to support Canada's war effort to the fullest extent that may be required of them."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, in all humility and plain common sense that one of the major needs to-day in Canada's war effort is the financing of a sound policy for agriculture, and the banks should be requested to proceed to perform this function.

There are other problems which need to be solved before Canada has a balanced production. One of those problems is that of the labouring man. This government has shorn the labouring man of every vestige of protection which his struggle through the generations has erected about him. It has shorn him in effect of the power to bargain collectively, of the right to organize, and of the right to strike. Quotations from certain orders in council may be given to show that what I have said is probably a little extreme. I can give quotations to show that what I have said is thoroughly moderate. It remains the duty of those agencies who deprived the labouring man of his own protection to see to it that by the same agencies adequate government protection is afforded that man before he is driven to desperation with disastrous results.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have said as much as I believe it is fitting I should say regarding the war effort, regarding balanced production in Canada. It does not give me happiness to have to say any kind of unpleasant things, but I felt myself to-day obliged to say some pretty sharp things, and I am going to say some sharper ones unless something is done about these matters with respect to the Canadian economy.

Before I close I wish to turn for a minute to the two amendments which have been moved. With the Conservative amendment I am not going to quarrel. I believe that the members of my group will see fit to support that amendment, on the ground that it is a vote of want of confidence in the government because of the fact that the government is not producing a balanced programme of production in this country.

With the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation amendment we are not going to quarrel particularly. We assume that the C.C.F. have finally got round to somewhere near the stand we took in 1939 before war was declared. They probably would be in agreement with the principles set forth in the excerpts which I read earlier in this speech from the statement issued at Edmonton. We therefore are likely to support the C.C.F. amendment.

Mr. LIONEL CHEVRIER (Stormont): Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with those who have preceded me in this debate in extending to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne my hearty congratulations. Both performed admirably; both, together with four other hon. members, had the great privilege and advantage of seeing for themselves in the British isles the havoc wrought by the forces of tyranny. They were able to observe for themselves the grim determination of the people of Great Britain to carry on against tremendous odds. The house has benefited by their experience and by their contributions to this debate.

One can with difficulty take part in this debate without referring to the great loss which our country has suffered in the death of her former Minister of Justice, Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. He was a man of great

integrity, unselfish, true to tradition, kindly, eloquent, a lover of freedom and a true disciple of Laurier. His speeches in this house were models; many of them will remain as masterpieces. His influence in this house and in the country at large will be felt for many years to come. He was a great Canadian who will rank among the greatest of our public men.

The speech from the throne opens with a reference to the character and scope of the present conflict. No doubt remains now that it is a world-encircling conflict. It has reached every continent, including our own. Each day it draws nearer and nearer, and one cannot foresee the end.

The first year of the war was one of disaster and disillusionment. The democratic nations relied on static defence and economic blockade. They were unprepared. The allied chiefs of staff made a serious mistake in thinking that they could sleep comfortably behind a Maginot line, because when it was flanked there followed the fall of France, and the liberty-loving nations were face to face with the grim reality that for seven years Germany had been preparing her youth for aggression and for a campaign of world domination.

The second year of the war has given us more room for hope. It began with the battle of Britain, in which those daring men of the Royal Air Force and the Royal Canadian Air Force saved that fortress of civilization—yes, and civilization itself. Our confidence grew with the victories over the Italians, who at the outbreak of the war had an African empire and who have now lost every vestige of it. Our hopes were shaken by the German successes in Yugoslavia, in Greece, in Crete and in Africa. Again they were strengthened by the passage of the lease-lend bill, which meant the mobilization on our side of the economic power of the United States. Finally, the fateful decision of the nazis, for whatever reason it was made, to attack Russia, has brought us, I believe, the most comforting news of this war. The campaign has now lasted for seven months. At the outset it appeared to be a complete nazi victory; it has now been turned into a humiliating defeat for the Germans, who are in retreat from Leningrad to the Crimea.

The third year of the war saw the British launch a fresh attack in Libya which from the outset met with success all along the line. It brought about the delivery of Tobruk and of Bardia. Many Canadians took part in the air operations in Libya and covered themselves with glory. Some 20,000 motor vehicles of Canadian manufacture, including tanks and universal carriers, stood the test in that campaign. Our hopes have been momentarily shaken in Libya by a counter-offensive, the details of which are yet difficult to appraise.

December saw the entry of Japan into the war, with the treachery and frenzy for which they are known; while their diplomats were negotiating at Washington they made the attack on Pearl Harbour. One cannot refer to the war in the Pacific without having a word to say concerning Hong Kong. For seventeen days Canadian troops held the enemy at bay against extreme odds. In the regiments from Canada were a number of young men from the constituency which I represent. Their fate is not yet known, but I pray they have not been called upon to make the supreme sacrifice.

The war in the Pacific, and particularly the precarious position in which Australia finds herself to-day, should remind us that if it is important and essential to maintain a Canadian army overseas, it is equally important and essential to protect our own shores from attack.

At this stage I should like to say a word with reference to Canada's part and contribution in this life-and-death struggle. Canada has been fighting on two fronts, the military and the economic. The military front is made up of the fighting armies, the air squadrons and the ships of the navy. The economic front is made up of the factory, the farm and finance. Canada, as we have been told, already maintains a Canadian army overseas, composed of approximately 130,000 men. The Canadian corps comprises three divisions, together with the fifth armoured division, to which have been attached an army tank brigade, corps troops and army troops. The speech from the throne refers to an expansion of the Canadian establishment overseas. The Prime Minister in his speech yesterday clarified that by saying that during 1942 two army corps will be established in Great Britain, composed first of three infantry divisions, and two army-tank brigades, and two armoured divisions. In Canada there are the fourth and sixth divisions. The sixth division consists of three brigade groups to which are attached corps and army troops, and there are also coastal defences. Canada maintains troops in Newfoundland and the West Indies; and the grand total of the Canadian reserve and active armies is approximately 450,000 men.

In the air force there are 100,000 men, with a large number on the waiting list. Soon there will be in Great Britain some twenty-eight squadrons, and twenty-five squadrons are said to be equal to one army division. Thus far there have been lost, in the air force, some 1,200 men. The greatest contribution of the

Royal Canadian Air Force is in connection with the commonwealth air training plan, to which Right Hon. Mr. Churchill paid such tribute in his memorable address in this house. Under that plan are trained airmen from Canada, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Australia. It is a commonwealth enterprise. Canada has undertaken the major burden in both men and money. Under the plan eighty per cent of the men are Canadians; and of the $824,000,000 which the plan will cost over a period of three years, this country will pay about $531,000,000. Some ten per cent of those trained under the plan are from the United States, and there are some 600 American instructors operating in the various training schools.

The navy has 350 ships and a personnel of 27,600, and here also we have a large number of men awaiting entry. Thus far 400 men and six ships have been lost at sea. A very important and essential part of the work of the navy consists in the convoying of food, troops and material to and from Great Britain. Thus far less than one per cent of the goods, equipment and men convoyed have been lost at sea.

A moment ago I referred to the economic aspect of the war. It is equal in importance to the fighting armies, the air squadrons and the ships of the navy. A modern infantry division costs eight times as much to equip and maintain as did the division of 1914-18. It has fifty times the horse-power in its transport and fighting vehicles. It has eight to ten times the fire power in its small arms and guns. A machine gun costs $500, and it takes tens of thousands of these guns to equip our troops. An anti-aircraft gun costs $28,000, and they are being produced at the rate of four hundred per month. A tank costs $90,000, and we have manufactured hundreds. We have sent large numbers to Russia, and the reports from that front indicate that they have performed admirably, particularly the type known as the Valentines.

A bombing plane costs some $100,000; a dozen can crash in a night. Our aircraft industry has been built from the ground up. It has manufactured or assembled in Canada some 3,749 aircraft, and the present average rate of production is forty per week, of all types. The automobile industry has played a tremendous part in equipping the forces of the empire. Over 200,000 vehicles of all types thus far have been built, and thousands are being delivered each month. Every four days Canada builds a corvette. Two 10,000-ton cargo ships already have been launched, and the programme for 1942 visualizes the production of 100 freighters of the 10,000-ton class.

In a statement made shortly before the house met, the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) said that to-day Canadian equipment is to be found on all the battlefronts of the world—in the Philippines, at Singapore, in China, Russia, the middle east and the British Isles. In his memorable address in this House of Commons the Prime Minister of Great Britain spoke of the production of corvettes and ships, which he said was proceeding on a scale almost equal to the building in the United Kingdom. Coming from him, this was truly a great tribute to the naval production of our country.

When one ponders these facts, sir, he will immediately see why it takes fifteen workers on the home front to keep one combatant in the field. Hence the economic front is truly a front, and not only a salient.

The farm is an essential part of the economic front. If in peacetime it can be said that the farmer is the backbone of the country, that is even more true in time of war. Cheese, bacon, canned salmon, wheat and flour are being sent to Britain in ever-increasing quantities. In the third year of the war our export of bacon to Britain will be more than our entire production in pre-war years. In 1941 we sent 112,000,000 pounds of cheese to Britain, and the contract for 1942 calls for 127,000,000 pounds.

In view of the shortage of labour on the farm and the increase in the cost of production it seems to me that the farmer, and particularly the cheese producer, is called upon to make an extra sacrifice, or an extra contribution. Every year since the beginning of the war—and I believe these are the words of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner)—Canadian farmers have accepted prices for their food commodities far below those to which they were entitled. This is particularly true of cheese. It is interesting to note in the speech from the throne that vast quantities of foodstuffs will go to Britain as an integral part of the war effort. It is to be hoped that for the primary producer this will mean an increase in prices. It seems to me there should be a greater parity between the return of the wage earner and the return of the farmer producer. Canada's contribution in foodstuffs centres chiefly around pork products, cheese, canned salmon, wheat and flour; and in all these commodities we are the chief source of supply for Britain. In his address yesterday the Prime Minister said that Canada is an arsenal, a ship yard and a storehouse as well as a full partner on the fighting front.

Wars cannot be carried on without finance, and in a statement in this house last year the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) told us

that for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1942, there would be needed, to meet the direct expenses of the war, the current costs of government and the advances to Great Britain, the sum of $2,800,000,000. This sum, I believe, was broken up as follows:

Estimated cost of the war for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1942	$1,450,000,000
Ordinary cost of government	468,000,000
Advances to Great Britain	900,000,000
	$2,818,000,000

This is a tremendous amount of money, so large it is hard to conceive. Perhaps some comparisons may help to make clear the stupendousness of this amount. In 1940 the total paid to all those working for salaries and wages amounted to $2,875,000,000. Therefore it would take 80 per cent of this amount to meet the direct costs of the war in 1941-42. It would require the production of all farmers in Canada for almost three years to cover the cost of war for one year. The direct cost of the last war, from 1914 to 1920, which would include the cost of demobilization, amounted to $1,670,000,000. The amount we now raise for one year is greater by $600,000,000 or $700,000,000 than that raised in the whole of the last war. These sums, I repeat, are stupendous. Still it is estimated that $1,500,000,000 will be raised by taxation and otherwise by way of national revenue. During the present fiscal year 78 per cent of our national budget will be raised by taxation, as compared with 47 per cent in the last war. Canada's per capita taxation will exceed in this war $110 as compared with $28 in the last war.

It is difficult, sir, to refer to the matter of finance without saying a word about the Hyde Park declaration. In the early stages of the war there was an official premium of 10 to 11 per cent on United States dollars in Canada. There was a freezing by the foreign exchange control board of United States cash already here. This method sufficed to keep the books between Canada and the United States reasonably well balanced, and Canadians were able to travel and purchase in the United States during that first stage.

In the next stage, however, we began buying hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of war materials in the United States, and we fabricated them to be sent to Great Britain, without thought of immediate payment from the mother country. During that period we ran desperately low in United States dollars; hence a travel embargo had to be imposed. Heavy taxes on non-essentials were needed to ensure that so precious an asset as United States dollars should be conserved for war purposes.

Perhaps by placing some figures on record I might give hon. members a better understanding of that picture. In 1938 imports from the United States into Canada amounted to $425,000,000. In 1939 they rose to $497,000,000. In 1940, during the first complete year of the war, they jumped to $744,000,000 and in 1941 it is estimated that they will reach $953,000,000. As opposed to this it is estimated that in 1941 Canada will export to the United States $475,000,000 worth of goods, which would then leave us with an adverse trade balance of $478,000,000. Something simply had to be done to offset this serious bottleneck. Then came Hyde Park. The United States began to buy war materials in Canada for lease-lend to the United Kingdom, the Netherlands East Indies, China and Russia. She also agreed to charge directly to lease-lend accounts of Great Britain raw materials which we needed to make munitions of war for the battle of Britain.

The dollar problem did not disappear. But from the most acute bottleneck in our war effort it became something manageable. A crown company, known as War Supplies Limited, was set up as a means of implementing this declaration. Its function is to negotiate and receive orders from departments of the United States government for war supplies to be manufactured in Canada. Since Hyde Park it is estimated that some $200,000,000 to $300,000,000 of war materials will be purchased in Canada. This will unquestionably relieve the pressure and substantially reduce the adverse trade balance.

Before concluding, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word about the Ogdensburg agreement, which was made almost within a month of the fall of France. As a result of this agreement there was set up a permanent joint board on defence to consider the safety of Canada and the United States. Its object was to consider in a broad sense the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere. It included problems relating to land, sea and air. As a result of this agreement the United Kingdom exchanged sites for bases. In Newfoundland and Bermuda these sites were leased. The other sites were exchanged for fifty over-age American destroyers, six of which went to Canada. Early in the war Canada sent a garrison to Newfoundland, and since the Ogdensburg agreement that garrison has been strongly supplemented by American forces. On the west coast joint defence has

been put into operation. A chain of well-equipped air bases has been established where none existed two years ago. On both coasts Canada is basing her defence on the three arms of the service, with the naval and air forces predominating.

Closely tied up with the central defence under the Ogdensburg plan is the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes seaway project, of which we have not yet heard the last word. With Japan in the war and the west coast subject to attack, and with enemy activity on the east coast, this giant undertaking is still regarded as a defence job. The proposed 27-foot deep waterway would open the great lakes to all but the heaviest warships. It would provide bomb-free anchorage many thousands of miles from the sea for unlimited concentrations of naval craft. It would make available for shipbuilding, factories in the Hamilton, Windsor and Detroit areas, where there is concentrated the largest amount of power, steel, coal, labour and machinery which can be found anywhere in the world.

The Ogdensburg agreement marks the full blossoming of a long association of harmony and friendship between Canada and the United States. It was the forerunner of that historic meeting at sea between Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt which resulted in the Atlantic charter, while the Hyde Park agreement brought about the declaration respecting the joint war production committee of the two countries. Both Hyde Park and Ogdensburg, so far as this country is concerned, have paved the way for the allied declaration which was made early in January, and which has now been implemented in the speech from the throne.

On September 10, 1939, Canada declared a state of war against Germany, and at the same time declared that she would stand at the side of Great Britain. Since that day Canada has never faltered. That is why Great Britain's Prime Minister was able to pay such a tribute to Canada in this chamber. He called our war effort "magnificent"; and I believe that in a press conference he gave afterward he went so far as to say that, tremendous as was the contribution in the last war, the contribution in this war was even greater. That effort, Mr. Speaker, is due to careful planning on the part of the government. It is due to the fact that men have been placed in the right places.

There have been mistakes. Unquestionably there have been delays; but of irretrievable blunders there have been none. There is one thing that has been manifest thus far, and it is the unity of mind and of purpose of the Canadian people. But we have now, sir, reached a very critical stage in our war effort, a stage which I think in some respects greatly parallels that of the last war. We are now in the third year of the war. It was in the third year of the last war that the crisis came which split this country against itself. I am sure no hon. member in the house would want to see a recurrence of those events. The plebiscite, in my humble view, is another means of preserving intact the unity of our people. Without that unity the war effort could not be national, it could not be total. I do not believe there is any section of this country, in the face of the peril which surrounds us, that would not want us to prosecute this war to the utmost of our strength. If it is to be prosecuted in that manner, the unity of mind and the unity of purpose of our people must be kept intact. I am sure the house will listen to the words of the former Minister of Justice on this subject, uttered not long before his death. He said:

> Sons of our country, brothers in one family, for the future of Canada as for the successful prosecution of the war, is it not imperative that no section of Canada, no race, no creed, should impose upon the other sections, the other races or the other creeds incurable wounds which might destroy our country forever.

In order to have total war there must be total unity, so that in the days to come the Canadian people, side by side with the British and American peoples, will, to use the words of Britain's Prime Minister in his Washington speech, for their own safety and the good of all, walk together in majesty, in justice and in peace.

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): Mr. Speaker, I should like to conform to that pleasant practice which is followed in this house and express my words of commendation to the mover (Mr. Fournier, Hull) and the seconder (Mr. Macdonald, Brantford City) of the address, and I do this not in any perfunctory way because I appreciated listening to these hon. members. Both of them are members of standing in this house who have made for themselves niches; both of them recently had the opportunity, as did I, of crossing to Great Britain by a most novel method. We saw for ourselves the valour of that people and the recovery they are carrying out; we saw the extraordinary way in which their nerve is being upheld. I was particularly delighted with the phrases used by the mover when he described, in rather touching words, the grace of their majesties.

The speech from the throne is intended to reveal to the people of Canada the intentions of the government in the prosecution of the war, recognizing as it does that the situation is critical and the danger great, and consequently that unless that danger to our existence is overcome by early victory, other

things fall into insignificance. Canada went to war two and one-quarter years ago in order to uphold her principles and to defend her honour. During this time the war has steadily expanded, and to-day she is confronted with far graver conditions because the war is on both her coasts and her men are fighting on every front.

Therefore I examine the government's intentions with critical interest. I find that the fullest consideration of the war effort, past, present and future, will be given in the course of the discussion, and that measures will be submitted providing for our national security and the prosecution of the war to the utmost of our strength. This implies to me that the very wide powers which parliament gave to the government under the National Resources Mobilization Act and other acts have proved insufficient for their purposes. That is indeed surprising, or has the government not yet made full use of the powers so granted to it by parliament?

Yesterday, when referring to the form and contents of the speech of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) gave him commendation—naturally it was qualified commendation—and accepted a good deal of what my leader said as being something to which he could subscribe. Then he went on in banter and referred to the fact that, as he followed him, the leader of the opposition appeared to spend the major part of his time in advocating compulsory service for military affairs and then had omitted that from the amendment which he proposed. To that view I certainly cannot subscribe because in my opinion the leader of the opposition treated compulsory service for military affairs as one of the factors making up what he conceived to be Canada's total national effort.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend omits the word "overseas." That is the point I was making.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It says, "any theatre of war."

Mr. STIRLING: I think that will develop from a re-reading of the amendment. My hon. friend was discussing what we consider necessary for man-power and its development in this country, and he dwelt upon the necessity of using compulsion in the matter of military service. When I come to the amendment which he subsequently laid before the house, I find the following clause:

> . . . additional measures designed to
>
> (a) completely mobilize the wealth and material resources and, on a selective basis, the full man and woman power of the nation, to the end that the nation may wage total war in any theatre of war.

[Mr. Stirling.]

For the Prime Minister to say that there is little reference in that to compulsory service seems to me to indicate that he needs something more than a microscope if he desires to get the meaning of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but I think I agreed with the leader of the opposition as to compulsion being applied to military service at the present time. My point was that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was identifying military service overseas with a total war effort, and the application of compulsion to military service overseas with a total war effort. My objection was that when he was presenting his amendment, attaching the importance he did to compulsion applied to military service for overseas, he did not so specifically state his point in the amendment.

Mr. STIRLING: I regret that I cannot follow the Prime Minister in his explanation of his exposition. It appears to me that my leader was referring to one phase of the man-power question, to the necessity, things having changed as they have and conditions being so much graver than they were, of applying compulsion if we were to carry out the war effort that we are supposed to be carrying out, a total one and that in any theatre of war.

We are further informed in the speech from the throne that approval will be sought of a balanced programme for further increases in the armed forces and for the production of munitions. I am not aware that parliament has in the previous war sessions put any bounds whatsoever on the numbers of the fighting forces or on the amount of production of which organized industry is capable. But the house will pay close attention to the way the money voted has been expended, and will readily accord what further authority is necessary.

Mention is made of the government's policy of "a total national effort for total war" and of "national selective service", and I look for evidence of either. When the national registration was arranged for under the National Resources Mobilization Act, the country welcomed it as evidence that it was the government's intention to use such a numbering of the people for the purpose of getting everyone able to work into work which would further the war effort. They were certainly justified in that assumption, if one may judge by the words which were used in explanation of the legislation when it was placed before

the house. I quote from *Hansard* one paragraph of the Prime Minister's speech on June 18, 1940, pages 854 and 855:

It will enable the government to make the most efficient use of our man-power for the varied needs of modern machine warfare. It is of the utmost importance to realize that success in war to-day depends upon the use of men for the kind of work for which they are best fitted. The armed forces are only a part of the essential equipment of war. The skilled worker in the factory, the transport worker and the farmer, to mention only a few, are as essential to the effective prosecution of war as the soldier, the sailor and the airman.

To that I subscribed at the time, and to that I subscribe to-day. It has to be a total war effort so that every kind of effort which can be put forward by men shall be made use of, and it will have to be directed, and, in certain instances, men will have to be compelled to give service.

Again I quote the Prime Minister, in the same speech:

National registration will also provide the government with an inventory of the mechanical and industrial skill of our population. Such an inventory will prove valuable in affording additional information on the extent of our resources of skilled labour which can be drawn upon to meet the needs of essential war-time industries. It will also show the directions in which intensive industrial and technical training is most urgently needed to provide an adequate supply of labour to meet the growing demands of our war industries and other essential services.

I also quote the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) speaking on July 30, 1940, when he was Acting Minister of National War Services. The setting of his remarks was that he was speaking of the communications which the government had received in which various persons throughout Canada volunteered their services in carrying out the registration. He said at page 2125 of *Hansard*:

Some of these communications represented whole staffs in large organizations, determined to see that this registration is properly made in the shortest possible space of time. That cooperation is given to the end that every available man, every product of industry and primary production and the whole credit of Canada shall be placed at the disposal of the governments of Canada and Britain to drive back the forces of Hitler and reestablish freedom in the world.

The registration was looked upon as something which would be of very great service to a government that desired to get every man's effort into the war in the best possible way in which it could be used. But the government finds that, in spite of the information collected by the registration, in spite of the powers granted by the National Resources Mobilization Act, progress in its policy of "total national effort for total war" has been impeded and impaired by a "controversy concerning commitments", and for that reason it proposes to seek by plebiscite:

. . . release from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service.

If the government can obtain such a release it will then feel free "to act in accordance with its judgment".

In the first place, what are the commitments? The one that comes to mind is the Prime Minister's statement of his opinion about compulsory service. Are there others covered by the term "any commitments"? If there are no others, it is a pity that it was not so specifically stated. The Prime Minister has on several occasions referred to compulsion as an issue in the last general election. That is not the case. A question becomes an issue at an election when opposing views are placed strongly before the people. At the last election, so far as I am aware, the argument for the use of compulsion was not stressed, and few, if any, advocated it. True, there has always been a body of opinion which held that compulsion by selective service was the fairest way to fill the ranks of the fighting forces. But that question was not an issue at the last election. For many years in Great Britain recruiting for the services was on a voluntary basis, but when the time came that the government of the day was persuaded that compulsory selective service was imperative, that government proceeded to put it into operation and it did not hold a plebiscite. It took the onus of putting the scheme into operation and it took the risk of censure. Similarly, when last year that government decided that it must remove the restrictions in order to include women, it did not hold a plebiscite. It included women and took the risk of censure. Yet this government, which has always stressed the supremacy of parliament, now prefers to hold a plebiscite. It is going to ask the electors whether they will release the Prime Minister from the pledge he made.

Between the time of the last election and the present day the position of the allies has grown graver. The war is on both our coasts. The United States has joined us and has taken of its manhood what it considers is required for the task confronting it. It did not hold a plebiscite. It acted in accordance with its wisdom.

In this country it has been evident for a year that our manhood must be subjected to direction of effort if what the government calls its policy of "total national effort for total war" is to be carried out. In the year that has passed, the wheat crop, the apple

crop, and some other crops were light, and, even so, the required labour was not easily obtained. In the season that lies ahead, there are prospects of greater crops and of greater demand for crops, for foodstuffs and for our munitions of war, and the farmers are already wondering what plans will be evolved so that labour may be available when it is required. They know of the registration. I do not think they know of what the government calls its policy of "national selective service". They know that industry is drawing away men and women by the lure of better wages and steady work, and they are anxious.

The government's efforts at recruiting for active service have been shrouded in some secrecy so far as total numbers by units and by provinces are concerned, except that in November last the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) submitted figures which showed that they were some distance below requirements; and now we have the sorry story, told by the minister on the last day of the 1941 session, that when he required to find in an emergency fewer than 2,000 trained men, some 130 with insufficient training had to be sent.

I do not suppose that I am singular in receiving continuous requests for advice as to how a man most desirious of helping in the war effort should get into touch with work he could do, and the only answer that one has been able to give is the address of the director of services. In the earlier months of the war we had the voluntary service registration bureau, and we were never able to get any information as to how that bureau functioned. There was an occasion, I remember, when it was intimated that the number of these applicants had reached five figures, but we were never able to get an answer to the question of how many had been put to desirable work for which they were suited. We have never been able to get an answer to the question of what percentage of applicants have received employment. The whole question of the man fitted for work lacking direction as to how he shall get into contact with that work, is still to be solved.

A blacksmith of my acquaintance was asked after the registration whether he was prepared to go back to his trade. He was not following his trade at the time. He said that he would be glad to. He heard nothing more; and then, as the work on which he was engaged, in an irrigation district, came to an end, he wrote, informing the authorities that he would be free the following month and would go to work at his trade if he was required. He was not seeking a job; he had occupation; but he wanted to do his bit. He was instructed to go to Vancouver and present himself in a shipyard. He drove the three hundred miles at his own expense, and he found that men were being laid off, not taken on. He went to other shipyards and found the same condition. He went to the labour office, and in that office they were astonished that he should have ever been instructed to find his way to Vancouver because he was needed to do certain work. So he, a disappointed man, returned home the three hundred miles at his own expense. He was wanting to help the war effort. Add that instance to many others of men who have mechanical training, who want to make parts in connection with contracts, who want to feel they are doing their bit, and imagine their feelings when told that the government has been impeded in carrying out its policy of national selective service by a controversy concerning commitments. Imagine the feeling in that blacksmith's district when he came home and it got around that that was what he had suffered when he, hoping to make use of his talents and his training in work, found at the end of a three hundred mile journey that he was not wanted; and imagine how that spreads around that fertile field of depression, among the many men in this country who are just waiting to be directed so that their skill and their talents shall be made use of.

This government was elected in March, 1940, by a considerable majority with a mandate of the people to get on with the job. Compulsory service was not an issue at that election, though the Prime Minister says it was. It did not prevent the government from making the only use I know of, to that date, of the registration, and applying compulsion to the training of young men of certain age classes, first for a thirty-day period, and then for a four-month period. It has not hampered the government in applying compulsion to those young men by retaining them in the reserve army. But note that the speech from the throne says that the government's efforts are impeded by its commitments, and it holds that, to set aside those commitments and get on with the total war effort, even though the facts which we face are completely different from what they were when the commitments were made, would savour of dictatorship.

Therefore the government is going to hold a plebiscite, and the people are to be asked, "Will you release us from our hampering commitment?" The government has been the custodian of the facts; it must of necessity control what we are told. It has released what it has seen fit, and the facts connected with our needs, if we are to wage total war, have not been very plentiful to us in this house. Would not a reasonable reply to the

question be from the man or the woman in the country, "Why ask me? You ought to know. You were put there to govern. You say your policy is total national effort for total war. Go ahead; don't ask me if you may."

There are in this country a considerable number of people of stocks other than English and French who came here and threw in their lot with us, and whose descendants, with our descendants, we hope, will build a greater and grander Canada. Very many of them have not yet sufficiently mastered our language to be able to follow the niceties of the question, when is a commitment not a commitment?

Mr. MARTIN: And vice versa.

Mr. STIRLING: It may be difficult for them to find their answer, yet the sons of many of them are in the armed services, and they under wise leadership would be as anxious as we are to defend liberty.

I could have understood the action of the government had it submitted a measure susceptible of simple explanation to people, asking for a yes or a no, though I could not have agreed with the action, because I hold that a government is put there to govern. But, to ask the people if it may be released from a commitment, and leave its subsequent action a mystery, is making government in this country a laughing-stock. In this plebiscite the government will have to use methods, yet to be described to us, for the purpose of informing the far-flung population as to the reasons and the facts connected with the question which they are asked. It will be no easy matter to do that. There are hundreds of thousands of people in this country who do not read a daily newspaper. Some of them no doubt see a weekly newspaper. There are, I do not know how many hundred thousand who listen to the radio; perhaps it runs into the millions, but my impression is that the dial is very quickly turned off when something entertaining ends. How are the government going to inform the people in detail of what this question means and why it is asked? If the government can answer that question satisfactorily, they may make those of us who dislike the idea of a plebiscite a little less hard against it.

The Prime Minister indicated yesterday that, in his opinion, three courses were open to him, and that two others had been suggested to him. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a sixth course open, a course which I think is the one this government should have followed. The proper course would have been to submit the difficulty of a commitment to parliament and take parliament's answer. This government was returned to power by a considerable majority. Each one of the members is the chosen mouthpiece of the constituents he was elected to represent. It is to them the Prime Minister should turn for an answer to the question: May I be released from a commitment which I made when times were far different from what they are to-day?

To parliament he can relate the facts, to parliament he can divulge the difficulties, far better than they can be explained to the population at large. Members of parliament are delegates sent by the people, they are sent to express opinions on whatever questions are put before them. The majority wish of parliament is supreme. Under a democratic system what possible objection can be voiced to letting parliament decide? Then the course that this government should follow would be to get on with what it calls its policy of total national effort for total war; get on with it though it is a year late; make use of national selective service so that the available man and woman power may be put to the best possible use, and then see the Canadian people adapt themselves to their duty and accept sacrifice and self-denial if these are required.

Mr. R. W. GRAY (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, in rising to express some views on the speech from the throne presented to this house on Thursday last, may I first be permitted to congratulate the mover of the address in reply, the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier), and the seconder, the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald), on the excellence of the material chosen and the clarity with which they expressed their views. Both these hon. members have recently returned from a visit to war-time Britain, and it is therefore fitting that they should have been chosen for this high honour. They have discharged their duty with credit to themselves and to the constituencies which they represent.

Since we met in this chamber in November last, a new and powerful enemy has attacked us. But a new and more powerful friend has joined us. When the history of this war is written, I feel certain it will be found that the part which the present Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King) has played as liaison officer as it were between England and the United States, in forging those links which now bind the English-speaking nations together, will rank among the highest of his achievements.

Mr. Speaker, we have passed through difficult times; we are facing times more difficult. We have achieved much; much remains to be done. That there is room for criticism the

government would be the first to admit. But in any criticism we may offer let the fact not be obscured that Canada is rendering a service of which we may well be proud. There are times when we are too prone to belittle our own effort. That is due in part to the fact that we are hearing over the radio and reading in the press of the huge production programmes announced by our neighbours to the south, and losing sight of the fact that we are a nation of some twelve million while they have some 130 million. We have, as has been pointed out in this house—and I think it cannot be too often repeated—accomplished some great things since we declared war. We have some 150,000 soldiers, sailors and airmen serving outside Canada. We have a total voluntarily enlisted man-power of something over 387,000. Our navy went into action immediately war was declared and has played an increasingly important part during the battle of the Atlantic. The personnel of the Royal Canadian Air Force as of December 31, 1941, totalled something over 100,000 men. To this must be added some 12,000 civilians, or a force of nearly twenty-five times as many as we had when war was declared.

I should like here to commend the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) for his foresight in establishing an air cadet corps and schools and other services in order to bring up the educational standing of men who did not quite meet the required qualifications. The commonwealth air training scheme is turning out pilots, gunners and observers at a rate far in excess of that which was planned for this time. It has been reported that some 80 per cent of the personnel of its air crews are Canadians, and the fact must not be lost sight of that Canada is paying 60 per cent of the cost. In its first three years of operation the plan will cost something like $500,000,000, more than the dominion collects in taxes in a normal peace-time year. Canadian aircraft industry, very small as we know it was at the beginning of the war, has now turned out something over 2,700 aircraft. Chemical and explosives plants of huge dimensions have sprung up. Shells are being made in factories, some of which were closed for years, others have been built upon soil which up to a few months ago was barren land. Tanks, army vehicles, are rolling off assembly lines; automatic weapons, guns and small arms ammunition are being produced in greater and greater quantities.

One could go on and tell of corvettes, freighters and smaller craft being built in Canadian shipyards. All this is a tribute to the industry and energy of the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) and the staff that he has gathered under him. Canada's direct war spending in the present fiscal year will be more than $1,300,000,000. When to the war expenditures are added the other expenses, federal, provincial and municipal, the Canadian taxpayer will be found to be paying in taxes between fifty and fifty-five cents out of every dollar he earns. These are some of the things we are doing, and, for a nation of around twelve million people, not to be deprecated.

In spite of these tremendous accomplishments more remains to be done. It is true that too many of us may be what is termed Monday morning quarter-backs, but it is a poor coach who does not take a lesson from such quarter-backs.

Mr. Speaker, these words stand out in the speech from the throne:

> The conflict can have but one of two outcomes. Either tyranny, based on terror and brutality, must be overthrown; or the free peoples of the world, one and all, slowly but eventually, will be reduced to a state of bondage. Upon the outcome depends, for generations, the future well-being of mankind.

Agreeing as I do with that statement, I am disappointed that the government have not given us the facts which enabled them to put into the mouth of his excellency the words indicating the gravity of the crisis. These were not surmises but facts of which they had knowledge; facts which, if given boldly to the people of Canada, would have been accepted just as willingly as the people have accepted every definite request made during this war. They have accepted, without question, higher taxation, restrictions, loans of all kinds, whatever they have been told was necessary for the successful prosecution of the war.

With this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I submit that in this crisis the government would be justified in now—and by "now" I mean immediately—asking parliament to extend the provisions of the National Resources Mobilization Act in order to eliminate the restrictions concerning service in Canada only, in order that our armed forces both here and overseas, including reserves and reinforcements, may be maintained at the highest possible strength consistent with the maintenance of our food supply and industrial production. Instead, the government is about to refer this question to the people of Canada in the form of a plebiscite. I would not be true to my convictions or to my duty as I see it if I should fail to voice in this house my disapproval of that procedure. It means delay; it means heartburning; it means bitterness. It means that after it is all over and the government is released from its pledge, the issue still must be faced; and the bogy of national unity

will again rear its ugly head. Speaking for myself alone, I do not ask to be relieved from the responsibilities that go with responsible government. I was elected to do my duty, as I saw it, to my country. If I fail to do so, then under our democratic system the remedy is at the polls.

Much has been and will be said of broken pledges. The hon. member for Brantford City, in seconding the address on Friday last, remarked that under our democratic system the promise of a leader was as binding as any bond under seal. Does the hon. member forget that in the mother of all parliaments, Westminster, on April 27, 1939, while the nation was still at peace, and only four weeks after the then Prime Minister, Mr. Chamberlain, had renewed a pledge made by his predecessor, Mr. Baldwin, that compulsory military service would not be adopted, Mr. Chamberlain introduced a motion in these words:

> This house approves the proposal of his majesty's government to introduce as soon as possible a system of compulsory military training, as announced on the 26th of April.

In the debate which followed the introduction of that motion, the prevailing opinion was the same as it should be here in Canada: The facts are there and we must face them as they exist to-day. Let me suggest to the Prime Minister that whatever his declaration may have been, as our first minister in this hour of peril he is bound to act in accordance with what he believes is required for the national safety. That is the supreme pledge which he made, though perhaps not in words, when he assumed the high office which he now holds. What of the solemn pledge given by President Roosevelt during his last election campaign, to the effect that the forces of the United States would not be sent overseas? Within one month of the declaration of war we find the president telling congress and the nation:

> We cannot wage this war in a defensive spirit. As our power and our resources are fully mobilized, we shall carry the attack against the enemy. American land, air and sea forces will take stations in the British isles—

Has there been any outcry in the United States of America against broken pledges?

There is another powerful weapon being used in this war, one of which we must not lose sight. That is the weapon of propaganda. Can anyone here doubt that the position Canada is taking to-day will be distorted far beyond its real significance? Can anyone doubt that the very real accomplishments of Canada, to which I have already referred, will be ignored in an attempt to show that in taking this plebiscite there is uncertainty and lack of sincerity when we say that total war can be met only with total effort? It does not matter what our enemies think. What does matter is the interpretation that will be placed on this action by our allies. I need refer to only one of them. On the very day that the government announced this plebiscite, the Commonwealth of Australia, through Prime Minister Curtin, was calling the man-power and the woman-power of the nation to take battle stations. What will the Australian people think as they read the pages of Australian casualties in Libya and Singapore; what will they think as they hear the air raid sirens warning of impending Japanese attacks, and at the same time read that Canada is leisurely to take a plebiscite as to whether or not the government may be released from certain pledges given prior to the hour of national peril?

These, sir, are days when the situation changes very rapidly, indeed almost from hour to hour. It is not too late to take a different stand; and I urge the government to extend the provisions of the National Resources Mobilization Act in the manner I have indicated.

Whenever the subject of compulsory selective service is brought up, there are those who immediately take it that this has reference to compulsory service in man-power for the armed forces only. Of course that is only one phase of a compulsory selective system. In the broad sense it would include all of us. It would mean immediate re-registration and reclassification. It would train those best fitted for industrial work; it would release man-power, replacing it with woman-power, for our women are just as anxious to serve as are the men. It would put an immediate stop to the flow of labour from the farm into industry at high wages, a situation which is serious in many parts of Ontario and which will require immediate action if the farmer is to be enabled to maintain maximum production. If proper boards are set up, it should clarify the system of calling up the extended classes for training. At the present time the uncertainty with which these postponements are being granted has a detrimental effect on the production of our farms. This is so in spite of the excellent manner in which registrars—and I refer particularly to the registrar in western Ontario, who is handling a difficult job—are carrying on this work. We find that farmers, particularly those having one son in the age category, are in a state of absolute uncertainty. It is all very well to say that there can be postponement. I am sure nearly every hon. member has had farmers come to see him in the fall asking what they should do in regard to putting in

a stock for the winter. They have had to be told: "Yes; a postponement may be given for a couple of months if application is made to the registrar." But then they ask. "Well, what about the next postponement, and the next?" They want to know if they will continue to get postponements, provided that conditions remain unchanged. I do not know what has been the experience of other hon. members, but in many cases of which I have knowledge, in which two postponements have been granted, letters have been received to this effect:

> Kindly be advised that commencement of your military training has been deferred until approximately ..... date. No further postponement will be granted.

That situation must be clarified. With all the emphasis at my command I state that a plan to provide farm assistance in western Ontario must be announced at once if our farmers are to be equal to the task of producing what is required of them.

I turn now to the question of man-power. What are some of the weaknesses of the voluntary system as we have it to-day? Key men in industry, and men who, if not key men, are of an age at which they would be more useful in Canada, are enlisting.

I am of opinion also that the pressure put upon young men of the trainee age, during their four months' training, to enlist for service in units anywhere is unfair, and in many cases unjust. It is a method of getting men through the back-door when we cannot get them through the front. Further, Mr. Speaker, don't let us fool ourselves by saying that we can go under the old system by extending the trainee age; in other words, by saying that if we can get 300 volunteers out of a class of 1,000 of the 21- to 24-age limit, then by extending the trainee age to 30 or 35 we can obtain 700 in each class. The method of embarrassing and, in some instances, coercing men into service is not to the credit of this country.

The question naturally arises: Are we getting sufficient men for the army under the volunteer system? Much has been said in connection with this matter—too much, perhaps. And as a result there is confusion. We have information from departmental bureaux, speeches, some of them from ministers of the crown, implying at least that all is well. On the other hand, we have the opinions of commanding officers of military districts, and of military recruiting officers, who say that we are not getting a sufficient number of men under the voluntary system.

They should know, and I prefer to accept their statement. I think this house should know of the latest system being adopted by those in charge of recruiting for the army, certainly in western Ontario, and, I am advised, elsewhere as well. The method is that of setting up civilian recruiting committees in the various counties. I attended a preliminary meeting a few weeks ago at which time the officer in charge of recruiting for that district frankly and honestly admitted the difficulty he was facing in getting recruits for the army. He told us that they plan an exhibit for two days in the county town, and that exhibit is taking place to-day.

That is all very proper, and in my opinion the army has been lax in not placing before prospective recruits the advisability of joining the army, telling them something of its life and helping them to choose the service in which they are best fitted to serve, in the same manner that visiting recruiting officers for the air force and the navy have been visiting various county towns and larger villages for the past few months, giving their assistance and help. As a result, they have been able to get volunteers.

But the weakness of the system as I see it is the fact that what is being attempted in these exhibitions is the shifting of responsibility to the shoulders of civilian committees. During the exhibit a meeting is requested, to which would be invited some 100 to 125 representative citizens, and the needs for recruiting are set forth. The civilians in turn would be asked to form themselves into a recruiting committee. I think I know the feeling of the majority of those who attended that preliminary meeting, and it was this: Responsibility for the proper and complete utilization of man-power and woman-power rests with the government and the boards it may create, and not with the individual, untrained and without proper knowledge of who should go and who should stay.

This brings me to a further argument in favour of unrestricted compulsory selective service; and when I say that I mean that there is under such a system a place for all of us, a job for all of us to do, not merely in the mobilization of men for overseas but also in the placing of an equal burden of sacrifice in some form on every one of us not in the armed services. This, in my opinion, can be done only by a complete and scientific organization of all our resources and, great as our accomplishments have been, no one will suggest that that effort has really seriously been made.

What criticism can there be with regard to a principle of the right of the state to call upon its citizens to sacrifice wealth, comfort and even life itself when the very existence of our civilization is at stake? Is the

compulsory system of selecting men for our armed forces unfair or undemocratic? No words of mine could answer this question as well as the remarks from the lips of Right Hon. Winston Churchill when, as a member of the British House of Commons, and largely opposed to the Chamberlain government, he supported the compulsory training bill in April, 1939, in these words:

> There is nothing undemocratic about this measure; it is the most democratic thing we have ever done. Provided that no exceptions are allowed, it will wear away differences between class and class, and it may also be the beginning of a far more broadly and evenly based society than we have ever known. . . . Almost everywhere we see hesitating, cautious governments, and resolute peoples. Here at home, the spirit of the people is far ahead of the government, and perhaps even of parliament, also. . . . This is a time when prejudices must be abandoned on either side, and a true comradeship established between all parties and classes throughout our loyal, anxious land.

If Canada does not put forth the greatest effort possible and we lose the war, the result is plain enough. The lights will go out on this continent for longer than the lifetime of anyone now living—much longer. Again if Canada does not put forth the greatest effort possible, her utmost effort, and none the less wins the war, how can we hold up our heads in the future, and what representation can we make at the bar of history? Sometimes it takes a terrible tragedy to enable a people to find itself. When the full story becomes known, Canada may find herself in Hong Kong. Britain found herself at Dunkirk. So long as the English tongue survives, the word "Dunkirk" will be spoken with reverence; for in that harbour in such a hell as never blazed on earth before, at the end of a lost battle, the rags and blemishes that had hidden the soul of democracy fell away. There, beaten but unconquered, in shining splendour, she faced the enemy.

They sent away the wounded first. Men died so that others might escape. It was not so simple a thing as courage, which the nazis had in plenty. It was not so simple a thing as discipline, which can be hammered into men by a drill sergeant. It was not the result of careful planning, for there could have been but little. It was the common man of a free country rising in all his glory out of mill, office, factory, mine, farm and ship, applying to war the lessons learned when he went down the shaft to bring out trapped comrades, when he hurled the lifeboat through the surf, when he endured poverty and hard work for his children's sake.

This shining thing in the souls of free men Hitler cannot command, attain or conquer. He has crushed it where he could from German hearts. It is the true tradition of democracy. It is the future. It is victory, if we will grasp it—victory, not of a military character, but victory over our own complacency, a victory which will enable us to see that there is no half-way house. It must be victory or defeat.

We have already heard talk of a new world to appear when this deluge of war has subsided. Unless we achieve victory for the great cause for which we entered this war, the new world will simply be the old world with the heart out of it. To redeem Britain, to redeem Europe, to redeem the world must be the settled purpose of every man and woman who places duty above a life of ease.

> Let us have faith
> That Right makes Might,
> And in that Faith
> Let us dare to do our duty
> As we understand it.

Mr. CHURCH: There will be a noble thirteen yet.

Mr. A. M. NICHOLSON (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I should like to express my appreciation of the words uttered by the mover (Mr. Fournier, Hull), and the seconder (Mr. Macdonald, Brantford City) of the address. I am sure that all members of the house envy them the experience they had in being able to visit Great Britain and to return to give us such a vivid picture of what Hitler has been doing across the sea. I suggest to the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) that he should make use of all hon. members who crossed the Atlantic and arrange that they bring first-hand information to the people all across Canada. I do not wish to subscribe to everything said by the hon. member for Brantford City and the hon. member for Hull, but I think that they, along with the others, could make a valuable contribution toward strengthening the morale of the Canadian people during this crisis.

I feel that every hon. member who takes part in the present debate must recognize that Canada has made a valuable contribution toward the defence of democracy. In my opinion, however, the question we should ask ourselves is not, "how much have we done?" but rather, "have we done as much as we ought to?" We cannot conclude that Canada has done all that should have been done. I should like to suggest that the government arrange now for the establishment of a separate department of government, a ministry of economic warfare or economic planning. I might remind the house that in September, 1939, Mr. Chamberlain outlined plans for the establishment of such a ministry in Great

Britain. He pointed out that his government had been engaged over a period of two years in organizing such a ministry and that the staff had been selected several months before hostilities broke out. He intimated that it was not until 1916 during the great war that a similar ministry had been established. His words were:

> For every man in the front line, you must have many behind the lines, engaged in the production and servicing of weapons of war.

Although two years have passed, it is not too late to establish such a ministry in Canada in order that we may plan our economic warfare. I am aware of the fact that we have a committee on economic policy under the chairmanship of the deputy minister of finance. The membership of this committee includes the governor of the Bank of Canada and some deputy ministers in key departments. Every member of this committee is carrying tremendous responsibility, and I do not see how it is physically possible for them to give the direction that should be given to Canada's economic policy.

The questions that should be asked and answered are: How many men and women can be used in the various armed forces in order that Canada may make her greatest contribution? How many men and women should be engaged in our various war industries? How many should we have on our farms producing the foodstuffs necessary adequately to feed our own people and to fill every inch of space on the boats plying the Atlantic? As I said, these questions should be asked and they should be answered.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has urged us to consume less. A year ago I asked him to be more specific and to help us decide what commodities we should not consume in order that we might help our war effort. To date the Canadian people are waiting in vain for direct leadership in the field of consumption. A bewildered Canadian people scan the daily and weekly newspapers and see where they are urged to buy automobiles, radios, refrigerators, furniture and every conceivable commodity. High-pressure salesmen interview people who have received pay cheques and explain that since these articles are being manufactured and sold, no harm will follow in acquiring possession. On the one hand our people are urged not to consume and, on the other, they are urged to consume.

Our farmers across the country have been urged by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) to produce less wheat. One of the pamphlets issued last year by his department says that less wheat in 1941 will help win the war. The government asked as a war service that the land sown to wheat in 1941 be reduced as much as possible compared with 1940. Are we to understand that the farmer who does not produce any wheat is making his greatest contribution? The Canadian farmers are waiting in vain for a lead from this government as to what should be done. I endorse what was said by the hon. member (Mr. Gray) who has just taken his seat regarding the uneasiness in the minds of the Canadian farmers. I, for one, am not satisfied with the decisions with regard to agriculture's place which have been made by the committee on national war services in our province.

Just recently I had occasion to discuss a case with the chairman of the board. This was the case of a young man who had bought a farm in 1937, two years before war broke out. He got married after war broke out and is now in the twenty-four-year-old age group. He has several cows, horses, pigs, chickens, et cetera. I realize that the chairman of this board is a judge who has an enviable reputation as a soldier and on the bench, but I am not willing to agree that he is in a position to decide what foodstuffs Canada should produce and whether a man's contribution should be made in the armed forces or on the farm. The order issued to this young man was to report on January 8, which involved the selling of his live stock and the necessity for making such other arrangements as he could. I think the board wisely agreed to give him another thirty days, but he still does not know what the decision will be at the end of that time. The chairman of the board pointed out that by being in the armed forces this young man could look after his family much better than if he were on the farm. That may be true, but is that the policy of this government? Is it the policy to take men off our farms who are producing and place them in the army and to leave our farms without men to operate them?

As I said, we want leadership. We want this government to do everything necessary to see that every man or woman is in his or her right place to make the greatest contribution. There is not an hon. member representing a rural constituency who has not had a great many inquiries from people who have said, "Well, if we have too much food, how about getting into a war industry?" Those of us who come from the west have had countless requests. I should like to cite one case which is unusual rather than typical. This is a case where I think one would say

offhand that there should not be any trouble in deciding into what category this man should be placed. I should like to remind the house that at the time the registration was being taken, the then Minister of National War Services explained that one of the reasons for taking the registration was to enable the government to tell the people where to go, to direct the people who were unemployed to find employment in industry, to enable people who are employed but trained for one particular type of work, to fit into another industry where their best contribution could be made.

The particular case I wish to discuss is that of a veteran of the last war, a man still in his forties, a mechanical draughtsman by trade. He has kept in touch with his profession while he has been on the farm. He wrote to me well over a year ago asking that he be given information as to where he might be able to make a greater contribution towards the war. I took his case up with the Department of National War Services and they agreed that this man had unusual qualifications and should be able to make a greater contribution than he was making in the particular industry in which he was then engaged. But they said they did not have the machinery to place him. They felt, however, that the employment agencies in Ontario would have no difficulty in directing him to employment. I got in touch with the employment office in Ottawa, and they said, "We have no suitable opening here, but the employment office in Toronto, Hamilton or Windsor will no doubt be able to place him." I communicated, in turn, with these other employment offices, and it was suggested that as my friend was in the west, he should communicate with an employment agency in the west, which would relieve him of the necessity of coming east. So I wrote to Winnipeg, and the employment office there said that in view of the fact that this man resided in Saskatchewan he should apply to the office at Regina. I then wrote to the office in Regina, and they said that in view of the fact that this man was living in the west and that all the war industries were in the east, he should apply to some agency in the east. So we were back to where we started. But my friend, a very patriotic citizen, is not satisfied to be staying on the farm producing what has been described as a drug on the market—wheat. He asked me to take his case up again last summer, and I have a letter here from the Wartime Bureau of Technical Personnel dated November 24, 1941, and referring to a letter they had written to my friend on September 27. Nearly two months after they had written him, they wrote me saying that there was a definite shortage of mechanical draughtsmen, and they said:

> It is quite possible that if he happened to be so located that he could conveniently make application in person to some of the larger organizations engaged in essential war industry, he would be successful in securing a position.

But he is not so situated. The letter goes on to say:

> I believe you will understand our hesitation in making such a suggestion to Mr. , or to anyone who happens to be so located that he will have to incur fairly heavy expenses in order to present himself at places where his services might be needed.

Would we say to a man who, at some place a long way from where fighting is going to take place, offers his services as a soldier: "We are sorry, but it would cost a lot of money to send you from here to where the fighting is going on, and we do not want to put the country to that expense." Of course we do not say that to the man who offers his services as a soldier. And here is a man who risked his life in the last great war and is now impatient at being kept on the farm and being unable to make a greater contribution in this war. Yet we are told that we should not go to the expense of moving him to places where employment might be found and where he might make a greater contribution.

I replied to this letter, giving a review of this man's case, and went on to say that I hoped the department would understand my difficulty in assuring my friend that Canada was doing everything that could be done and should be done.

I believe that without any further delay we must have a comprehensive plan for agriculture. Next week a delegation will visit this city from western Canada, a delegation that is being sent here by the hard-pressed people of Saskatchewan. Certain newspapers have suggested that if these men can find money to travel to Ottawa conditions in the west cannot be very difficult. Those who make this suggestion do a great injustice to the people of Saskatchewan. The contributions to send these people here will not average twenty-five cents per person, so that the suggestion is most unfair. I think it is unfortunate that it should be necessary for these people to come to Ottawa in order to get from the government an outline of a plan and to secure a fair deal. I remind this house that we are making plans for the development of our war industries, but we never say to a manufacturer who is making planes or tanks: "We are sorry that there is no other market for your product in the world to-day, so we will give you half of what it costs to produce it."

This government is in the business of handling wheat for our farmers. There is no market for wheat, of course, except such markets as we provide for it, but wheat is an essential commodity for national defence in Canada and for Great Britain. Therefore I say, Mr. Speaker, that this government must without further delay outline a plan to ensure that all necessary foodstuffs be produced and that those producing them will receive a fair return.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mr. Speaker, before the six o'clock recess I took occasion to ask a number of questions relating to the position in which, it seems to me, we now find ourselves as a result of the lack of a bold, courageous plan; and I should now like to pose some additional questions, feeling that each one should be answered.

First, what is the policy with regard to the production of automobiles, trucks and buses in Canada? According to a press statement a new automobile contains, on the average, about 1,700 pounds of steel, 500 pounds of iron, 60 pounds of copper, 20 pounds of aluminum, 70 pounds of cotton, and 15 pounds of wool, with a few pounds of glass. The latest statistics supplied by the bureau of statistics present an alarming study of the increase in the production of passenger automobiles for domestic use. Here are the figures of sales, month by month, in the years 1939, 1940 and 1941:

	1939	1940	1941
January	4,795	6,738	5,727
February	4,507	7,780	6,728
March	7,998	10,481	11,272
April	14,255	15,453	16,082
May	14,334	16,646	10,170
June	8,620	12,604	8,108
July	5,826	4,542	6,306
August	3,672	2,755	4,333
September	4,948	3,572	3,785
October	5,682	4,827	3,879
November	7,613	7,616	3,385
December	7,804	8,775	....

The statistics for December, 1941, are not available.

I should like to draw the attention of the house to the following increases in the early months of 1940 compared with 1939: January, 40 per cent; February, 72 per cent; March, 31 per cent; June, 46 per cent. It is true that the later months of 1941 showed a decrease, but the total number produced in the first eleven months of last year is given as 79,775, compared with 93,014 in the first eleven months of the previous year.

[Mr. Nicholson.]

In peace time I am enthusiastic about having an automobile in every garage. But in a war of machines I think it is unfortunate that so many skilled mechanics and so much valuable material should be utilized in the production of automobiles for pleasure. The production of trucks and buses has been increased; in the first eleven months of 1941, 32,218 were produced, compared with 26,618 in the corresponding period of the previous year. I know it can be argued by those who are selling these commodities that they have sales staffs to maintain and factory workers to pay, and that they cannot very well be expected to sacrifice their organization. But a plan which will include the entire country should be taken into consideration. Every mechanized unit possible should be supplied to our forces; we cannot continue to drift along using such a large volume of material in these non-essential industries. Last summer, while travelling on the train which goes from Saskatoon to Edmonton, I was told that every day of the week there is a large bus which runs on practically the same schedule as the train. On the day I was travelling there would have been no difficulty in accommodating on the train all the bus passengers. Surely we must not leave it to individual bus companies to decide whether theirs is essential work or not. There must be planning of necessary transportation in Canada. The production of the equipment necessary to transport our people must be carried on, but we should not have any unnecessary manufacture of buses or trucks or automobiles when the materials used in their production are needed for other purposes.

Then I should like to ask, what is our policy with regard to housing our people? I have discussed this subject on several occasions in the house. In my opinion we have here a problem which so far has not received the consideration it deserves. I raised the question when the house met here last November and the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe), in whose department the appropriations for war-time housing are made, stated, regarding the situation in Winnipeg, which I had mentioned in passing:

> Winnipeg was a city where there were many vacant houses. I suppose before the war there was no city which had as large a number of vacant houses as had Winnipeg. I have heard of no shortage there, but if a shortage occurs we will meet it.

I understand that, following this statement by the minister, there were some unfavourable comments from Winnipeg; an official of Wartime Housing Limited was sent to Winnipeg to find out what was the situation, and one of the directors of Wartime Housing in Winnipeg said that Winnipeg did not have

any housing problem. What are the facts? I received this week the 24th annual survey of vacant houses for the city of Winnipeg, issued by the health department of that city, and I want to congratulate Winnipeg upon having such an efficient department of municipal administration. On the first page of the report we are told that the total vacancies in Winnipeg, which I believe is the third city of Canada, are 111 houses and suites at the end of November, compared with 337 a year ago and 704 in the year before that. How does that compare with the statement made by the minister in November that in Winnipeg there was no shortage of houses? The percentage of vacancies in 1939 was 0·86 per cent; in 1940, 0·43 per cent; in 1941, 0·20 per cent; and this very carefully prepared report states:

> It will be seen that we have reached an all-time low in the number of vacancies, which means that more and more families are having to crowd together. This condition is, of course, in conflict with our health and other by-laws, but it is evident that there is little we can do about it. . . .
>
> The shortage of accommodation for the low-income group has been acute for years and I have referred to this over and over again in these reports. The present plight of the average working man to find moderate but satisfactory living quarters for his family is lamentable. . . .
>
> Surely our present housing shortage cannot continue much longer. The risk to health of our sub-standard housing, not to mention that of the fire hazard in our nondescript tenements, much evidence of the toll in moral and mental standards, also the cost of crime, in our blighted districts. . . .
>
> The doubling-up of families is one of the chief characteristics of slum areas and this condition is spreading like a cancer into some of our most exclusive residential districts. It is only a matter of time, therefore, when these districts will degenerate into blighted areas.

I object to a minister of the crown stating that Winnipeg has not a housing problem, in view of the fact that information of this sort has been supplied to the various cabinet ministers over a period of years. The officials of Wartime Housing Limited should have consulted the health department of the city of Winnipeg, to find out whether the statement made by the Minister of Munitions and Supply was correct. I say again that there is a very serious shortage of houses in Winnipeg, where large capital expenditures have been made in connection with the war effort. Hon. members will understand that after being at war for two years we should have some general plan with regard to the housing of our people.

I am interested in this subject from a peace-time point of view, but particularly concerned about the problem as it affects our war production. It is impossible to get maximum production from people living in the sort of houses that I saw when I passed through Winnipeg last week. We had in Canada a national housing administration that had done commendable work, had made extensive plans for launching into the building of necessary temporary housing in areas where new houses were needed; but instead of giving this department, over which we have control, the go-ahead signal, we find a number of dollar-a-year men taken into war-time housing. The order passed at the time this department was set up went on to say that each of the directors would serve without remuneration. I believe we have had too many men who have offered their services without remuneration. Men who can give their time without remuneration are not necessarily the best men for the job. Without further delay we should have a comprehensive plan to deal with the acute problems of housing all across Canada.

At the Seigniory club the other day some concern was expressed as to whether the work of the national housing administration would be discontinued. Here parliament is in session, but we have no statement as to whether this very important part of our national life is going to be overlooked. We are told that some $20,000,000 have been spent in connection with war-time housing, but as a member of parliament I have had the greatest difficulty in finding anyone in any department here prepared to discuss whether we are getting good value for the money spent, whether the taxpayers can be assured that all is well in war-time housing. Without further delay there should be a clear statement made by the government as to its policy in connection with housing.

I come to another equally important question: What is the policy of the government with respect to the consumption of liquor in Canada? Again I refer to the bureau of statistics. Just to-day I have received the latest figures regarding the consumption of spirits, malt liquors and wines in Canada. I am shocked to realize that the Canadian people in this very critical period are spending so much of their money for and allowing so much of their labour to be engaged in the production and distribution of intoxicating liquors. The apparent consumption of spirits is reported as follows:

Year	Gallons
1939.....	3,433,664
1940.....	3,818,409
1941.....	3,714,790*

*A slight reduction.

Of malt liquors the apparent consumption was:

Year	Gallons
1939	63,204,917
1940	66,196,961
1941	78,529,426

For wines the figures are:

Year	Gallons
1939	3,461,867
1940	4,012,917
1941	4,812,614

I am sorry that the provincial governments have not yet submitted statements concerning their operations for the past year—at least only three have done so. Gross sales were reported as follows:

	1939 Gallons	1940 Gallons	1941 Gallons
N.B.	3,714,000	5,209,000	6,627,000
Man.	5,947,000	6,653,000	7,887,000
B.C.	13,758,000	14,960,000	17,590,000

Recently, on October 22 to be exact, a delegation representing many churches and temperance organizations waited upon the government in Ottawa. Representing the Roman Catholic church was Rev. Canon Philippe Casgrain on behalf of His Eminence Cardinal Villeneuve. Representing the Church of England was Canon Judd, of Toronto. Rev. T. Christie Innes represented the Presbyterian church and Rev. Peter Bryce represented the moderator of the United church. There were representatives from the Baptists, the Evangelical church, the Salvation army and various temperance bodies. This delegation had been here a year ago, and at that time were, I understand, promised that the government would give their representations careful consideration. That is a favourite expression with this government; "The matter is being considered." We have been told that so often that we are getting most impatient.

This delegation asked:

1. That sale of alcoholic beverages in taverns, beer rooms, wine shops, et cetera be discontinued and that sale of such beverages be confined entirely to government-owned liquor stores.

2. That sale from government liquor stores be permitted only between the hours of three o'clock in the afternoon and eight o'clock in the evening, and on week-days only.

3. That all advertising of liquor in Canada be forbidden except in the place of sale.

4. That when the request in item 1 is implemented, an order issue from the Department of Defence closing all wet canteens in military establishments.

I understand that the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) referred to the divided jurisdiction between the dominion and the provincial governments in the matter of liquor control, but he assured the deputation that the matter would be given earnest consideration by the government. That is an old story also, about divided jurisdiction. But we have the War Measures Act, which gives this government the right to do anything that is in the interests of the Canadian people during the war, and I submit that the representations made by this representative group were very reasonable. They have formulated these representations, taking into consideration the minimum that should be expected to win the support of the Canadian people.

I was interested in reading an article in the November issue of the *Fortnightly*, written by the eminent scientist J. B. S. Haldane. Writing about their problem in Great Britain, he said:

The less food we waste the less we must import. A very large amount of barley and hops grown in this country is used for making beer, which has practically no food value. The barley could be used for bread or feeding cattle. The hop fields could be used for beans or other food plants. If not another gallon of beer were brewed, this would save scores of ships for essential imports. But the disappearance of beer would cause grave resentment, both among beer drinkers and in the drink trade, some sections of which are making record profits at present. The resentment would be legitimate if the soldiers got no beer while the officers had their whisky. So the country as a whole would have to go "dry". On the other hand I see no reason why the publicans should be better treated than the little shopkeepers who are forbidden to sell rationed food because they have less than twenty-five customers registered. But this gigantic food waste could only be stopped after a big propaganda campaign. And in view of the close connection between the Conservative party and the drink trade I do not believe that it will be stopped. I may add in parenthesis that I am not a total abstainer, but have very nearly become so for the duration of the war.

I had better explain that he was not speaking of the Conservative party in Canada.

Mr. HOMUTH: It would be a good idea to make that very clear.

Mr. NICHOLSON: At the outset I stated that I was quoting from an article by a British scientist, appearing in a well known British publication. But I might say that what Professor Haldane says about the Conservative party in Great Britain might be said of the party in power here.

Mr. HOMUTH: Why not say it?

Mr. NICHOLSON: Because I am quoting his article. I am not writing an article or making a speech—

Mr. HOMUTH: You are making a speech, so why not say it?

Mr. NICHOLSON: I think it unfortunate that this large amount of money should be expended in Canada in connection with the

drink trade, while so little money is spent by this government to educate our people with regard to the evils in connection with the use of drink, and, as Professor Haldane says, to "carry on a gigantic propaganda campaign." Perhaps hon. members would be interested in an article that appeared in the *Temperance Advocate,* published in Brampton, with regard to what they are doing about this problem in that so-called godless country, Russia. It states that back in 1933 they launched a strong campaign against the use of alcohol. There was a great and completely organized anti-alcohol movement, with the equivalent of local option. No liquor was sold in the vicinity of the barracks of soldiers or sailors, or of labour exchanges. Sale was also forbidden on pay days and during annual conscription. The advertisement of the sale of alcohol was forbidden in the press, in the streets, in railway stations, on boats and in other public places. Anti-alcohol teaching was carried on in all primary and secondary schools, and was included in the training courses for teachers. Anti-alcohol propaganda was included in theatre and cinema productions.

I believe the valuable work that was started in Russia in 1933 has had results we can all appreciate. The fact that Hitler has been stopped so completely by the Russian army gives a great deal of support to my statement that Russia has been able to make a much greater contribution, as a result of the propaganda that has been carried on, than she ever could have made under the old regime, under which the government received so much revenue from the manufacture and sale of liquor.

There was another table which I intended to quote, showing the revenue to this government from the liquor trade. Perhaps I can dispense with that, but in view of the disastrous results of the use of liquor in Canada at the present time I urge the Department of National War Services to appropriate a large sum of money for the purpose of carrying on the necessary educational work to place the facts in this connection before the Canadian people. I realize that the views I have expressed are not shared by a great many hon. members. But to-day we find ourselves in the most critical situation ever known in human history. The laissez-faire methods that were tolerated in peace time are not good enough in the present crisis. Plans must be evolved by which every Canadian industry and indeed every Canadian individual will carry on the work most necessary to be done to enable us to make our greatest contribution to the preservation of democracy and the absolute defeat of Hitler.

Hon. W. EARL ROWE (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General has very graciously read to this house a speech from the throne that has been cautiously prepared by the government of the day. May I add my congratulations to those already offered to the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) on their addresses, which were delivered with a dignity in keeping with the highest traditions of this house. As legal gentlemen they certainly demonstrated a skill and ability in their defence of a somewhat difficult case.

The worst apprehensions of the Canadian people at last have become a reality. We have learned from the speech from the throne that a plebiscite is to be submitted to the people in which they are to be asked whether or not we are going to back up those gallant, loyal sons of Canada who are fighting for our freedom. Canada is a great country. No other country in the world enjoys our geographical security. No other country with our population enjoys such vast resources, such strength in agriculture, industry and potential wealth of all kinds. Canada played a noble part in the last great war, and the soldiers, sailors and airmen who are fighting the battle of freedom in this war are the noblest of our countrymen.

During the past twenty-nine months the people of this country have done a great deal indeed. I might say also that the government has done something. Indeed, we have accomplished much; but much more could have been done, and I believe much more will have to be done if we are going to win this terrible conflict. We must take the offensive. Whenever and wherever possible we must increase our production of foodstuffs and munitions, no matter what sacrifices may be involved. As soon as possible we must raise, train and fully equip an army of unheard-of numbers on land, on sea and in the air, if we are to meet the onrush of the combined axis forces in the spring drive. We must have our armies mechanized and trained, not to fight where it is hoped the enemy never will be found—that is, here in Canada—but to fight wherever the enemy may be met. This also involves the training and equipping of vast reserves to back up our gallant soldiers in the front line. In these days first things must come first with every Canadian, and to-day the foremost requirement is the winning of this war. We are in a struggle that will require every available ounce of energy we can muster. Let us become concerned with the defeat of the enemy, and not only with the defence of Canada. If we meet the enemy

where the fighting now is going on, then the enemy will never reach our shores. To advocate any other policy is, to my mind, near treason, for when we declared war in September of 1939 we meant what we said; we were not just playing soldier.

Many problems must be faced by this parliament if we are to achieve an all-out war effort. To one reference in the speech from the throne I believe every Canadian will give whole-hearted approval; that is, the statement that we are to contribute to Britain vast quantities of foodstuffs, munitions and supplies. In this regard may I say that if our government would come out with a courageous policy and tell our young men where they belong, whether they are needed on the farm, in the factory or in the front line, we then would have equality of service and, along with it, equality of respect as between the boys who are fighting our battles on those different fronts. If you told the boy on the farm that was where you wanted him, you would enable him to escape any feeling of humiliation he might have because he was not wearing khaki. You would create a feeling of equality between the boy in the factory, earning $7 a day, and the boy in khaki receiving $1.30 a day. Nothing less than a courageous stand will meet this situation.

So far as munitions are concerned, I believe this country has done a great deal and will continue to make a substantial contribution. Unfortunately I do not have the same feeling of confidence with regard to agricultural production. It will be impossible to meet the demand for agricultural production without some direct, immediate action by the government. I think nothing short of the establishment of a food production board can give the necessary leadership if we are to achieve our objective and keep our forces fed. At the appropriate time this session I propose to ask the government to appoint a national food board capable of integrating a gigantic national effort combined with a willingness to cooperate with all elements of our population in order to achieve our objective in this regard.

The evident inability of the Department of Agriculture to-day to make public definite goals of production for 1942 and 1943, as has been done in the United States of America, constitutes a serious problem to our whole war economy, because, as hon. members are aware, enough food of the right kind is a rock-bottom essential of war-time production and morale, and necessary for our fighting ability. Enough of the right food cannot be secured either, if industry is going to be placed on a cost-plus basis and farm production is left in many cases on a cost-minus basis, thereby leaving industrial employers to take the men off our farms.

We hear a great deal about preventing inflation, but, Mr. Speaker, unless the increased purchasing power is diverted from consumer markets, we shall have the general public competing against the government for materials and supplies essential for an all-out war effort. These problems must be met, if we are going to have an all-out and all-round war effort. This situation must be met if our unprecedented effort to control inflation through the establishment of price and wage control is to achieve any degree of success.

I believe consideration should be given to some form of compulsory savings under which a graduated percentage of all incomes in excess of a certain stipulated amount should be paid directly to the government and credited to the individual with interest at a stated rate, the principal to be repaid after the war. I may say that many people will need some of their principal. I believe some plan of compulsory saving should be part of any sound programme of price control, and I propose at a later date to discuss this matter further.

To-night, however, I consider that these important issues temporarily fade under the shocking proposal in the speech from the throne by which the government of the day, with a large majority behind it, is endeavouring to escape its responsibility in military reinforcement.

I listened to that speech—and I have heard many come down in this House of Commons—with very great care, because I realized that much hinged on what the government proposed to do at the present time. I have followed it through, as carefully as I was capable of doing. In brief generalities it reviews a few of the past war tragedies. From there, to the end, with unprecedented cruelty it postpones future purposes.

The very speech itself begins with the words, "There no longer can be any question", but it ends with the government fearfully and feebly asking others to give the answer. It tells us that the government knows we are in the gravest crisis in the world's history now. But the government will not take full responsibility to act until after they hold a plebiscite, either next spring or summer. May I be pardoned for again using those apt words of the Montreal *Gazette*, in saying that "never in the history of this dominion have so many people been so humiliated by so few."

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): A pretty poor source.

Mr. ROWE: If the Minister of Marine can take comfort from it, then he is a better parliamentarian than he is Minister of Marine.

Mr. POULIOT: Minister of National Defence for Naval Services.

Mr. ROWE: I intended to give the minister a better title than "marine." I must say, however, that that is one branch of the service which possibly is doing all it can; and perhaps that is what makes the minister so confident that he can pull up the slack for the rest of them.

When democracy faces the test of its greatest adversity, our government, to which the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services belongs, demonstrates its greatest weakness. We have been told that "he who hesitates is lost." Yet we postpone for months the needs of the hour. In other words, Mr. Speaker, while our homes burn, we hold a firemen's ball.

What a spectacle of inspiration to those great Britishers, like Smuts of Africa or Curtin of Australia, has their big sister Canada given them in their hour of crisis! There appears to be considerable confusion as to what the action announced by the government means. It is a topic of argument on the street corners. Some farmers in the back concessions think it may mean an election; some other people think it may mean conscription; some others believe that it means relieving the present government of the great numbers of promises they have made since 1919; others believe that it means relieving the government of some of their broken promises. Others just do not know what it means, but they believe it just relieves the government and lets it do as it pleases.

To-day the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King) tells us that it means getting the people's opinion, provided he does not tell anybody what he will do after he gets it. Mr. Speaker, "it is a means of consulting public opinion, when a public body is unable to take the responsibility which belongs to it." Nobody knows what the answer is going to be, and nobody knows what the action will be after the answer is given.

This is the most Asquithian type of appeasement that has ever been proposed by a responsible government in a time of war. Unfortunately it is the same type of appeasement and complacency which has dominated our actions in peace-time failures, and which now so dangerously retards our war-time action. It was this type of wait-and-see policy which held up for two years Canada's air training plan, following the visit in 1938 of the British aviation authorities. It was this famous wait-and-see policy which made Prime Minister Asquith in England the greatest armchair warrior of the last war, and bids fair to make Prime Minister King of Canada the greatest wait-and-see warrior of the present war.

The Prime Minister takes great pride in his relationship with the great republic to the south of us, and on many occasions he has so stated. May I compliment him on any progress he has made in that regard. Speaking in his home constituency of Prince Albert on February 29, 1940, he is reported to have said:

> Canada has done more to help bring about that friendlier relationship between the United States and Britain than has any other part of the empire, even than Great Britain herself.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWE: I wish I could deliver one of those five-hour speeches of the Prime Minister. If I did I would get a lot of applause. Perhaps, however, the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) will applaud me again if I quote another part of the same speech:

> It is a matter of great pride that I have lived to see the day when I could go to the President of the United States and work out a reciprocity agreement. It took twenty-five years to bring it about, but I lived to accomplish it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWE: I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I shall be allowed the time hon. members opposite have applauded, after my quotation from the Prime Minister's speech.

I am sorry that through this relationship with the United States the Prime Minister has not copied the example of his great friend to the south. He must surely observe the contrast of the last twenty-five years.

The Prime Minister tells us that he could not break one of those pledges of his. I have not time at my disposal to tell hon. members about those he has broken, but I would point out to him what happened in the United States of America. In 1916 President Wilson was elected with the battle-cry that he would keep American boys in the United States. But in 1917, when the hour of crisis arose, he drafted those American boys to join the British forces in France.

By way of further contrast I would draw the Prime Minister's attention to the recent election of Mr. Roosevelt. Here is one of the

promises made by the President of the United States over the radio just prior to his recent election:

> And while I am talking to you, mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

Since that promise was given, the President of the United States asked for and received from his parliament and from his country the right to send United States soldiers anywhere an enemy might be encountered.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): This is not a foreign war; the United States was attacked.

Mr. ROWE: She had the courage to draft men before she was attacked; the Canadian government has not courage enough to draft men after we are attacked. That is responsible government functioning in a crisis. With almost frenzied eloquence we heard the hon. member for Brantford City tell this house that the Prime Minister was the first leader of the allied countries to declare war on Japan. Then he told us that the Prime Minister is going to be the last man to draft men to fight her. While the battle rages in every quarter of the globe, we have a wait-and-see policy to draft men to stay in Canada only until we hear how that policy is decided for this great lopsided, top-heavy government, by those outside the government.

We are now told by the Prime Minister in the twilight of his long years as leader that we must give him time off in this crisis to go back over the record. I know very well, and any other senior hon. member in this house knows that his record is strewn with broken pledges. He wants to revive one now in order to make it sacred in this time of crisis. I well remember that famous list of pledges and the planks of the platform in 1919. I remember how he excused himself here on the floor of this house when twitted for having dropped these planks so rapidly that we could not count them, by saying that that platform was only a chart to compass a course no one knew.

In 1925 he made that famous promise to reform the senate, but at that time we did not have a plebiscite so he could go back to York North. In that election he promised most faithfully to reform the senate, and I was sitting here in this house when he said rather jocularly to the former Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Mr. Bennett, that he had reformed the senate by placing in it the first lovely lady. That was a reformation because, although she is a staunch Liberal, she is a great improvement over many of the Liberals who were there.

Now in this hour of world crisis we are asked to provide unprecedented millions to supply equipment for overseas forces, while in the same breath we are asked to spend several millions to have those outside the government say whether or not we should draft men for Canada only. Three million dollars spent for a three months' delay! It will surely be made known to the opposition countries that Canada's secret weapon is a slow-timed dud. When we come to think of it we realize that our position is being made ridiculous. I plead with the government to change their course. Surely they are not going to lead us down this course at this time.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWE: It is all very well to jibe from the back benches when there are so many of you there. Is that all you can say to the boys overseas? Go over and talk to them and tell them why they should vote for or against this plebiscite. For twenty years those who sit to your right, Mr. Speaker, have hackneyed this issue back and forth across the election roads of Canada, claiming to be preserving unity in time of peace. They now plebiscite it to split their country from end to end in time of war.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Where did the hon. member stand in 1940?

Mr. ROWE: Where did the minister stand in 1925?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Where did the hon. member stand in 1940? Did he stand with his leader?

Mr. ROWE: I stood with my leader as I always do. My pledges to my constituents are just as good as my hon. friend's leader's are to his. As I say, this issue has been hackneyed up and down this country along with a claim for unity. The same men who claimed that they were bringing about unity in Canada by harping on an issue that was then twenty years old are now going to leave it wide open in a time of crisis. Is it any wonder that the red herring, abused so much in time of peace, has now become the white hope that is feared so much in time of war? We have made ourselves ridiculous and we shall be making this country ridiculous. We are told that the reason for this cowardly action by a supposedly responsible government is to release the Prime Minister from pledges given to the people of Canada prior to the last general election.

An hon. MEMBER: Your pledges too.

Mr. ROWE: I will look after mine; you look after your own. If you support this government, I venture to say that I shall be back but I do not think you will. That is if it is left to the boys overseas, the most gallant gentlemen we have at the present time.

An hon. MEMBER: What about 1917?

Mr. ROWE: I am not talking about 1917 and 1930 when it is was not an issue; do not bring that up now. You will have trouble enough with the red herring that has been yours for twenty years. What has happened since the last election? We have seen Germany overrun Denmark; we have seen her overrun Norway; we have seen her practically dominate Sweden; we have seen her take charge of the Netherlands; we have seen Belgium fall. We have had our own Dunkirk, and we have seen Italy and Japan join the axis. We have seen the United States go into war, and we have had our own Hong Kong and our near Singapore. We have seen great countries overrun like Bulgaria, Yugo-Slavia and others. Our great sister dominion Australia is in danger, yet what do we do? This afternoon we heard a brilliant speech by the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Gray). Many of you may not agree with it, but few of you could duplicate it even if you had the same convictions.

The United States of America have had their Pearl Harbour; England has had her Dunkirk; Canada has had her Hong Kong, but she now says that she is going to meet it with a plebiscite next summer. The minister smiles; I could not smile if I were in his place and had the responsibility for a policy like this. We have no time to talk because dangers are approaching on our east and on our west. We are told that the reason for this action has something to do about an election. I followed the pledges given by the Prime Minister in the last election, even though I was the last one who thought that he was going to keep his promises. I have been following his pledges for many years, and I do not know of any leader who has gone further by sacrificing more promises than has the present Prime Minister. This is the most novel incident in Canadian political history, that he should try to make one sacred. If I could have the time I could name a list of promises that he has broken as long as my arm.

An hon. MEMBER: Give us one.

Mr. ROWE: The hon. member would not understand it if I did. When a man follows a leader so blindly for twenty years and he keeps breaking promises all that time, it is difficult for him to understand. After two and a half years of war we are told that we must have a mandate, that it is necessary to appeal to the people by means of a plebiscite, in order to secure men to back up those gallant boys who have left our shores. Moreover, notice has been given this government of the position taken by our party. Time and time again our present leader has told the leader of the government that he would support him, that we as a party would support him, just as the United States supported compulsory service when the occasion arose.

Loyalty in this chamber is not confined to any one party. There are loyal men to your left, Mr. Speaker, and loyal men to your right, and I venture to say that there are very few in this house who would oppose the Prime Minister if he came out with a bold and courageous war policy at this time. That is all we have asked him to do. I made my position clear in this house in the November session, and hon. members will find what I said at page 4370 of *Hansard*. I said then:

> The time has come when this government should take vigorous action. I should like to see the Prime Minister of this country provide by order in council for compulsory selective service, and then come back to parliament and say, "I did not have a mandate to pass compulsory selective service for home service, let alone a mandate to send the boys overseas, but this is what I have done." I should like him to tell us that he had gone down to the compatriots of the Secretary of State in the province of Quebec and explained to those loyal people that the home front for the defence of Canada was overseas, that without a mandate he had brought in compulsory selective service to defend the shores of Canada and he therefore had provided for compulsory selective service for where the fighting is going to be. Do not dodge the issue. If there is anything I can do to help this government, I am ready to do it. I have endeavoured privately and otherwise, to make suggestions and offer proposals to this government which I believed might help. Surely we can get away from politics for a while.

The same sentiment was expressed forcefully by the leader of our party in this house and by the present leader of the largest opposition group in this country, our next Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, in a recent broadcast. Some of my friends may laugh—

Mr. MARTIN: He has to be elected first.

Mr. ROWE: He will be elected and may be elected sometimes when my hon. friend will not be elected. Let my hon. friend listen to what he said because he said it better perhaps than others can do. Mr. Meighen said:

> We, the Conservative party, stand at this time in the way of no war effort however big, however drastic. On the contrary—

I ask my hon. friend the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell), who made such reckless statements yesterday, to listen to this:

On the contrary, we stand behind demands for every sacrifice however extreme, every sacrifice whether of time, money, property, income, as well as men for the army, so long as the laws making these demands are equitable and fair and apply everywhere without discrimination. We are against subterfuges—

I ask the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) to listen to this:

We are against subterfuges and evasive practices that impose on the willing; that put a penalty on patriotism and allow the selfish to escape. We stand ready to help the government in its endeavour, yes, to help it the more, the greater the endeavour. We demand that political expediency be forgotten; that we decide what is the right thing to do and do that very thing, and trust to the conscience of the nation. When we call upon the government to abandon political expediency, we must be ready to abandon it ourselves. We are, therefore, prepared to join with the government, share the responsibility with them, carry the onus, if there is an onus, and suffer the consequences whatever they may be. But while prepared to share the burdens of office, we are not striving or asking for office; we are striving only for victory. There are great tasks that must be done, and with might and main we will demand that they be done, and done now. Canada must not fall short of her best and her mightiest. Canada must move with redoubled speed.

Surely, Mr. Prime Minister, if you have the interests of the country rather than the interests of the party at heart, that announcement of policy from the leader of the largest opposition group in this country and his offer to cooperate must mean something to you.

We are told that a plebiscite is necessary now in order to release the Prime Minister "from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service." Those are the words of the speech from the throne. True, opposition has been expressed by the Prime Minister to conscription for overseas service, but those statements were made on his own responsibility and largely since the last election, and as my hon. colleague (Mr. Stirling) said this afternoon, those statements of the Prime Minister were not opposed, they were not an issue in the election campaign. Those statements were not opposed by hon. gentlemen to our left or by those who sit behind me or by hon. gentlemen who sit opposite. But no one at that time knew what was going to come. We knew nothing about Dunkirk and the blitz attack on England and nothing about Hong Kong. Surely in a time of national peril, when every dollar, every weapon and every man are required in the defence of liberty, we are not so weak as a people that we must accept a plebiscite regardless of its vicious consequences.

We are told by the Prime Minister that this plebiscite is necessary in order to preserve unity. Has democratic government in Canada fallen to such a degraded level as to flout, by the expenditure of public money, the responsibility inherent in the right of office? The Prime Minister himself did not say so in the last election campaign, because here is what he said in a radio broadcast from the city of Ottawa which I heard on February 23, 1940, and which was reported in the Toronto *Star* of the following day, and I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite who applaud the Prime Minister so vigorously to-day, had he not better add these words to his plebiscite and seek relief from this commitment also? The Prime Minister said:

Under our parliamentary system the party with the majority in the House of Commons is charged with the responsibility for government. From that it can't escape, even if it would.

Unity is a very important thing in any democratic country. With that we all agree. But to bring up the cry of unity to cloak a policy of appeasement is an entirely different matter. We believe in unity just as much as any hon. gentleman opposite does, but to raise at this time the cry of unity in order to cloak a policy of appeasement—

Mr. CRERAR: Appeasement of whom?

Mr. ROWE: Appeasement with whom? I would say to my hon. friend: Go overseas and make appeasement with the boys over there.

Mr. CRERAR: Appease whom?

Mr. ROWE: We have listened to hon. gentlemen opposite talk about economic appeasement for the past twenty years. It has been their watchword, and here is a policy of appeasement from the government when the life and security of Canada hang in the balance and when our boys are fighting our battles overseas. No Canadian—

Mr. CRERAR: If my hon. friend will permit a question, will he explain what he means by his expression that we are appeasing somebody or something. Whom are we appeasing?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Appeasing your own conscience.

Mr. ROWE: That is a very good answer. I am not going to be distracted from what I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, because the interruptions of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources (Mr. Crerar) seldom add much to any of the debates of this house.

Mr. HOMUTH: Where did he stand in 1917?

Mr. ROWE: I say that no Canadian, whether the minister or myself—and I say that in all respect because I know he is the senior member of this house at this time, and I compliment him upon that and upon looking so well—no matter what province he comes from or what his race or creed may be, can as a Canadian and a British subject subscribe to this bogy of unity now brought up to bolster a broken-down government of appeasement floundering on the rocks of responsibility. If this government, by weight of its majority, insists upon evasion of the responsibility which goes with responsible government by foisting upon the people of Canada a plebiscite on conscription, it will establish definite and distinct lines of cleavage which will exist long after the record of this government becomes buried in the dust of history. Such action will throw into Canadian unity thorns which generations yet unborn will be called upon to remove. Do not, I say to the government, create a smoke-screen to cover your retreat from duty. Do not create a bottleneck of a "wait and see" war policy. This Asquithian policy of appeasement should be thrown into the discard, and let us, as a people, face the realities of war. For the first time in our history we find ourselves vulnerable to attack on both coasts—and the Prime Minister raises the cry of unity!

Did anyone ever see a family disunited when there was a thug at the door? Why, this cry about unity is the most ridiculous bogy that was ever trailed across a difficult road. If in the face of these grave dangers the head of the government cannot preserve unity, then it is high time for the head of the government to make way for someone who can. The welfare of Canada far exceeds the welfare of any individual or of a party, no matter how long that individual or that party may have been in office. In the face of grave danger in the last war, Asquith made way for Lloyd George without an election, yes, and without a plebiscite. No one ever heard of a plebiscite in England in war time.

An hon. MEMBER: They had it in Australia.

Mr. ROWE: That is not the British way of doing it. But they were anxious for inspired leadership; they realized that leadership of that kind was just as important in the defence of the empire as was military might. A more modern example of this is to be found in the records of the British parliament, where, on May 8, 1940, Lloyd George rose from his seat and, facing Mr. Chamberlain, declared that the best service the Prime Minister could render his country would be to surrender the seals of office. When the people of Britain finally realized the might of the enemy, Chamberlain gave way to the more aggressive, confidence-inspiring leadership of Churchill. This was also accomplished without an election and without a plebiscite.

The situation is no less serious here in Canada. Surely the government will change its mind and spare this country in her hour of peril from the expense and shame of a plebiscite, or the danger and delay of an election. The present Prime Minister has served Canada in a high position for a great number of years. However, let us realize as a people that while the Prime Minister has served the country, the country's peril of the hour does not serve the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the fact that we are now called upon to sanction a plebiscite and a huge expenditure of public money to release the Prime Minister from pledges which he made to the people of Canada long ago on the question of compulsory service, I feel that, should I withhold my opinion at this time for fear of giving offence, I should consider myself guilty of near treason towards my country. Therefore, as one of the senior members of this house, I say that the greatest contribution the Prime Minister could make to an all-out war effort would be either to assume responsibility, or surrender the seals of office to someone who shall let parliament decide and avoid a plebiscite or an election during our nation's most perilous crisis.

Much has been said, Mr. Speaker, about our unity. However, the source of the unity of Canada is not the welfare of any party or any province; it is the consequence of external pressure. Let us not search for unity by actions that will breed disunity; let us not search for some palliative; rather, in this hour of peril, let us face the facts, not on a basis of political, racial or religious faith, but as Canadians and as Britishers.

Further, let me say—and I say this with all sincerity—sentimental sobbing about unity in time of war will be, to my mind, one of the most disastrous things that could happen to this dominion. A continuation of this type of thinking will bring us to the end of the war divided, and then we shall have the spectacle of our allies having won a war for us abroad and us losing the peace at home. Let us not forget that it was the sons and daughters of two great races that gave Canada her birth. Let us not forget either that even France has fallen—England still lives. Let us then stand together to make sure there

will always be an England, which is the only assurance that France in all her glory will ever rise again.

I say that a compromise such as this proposed plebiscite will bring us disunity, class consciousness and racial strife, and in the misbelief that we are defending our system of government, we unconsciously surrender its very citadel.

We stand to-day as a united country. We entered this war as a united country, and we stand in unity with our allies engaged in the grimmest struggle for life and freedom that the world has ever known. Against half the world we stand to-day, not as Englishmen, not as Frenchmen, not as inhabitants of the Atlantic or the Pacific provinces. Without thought of sectionalism we entered this war as a nation in September, 1939, and without need of a lot of talk of unity or sectionalism we shall win this war, if God spares us and we have courage to face the issue.

By that declaration of war we pledged ourselves as a nation to cooperate with our allies to out-build, to out-produce, to out-fight and finally to overthrow the tyranny of the axis powers.

Dare we as a people rescind that pledge? Are we to be led again into the "valley of humiliation" to serve the purpose of any party? When we hear flashes from the radio that Latin-America is turning solidly against the axis, that Australia is going to be invaded and is fighting with her back to the wall, and that Singapore, the great centre of our eastern trade, is tottering, I put this grave issue to the government and I plead with them again to reconsider their course and save us from the shame and disgrace into which they are evidently leading us.

I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that Canada must not wait for expediency, while England fights for freedom.

Mr. H. E. BRUNELLE (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak in French. I shall, however, make a few remarks in English so that they shall be understood by all.

I must in the first place congratulate the hon. member (Mr. Rowe) who has just resumed his seat; he surely made a brilliant plea in favour of the violation of pledges and promises solemnly made. I believe I heard the hon. member, and also the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), say recently that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) had not asked for a plebiscite before he declared war on Japan and before he passed a measure for the control of prices.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No; I said he did not ask for a mandate to declare war on Japan.

[Mr. Rowe.]

Mr. BRUNELLE: I accept the correction of the leader of the opposition, but I desire to point out that during the election of 1940 the Prime Minister on behalf of the government stated definitely that he would not introduce a measure of conscription for service overseas without consulting the people. During that election he did not say that he would or would not declare war on Japan, nor did he say that he would or would not pass a law to control prices. In my opinion there is a great difference between these situations. The mandate which the government received in 1940 was a mandate not to propose conscription for service overseas.

It is, Mr. Speaker, useless to undertake at this time to discuss any problem other than the one of war. In contradiction of what has been said, I wish to express my own opinion, and give some reasons in support of it, that conscription for service overseas is not so urgent and expedient a measure as some would have us believe. Let me say that in reading much of the press comment of to-day, and in listening to most of the speeches which are made, particularly by the opposition, one who was ignorant of Canada's war production would be inclined to think that this country has done very little. Yet the real facts show that the contrary is true, and those facts were very ably and clearly set out by the Prime Minister in the magnificent speech which he made yesterday.

In the eyes of a few, conscription of manpower seems to be the only thing which will win this war. Other factors that may be found in this country, or that may be found in the countries of our allies, do not seem to count. If anyone thinks that I exaggerate when I say that conscription alone will win this war, according to some people, let me quote the words of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) in a speech he made last November in this house to show that conscription for service overseas is the only thing that will win the war and save the empire:

> The government's adherence to the voluntary system of recruiting is inconsistent with total war, and yet this is the only kind of war that will enable us to help defeat Hitler. It is perfectly obvious to every thinking man that Canada cannot make a total war effort without compulsory selective service, and also that if our aid is not to be a vital factor in this struggle this empire, and with it Canada, is doomed.

If such a point of view is not silly, it surely is ridiculous and even insulting to the other peoples who are siding with us in this war. Canadian soldiers are brave; they are courageous, ingenious and strong. But the 50,000 Canadian soldiers, which is about all, or

possibly more than conscription will bring in addition to those we have already—at any rate it is more than it gave in 1917-1919—spread over the various fronts of the war, will not relegate the millions of British soldiers, and American, Russian, Indian, Australian and all sorts of other soldiers, to the background, and will not, like an irresistible whirlwind, smash every obstacle that will be in their way and win this war.

In reality we have accomplished wonders in the totality of our war effort. I shall not undertake to enumerate the various activities of our government, because those who do not want to see or believe up to this time will not any more see or believe by reason of further proof. They did not change their opinion after Senator Pepper last year expressed the following appreciation of our effort:

> I owe it to you to say that it is the gallant and limitless way in which all of you who are fighting this good fight of faith have thrown yourselves into it which has made our people as determined as they are to help you until it hurts. Before I came here I knew what share of your income you were spending in the cause, I was aware of some of the external evidences of your mighty effort, but I did not know until I came to see it and to feel it just how fixed and determined was the purpose of your people to carry on until the inevitable day of victory against this devilish attack on freedom everywhere.

They did not change their opinion after the Right Hon. Malcolm MacDonald, who represents Great Britain in our country, expressed his appreciation of our war effort. I quote from an article in the Toronto *Star* of August 26, 1941:

> If there are those in Canada who discount the dominion's war effort, Right Hon. Malcolm MacDonald, the British High Commissioner to this dominion, is not one of them. Speaking at the Couchiching Canadian Institute, Mr. MacDonald, with no wish to belittle the United States effort, pointed out nevertheless that Canada's, on a basis of proportionate wealth and population is greater. Said Mr. MacDonald, Canada's war effort is such that no country on this continent can throw stones at Canada.

They did not change their opinion either when General McNaughton in August 1941, used the following words:

> It is tremendously gratifying to us here to be using Canadian equipment and to find it unbeatable. . . . We are not going to win this war by force of numbers, but by our inventiveness and thoroughness in the arming and in the supply of materials.

They did not change their opinion when Lord Halifax paid tribute to this country and the immense help it was giving to England and to the British cause. They did not change their opinion when Mr. Churchill in this house expressed in such clear terms his appreciation of what this government has done to help win the war. I quote one paragraph of Mr. Churchill's speech:

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

To-day the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) read to this house another expression of appreciation showing what Mr. Churchill thinks of what we have done recently.

The opposition did not change their view, and they will not change it, or cease to belittle our war effort, for the simple reason that it is a Liberal government that has done it. If I did not want to deprive them of the pleasure of saying we are playing politics, I would tell them many things that I would feel justified in saying. But I cannot refrain from thinking aloud of the agitation which is now being stirred up in Montreal by the *Gazette* and in Toronto by some newspapers and some other people, which has behind it a faction which is strong and merciless, and that faction is no doubt the big interests and the money monarchs of this country. I will not talk of the calamities that would fall upon our people if that class were governing the nation. Suffice it to say that after two years of war in which we have made enormous sacrifices, unity and harmony still reign in our country. I shall not praise or defend or speak for any one section or another of Canada, or for any province, for I believe it is time that people should stop making such comparisons as to war contributions. The time has come when everyone should take for granted that every province and every section are ready and willing and prepared to do what should be done to win the war. The performance of duty is not contingent upon what the other fellow does or does not do. Worthy members of the fire brigade in case of emergency do not stop to think of how their work compares with the work of others; they simply do what they should do. It was the Pharisee who thanked the Lord that he was better than others.

There is a relationship between love of country and love of God, on the one hand, and the merit of those whose duty is to serve, on the other hand. But I take this occasion to say that when duty is fulfilled in hardship, in suffering, in danger of losing an eye, a limb or even a life, it behooves those who benefit by the fulfilment of such duty to acknowledge their debt as adequately as possible, either by tribute or by actual remuneration. A doorkeeper, a messenger, a pick-and-shovel man, accomplishing his duty on firm land with

a minimum of risk, receives between $2 and $4 a day, and other classes of people receive a great deal more. Yet the soldier defending his country, protecting the messenger, the doorkeeper, the lawyer, the doctor, the farmer, the business man, the money-monger, the preacher, the woman and child, receives only $1.30 a day, with no union to guarantee him an eight-hour day. This is beyond my comprehension. I am told that Canada pays her soldiers better than any other country. Well, sir, I can only say that at least Canada has the honour of leading the civilized nations of the world in the partial abandonment of a barbarian custom.

At any rate our dominion is doing and has done very well. If the allies—England, China, Russia, India, the United States and the dominions—were supplying as many soldiers of all categories as Canada is, our cause would have an army of 35,000,000 equipped men on the various fronts. Yet up to the present Canada has not been in a unique position. Ulster, Australia and south Africa do not have conscription for service overseas. In two referendums during the last war the Australians turned down any suggestion of conscription for overseas service. At that time we did not hear that the Australian people had committed such an extraordinary indignity in so doing; and to-day I wonder whether the Canadian people are acting so very differently from the way in which the Australians acted during the last war, which I think also was rather a serious war. During last session I think I heard the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) ask with disappointment why our soldiers were not at the side of the gallant Australian soldiers in Crete or Africa or Greece. To-day we hear the disappointed voice of Prime Minister Curtin of Australia asking the United States and England for help in order that he may defend his territory. This point of view was expressed even yesterday by the leader of the opposition, when he said at page 20 of *Hansard:*

> What happened at Pearl Harbour may happen at Esquimalt. What happened 160 miles off Halifax may happen at Halifax. What happened 60 miles off Long Island may happen at Sydney, Saint John or Quebec.

I am sorry the leader of the opposition is not in his seat, so that he might hear what I am going to tell him; but while I am speaking of him I should like to mention what he said yesterday with reference to the merit of the plebiscite. These were his words:

> . . . the loyal people of Canada will and do feel deeply humiliated. . . .

I may say that loyalty is not to be found only in the hearts and ranks of the opposition. We are, however, accustomed to that sort of declaration, so the leader of the opposition can continue in that vein. It will not do much harm; and he can go on thanking the Lord that he is better than others. If Canada is likely to be attacked, let us arm to meet that attack; let us prepare for home defence. If, on the other hand, Canada is not likely to be attacked, let us and let the allies take advantage of that situation and produce here three or five times more ships, tanks, guns and aeroplanes in our factories and plants which are not exposed to destruction. It has become a platitude to say that steel will win this war, but since it is so true, we must keep on saying it.

Upon their return to England recently, Prime Minister Churchill and his ministers replied to several questions which were put to them. I think it was the under-secretary for air, Lord Sherwood, who said: "Of course there is the difficulty there always has been about weapons in this country, because we are still a long way behind what you would properly call a real preparation for war. We are short of weapons, but we shall get those weapons." They say that we will maintain production, in spite of conscription, by employing women. Without further discussing the question of the employment of women, let me say that it will create an overwhelming after-war problem. At present in England an organization is being formed to protect men's jobs against what I might call the infiltration of women into the domain formerly almost exclusively occupied by men. They say the menace is as great as Hitlerism. If that had not been said in England, I would hesitate to say it in this house, but the organization just mentioned made the statement that during the last depression there were two million men able and willing to work who could not find work, while six million women were employed in various industries, trades and professions. Therefore I say that after this war we shall have to face a tremendous labour problem.

I felicitate the Prime Minister on having appointed an able labour leader, in the person of Mr. Mitchell, as Minister of Labour. On each and every occasion the Prime Minister is proving to be a wise, sound statesman. He has been true to the promises and pledges he has made to the people of Canada; yet strangely enough a certain school of thought has lately argued that it would be a virtue for him to repudiate his promises and violate his pledges. The Prime Minister deserves the confidence of the people. I for one do not hesitate to say that he has my confidence. The speech he made in the house yesterday is one which will go down in history as a most salutary expression of honesty, nobility and

decency in public life. Lest it might be said that my appreciation of the Prime Minister is based on partisan inclinations, I should like to read an appreciation published by the Montreal *Star* on the occasion of his birthday anniversary. It states:

> Of his patriotism, his devotion to duty and his sacrifice of personal interests in the service of his country there can be no doubt whatever. . . .
>
> To-day Mr. King is carrying a tremendous burden under which a stronger man might well have given way. He is, fortunately, in the enjoyment of good health, and he is meeting the strain of public office with serenity and stoic endurance. That he may be long spared to serve the country whose gratitude he has so well deserved is the united wish of the Canadian people.

I might say, before I speak in French, that I completely approve his attitude and stand on the plebiscite question.

(Translation): Mr. Speaker, a single topic fills the minds of all hon. members and, without doubt, of all the people of Canada—the forthcoming plebiscite. At the last general election the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his ministers pledged themselves not to enact conscription for overseas service without having obtained a special mandate to do so. The Conservative party gave the same pledge, but, maintaining that breaking pledges is a virtue, its members have long ago repudiated their promise and announced that they were in favour of conscription for overseas service. Many people in the English-speaking provinces consider that the situation in the various theatres of war has become so different that changes are needed in our methods of raising men far the army. The Conservative party contends that the people are in favour of conscription for service outside of the country and, in order to make sure that events would not falsify its contention, it recently launched a great movement with a view to convincing the country that conscription for overseas service is the proper policy.

In order to put a stop to this agitation and to prevent this boasting on the part of the Conservatives from disrupting national unity at a time when it is so necessary to be united on the principal matters relating to the prosecution of the war, the Prime Minister, faithful to his pledge, has decided to ascertain by means of a plebiscite whether the views of the electorate have changed since 1940.

The question to be asked is a very simple one: "Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?" The people remain the masters. I shall not anticipate; rather, I shall await with calmness the decision which the Canadian people will give by their vote after having realized that they are the masters and that they have to decide themselves a question of which they all know the importance.

Whatever may happen, whether some other kind of conscription is established or not, I take the liberty, Mr. Speaker, to point out, on behalf of a certain number of Canadians at least, the urgency of making some improvement in the living conditions of our young men in the army and in the training camps. At best, the soldier's life is not a bed of roses. That is inevitable. Many of our young men find themselves away from home for the first time, and they obtain their first experience under rather unfavourable conditions. Again that is inevitable. War cannot be carried on without some discomfort. Yet, without blaming anyone, for we have embarked in a new military enterprise which is still at the organization stage, there is seemingly need to effect certain improvements.

I talked to young French-Canadian soldiers stationed at Petawawa, Peterborough or Kingston. Not being conversant with English, they feel at a loss in the midst of a throng speaking nothing but English, in the midst of a group of young men who follow their own way of entertainment, leaving our compatriots under the impression that they are strangers in their own land. Most of the officers—whom I do not blame, since they are only the victims of the present situation—most of the officers do not speak French and our soldiers can only follow the orders by sound or gesture or through an interpreter. How could they be interested in military matters and make the same progress as the others, in such circumstances?

I request that the hon. Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) whose kindness and willingness are well known both in this house and outside, be kind enough to give proper consideration to the problem I have just outlined. Young men who do not know English should not be sent to camps where officers cannot give orders in French, except on their own request.

We must realize, Mr. Speaker, that the French-Canadians are neither by nature nor formation inclined to embrace military life or join the army. However, they are ready to sacrifice everything for the defence of their country and, to date, they have willingly accepted the present conditions and have behaved in such a way that we should never lose an opportunity of singing their praise. I take this opportunity of congratulating them from the bottom of my heart. Nothing should be avoided that could simplify their task.

Time and again, public bodies and organizations of all kinds in the province of Quebec have requested the formation of a military college in their province. I take the liberty of repeating this request on the floor of this house.

Would it not be in the public interest that we should train real French-Canadian officers in large numbers who would be competent to take command of numerous regiments, battalions or divisions? It would help to eradicate the idea among our co-citizens that French-Canadians are not appointed and cannot be appointed to important posts, even in the army. Bad impressions often degenerate into prejudices which, when they are aimed at people of a different race or religion, become very dangerous.

There is in the province of Quebec an impression, even a conviction—and I am not prepared to say that it is not founded—that we are not getting our fair share of the good positions in the civil service and in industry, particularly in the war industries. The blame cannot, I think, be laid at the door of the ministers or of the government. A certain state of affairs has become general. I have endeavoured to make suggestions with a view to remedying it. The ministers in charge of our four war departments are very busy men. They are labouring under a heavy burden of work and care. They have not time to attend to everything, and meanwhile some of the higher officials of their departments who do not realize the importance of a fair distribution of positions, especially in time of war, or who do not trouble themselves to bring it about, are taking advantage of the circumstances to push forward their own friends to the detriment of our people.

Mr. Speaker, after spending six years in this house I have come to the conclusion that the deputy ministers of the various departments should be ordered, clearly and unequivocally, to give at least one quarter of the civil service positions to French-Canadians, in spite of all rules and rulings made by the civil service commission, provided the applicants possess the required qualifications. Otherwise, I do not think we will ever get satisfaction. I doubt that the civil service commission will ever grant our request of many years standing and this is an incessant cause of complaint in the province of Quebec.

Besides, we have practically no representatives on the office and managerial staffs of the war plants and I know what I am talking about, for I have made personal inquiry in the matter. I have myself witnessed these conditions. The competent men may not always be available, but the abilities required in the training of an office or managerial staff are so varied that many of our compatriots could fill some of these positions. Here again, let us take steps to correct this situation and let those steps be taken as soon as possible, for it is essential that the public mind be at rest and willing to submit to measures which are necessarily unpopular. If our citizens gather the impression that they may not have their share of the cake, they might easily decide that those who get all the cake should be alone to defend it. Small and ceaseless exasperations leave the most far-reaching impressions both physically and morally.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, I desire to state that my remarks were made with the greatest sincerity and for the general good. These suggestions were uttered with the sole purpose of eliminating causes of friction, which although seemingly negligible, may be important enough to provoke, in the end, a state of mind, incompatible with the conditions required to promote national unity and ensure the maximum collective effort of all Canadians.

Mr. A. H. BENCE (Saskatoon City): Mr. Speaker, I am going to take advantage of the generality of this debate to discuss one or two matters, some of which may be interrelated, but all of which I believe have an important bearing upon the country's war effort. Usually suggestions relating to matters of finance are reserved until the budget debate, but it seems to me to be almost nonsensical to reserve such suggestions until after the financial policy has been formulated and announced, for then it is difficult indeed to have it changed in any material particular. Consequently it seems to me that now is the proper time to suggest a course of action, before the ministerial mind has been set in its almost unalterable mould.

A few short weeks ago the price-ceiling legislation was announced by the administration, by an administration which did not deem it advisable even to consult the people's representatives before putting into effect what has been described as one of the most drastic steps ever taken by any free country. To my mind it was another piece of evidence of the growing impatience the administration has with parliament and the functions of parliament. I know it has been said that there was not time to call parliament together before these regulations were passed, but the fact is that parliament is always at the service of the people who send us here. Parliament had been adjourned last June for the very purpose of being called together on short notice. If you examine the events preceding this legislation you will see that legislation

of this type was almost inevitable. I suggest that there was no real reason, no good reason, why the people of this country should not have had the right to have their representatives pass upon this legislation.

Anyone who has considered or studied the matter at all knows that a basic period had to be set, and that it had to be unalterable. In this particular case it was from September 15 to October 11. No one will deny that it was necessary that this period should be unalterable, but also no one will deny that the people's representatives should have had the right to scrutinize these regulations before they were passed. Surely no one will deny that we sitting here should have been given the opportunity of presenting the views and opinions of our constituents from one end of this country to the other. I say to the house that the action taken by the government was the very negation of democracy, the very denial of all that we are fighting for. We know that at the beginning of this war it was necessary to give the administration practically unlimited powers, and those powers were given without stint. At the same time this parliament and the country felt that those powers should not be exercised in any arbitrary or dictatorial manner and that they should not be used unless absolutely necessary. Surely the administration must see how important it is that we should not adopt dictatorial or totalitarian methods in this country unless the emergency is such that they are absolutely required. To do otherwise can be but to create distrust, suspicion, ill-feeling and fear, and I suggest that in future the administration bear very carefully in mind the necessity of not passing any legislation by order in council without consulting the people's representatives unless such a course is absolutely imperative and there is no other way out.

These regulations were passed for a definite purpose as an anti-inflationary measure. It was apparent from an examination of the situation which had arisen since the beginning of the war that anti-inflationary measures of some kind were necessary. The purpose of this legislation has been explained on numerous occasions both in this house and out of it. I do not propose to dwell at great length upon that phase, but briefly I should like to recapitulate my understanding of the situation in the following manner. From the beginning of the war until the time when the regulations were announced, a period of a little over two years, the rise in the cost of living in this country was about 15 per cent. Of that amount one-half had taken place in the first eighteen months of the war, and the other half within the next six months, thereby demonstrating that the inflationary spiral was beginning to accelerate tremendously. The reason for that was obvious. At the beginning of the war there was a tremendous unemployment slack in this country which had to be taken up. This slack was used, first of all, to supply additional labour which was required for war purposes. It was used at the same time to supply those additional consumer goods which the increased purchasing power was demanding—additional purchasing power which came into being through the unemployment slack being taken up, through men being provided with jobs, and also by reason of the fact that the armed forces we were raising in this country, our soldiers and our sailors and our airmen and their dependents, were all in receipt of pay. At that time there was no need to restrict the production of the ordinary consumer goods because the material was not yet required for war purposes. We were in the transition period, referred to by the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) as the "tooling-up period." Consequently the amount of raw materials required was not so great. But, as the war progressed, more and more men were employed in the manufacture of war materials and more and more men were required for the armed services. As more and more material was required for the production of aeroplanes, tanks, shells, guns, rifles and that kind of thing, it became evident that the production of the ordinary consumer goods, those things which we use in everyday life, clothes, drugs, cars and so on, had to be cut down, and cut down drastically, and so we had the picture of a daily increasing purchasing power fighting to obtain a continually diminishing supply of consumer goods. Prices started to rise, and the price-ceiling legislation was put into effect.

The price-ceiling legislation did not achieve any miracle. It did not supply us with additional consumer goods; it did not take away any of the increased purchasing power. All it did was to put a limit on the price that could be paid for the things the people were wanting to buy. It put a stipulated limit on the price that could be paid for the goods which were available. The situation then was this. There were just as many people wanting to buy and with just as much money, more money in fact than they had before, and they were wanting the goods that were available at the established price level.

Having dealt with that phase briefly and described the position, I come now to the question of what means does the government propose to adopt to see that this continually

diminishing supply of goods which are available to the people of this country are distributed in a fair and equitable manner.

That the system of price-fixing will require policing is almost axiomatic. That we shall require and must have a proper and efficient system of rationing in this country seems to be obvious. We cannot and must not allow this system to develop into a catch-as-catch-can one. We must not allow a haphazard policy to be adopted for the distribution of those goods that are available. If there is to be justice and equality among all classes of our people, these goods will have to be distributed on the basis of the greatest need, and not on the basis, I suggest, of personal influence on the part of the individual or something of that kind. So I suggest to this administration that it should announce, and very shortly, a proper and adequate system providing for a fair and equitable distribution to all classes, based of course on the principle of the greatest need, of those things which are available to the consuming public. We cannot allow a system to grow up in this country such as has been suggested in connection with sugar rationing. If we are going to have equality between all classes, it is impossible to have what has been described as the "honour system". The great majority of the people of this country will do the fair and the proper thing, but in all countries and among all classes there are people who will not do the proper thing.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: They are in Toronto.

Mr. BENCE: I do not know about Toronto. I come from a long way from there. The fair and proper thing, I suggest, is to have a system which will provide that a man, whether he comes from the far coast or from Toronto or from the Atlantic seaboard, will have equal rights with his fellows when it comes to the distribution of those things that are available, and the distribution should not be left to any haphazard system which would allow one section or one type of person to obtain more than another.

Another matter on which I think we should have some elucidation and for which I believe the government should propound a solution is this. Having come to the point I have described, having decreased the production of consumer goods, having increased purchasing power, and having set a limit on the amount that can be paid for consumer goods, what does the administration propose to do to take up the extra money that is available? What is it going to do with this extra purchasing power? The administration knows that this must be drained off, and it is endeavouring in certain ways to effect that purpose. For example, high taxation has been put into effect. High-powered and high-pressure saving and loan campaigns on a voluntary subscription basis have been put on. But I suggest that in the very nature of things this cannot do the job efficiently. According to those who purport to know, taxation has reached its limit. The question of voluntary savings campaigns and voluntary loans has been receiving, I know, the consideration of the administration, but so far the government has not given a lead to this house as to how it purposes to take away from the people, other than by the voluntary system, more of that purchasing power.

Is the government going to allow, for example, those persons who do not contribute to war savings certificates or to loans, to take time off from their work to take things a little more easily because they have some extra money in their pockets and do not know where to spend it? Or is it going to allow them to spend their money on luxuries of the type to which my hon. friend the member for Mackenzie (Mr. Nicholson) has referred—things like hard liquor or soft drinks, as they may prefer? Or, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) suggested a year ago he would consider doing, is the government going to put into effect a system of compulsory borrowing, or give consideration to the enactment of legislation for compulsory savings such as the form that is known as the Keynes scheme and is in force in England to-day? Or, if the government is not going to do any of these things, will it explain to the house and to the country how it intends to pick up and take care of in an efficient and equitable manner that additional purchasing power? The Minister of Finance, although he has not yet made a statement to this house in connection with the matter, stated yesterday in the city of Toronto that up to this time the administration had decided that it would not put into force any type of compulsory savings or compulsory loans. I hope he will give a statement to this house in the course of this debate, and that he will explain the reasons for that policy, because in my opinion, unless something is done, something more than is being done now, either the tremendous pressure which is being created under that price ceiling will burst through the ceiling, or we shall have a type of chaos in this country. There cannot be anything else. I suggest, therefore, that the price ceiling is one step and one step only in the course of anti-inflationary measures. Of itself, by its very nature it cannot possibly accomplish the proper result; it has to be accompanied with a method of drawing from

withunder that ceiling that extra purchasing power which, as I say, is increasing day by day.

One tragic and important consequence has developed from this diversion of our national energy and our raw products from a peace-time to a war-time production. It is a result with which I, coming as I do from the western plains, am greatly concerned. I refer to the large numbers, increasing every day, who have been thrown out of employment on account of that very diversion, on account of the fact that they were employed in the organization, distribution and selling of the products which the administration has now said must be so drastically curtailed. Unfortunately for the prairie provinces, and unfortunately in the long run, I predict, for the whole of Canada, the administration has not accomplished, with any degree approaching success, the spreading of our war effort from an industrial point of view across the whole of this dominion. No real attempt has yet been made to iron out what some of us have referred to before in this house as the economic sectionalism of the country, and consequently we on the western plains, particularly in Saskatchewan, from which I come, have no alternative employments in which to place the men and women who are being thrown out of their work by the diversion to which I have referred. In this war we have done very well where we have been given a chance. The figures on recruiting which were supplied to this house the other day will bear me out in that statement. But as I have said, in the industrial field, and particularly in Saskatchewan, we have been given little or no chance, and there is nothing for these men and women to do whom I have described, some of whom have been employed for as long as twenty or twenty-five years, even more. They are being discharged in large numbers because their employers have nothing to sell, and thereby a great problem has arisen which, I say, is the direct responsibility of the administration to solve.

I suggest, as an expedient which would alleviate this condition to a certain extent, that in view of the fact that these people have been thrown out of employment through the policy of the government to cut down domestic production and place a price ceiling on goods, when the administration comes to choose men for positions—of which the Prime Minister suggested there would be quite a number—in connection with war-time prices and trade board appointments, first preference should be given to those people who have been so deprived of a living by the government's own action. I assert that they are entitled to the first consideration. After all, what better men could be found to act in the administration of price controls, of rationing and so on, than the people who have been dealing in these products for so many years? Who can know better the prices and the qualities of goods than those who have been dealing in them, handling them, distributing them over so many years? I seriously commend this suggestion to the administration. Mr. Churchill, when he was in Ottawa, said that there is a place in this war for everyone. I suggest that the administration as speedily as possible see to it that the services of these people are utilized.

Quite a lot has been said lately on the subject of compulsory service, and I do not propose to traverse the arguments which have taken place in this house or have been going on in the country during the past few weeks. The administration has now announced its intention of seeking to be absolved from what it believes to be a binding commitment. All I have to say in that regard is that, if a thing is necessary for the preservation of our people and of our country, that thing should be and must be done irrespective and regardless of the political consequences in the years to come. The people of Canada look to the administration and to the members of the cabinet for leadership at a time like this. They were elected as the leaders of this country, and the country rightly looks to them for leadership. The people feel—I say this with confidence—that they should exercise that leadership without fear, favour or affection for anyone. Mr. Churchill, the leader of the British commonwealth of nations, of which we are an integral and inseparable part, the man we are all so fond of quoting in these days, had something to say about leadership a short time ago. These are his words:

> Nothing is more dangerous in war time than to live in the temperamental atmosphere of a Gallup poll—always feeling one's pulse and taking one's temperature. I see that a speaker at the week-end said that this was the time when leaders should keep their ears to the ground. All I can say is that the British nation will find it very hard to look up to leaders who are detected in that somewhat ungainly posture.
>
> If to-day I am very kindly treated by the mass of the people in this country it is certainly not because I have followed public opinion in the last few years. There is only one duty and one safe course, and that is to try to be right and not to fear to do or say what you believe to be right. And that is the only way to deserve and win the confidence of our great people in these days of trouble.

Sometimes it would appear that we in this country do not realize the terrible consequences that would befall us if we should—which God forbid—be defeated in this terrible struggle.

We are committed to a life-and-death struggle. We were committed to that struggle in September, 1939. I have always felt that whenever one starts to fight, whether against an individual or a nation, he must fight with both fists, and unless one does, the other man, particularly if he is fighting without reserve, is likely to come out on top. As far as I am personally concerned I committed myself publicly some time ago and I stand by that commitment, that we must do everything without reserve. That means complete and total mobilization, of material things as well as of man-power. One of the worst things that could happen for the morale of the people of this country would be to give to those people who are giving their husbands, their sons, their brothers, their sweethearts and their friends, the idea that those with material wealth were not prepared to put everything they have into the balance in order to save and preserve our way of life.

If the administration is determined to follow its course with respect to the taking of a plebiscite, then I suggest that there should be no half-way measures in the taking of that vote. I was astonished to see in the press the suggestion by the Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty) that we might use the 1940 election lists. I have obtained some knowledge during the last few months of the 1940 election lists, and I know in my own constituency literally hundreds have moved away from the addresses given in 1940 and hundreds more have left the constituency. Therefore, if a vote is to be taken, I urge that it be taken properly, and that everyone who is qualified be allowed to vote. Further, if the 1940 election lists were used, there are a number of men in our armed forces to-day who were not qualified to vote two years ago; they would be deprived of their vote.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The hon. member is talking nonsense.

Mr. BENCE: The hon. member will have his opportunity to speak. He has never been backward about speaking in this house or interrupting other speakers when he felt like it. Men who were under twenty-one years of age in 1940 were not qualified to vote.

Mr. Speaker, Canada is recruiting the women of our country for service in the ranks, and I understand that the response has been excellent. This is a matter of great satisfaction, and I am pleased to remember that it was my friend and colleague the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) who first suggested this matter in this house during this parliament. In connection with the matter of raising a women's army and women's air force I have this warning to offer to the administration: that those women should be used for the purpose for which that force was intended, namely, to replace category A men in order that those men might be available for a more active theatre of war. They should not be used to replace ex-service men from the last war, men who are not able to grade up to the physical category they formerly did, but who offered their lives in the last conflict and who are serving in the only and best way that is available to them at the present time.

In Saskatoon recently we had the spectacle of ex-service men from the last war who had been hired in civilian capacities, as cooks, dish-washers, general handymen and so on, being discharged and replaced by category A service men. The explanation given was that there were too many general duty men available, that a number of air force men had been brought in from other districts, and that there was a limit set by the department on the number of general duty men that could be used in any particular station; consequently it was the ex-service men who were discharged.

I am pleased to say that that situation has now been remedied. As a result of a request that I made to the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power), he gave me an explanation, and I am pleased to be able to quote the last paragraph of his letter:

> It is regretted that any difficulty arose in connection with this matter, but the situation is now more stabilized, and it is not the intention to dispense with the services of any returned men now employed as civilians and who are carrying out their duties in an efficient and satisfactory manner, and the various units have been advised accordingly.

For that I was very grateful. But in the next mail I received a letter from the secretary of the Saskatoon branch of the Canadian Legion advising me that there was further trouble in this regard and that his branch had been officially notified that about fifty ex-service men employed at No. 4 service flying training school were being discharged at the end of this month and being replaced by the women's air force. Was this, I ask, the reason why a women's army or air force was raised? I suggest it was not. There is a job for women in the service of this country, but it is not to displace men like that. I warn this administration that there will be a storm of indignation if, in its zeal to raise that army so rapidly, it allows this kind of thing to happen. To let that course be followed is, in my opinion, nothing short of disgraceful, and the government should take immediate steps to see that the situation is rectified.

Mr. EDOUARD LACROIX (Beauce) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the situation in which we find ourselves at this juncture is so serious that I feel in duty bound to rise in this house and express my viewpoint which apparently does not coincide exactly with opinions put forth until now.

To speak his mind fully is at times unpleasant to a public man, for someone's feelings may be hurt. Still I wish, at the very outset, to assure the hon. members of this house that my remarks reflect my sincerest convictions and that I would deem myself unworthy of public service were I to remain silent at this time.

My family first came to Canada in 1660, which means that I am rooted to the soil and that my viewpoint is thoroughly Canadian, solely Canadian and nothing more. I am a Canadian living in his homeland, who was born here, who understands all that a Canadian heart can feel and whose wish it is to ensure by every means in his power the greatest possible happiness for the generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, what is the present purpose of certain extremists from Toronto?—for such is the origin of that whirlwind of disunity spreading throughout our fair Canada at the present time.

Unity between the two great races in this country would mean in the eyes of this handful of nervous individuals à la Hepburn an absolute obligation to think and act in accordance with their own narrow conception of things. It would mean submitting to the dictates and personal interest of a few individuals who, for one reason or another, would wish to see the government of this country entrusted to their hands the better to sabotage the future of those inhabitants so that the appetites of these extremists might be satisfied.

Two great races, between 7 and 8 millions in number, true Canadians all, count for little or nothing in the calculations of such ambitious people who in time leave for Bermuda or elsewhere so that their heirs may be spared succession or other duties or even taxes directly attributable to their own blind, excessive and unreasonable demands.

The war effort which has been demanded in such sections is too great for a young country of twelve million inhabitants. Nothing was being done fast enough; to hear them, more is forever required, more man-power; there never is enough man-power according to them—production is always insufficient—and the cry goes out for more, and more and yet more.

To-day, these extremists are beginning to feel the effects of their exaggerations. One must pay and in order not to pay, they would transfer upon the shoulders of generations to come the excessive burden of this costly war.

They have, first, to secure the services of a new leader—and of course the security of his well-being is guaranteed for his lifetime—then conscription is taken as the battle standard—it worked so well with the same leader in 1917—

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that such extremists can find some measure of support from a few of our friends who force the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to make such concessions.

Because to ask the people of Canada, by means of a plebiscite, to release the government from its solemn promises, is surely a terrible concession to the extremists.

At the last general election, 90 per cent of the public men of Canada, and I am one of them, have said that they would always be opposed to conscription for sending troops outside of Canada. Indeed, in 1939, I affirmed the same convictions right in this chamber.

Some will say: Give a free hand to the government; you must have confidence in the Prime Minister who will never enforce conscription for overseas service.

I have confidence in my leader. I have supported him on every occasion since 1925.

But if we release the government from its sacred promises, what would follow should the Right Hon. Prime Minister disappear from the scene? Mr. Speaker, I wish the Right Hon. Prime Minister long life, health, happiness, but God alone can prolong his life. Who in this house is sure of to-morrow? And what if our hon. leader were to disappear sooner or later? For what reasons should we leave the known for the unknown? No, no, I, for one, think the issue at stake too important to run such a risk.

Mr. Speaker, if this measure is so vital in 1942, why was it not brought up during the 1940 election? Is the situation more desperate in 1942 than it was in 1940?

That is what I wish to discuss fully. I hope to prove by an official document that the reverse is true.

To my mind, Canada has done more than her share and it is about time someone should say so on the floor of this house; the voter is not the only one bound by his duty.

We have a right to ask ourselves if some military authorities are absolutely reasonable when they tell the public as they did again the day before yesterday: Canada is in great danger; Canada is encircled by the enemy;

we must wake up; we must stand shoulder to shoulder, close our ranks; young men must enlist, go and fight overseas.

Mr. Speaker, those flights of oratory are nothing but a state of nerves. Our country is in danger, in immediate danger, encircled, go and fight in Europe, repeat those nervous people...Well, if the country is in so great a danger, let us keep our man-power here; call back here, immediately, shall I say to the military authorities, our army of volunteers stationed overseas.

That would be more logical to defend our people, our land, everything dear to us. Charity begins at home, says the proverb; apply it.

Are we in a more precarious position than we were in 1940, even in 1941? I say no, a thousand times no. And I shall prove it. Since 1940, the number of our allies has increased by 180 millions of Russians and by 130 millions of Americans. Since 1940, our factories have functioned at full capacity.

In a booklet entitled "Canada at war", No. 4, published by the office of Public Information under the authority of the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson), and dated December 4, 1941, I find figures that are very eloquent when compared with those of other countries.

Page 6, I read:

To-day about forty per cent of our national revenue goes to war needs.

Further down under the heading: "Armed forces" we read that the following figures are necessarily a rough estimate, but nearly accurate.

Enlisted voluntarily for service everywhere: In the navy, more than 27,000.

In the army, 240,000. In the air force, more than 93,000. Altogether over 360,000 volunteers for service anywhere. The number of volunteers exceeds 500,000.

These figures show, Mr. Speaker, that on December 4, 1941, Canada had under arms for service anywhere approximately 5 per cent of its total population. Mr. Speaker, is 5 per cent much or little? I say that it is much. As I see it, it compares well, nay favourably, with conditions in countries now at war the world over. It compares well with Russia whose army of 9,000,000 men represents exactly 5 per cent of its total population of 180,000,000. It is comparable to an army of 6,500,000 men in the United States, if the latter country had such an army. It is comparable to 20,000,000 men under arms in China, assuming that 5 per cent of China's population were under arms. It is comparable to 4,000,000 men under arms if the Dutch colonies had an army of such proportions.

After all, let us be honest about it and let us give Canada and the Canadian government their due.

On page 7 of the same pamphlet we read that, in the six months between May and November, 1941, voluntary enlistments for service anywhere, in the Canadian armed forces, amounted to more than 100,000. The total is made up as follows:

Navy	11,000
Army	59,000
Air force	35,000
Total	105,000

And that in the six months alone between May and November.

Mr. Speaker, how generous do I find the people of Canada! Extremists alone persist in exclaiming: "More, more, and still more!" They are more exacting than the Prime Minister of Great Britain who, for his part, exclaims: "A magnificent effort." On opening the dictionary, I find that the word "magnificent" means: "A high degree of generosity." Personally, I am quite content with the tribute of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

Treating of the financial aspect of the situation, the pamphlet shows, on page 31, under the heading of "The greatest undertaking in Canadian history", that our expenditures for the present fiscal year amount to $2,650,000,000. Mr. Speaker, this quite exceeds the three digits we learned in the little red school house. The figure is made up of 10 digits, and I feel that many of our friends here are unaware of this fact.

The pamphlet adds:

To finance the fulfilment of its various undertakings, the government needs 45 per cent of its total revenue.

This means, Mr. Speaker, that for the current year the war effort will require 5 per cent more than last year, that is, 45 per cent of the country's total income, as compared with 37 per cent in England during 1941.

On page 58 of the same pamphlet, in the last paragraph, I find the following:

Combining the war expenditure with the ordinary expenditure of all the administrative services of Canada, federal, provincial and municipal, it will be necessary, in order to foot the bill, that the citizens of Canada contribute approximately 50 cents out of every dollar of income.

On page 66 of the same pamphlet, I find a comparative table showing the taxes paid by the citizen of Canada and the citizen of the

United States. The Canadian citizen with an income of $1,600 pays in income and national defence taxes $71 a year, against $6 paid by the citizen of the United States enjoying a similar income. A Canadian earning $3,000 a year will pay $355, while the American of similar income will pay $138. On an income of $5,000 the Canadian citizen will pay $925 and the citizen of the United States $375. An income of $10,000 is taxed $2,930 in Canada against $1,305 in the United States and a $20,000 income pays $8,030 in Canada against $4,614 in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary to make this comparison in order to show where Canada is being led by its war effort and to see whether it is true, as some extremists contend, that Canada is not doing its duty and its whole duty.

Moreover, on the 4th of December last, there was no question of lending Great Britain $700,000,000 without interest for the duration of the war, nor of making to England an outright gift of one billion dollars worth of foodstuffs, munitions of war, etc., in addition to maintaining our own forces overseas.

I quote the following words spoken by the Prime Minister and printed on page 42 of *Hansard:*

> For the future, in addition to the financial provision for raising and maintaining Canada's own armed forces, the government will, as a part of Canada's direct contribution to the defeat of the axis, ask parliament to make provision for meeting Britain's shortage of Canadian dollars by supplying, free of charge and without obligation, to Britain, munitions of war, raw materials, and foodstuffs up to an amount of one billion dollars.

Mr. Speaker, what a beautiful country we live in, what splendid people we are! The assumption of these obligations represents the discharging of the debt of a noble son towards his father. However, this son, Canada, has, in the past, been very generous to his father.

Our national debt, which, in 1911, under Sir Wilfrid Laurier's administration stood at $300,000,000, had exceeded $3,000,000,000 in 1920, and will stand at more than $6,000,000,000 in 1943. This entire increase is attributable to European wars. Starting with annual interest payments of $13,000,000, that is $1.50 per person in 1911, we shall attain the figure of $200,000,000 in interest, in 1943. This represents a sum of $16 a year for each Canadian. Still I would be satisfied if I were sure that this last billion dollars is a final payment on the account of our total independence. But we have no such assurance.

This is not all, Mr. Speaker. The government asks to be relieved of its promise to forego the blood tax, that is conscription, for the release from previous commitments has no other object but the adoption of conscription.

What makes me still more anxious is this paragraph of Hansard, page 51. I quote:

> It will be seen that in seeking freedom for itself to act on all matters pertaining to war in accordance with its judgment, the government is taking a course which will remove all legitimate excuse for controversy, and the course best calculated to maintain the unity of the country in this time of war.

Mr. Homuth interrupting, asked:

> Then what will they do?

And the Right Hon. Mackenzie King answered:

> That will depend in part upon what my hon. friend and those who are round him will do.

I gather from this that the Conservative party will be in a position to blackmail the government and force it to adopt conscription.

For the last 25 years, Mr. Speaker, the conscription issue has been debated. My leaders have taught me that it would be absurd to force our sons to fight in Europe against their will.

I am convinced that it would be a folly. Our line of defence is in Russia, in China, at Hong Kong, shouts the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson). Would he be kind enough to tell us how many of our English friends from the British Isles are at present in Russia, in China or at Hong Kong? We will probably be told that the British Isles are in danger.

But Canada is in immediate danger, says General LaFlèche.

No, Mr. Speaker, we must be logical with our Canadian people. I, for one, am convinced we have gone too far; our effort, as regards both man-power and capital is out of proportion, compared to the capacity of our population of 12 millions.

Nobody in Canada wants to lose the war, but we shall lose both the war and the peace if we bring economic ruin on Canada. We shall be the slaves not of Germany or of Japan, but we shall nevertheless be slaves for a hundred years to come. Mr. Speaker, militarism has spelled the ruin of Germany and Japan. It will reduce those people to slavery for centuries to come. Is not militarism in Canada already driving us to it? Those are questions we have a right to ask ourselves, we have a right to take into consideration. It seems to me we must be logical with ourselves. I am convinced we have gone too far.

Our farmers are already short of help and many of their sons would better serve our war

effort by remaining on the land and producing the foodstuffs so necessary to feed our soldiers. There are, in my own constituency some sad cases. Reluctance is shown in granting exemption to the eldest son of a widow who has to feed twelve children with the sole products of her land.

Another young man is being harassed, who inherited his father's farm, with 30 cattle to feed, and who lives alone on his property. If he were mobilized, it would be necessary to slaughter all these cattle, for there are seasons when cattle are in no condition to be sold, and the land would remain idle during the owner's absence. How many more similar cases could I not mention. I could go on indefinitely. There are new instances every day.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now conclude my remarks. I have sought to give, in my own way, a clear outline of the critical situation in which we find ourselves and to ask the Prime Minister, as well as all the ministers, to consider the post-war period. Is it a fact that ours is the only government in the world having a commission charged with studying post-war problems? Mr. Speaker, it is great time for us to do some reckoning, to think of those who will come after us, and of all the responsibility which rests upon us. Will this government, the strongest since 1867, capitulate in the hands of a small clique from Toronto bearing, in some cases, the colours of the dollar-a-year men who, after gathering some ten million dollar orders, quit for criticizing the present administration. They would have Mr. Meighen instead so that future generations might have to settle for their extravagance.

In conclusion, I regret to state that after due deliberation I feel obliged to vote against the Tory amendment, against the C.C.F. subamendment and against the main motion, that is against the adoption of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, just as I shall vote in the coming plebiscite against releasing the government from the obligations assumed in 1940 both by them and by 90 per cent of public men in the country.

Mr. ABBOTT: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Antoine-Westmount (Mr. Abbott) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. LACOMBE: I desire to submit to Your Honour standing order 34 which reads:

Every member desiring to speak is to rise in his place, uncovered, and address himself to Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. E. Lacroix.]

Standing order 35 provides:

When two or more members rise to speak, Mr. Speaker calls upon the member who first rose in his place; but a motion may be made that any member who has risen "be now heard," or "do now speak," which motion shall be forthwith put without debate.

When a few moments ago the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Lacroix) rose in his place, I rose at the same time, Mr. Speaker, and I want now to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. member for Beauce sat down I saw the hon. member for St. Antoine-Westmount (Mr. Abbott) who rose immediately and moved, seconded by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Fulford) the adjournment of the debate, which is the motion now before the Chair.

On motion of Mr. Abbott the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Wednesday, January 28, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

PRECIOUS METALS MARKING ACT

AMENDMENT WITH RESPECT TO SPECTACLE AND EYEGLASS FRAMES

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 4, to amend the Precious Metals Marking Act.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Explain.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): This is a relatively small matter. While the wording of the amendment may appear somewhat technical, the purpose of this bill is to facilitate the marketing of gold-filled spectacle ware. At least 75 per cent of this particular type of merchandise sold in Canada is manufactured in the United States. Over there they must conform to the Bureau of Standards, whereas in Canada our manufacturers must conform to the Precious Metals Marking Act. There is a slight variation in these two requirements, and in order to facilitate the marketing of these goods without loss of service to the public, it is deemed advisable to make this slight amendment. The amendment has been approved by the Canadian Jewellers' Association.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CANADIAN FORCES

REINSTATEMENT IN CIVIL EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONS WHO ENLIST IN HIS MAJESTY'S FORCES

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (for the Minister of Labour) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 5, to provide for the reinstatement in civil employment of individuals who enlist for service in his majesty's forces or who perform essential war employment.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. McLARTY: The purpose of this measure is to implement the undertaking that was given at the time the order in council was passed providing for the reinstatement in their civil employment of those who joined His Majesty's forces. At the time the order in council was passed the house was advised that in view of the fact that this was a measure which would be required not only during but also subsequently to the war, legislation to effect it would be introduced at this session.

Mr. CHURCH: Any distinction between those who serve overseas and those who work in the offices here but who wear uniforms?

Mr. McLARTY: The legislation will generally follow the order in council, and my recollection is that the only provision is for those who have joined for service in his majesty's forces. I do not think there is any distinction between any classes of the service.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Would the hon. gentleman indicate the number and date of the order in council?

Mr. McLARTY: I do not remember the exact date of the order, but speaking from memory it was passed in the month of June last. I shall, however, be glad to furnish the hon. gentleman with the information.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

QUESTIONS AND MOTIONS FOR PAPERS—PRECEDENCE OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on the order paper there appear a number of questions and a much larger number of notices of motion for the production of papers, most of which seek important information relating to the war effort. I believe it will be the consensus of opinion that we should have the information thus sought brought down at the earliest possible date. Under the rules this order will not be called, as I understand it, until the present debate is concluded. Therefore I would ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) if he would seek the consent of the house to a motion similar to that which was passed during the debate which took place in November, 1940, and which will be found at page 240 of *Hansard* for November 20 of that year. The right hon. gentleman moved this resolution:

> That consideration of the special order relative to the debate on the address to his excellency be suspended until the house has proceeded to the orders respecting questions and notices of motion for the production of papers standing on the order paper.

This seems to me a wholly reasonable request, and one which might readily be complied with.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): As my hon. friend was speaking, I had in mind that a similar situation had arisen during a previous session and that it was dealt with in the manner to which he has just referred. I shall be very glad indeed to instruct the Clerk—indeed, I do so now—to place on the order paper a resolution similar to the one which my hon. friend has read. I have no doubt it will meet with the general approval of hon. members.

IMPERIAL WAR CABINET

DOMINION REPRESENTATION WITH GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND—CANADA'S POSITION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have received this morning from our high commissioner in London the following text of the statement made by Mr. Churchill in the course of his speech in the House of Commons at Westminster yesterday, the 27th instant, on the subject of dominion representation in the war cabinet of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The statement begins:

> Now I come to the question of our own empire or commonwealth of nations. The fact that Australia and New Zealand are in immediate danger zone reinforces the demand that they should be represented in the war cabinet of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. We have always been ready to form an imperial war cabinet containing the prime ministers of the four dominions. Whenever any of them has come here they have taken their seats at our table as a matter of course. Unhappily it has not been possible to get them all here together at once. General Smuts may not be able to come over from South Africa and Mr. Mackenzie King could unfortunately stay only for a short time. But Mr. Fraser was with us and it was a great pleasure to have him, and we had a three months' visit from Mr. Menzies who was also a great success, and we were all very sorry when his most valuable knowledge of our affairs and the war position and his exceptional

abilities were lost. For the last three months we have had Earle Page representing the commonwealth government at the cabinet when war matters and Australian matters were under discussion, and also in similar circumstances upon the defence committee. As a matter of fact this has always been interpreted in most broad and elastic fashion. The Australian government have now asked specifically that an accredited representative of their commonwealth government should have the right to be heard in the war cabinet in the formulation and direction of policies. We have of course agreed to this. New Zealand feels bound to ask for similar representation, and the same facilities will of course be available to Canada and South Africa.

The presence at the cabinet table of dominion representatives who have no power to take decisions and can only report to their government evidently raises some serious problems, but none, I trust, which cannot be got over with good-will. It must not, however, be supposed that in any circumstances the presence of dominion representatives for certain purposes would in any way affect the collective responsibilities of his majesty's servants in Great Britain to the crown and parliament.

From the foregoing, it will be seen that Mr. Churchill has made a clear distinction between an imperial war cabinet, which, in addition to the Prime Minister of Great Britain, would contain the prime ministers of the four dominions, and an arrangement under which an accredited representative of any of the four dominions will have the right to be heard in the war cabinet of Great Britain in the formulation and direction of policy.

Mr. Churchill's statement makes clear that an imperial war cabinet containing the prime ministers of the four dominions would involve having them all together in London at one and the same time, either periodically or continuously. This, as Mr. Churchill points out, has not thus far, at any time, been possible. It requires no comment to make clear how impossible it would be to form, at the present time, with its seat in London, an imperial war cabinet containing the prime ministers of the four dominions.

The statement also makes clear that since the outbreak of war, whenever any of the prime ministers of the dominions have been in London, they have, as a matter of course, taken their seats at the cabinet table in the war cabinet. On other occasions Mr. Churchill has made it equally plain that this privilege will continue to be accorded to the prime ministers of the dominions.

Mr. Churchill's statement next discloses that in the last three months Sir Earle Page, representing the commonwealth government of Australia, has been accorded the privilege of being present at the cabinet table in London when war matters and Australian matters were under discussion and also, in similar circumstances, in the defence committee. It is clear from the statement that this privilege, while broadly interpreted, has, however, been extended only as a matter of courtesy. What recently has been asked specifically by the Australian government, and agreed to by the government of Great Britain, is that an accredited representative of the commonwealth government of Australia shall have the right to be heard in the war cabinet in the formulation and direction of policies. Similar facilities, Mr. Churchill states, will, of course, be available to New Zealand, Canada and south Africa.

Mr. Churchill's statement leaves no room for doubt that the power to make decisions and the responsibility for decisions made in the war cabinet of Great Britain will continue to rest with the war cabinet of Great Britain. The right being accorded to accredited representatives of the dominions is that of "being heard" in the formulation and direction of policies.

It is clear from the word sent by the British government to the governments of the several dominions to which I made reference yesterday, that this right to be heard relates to the machinery for consultation between the government of the United Kingdom and the governments of the other members of the British commonwealth on matters of urgency connected with the war; further, that it has resulted from the United States entry into the war, and recent developments in the Pacific, and also from the request of the Australian government.

Speaking for the Canadian government, I may say that the existing machinery for consultation between not only the governments of Great Britain and Canada but also between Canada and the governments of the other dominions has, in our opinion, worked exceedingly well. If at any time in the future we should find the means of consultation inadequate to meet the new developments which have arisen or which may arise, our government will not only be prepared but glad to avail itself of the supplementary arrangement to have our views presented to the war cabinet of Great Britain by an accredited representative, in accordance with the procedure which was announced yesterday by the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

PACIFIC COUNCIL

REPRESENTATION OF CANADA ON COUNCIL TO CONCERT COMMON DEFENCE IN SOUTH PACIFIC

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Prime Minister? Press dispatches appearing

yesterday afternoon quoted Prime Minister Churchill as saying in the British House of Commons that negotiations are under way—in other words that they are not yet completed—to set up in Washington a Pacific defence council, comprising representatives of Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, the Netherlands East Indies, and presumably the United States. As a nation at war in the Pacific area, is Canada to be represented on this council, and if not, why not?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was good enough to send me word that he intended to ask the question he has just asked. I have a reply which I shall read to the house.

The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom announced in his speech in the House of Commons at Westminster yesterday that it is proposed to set up a Pacific council in London comprising Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand and the Netherlands East Indies, which would be able to transmit their united views to the combined chiefs of staff committee sitting at Washington. Final arrangements regarding the working of the Pacific council have not yet been decided upon. Its primary responsibility, however, will, I understand, be to concert the common defence of the countries in the south Pacific which Japanese aggression has placed in the immediate danger zone. The physical and geographical complexities of a world war waged on so many fronts compel subdivisions of responsibility. Our immediate sector of the Pacific front is one we hold jointly with the United States. Arrangements for the common defence of the coast of north America both on the Atlantic and on the Pacific are being worked out jointly by Canada and the United States.

Mr. GREEN: With regard to the answer given by the Prime Minister to my question, did I understand him to mean that Canada was not asking for representation on the Pacific council?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might say that such information as I have about the proposed Pacific council is what I read in Mr. Churchill's speech of yesterday. I have given to my hon. friend the only interpretation it is possible for me to put upon his words, and I believe on reading what I have said my hon. friend will see that the explanation I have given as to the representation on the council being confined to the countries named is due to the fact that it was expected to relate only to matters in the south Pacific, or the zone in which the Japanese are operating at the present time.

With respect to the Pacific on and about the north American coasts, as I have said the responsibility rests primarily between the United States, ourselves and Great Britain. It is just a division of the zones, as I see it, in which there are the several responsibilities. But in any event, now that the matter is before the government in the form in which it is, we, of course, are taking occasion to look carefully into it.

Mr. GREEN: I would point out to the Prime Minister also that in reading the extract from Mr. Churchill's speech the Prime Minister did not read the succeeding paragraphs, which said that Australia and New Zealand had asked that the council, instead of being set up in London, should be set up in Washington. The Prime Minister's statement a few moments ago was to the effect that it was to be in London. Apparently the negotiations are looking to setting up the council in Washington.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I believe a reading of the text bears out what I have said, namely that the announcement made by the Prime Minister of Great Britain related to this council as being located in London, but it was to have its views transferred to the chiefs of staff in Washington. There has been, I understand, since the original conference with New Zealand and Australia, some request on their part that the council itself should be located in Washington, but what answer has been given to that request I am not in a position to say at the moment. I believe what I have said will cover what my hon. friend has in mind.

Mr. CHURCH: Will the Prime Minister table all the correspondence both of this year and of last year on this matter and respecting the empire war council?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With respect to this particular matter, there is no correspondence that I am aware of.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think the hon. member is referring to something else.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Sometimes I have difficulty in catching the purport of my hon. friend's questions. But generally with respect to the tabling of confidential correspondence, may I say that before it can be tabled the consent of all governments concerned will have to be obtained. In any event, where it is thought that it would be inadvisable to make public any part of correspondence at a time of war, that part should not be made public.

CHEESE

QUESTION AS TO THE SHORTAGE OF BOXES AND MILK CANS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. It has been drawn to my attention that there is danger of a serious shortage of cheese boxes, owing to the failure of the controller to release material for manufacture. It has also been drawn to my attention that the same condition exists in regard to milk cans. It is pointed out that there is an insufficient quantity of tin to coat the cans. Have any representations been made to the minister on this subject, and if so, does he intend to take action?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, my answer is that I have not recently discussed the question, just as it has been put, with officials. Only this morning I discussed the general question whether there was any difficulty in regard to materials generally which might be under the control of the boards. I was informed that there are no insurmountable difficulties, and that everything is being arranged satisfactorily.

I shall, however, make definite inquiries with respect to these particular matters, and if there is any further information I shall give it to-morrow.

ST. PIERRE AND MIQUELON

REPORTED NEUTRALIZATION FOR DURATION OF THE WAR

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Prime Minister. I have not been able to give notice of it, because it has just come to my attention. A report appearing in the New York *Times* of yesterday, January 27, states that a solution has been reached in London for the neutralization of the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon for the duration of the war. The article continues:

> Canada, it was indicated, will be asked to assume the responsibility for the protection of the neutrality of the islands, and Admiral Muselier will withdraw his small force.

Is the statement contained in that dispatch correct, and if so what is the nature of the solution which has been reached with respect to this vexed question?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The matter to which my hon. friend has referred, as he is aware, is one of very grave importance, and the time at which an announcement in respect of it should be made is a matter which should be taken into account. I shall be pleased to give the house a statement in the matter as soon as I am advised by the governments of Great Britain and the United States that so far as they are concerned it will be quite satisfactory that a statement on which they are agreed can be made in the Canadian House of Commons.

PRINTING BUREAU

RETIREMENT OF EMPLOYEES FROM SERVICE WITHOUT PENSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. R. BOUCHER (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to ask of the Secretary of State. I am informed that upwards of eighty employees of the printing bureau between the ages of 65 and 70 years are shortly to be retired from the service without pension. I should like to ask the minister if this is so, and if in view of the present state of affairs he would not consider it to be in the public interest to retain the services of all who are still competent to carry on their duties, even though approaching the retiring age.

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): The hon. member for Carleton was kind enough to give me notice of his intention to ask this question. The figure which he mentioned of 80 employees over the age of 65 is somewhat too high. Actually there are 33 over 65 who are now employed in the printing bureau. The matter of the extension of the term of employment rests primarily with the treasury board. But I believe that under existing circumstances such employment has been continued and, unless ill health intervenes, it will be the policy to continue it in the immediate future.

WAGE CEILING

SETTING UP OF REGIONAL BOARDS UNDER NATIONAL WAR LABOUR BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): Yesterday the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth) asked a question about the setting up of regional war labour boards, and at the time I advised him that I thought that these had all been set up. I have confirmed that information. The regional war labour boards, which, as hon. members of this house know, were to be appointed for each province, have all been appointed, the first on December 2 last and the last on January 9.

JOINT DEFENCE

POSSIBILITY OF SENDING CANADIAN SOLDIERS TO ASSISTANCE OF UNITED STATES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Yesterday I directed a question to the Prime Minister and he said that it would have been more appropriate to direct it to the military authorities. I assume that the Minister of National Defence is the highest military authority, and I will ask him whether he is prepared to answer my question. I shall repeat it if necessary.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I think my hon. friend misunderstood my answer if he believes I said that he should not have directed his question to me. Directing his question to me was quite all right. What I did say was that before the question could be replied to, I thought the military authorities of the defence department would have to consider it.

Mr. BRUCE: I may have misunderstood the Prime Minister. May I hope, then, to have a reply to the question from him?

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): The hon. member for Parkdale inquired yesterday if units of the sixth division would be available to be sent to the assistance of the United States. That question is a rather large order. Whether they would be available of course would depend upon the military circumstances at the time, and the need for them. There are a great many troops in Canada which might be utilized besides the brigade groups of the sixth division. I want to say to him, however, that the units of these brigade groups would be available if it were considered advisable and necessary to send men to the United States, less any home defence personnel who were in those units who did not volunteer for that duty.

Hon. C. G. POWER (Minister of National Defence for Air): Speaking for the air force, all the air force is available for service in the United States if the necessity should arise.

Hon. ANGUS L. MACDONALD (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): That is true of the navy.

SUGAR

RATIONING IN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES—BEET SUGAR CAPACITY—CONFECTIONERY INDUSTRY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should give an answer to a question asked on Monday by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore). The first part of his question was:

> Why has the sugar ration in Canada been set at three-quarters of a pound per person while in the United States it is fixed at one pound?

The answer is supplied by part of a press release issued by Mr. Leon Henderson on Monday, from which I quote:

> Consumption of sugar this year—

He is speaking about the United States.

> —should average close to one pound per person per week. This does not mean that under the rationing plan now being proposed it will be possible to buy that much per person each week for home use. Actually, the initial sales under the plan may not be more than three-quarters of a pound per week per person; since sugar will have to be provided for people who eat in hotels, restaurants and institutions, sugar so consumed will help make up the annual total of fifty pounds per person. . . .

The ration of three-quarters of a pound per person in Canada relates to home use and therefore is consistent with the rationing plan adopted in the United States. The latter part of the hon. member's question was:

> Again, have any steps been taken or has any plan been made to increase Canada's beet sugar productive capacity by the building of factories? If not, why not?

If the hon. member is asking that consideration be given to that question, I can assure him that consideration will be given to it. I may say, however, that the sugar administrator advised the beet sugar industry some time ago that they should do everything possible to bring production of beets up to the maximum capacity of their factories. If this were possible in the case of the two factories in Alberta, it would mean that beet sugar production would exceed the total requirements of the three prairie provinces.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): While the minister is dealing with this point, and if I am in order, I should like to ask whether any decision has been reached with respect to the allocation of sugar to confectionery manufacturers. During the ten long years of the depression I do not think there was any other industry that suffered more than this one. Most of the confectionery manufacturers had to absorb the sugar tax. In arriving at any decision I hope consideration will be given to that fact. Has any policy been announced or adopted with respect to the allocation of sugar to this industry?

Mr. ILSLEY: I shall have to make inquiry from the wartime prices and trade board before I can answer that question.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Tuesday, January 27, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. DOUGLAS C. ABBOTT (St. Antoine-Westmount): Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my tribute to those which have been paid already to the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) who moved and seconded the address in reply to the speech from the throne. As the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has already said, from the point of view of both substance and the manner of presentation their speeches were outstanding. Of course, I may say that that is no more than I would have expected from two such distinguished members of my own profession.

I propose now to place before the house certain views which I hold on two rather controversial questions, the question of conscription and the related issue of the plebiscite. May I say at the outset I realize that for some months there has been a feeling in my constituency that I should have made a public statement of my views on these questions. I have been in public life for only a short time, and, rightly or wrongly, I decided that any statement which I might have to make on a matter of public policy of a controversial nature would be made in the house and not before service clubs or in "Letters to the Editor." So far I have adhered to that rule. I am now taking advantage of the first opportunity I have had of placing my views on these questions on record.

Like most returned men, I am personally a believer in conscription. Those are my personal views and, I think, the views of a good many others, including the majority of my constituents. But I am satisfied that had an attempt been made to enforce this policy at the outset of the war, the result would have been disastrous. I am convinced that it would have split this country from one end to the other, and that our war effort to date would not have achieved anything like it has done.

So far as I am concerned, the question which I must ask myself, and which I think every hon. member must ask himself, is: What policy will result in this country putting forth its maximum war effort? I am prepared to support any policy which I believe will accomplish that object. I intend that any remarks which I shall make to-day with reference to conscription shall apply to conscription for the armed forces. That is the field in which the controversy appears to be most acute. As the Prime Minister indicated in his speech on Monday afternoon, the war effort of this country covers a pretty broad field. The army aspect is only one aspect of our war effort. It is evident to me that in a country of this size there must be a top limit to that armed force effort.

That top limit is something on which I do not feel qualified to express an opinion, and I doubt whether there are very many people in this country, or, for that matter, in this parliament, who are in a position to give an informed opinion on that question. It depends obviously, it seems to me, on a great many facts which of necessity can be known to only a few people. As was stated here, yesterday, we are a nation of some eleven and a half or twelve million people, and as an editor friend of mine wrote the other day, a considerable number of those people have either not yet cut their eye-teeth or lost them forever. Therefore, if we accept the statement which has often been made that it takes anywhere from twelve to fifteen men or women to support one fighting man, it does not require any knowledge of higher mathematics to realize that our armed forces cannot be as extensive as some of our more enthusiastic citizens would lead us to believe.

I take it that the purpose of conscription or compulsory service is to provide an adequate body of trained fighting men; and, of course, since the training takes time, that training cannot be deferred until the need at the front becomes urgent. We have at present in this country a considerable number of men in training under the compulsory system. We can call up and train more, and it seems to me that the controversy in recent months has turned entirely on the question whether we should now adopt a policy of saying that these men will be liable for military service elsewhere than in Canada, or whether that decision should be deferred until the need in the fighting areas becomes apparent. At the moment the men we are calling up are not, of course, available for service outside the territorial limits of Canada. The provisions of the National Resources Mobilization Act provide that they shall not be so liable. So far as training is concerned, the result is the same. The men are being trained; but as matters stand at present, when trained, if they are required outside, they cannot be sent. That is because the government went before the people of this coun-

try in March, 1940, and expressly pledged itself that, if returned to power, it would not enforce compulsory service for the armed forces overseas.

This brings me to the second part of my remarks, namely, the proposed plebiscite, which in effect is asking, as we all know, that the government be given a free hand, that they be released from that pledge and be in a position, if the situation demands it, to send our armed forces whereever they may be required. We pride ourselves, Mr. Speaker, that we are living in a democracy, and we say that we are fighting to preserve that system. The whole basis of that system, as I have always understood it, is that the will of the majority shall prevail. As I said a moment ago, the government of this country went before the people less than two years ago and made an express statement that it would not enforce compulsory service for overseas. The government was returned on that basis. It has frequently been referred to as the pledge of the Prime Minister, but in my view the pledge is not the pledge of the Prime Minister alone but the pledge of every Liberal candidate who offered himself for election.

So far as I personally am concerned, conscription was not an issue in my riding. I do not recall that it was referred to at any time during the campaign. It certainly was not referred to by me; nevertheless I consider I am just as much bound by that pledge or commitment as any other Liberal member who was elected in March, 1940. One reason, by no means the only reason, but one reason why the present Prime Minister of Canada has retained the confidence of his fellow Canadians for a longer time, I think, than any other Prime Minister in the history of this country is that the Canadian people know that when he gives a pledge or makes a commitment, it will be respected.

I have no sympathy with the view that political pledges are made to be broken; I do not particularly care what the circumstances are; it savours too much to me of the doctrine that the end justifies the means. The government is charged with evading responsibility. If insistence on respecting a pledge solemnly given is evading responsibility, the charge is correct, but that does not coincide with my definition of that term.

On this question of responsibility I should like to say a word or two about the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin). As we all know, the minister has gone through a long illness, and we are delighted to see that he has made such a splendid recovery. I do not think anyone in this country could have criticized him had he decided that he had already given generously of his time and ability to the public service, and that for reasons of health he should now retire to the side-lines and leave responsibility to someone else. He has not done that. I do not know, but I strongly suspect, that his return to the duties of his office and in this house are much against the advice of his medical advisers. Whether that be so or not, it does not strike me as being an evasion of responsibility, and I commend his action as an example to those numerous critics who are always so willing to define other people's responsibilities.

I have heard other criticism of the plebiscite on the basis of the effect it will have outside. I think the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe) said last night that it did not matter what effect the plebiscite had on our enemies, but that it did matter how it affected our friends, and I presume he had particular reference to our great neighbour nation, the United States. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, that is a form of criticism which does not carry very much weight with me either. Anyone who listened to the speech of the Prime Minister the other day—as a matter of fact he did not need to listen to that speech because he knew it before—must realize that the war effort of this country is a magnificent one. We sometimes worry too much about what other people think about us and not enough about what we are actually doing. It is what we do that counts, and I venture to say that the war effort of this country will stand comparison with that of any other. So far as the United States is concerned, I would be the last to minimize the efforts they are putting forward, but from the outset of the war their interests were just as much at stake as our own. They have come in now. They are in, and I think it will still be some little time before, either on a proportionate basis, or on any other basis you wish to take, their effort will come up to ours. I have no doubt it will, but in the meantime we need not worry particularly about whether our war effort will be misunderstood in the United States.

I should like now to make a brief personal reference on this question of plebiscite. I have had a certain number of communications, by telegram, letter and otherwise, intimating that the stand which it was assumed I was taking on this question was dictated by considerations of political expediency or party loyalty or the like. Well, I am almost forty-three years of age, and except for some two and a half years I served overseas in the last war I have lived all my life in this country. I suppose that on the basis of the mortality tables I may have another twenty or twenty-five years to go. I have three young children

who, I hope, have considerably longer. If anybody tells me that the stand which I take or the views which I express on questions such as we are now considering, relating to the prosecution of this war, are dictated or actuated by motives such as I have suggested, I will say to these people that they are talking utter rubbish.

I know that in war time we are in danger of giving our emotions free rein, and we have to make allowance for that; but I believe we could do with a lot less high-powered emotion and a lot more careful analytical thinking. In that connection I was struck by a phrase that occurred in a sermon I listened to last Sunday in Montreal. It was delivered by the Reverend Mr. Wilkinson, rector of the church of St. James the Apostle. He was discussing this question of thinking, and he said: "Some people who think they are thinking are only rearranging their prejudices."

I was very much encouraged to read in the press on Saturday night the statement made by Mr. Alex Walker, Dominion President of the Canadian Legion, of which I am a member. Mr. Walker said that all branches of the legion would work to secure an overwhelming result at the polls so that this plebiscite would be transformed into a weapon of victory. I congratulate Mr. Walker upon that statement. I think it is an example of clear thinking—

Mr. ROSS (Souris): What else did he say?

Mr. ABBOTT: —such as I have referred to. I congratulate him and commend that attitude to some other organizations such as committees for total war and the like.

It seems to me that no useful purpose is going to be served by interminable debate in this house or outside as to the desirability or otherwise of this plebiscite. We are going to have it, and, in spite of what some people may have to say, it is a thoroughly democratic procedure. I spoke a moment ago about responsibility, and I suggest that the people of this country as a whole now have an opportunity to assume their responsibility, to turn out and vote and show each other, and the rest of the world if you will, that democracy can be made to work even in war time. So far as my own constituency is concerned, I have no doubt as to the result. I cannot believe that it will be other than an overwhelming affirmative answer to release the government from its pledge and to give it a free hand to conduct the war as it sees fit.

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two Mountains) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the government has made solemn promises and parliament has no power to release it from commitments which induced our population to return it to power. It is for this reason that I shall again revert to the ticklish question of conscription in order to hammer a truly Canadian mentality into the minds of the ultra-loyalists, if such a thing is possible. Allow me to recall to them the recent political history of our country, which is also theirs.

Speaking on conscription, the Right Honourable Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) on March 30, 1939, made the following statement before this house, as you may read on page 2426 of *Hansard:*

> One strategic fact is clear: the crossing of the oceans is 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.
>
> 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. Profits could and would be rigidly controlled, and profiteering suppressed. But men's lives and men's wills cannot be put on the same basis as goods and profits. The present government believes that conscription of men for overseas service would not be necessary or an effective step. Let me say that so long as this government may be in power, no such measure will be enacted.

On the following day, the right hon. Minister of Justice made the following statement, recorded on page 2468 of *Hansard* of March 31, 1939; this is his greatest title to glory, in spite of all that may be said by Ernest Lapointe's self-seeking eulogists who are now attempting to exploit here his brilliant career in order to enhance petty interests implacably branded by his whole life. The former Minister of Justice used the following words:

> Now I am going to touch a subject which is a delicate one. The French Canadians will never agree that any government has the right to force them to military service on the other side of the ocean. In 1917, that was my view, and I have never altered it. I believe that conscription, in 1917, was a blunder of frightful magnitude, and that we are still reaping the sad and sorry results of that ill-conceived policy. I was pleased that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Manion) said yesterday, what I have myself learned, that the results did not in any way justify the taking of the risk; because in the end very few conscripts ever saw the front lines during the war. All should be reconciled to the doctrine which I have just expounded. The best way, the most effective way of helping is not the way that would divide our country and tear it asunder.

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.

These grave statements have been accepted with satisfaction by the whole country. At the general election of March 26, 1940, the Canadian electorate overwhelmingly approved a thoroughly Canadian policy and nothing else. Of the two main party leaders engaged in the struggle, one claimed that the Canadian government's war policy was inefficient on account of its moderation. However, he stated that it should remain on a voluntary and free footing. The other laid down as a principle that our war effort should remain moderate, voluntary and free. Of two evils, the Canadians chose the lesser. The popular vote of March 26, 1940, expressed a choice of a thoroughly Canadian policy more than anything else. However, neither of the leaders had thought that a time would come when war contingencies would alter the situation. War remains indifferent to all political machinations and no one, even though he be the greatest genius, may foretell its emergencies. Once war is declared all its consequences must perforce be accepted and endured. The soldier deserving of the name never spares even his own blood. Only war profiteers measure their efforts by their value in gold, for they are too petty to rise to the heroism of the soldier who stands ready to make the supreme sacrifice.

Military and financial imperialism, the petty interests and criminal hypocrisy of war profiteers should not be allowed to impose conscription on a whole nation who condemned it scarcely a year ago. Let the government deal, once for all, with these fomenters of national disunity and these war profiteers! Those who clamour for conscription are abusing the government of the people for the people and are insulting democracy, the defenders of which they claim to be. Wilfully ignoring the will of the electorate, as clearly expressed on March 26, 1940, they set themselves up as would-be dictators of Canada. A country which, through the might of her resources and the valour of her blood fights dictatorship must, by all means, free public opinion from the hateful theories of those fosterers of discord and disorder. They are the ones who are truly sabotaging the war effort and the national defence.

I shall now demand, once again, exemption from military service for farmers. The ultra-loyalists should not construe this request as the expression of a feeling peculiar to my province. There is no better evidence for that fact that the letters I have recently received from many places. Of whatever race they may be, the writers, like the majority of true Canadians, wish to save our agriculture from disaster and our nation from bankruptcy. Loyal and true to their King, they believe that they can serve him best on the very soil where unprecedented efforts and sacrifices are being made. The warning cry sounded in the letters written to me by those people is as follows:

I should like to read a letter which I have received from New Brunswick:

Royal Road,
Feb. 21, 1941.

Mr. J. B. L. Lacombe,

I saw by the paper where you are going to ask for exemption for people engaged in agriculture. May you meet with every success.

My husband is a cripple, he lost his leg two years ago when his team ran away with him on a reaper. Our only help and support is a son and if he has to go in training, we don't know what in the world we are going to do. May you get every support.

Yours truly,
Mrs. William Nealis,
Fredericton, R.R. No. 1, N.B.

That is from the constituency of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson).

Another letter which I should like to read is from Saskatchewan:

Balcarres, Sask.,
March 1, 1941.

Mr. J. B. L. Lacombe,
Ottawa, Ont.
Dear Sir,

An item on Feb. 26, issued of *Free Press Prairie Farmer* that all farm youth be exempted from training. I beg to ask why parties in my position cannot obtain help to get back to another start. I am married, 44 years of age, wife and two children, girl 16, able to work and boy 11, school age. I have tried to exist on $7 municipal relief and such odd jobs as I could pick at very small wages for the last three years. Lost nine horses through disease, had to sell other stock. Have applied to governmental service, also offered to join the army but not fit. Now I must vacate the building I live in with nowhere else to go as mortgage company wishes us to move. Then I have no money for advance rent on house in town also need clothing, fuel and groceries, etc. for family use which I cannot get work nor money to pay for. I was drafted off a farm while the sole support of my parents in last war and saw thirteen months army service. I have tried

every branch of government service for employment to no avail. I and my family are badly destitute. I would like to know why something cannot be done to give families in my position another start even in agriculture work. There are two or three in the same position in this district. I would like to buy more certificates but would also like to be in position to make a fair living for my family. Also hoping something can be done to give in this matter chance, I beg to remain,

Respectfully yours,
D. T. Young,
Box 1095, Balcarres,
Saskatchewan.

I may add that similar representations have been made to me by a great number of English-speaking farmers from Ontario, the maritimes and the prairies. However, the letters containing those representations were confidential and I would be unfair to the writers if I were to state their names.

History repeats itself. During the last war, thousands of Canadian farmers of every racial extraction, over eight thousand of them in fact, laid before Sir Robert Borden in this capital of Canada, a unanimous petition urging the then prime minister to exempt their sons from compulsory military service. They met the head of the nation during the winter of 1918 at a huge meeting that took place in one of the theatres of this city. Sir Robert Borden rejected the petition presented by the farmers, who in turn defeated his successor at the election of December 6, 1921. In the prairies and in Ontario, the Progressives and the United Farmers returned a considerable number of members, and as a result, for nine years the Liberal party itself would have been unable to remain in power without their support. Almost a decade elapsed before the Conservative party again took power on July 28, 1930.

Those events should teach a lesson to those who might be tempted to repeat the frightful blunder of 1917. The common people's reactions would be still more dreadful in a second post-war period.

At a time when the farmer is the most affected by the minimum prices regulations, and when he is deprived of the help he needs for cultivating his land, it is important to exempt from military service farmers' sons, farm labourers and all persons who are working in industries related to agriculture. Exemption courts should be set up in all constituencies. Invested with the necessary powers, such courts would be instructed to seek the most efficient means of preserving agriculture, our first line of defence.

The letters I have mentioned express an opinion held throughout the country by those who believe in the survival of Canada through agriculture. Those letters show how well-grounded are the demands which I have felt constrained to submit again to parliament. As regards conscription for overseas service, the great majority of Canadians, from whatever race they may be descended, are against it. That is evidenced by the vote given by the young men in all Canadian universities. Canadian citizens, whatever their age, their condition, their calling or their residence, have rejected conscription in the past and they are still condemning that measure. The financial sharks, who through their unbridled greed have rearmed the axis powers, are alone in again supporting conscription. Those traitors to their country who were branded by Winston Churchill himself scarcely four years ago in the British House of Commons, are still demanding conscription. Those rascals who have plenty of money will only be satisfied when they have fully appropriated our resources, our incomes and our blood. I say again as emphatically as I can "Our first line of defence is in Canada." And if, unfortunately we were sooner or later to face an invasion, those who have neglected to rearm our country for the benefit of military and financial imperialism shall have to bear the dreadful consequences of such an invasion.

Here is a letter sent to me by a Toronto citizen. It is a good illustration of the true Canadian national sentiments shared by all those who believe that our main duty is the protection and defence of our own shores.

I will read a letter from Toronto:

172 Oakmount Road,
May 9, 1941,
Toronto, Ontario.

Liguori Lacombe, M.P.,
Parliament Buildings,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,

It was most refreshing to read your recent speech against conscription. I had long ago given up hope that any of our representatives thought the same way that I and many of my fellow citizens do.

The imperialists will probably ruin our country financially but, as long as you are championing Canada's rights, I do not think they will desiccate our national unity. This war is following the same pattern as the last one, and the imperialists are again preparing to fertilize Europe with Canadians. When are we going to assert ourselves as a Canadian and American nation?

With best wishes, I remain,
Sincerely,
John V. Newton.

I shall read another letter sent to me by an honest Ontario farmer, requesting, for his sons working on the farm, exemption from compulsory military service and training. This letter is worded as follows:

Springfield, Ontario,
February 20, 1941.

Dear Sir,

I read in the London *Free Press* to-day of your resolution exempting all young men who are engaged in farming from military training, and I want to congratulate you for your stand. Not that I think that farmers or their sons are any better to fight for their country than anybody else, but I do think that a good many of them can serve their country better by staying on the land. It does seem to me that there are some at Ottawa who do not understand conditions pertaining to agriculture. Now I would like to state, and you can use this if it will be of any benefit in getting your resolution through. One year ago last fall, my wife and I bought one hundred acres with the understanding that our son was to take it over when he was twenty-one. Well, he went on and worked it last year, cleaned it up for accredited cattle, has sixty acres ploughed; he has a contract signed to grow peas and beans for the canning company. Now the point is, what is he going to do. He will be twenty-one in June. Under the present law it would seem the only thing he can do would be to sell his stock, which we have been trying to build up for years. I might add that this farm is three miles away from my own farm, and I have all I can possibly do to work my own farm.

Yours truly,

Harvey Nigh,
Springfield, Elgin County,
R.R. No. 1, Ontario.

(Text) Let me add just one word on agriculture. Every hand is needed on the farm, and the farmer plays an essential part in the war effort. Farmers, farm labourers and all persons employed in industries relating to agriculture should, therefore, not be called up for military training. Whether the farmer be engaged in the production of food, in the raising of live stock or in lumbering, he provides our fighting men with food, clothing and shelter. I urge that we exempt the farmers from military training.

Concerning the matter of conscription for overseas service, I believe I am justified in repeating what I said in this house on April 30, 1941. The adoption of such a measure would endanger the very foundation of national unity. It would imperil true Canadianism which must be prevalent and alive in all our people and their leaders. Let us not repeat our past monstrous mistakes.

Before concluding, I beg to remind the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the government of their commitments toward the people of Canada. When Canada was on the verge of declaring war upon Germany, that is on September 8, 1939, the Prime Minister stated in this house, as reported at page 36 of *Hansard* for 1939:

I wish now to repeat the undertaking I gave in parliament on behalf of the government on March 31. The present government believes that conscription of men for overseas service will not be a necessary or an effective step. No such measure will be introduced by the present administration.

Even a few months after the last general election, the Prime Minister made the following declaration, as reported at page 966 of *Hansard* for June 20, 1940:

Those who were anti-conscriptionists were against conscription for service overseas, and as long as this government is in office we are going to maintain that position and see that effect is given to it. That is just one of the reasons why, in carrying out the will and the wishes of the people, we do not propose to take into this government any of those whose object in coming into the ministry would be to see that conscription overseas was again made one of the issues in this country.

As to the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition, I do not approve of it, and my constituents could not approve of it either. This amendment deplores the plebiscite on conscription for overseas service, but it is not opposed to conscription itself. Therefore, as I have always been against conscription, I will not, in this difficult moment, shun the fulfilment of my duty. I request the government to respect its pledges and the terms of the anti-conscriptionist mandate, which it received from the people of Canada on March 26, 1940.

Will the most powerful administration which the country has had so far, withdraw before the invasion of the howling mob of rotten financiers? Behind the ramparts threatened by the assault of conscriptionists, will our leaders stand up in front of the enemy, who wants to sacrifice at all costs the defence of Canada upon the altar of military and financial imperialism? Will they respect their pledges and the mandate which they received from the people? This is what we shall see. Personally, I will not free the government from its commitments and promises because, in accordance with the terms of its mandate and the constitution of the country, it may and must administer the country during at least three years without imposing conscription. I will not free it from any pledge it has given against compulsory service overseas, because our total war effort must be directed more than ever to the total defence of Canada before all. The leader of the opposition stated that our line of defence was everywhere in this confused universe. He grieved over the fate of Australia, which is dangerously threatened. He fears that Halifax, Saint John, Vancouver or Quebec may meet with the fate

of Pearl Harbour. If that is true, our first line of defence more than ever is on our shores, and our first duty is toward Canada.

The leader of the opposition, in his amendment, is asking for a total national war effort and for the mobilization, in any theatre of war, of our complete effective in man and woman-power. He also requests the total mobilization of the wealth and material resources of the country to be used for war purposes throughout the world. He does not speak of the defence of our shores.

Are Halifax, Vancouver, Saint John and Quebec adequately protected, or is their defence merely casual? Are the more thickly populated cities of Canada ready to face an air invasion from the enemy? These matters do not seem to interest the leader of the opposition or the government. They believe that we should fight in Europe, Asia, Africa, the South Sea islands and undergo the utmost sacrifices in natural resources, munitions and man-power, even if Canada must neglect its own defence and suffer the same fate as the countries dominated and subdued by the enemy. The commonwealth of Australia is seriously threatened, while its heroic soldiers are facing death in Africa and thousands of others were mowed down by the enemy in Greece and in Crete less than one year ago. Did the government and the opposition come to an understanding to reserve the same deplorable fate for Canada?

From their former actions, from their former statements, I can only arrive at the conclusion that at present we are facing the most anti-Canadian and imperialist policy which the country has seen so far. Therefore, fully aware of my responsibilities toward my constituency and my country, I will vote against the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I will vote against the amendment and against the amendment to the amendment, because the latter also calls for the conscription of man-power for overseas service, as well as for the conscription of wealth.

When the rules of the house allow it and when hon. members have voted on the amendment to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), seconded by the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix), I will immediately move an amendment to the amendment requesting that the government keep its pledges and the terms of the mandate which it received from the people of Canada during the general elections of March 26, 1940, against conscription for overseas service.

I will close with the following statement: The formation of a Canadian party is necessary. I will adhere to this party which was originated to-day in this House of Commons. Other hon. members also will adhere to it, together with all true Canadians. Our policy will be directed toward the prime defence of Canada, toward the best interests of the country in the economic and social domain. This doctrine, believe me, will not be the exclusive prerogative of one province. It will shine over the whole country and over all loyal Canadians, faithful to His Majesty the King of England, who is also the King of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, may the extreme inequalities of wealth which have led our democracy to the verge of the abyss disappear from this world. Was not this wish expressed in the war aims of the allies, as approved by His Majesty the King, by the Archbishop of Westminster, and again recently by Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt when they drafted the charter of the Atlantic? May the war profiteers and the thieves of Valcartier camp who took away from our worthy soldiers the food which was intended for them perish also. May the corrupters of democracy perish in order that we may save whatever good and praiseworthy elements are still left in it. May the traitors to our country perish, those who have rearmed Japan and the axis powers to the prejudice of the allies and Canada. Let us sever the last link which ties us to those renegades who have forsaken their sacred pledges, and let us join the Canadian party which has just been created in this house. We shall soon set forth the doctrine of the new Canadian party which has been established in the best interests of the country.

The new Canadian party requests better remuneration for our land, sea and air forces. The wages received by employees of our war industries are two, three and even four times as great as those received by our soldiers. Those employees work only eight hours a day. The soldier who gives his life, who sometimes wrecks his future when he outlives the battle, gets but a meagre compensation. No soldier, airman or seaman should receive less than $4 a day, exclusive of his uniform, upkeep and food. The first duty of the Canadian party will be to retain the farmer on the land, to produce munitions and supplies, to organize the defence of Canada before all, and to give the defenders of our country the fair remuneration to which they are entitled.

Mr. KARL K. HOMUTH (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I have on my desk the speech from the throne. We usually look upon that speech as the legislative menu card for the coming session, but a careful study of this

document almost leads one to believe that this menu card was prepared in a country which was on very severe rations. One item that we had expected to see on the card is not there, and in its place is something that is certainly not palatable to most people of the country and is absolutely nauseous to a great many. I refer to the question of the plebiscite.

There will be opportunities to deal with other departments of the government as the session proceeds. I want to deal particularly with the questions of man-power and money as they affect our war effort, and with the suggestion that we are having a plebiscite to relieve the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) from a promise which he made.

In the first place the voluntary system has fallen down. I think every hon. member in the house will admit that that is so. The proof is to be found in the radio addresses and speeches of high ranking army officials and important members of the government. Anyone who attends the recruiting meetings that are being frantically called throughout this province will realize only too well how the whole system of voluntary recruiting has fallen down.

Mr. MUTCH: That is pure nonsense.

Mr. HOMUTH: It is not pure nonsense. If it is pure nonsense, then my hon. friend's leaders in the cabinet and the various officers who are out recruiting are not telling the truth.

Mr. MUTCH: It is either nonsense or sabotage; the hon. member can have it either way. I know something about it.

Mr. HOMUTH: So do I. I know a lot about it. The hon. member will have an opportunity of expressing his views.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Make him withdraw "sabotage."

Mr. HOMUTH: I did not hear him say it. Oh well, no one pays any attention to what he says anyway.

The very fact that the government have decided that we should have a plebiscite, the very fact that they are asking the people of this country to release them from their promises with respect to service overseas, should be ample proof that the voluntary system has fallen down. Certainly if they were getting all the recruits they needed, the Prime Minister would never suggest having a plebiscite on this question.

If the situation is so serious, there is only one answer—national selective service. We have to get them in; we must have men to fill up the ranks when the time comes. If we cannot get them in voluntarily, then we must have national selective service. All we expect is that the government of the day shall have the courage to see to it that the men who have enlisted for overseas service, the men who have already left the shores of Canada, are not going to be deserted. Certainly no hon. member would suggest that the ranks of these men who have gone overseas should, when the time comes, be decimated by any failure to give them the necessary support. Surely no one would expect us to say to them: We have no more men to send to support you; so far as that phase of our war effort is concerned we are through.

When we declared war on Germany, and I was one of the members of parliament who sat here and voted for the declaration of war on Germany, did we say to Herr Hitler: We are declaring war on you and if you ever dare come near our shores we will slap your wrist and send you back? Or did we say to Germany: We are declaring war on you and we are going to fight you anywhere to drive from the face of this globe the vicious philosophy you preach. Isn't that what we said? There is only one way in which we can do that, and it is to fight our enemy wherever he can be found. When we declared war on Japan did we say to Japan: We are going to wait until you come here before we fight you? Did we say that to any nation with which we declared ourselves at war?

I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, at the reluctance of the government to take the courageous move they ought to take in order to get the required number of men. The only reason they give for not doing so is that the Prime Minister made a certain promise. Certainly he made a promise. But does that mean that no matter how serious this war may become, no matter how closely it may approach our shores, no matter how many men we lose, the Prime Minister is not prepared to fill up their ranks because of that promise he made; that instead he is going to take a plebiscite? That promise was given by the Prime Minister before the ravage of Norway and Denmark and Holland and Belgium. It was made before Dunkirk; it was made before Greece; it was made before the murderous attack by Japan, not only on the United States but on ourselves, in which we lost two regiments at Hong Kong.

If this were the only political promise the Prime Minister had ever made, or if he had been in public life only a short time, then I would say that in trying to keep such a pledge he was taking a real statesmanlike responsibility. Or if he had carried out all the promises that he has made in his long

political life, then we might unhesitatingly say that this is just what you would expect him to do, to be consistent with the course he had followed during all his political life. But, Mr. Speaker, his political life is cluttered not only with broken promises but with promises that he has made and failed to carry out and never will carry out.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Name them.

Mr. HOMUTH: I will name some of them right now. But no promise he ever made had the political significance or the political repercussions of this promise with regard to compulsory service for overseas. I could go back to 1919, and to the various elections held since then, and quote promise after promise that the Prime Minister made which he has never tried to carry out and has no intention of ever carrying out. But let us come to more recent days, to the election of 1935. Many of the members of this house will remember that throughout this country at that time large camps had been established in which unemployed young men were housed and clothed and fed and trained. During the campaign of 1935 the present Prime Minister directed attention to these camps every time he made a speech, and he always referred to their military aspect, to the fact that they were administered by the Department of National Defence. He tried to sow in the minds of the people of this country the idea that these camps were simply a military move, and that the boys were there under military rule and discipline, which might mean that eventually they would become soldiers. He was going to close all of these camps. He was going to take the boys out of the camps and give them lucrative employment. He painted a glowing picture of these boys marching out of the camps and working on the railways and other great public projects throughout this country. He closed the camps all right, but what did he do with the boys? The boys were left to wander up and down the highways and byways of this country, unwanted by anybody. If that was a sacred promise of the Prime Minister, and it certainly was a promise, he did not carry it out.

Again, speaking in the west before he went to England, the Prime Minister made another promise. He reiterated his stand on conscription for overseas service. He told the young men that they ought to get into the army or the finger of shame would be pointed at them as long as they lived, and then he added: "I give this pledge, that there will be no coercion for overseas service." Is there any hon. member of this house who will stand up to-day and say there has been no coercion in Canada for overseas service? Why, Mr. Speaker, I said during the last session of the house, in November, and I repeat now, that we have had in Canada the most cowardly system of coercion for overseas service that was ever conceived, because the boys who were taken into the training camps were shamed and humiliated and everything possible was done to drive them into active service for overseas.

Mr. MARTIN: Quote the Prime Minister's statement which you are talking about.

Mr. HOMUTH: Look it up in *Hansard*. You have more time than I have.

Mr. MARTIN: The fact is you have not got it.

Mr. HOMUTH: There are two promises that were made by the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask hon. members not to interrupt.

Mr. HOMUTH: I do not mind, Mr. Speaker. Again, the Prime Minister on many occasions has declared that he and any government that he was leading would never declare war on any country unless parliament was first called.

Mr. ROWE: The hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) cannot deny that one.

Mr. HOMUTH: Yet over one week-end he declared war on four countries—Finland, Roumania, Bulgaria, Japan—

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a conversation going on across the floor which is not fair to the hon. member who has the floor, and I would ask hon. members not to interrupt.

Mr. HOMUTH: The Prime Minister made the statement that war would not be declared on any country unless parliament was first called. He enunciated it at every election. But he did declare war on various countries without summoning parliament. What made him declare war in those cases without calling parliament? Something unlooked for, something unprecedented, something he had never thought of when the promise was made. Yet was that promise not just as sacred as his promise on the question of compulsory service for overseas? When the Prime Minister declared war on Japan he gave out the statement that he had consulted with the leader of the opposition about declaring war. In fact I understood he had consulted with the leaders of all the groups in the house. But let me tell the Prime Minister this, so far as his promise was concerned: that the leader of the opposition and the leaders of

the other groups sitting on the opposition side of this chamber are not the parliament of Canada.

This is the parliament of Canada and this is the house which he said would make the declarations of war. But these are things affecting more or less the material welfare of the people, whereas the question of conscription for overseas, the filling of the ranks of the fighting forces, have to do with the actual life of the person. If we took definite action right now and did it as quickly as possible it might save more lives than anything else we could do. Is it not plain to all of us that the Prime Minister's attitude now is no excuse for him? Are there any bodies of Canadian citizens who are prepared to say now that they are against an all-out war effort? Are there any people in this country who are prepared to say that we are going to desert the men overseas? From the riding I represent there are a thousand men who to-day are serving beyond the shores of Canada, and there are many more enlisted for active service. What are we going to say to them? What am I going to say to the mothers and fathers of these men?

Reference has been made in this house to the dynamic leadership of those two great leaders, Churchill and Roosevelt. The hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) has referred to these leaders—and incidentally, in his speech the other day he completely swallowed himself so far as his attitude to this question is concerned, because he certainly expressed different views a couple of weeks ago in the county of Waterloo. He referred to that great man Roosevelt—and a great man he is, and a great friend to us and to the empire. But when Roosevelt was elected there was no idea of the United States being embroiled in any war in Europe, or in any war at all. They would not send men outside the United States. Well, is he any less democratic than the Prime Minister of Canada? Are his promises any less sacred?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): He said, "any foreign war."

Mr. HOMUTH: Certainly. Now he has changed his mind because he has seen the danger as we see it here. And the very man who is leading England and the empire to-day, the most outstanding figure in the world, has done a great many things in this war, in the House of Commons in England, which time after time parties had pledged themselves against.

Now the Prime Minister says we will take a plebiscite. I asked him the other day, and then what? I said, after the plebiscite, what? He would give no answer. It was simply an evasive answer. He is not pledged to do anything; he is not going to pledge himself to do anything.

What if the people of Canada vote against this? What if the people vote not to release the government from its promise? What then are we going to do? What is Canada going to do? Hon. members speak of this plebiscite as if it were a foregone conclusion that it will carry; and yet within the last two days we have heard opposition to the plebiscite from the government side, and how some members are going to work against it and vote against it. This very plebiscite itself is bringing about national disunity, because this vote will end simply in a fight on conscription; on one side you will have the conscriptionists and on the other the anti-conscriptionists. The country will be split wide open; and after that, I say, what then? What is the government going to do? What is the Prime Minister going to do?

We are going out in the course of a few weeks to urge the people of Canada to invest in the war loan. We are going to plead with them to put up every dollar they can. We have gone into various industries in the country and pleaded with the workmen to give everything they can in war savings. I was asked if I would address a couple of meetings in my riding on behalf of the war loan, and I know that one question is going to be: How about the cost of the plebiscite? For someone will have to take charge of the work—and it is going to be a great opportunity for a large band of Liberal workers, from one side of the country to the other, to have a job for a few days. Someone will have to take charge of it, and money will have to be spent to explain the thing to the people. Money will have to be spent to organize the people—or is it going to be an unwanted baby, and are the people going to be left to vote just as they like without anyone taking the initiative? When I ask these people to invest in the war loan I shall have to say to them: Well, the first four or five million dollars will have to be raised anyway to pay for this plebiscite so that you people can decide whether or not the government is to continue in this war so far as man-power is concerned. From one end of the country to the other there is sweeping resentment at the spending of this money on something that the government itself should have the courage to do.

If there is behind the Prime Minister any large group of members who are opposed to national selective service, I think the time has come when the Prime Minister should say to

them, "We have come now to the parting of the ways; we have now come to the point where we have to do the brave thing on behalf of the country, and if you cannot see eye to eye with me, then we shall have to part company." The Prime Minister can be assured of sufficient support in this house to put any such bill through. In fact, I think he should go further than that. I think the Prime Minister should be prepared to-day to say, "I am going to form a truly national government in this country so that I can wage war against the aggressor with every dollar, with every man and every woman and every bit of material wealth that we have in Canada, and it is not going to be the responsibility of any political party, nor is it going to be hampered by any political expediency, but all the parties in the Dominion of Canada are going to be behind this war effort"—as they are.

Hon. members opposite sometimes laugh when we mention the question of national government. The Prime Minister on more than one occasion, and the late Minister of Justice, Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, on one or two occasions, referred to the great Liberal following in the House of Commons—180 members. And the Prime Minister said: "What could be more national than that? What could be more of a representative national government than 180 members out of 245, representing constituencies from Halifax to Vancouver?" It may be true. But the peculiar part is that when he wanted a minister of national defence for naval services there was apparently no one in that great national group fit to fill the job, so he went outside to get a minister for the navy. Then he wanted a minister of justice. Now, I have met and associated with a great many of my right hon. friend's legal friends from the province of Quebec; bright men, smart men, men with long experience in politics, men with long experience in the courts of their province. But apparently not one of them was fit, in the eyes of the Prime Minister, to be minister of justice; he had to go outside of the elected members to get a minister of justice.

Mr. MARTIN: Why did you go out of the house to get a new leader?

Mr. McDONALD (Pontiac): And a discredited leader.

Mr. HOMUTH: Let me remind my hon. friend that the new leader has served a long time in parliament and was still part of the parliament of Canada. Then the government wanted a minister of labour. Certainly they have tried many of them in the last couple of years, and one was no more successful than the other; they have bogged labour down, they have messed up all the legislation concerning labour; it is in a worse mess to-day than it was two years ago. They wanted a new minister of labour, and none of the hon. members on the other side of the house who have been associated with industry or have had something to do with labour was considered fit. I see the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Fraser). I say and have said before they could not have got a better man in the cabinet for minister of labour or anything else, because he is the most dynamic personality I have met for a long time. He may be ruthless in his politics, but from long association with him I would say that he never went after anything that he did not get.

There, Mr. Speaker, is the picture that we have of this great national government.

The hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Gray) referred the other day to the farmers. This is becoming a serious question. In our district farms are being sold out; farmers are being taken to the training camps; their sons may get two postponements and then they are told there will be no further postponement and they do not know what to do. These men do not want to shirk their duty. All they want is for someone to say: "This is the job you ought to do." They say: "Let them tell us whether we should stay on the farm or go into the army, but at least give us some leadership." But there is no one to do it. Every time one mentions selective service the idea of conscription comes up, and everyone thinks: That means we are going to grab all the man-power in this country and put it in the fighting forces. It is nothing of the kind. Hon. members know that. We should select men and women for the job they can do best in this war. There is a great army of men, fifty to fifty-five years of age, who cannot get into industry, who cannot get into the armed forces. These men want something to do. They feel disappointed and frustrated because they cannot get into something that will help the war effort. Yet when men are needed for special war jobs and the civil service is filled up with thousands of extra employees, these men are given no consideration because they are too old to come under the act. Since these jobs are only temporary, these are the men that should be taken into the service, thus releasing others who are young and can go into the forces or into other jobs.

I referred to the fact that recruiting had fallen down. We are facing a very serious problem. Now the government are trying a new scheme; they are going to issue dress suits for the soldiers. The hon. member for

Halton (Mr. Cleaver), in a speech in his own county, before the Burlington Branch of the Canadian Legion, said that there will be no difficulty after these new suits are issued; we will get plenty of recruits for the army then. Well, I do not think it is going to have that effect. But I suppose if it fails the next thing we will do will be to give each soldier a wardrobe trunk and a valet and see if that will help.

There is a very serious aspect to this matter. We are going to supply the soldiers with an extra uniform. When this was decided upon was it simply a promise by the Department of National Defence without taking counsel with the Department of Munitions and Supply? I warn this government that within a few months if we are not careful, there will be a serious shortage of the wools required for military goods; we may not have any more of them in the country. Our men do not want this dress suit, and it would be far better for the government and more pleasing to the soldiers if the government said: Here is the price of that suit; take it and use it for yourself."

So, Mr. Speaker, I think I am expressing the feeling of the great majority of the people of Ontario when I say that the people of this country would be satisfied and glad to have the government say to them in this all-out war effort, "We are going to amend the National Resources Mobilization Act and see that every available man and woman is used in this war in one way or another." The government have power already to conscript —if you want to call it that—money, factories, material wealth.

An hon. MEMBER: They are not doing it.

Mr. HOMUTH: But they have the power. That is another promise they are not carrying out. All they have to do is get the added power to use the man-power of this country for overseas service. I am prepared, I know every hon. member in this party is prepared, and I think most hon. members on this side of the house are prepared, to support the Prime Minister in such a move. If he will bring down a bill to-day to that effect we will give him wholehearted support. I am prepared to support him or any other leader or any party in this house that will see that we have an all-out war effort. We are not fighting to-day simply to protect territory that is ours; we are not fighting an aggressor who has only territorial designs; we are fighting the bloodiest bunch of bandits ever let loose on this world. To-day we see the march of this militant godless force, and it is going to take everything we have to conquer it. Let us then do the job that as freemen we should do.

Mr. G. S. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer briefly to two matters only, the questions of man-power and the plebiscite, both of which were mentioned in the speech from the throne.

It must be apparent to everyone to-day that the question of the proper allocation of man-power to provide the proper men for the farm, the forest, the mine, the factory, the fisheries and the army, is the most vital question facing this house. During the past few months high ranking military officers have made many speeches throughout this country with regard to the need of men for the armed forces. To any hon. member who resides in an agricultral district the sorry plight of the farmer to-day must be clear. In the county of Hastings, in which I reside, they produced over 9,500,000 pounds of cheese in 1941, the record for all Ontario, and an even greater production is planned for 1942. But I would point out that in my county many cheesemakers have been called up under the present system of selecting men for compulsory service. It is quite true that these cheesemakers may obtain exemption for short periods, but, as we all know, these exemptions finally come to an end, and sooner or later the cheesemaker must report to the training centre. One must realize that cheese factories must plan their production for at least a year ahead; and if these factories are to maintain this enormously increased production, they must be assisted. The same thing applies to the farmer, who has been asked and encouraged to increase his acreage under cultivation, to increase his stock, and so on. In many instances he finds that no help is available, while his sons are called up for training. The same thing applies to the lumbering industry in the counties of Hastings and Peterborough. Many camps are not operating there during this winter, for the simple reason that no men are available, and also because the lumber operator cannot compete with wages paid by industrial concerns.

A proper system of selective compulsory training would have the effect of placing every man and woman in this country in the place where he or she can best serve to further our war effort. As long ago as March, 1941, I advocated in this house a policy of that kind, and even urged that conscription for overseas service was the only way to fill the need with regard to supplying man-power.

At that time it was almost treason even to mention the word "conscription" in this house, and I was told by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) that my words would tend only to create disunity. Yet to-day the minister himself must know better than any other hon. member the serious need and lack of men for the army. He knows of the strenuous efforts being made by the various district officers to obtain the men required. Our general staff must know of the situation. Why, then, are we waiting to take the proper action that will ensure all necessary man-power for our armed forces? The Hong Kong expedition is only one incident showing the serious lack of trained men; and our so-called reserve army units, which the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) so loves to set out in his monthly blue-book, in many instances exist only on paper. Perhaps it would be just as well not even to mention the equipment the average reserve unit has for training purposes. The methods used at some of the training centres, which pride themselves on obtaining one hundred per cent of their men for active service, are little credit to a democratic country. The underhand methods of compulsion and coercion would be more credit to the government of nazi Germany. But this is just another example of the tragic need of men for the armed forces and the lengths to which this government will go to obtain these men instead of facing the true facts.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and other hon. members may make excuses and explanations, may becloud the issue with smoke-screens as lawyers and politicians love to do, but the fact remains that men are needed at once for our armies overseas. You may call it conscription, selective service or whatever name you choose, but the need for man-power is the vital, urgent need of the hour. Why, then, should we not, as members of parliament, face this paramount issue and here and now set up the proper machinery to ensure all branches of our armed forces a steady, regulated supply of man-power? When the government of Canada declared war in September, 1939, and decided to send a force overseas, I submit that every member of parliament and every citizen of this dominion assumed an obligation to support those boys with clothing, food, arms, equipment, and the finest of weapons in unlimited quantities. We assumed the further obligation to support them with all needed reinforcements for any emergency, no matter how drastic.

The Prime Minister has spoken about broken pledges, and no doubt much more will be said in this house on the same subject. I should like to point out to all hon. members that a pledge, express or implied, was given by every member of this house and every citizen of Canada on the day war was declared, to every man and boy who enlisted for overseas service. I submit that this pledge must have preference over every other commitment or pledge, and must be honoured to the full limit of our resources. This country is facing a grave national emergency, the first in our history. At such a time, when the very existence and safety of the state are at stake, the rights and privileges of individuals, the observance of pledges, commitments, promises and everything of that kind, must be ruthlessly cast aside, and the proper authorities must take whatever steps are necessary to ensure the preservation of the state.

Have we then, as members of parliament and as citizens of Canada, no duty to our men overseas? Are we at this late date to waste more precious time and money in the holding of a plebiscite to determine whether or not we are going to supply those boys with reinforcements? In the event that the majority of the people of this dominion vote in the negative, what is to happen? Are we then to withdraw all our forces from beyond the seas? Or are we to say to the boys, "No further aid will be sent you. You will get no further help from home. You will just have to do the very best you can with what you have?" Surely no hon. member will even attempt to argue against supporting our troops in every possible way, to the very limit of our resources.

Many hon. members are veterans of the war of 1914-18. I appeal to them, irrespective of the party or group to which they belong, to rise in this house and denounce this treacherous betrayal of our boys overseas. Such hon. members know what war means, because they helped to pay the ghastly price that all free men were called upon to pay between 1914 and 1918. Many hon. members still carry on their bodies marks and scars which formed part of that price.

Any hon. members who went through the battle of the Somme, who took part in the fighting at Courcelette, the fighting in Death Valley, or the storming of Regina trench or Sugar trench will easily recall what their unit looked like when they returned to Tower hill or the Chalk pits. They will remember the immediate need of new clothing, new equipment, and, above all, the need of immediate reinforcements to enable their unit to carry on as a fighting force. Or do they recall that grim Easter morning in the snow-storm at Vimy Ridge? Many units had tough going

that day, and the days that followed. And they will recall that many reinforcements were urgently needed.

Any member of this house who went through Passchendaele will never be able to erase the memory of the mud, the filth and the slime of that man-made hell-on-earth, for Passchendaele showed better than any other scrap how men and equipment can be used up. Hon. members who went through these scraps, what would you have thought if, after coming back from Courcelette or Passchendaele, with your unit cut to pieces, you had been told by your commanding officer that the parliament of Canada had decided to hold a plebiscite to decide whether or not further help or reinforcements should be sent to aid you? If anyone had dared utter such words you would not have been able to find fitting and proper language in your extensive army vocabulary to express your disgust and contempt for such a cowardly course. But you knew in those long-ago days in France that the parliament of Canada, the people of Canada, your own kinfolk, would not fail you. Why? Because they were Canadians all through, people who had born and bred into their beings the finest of traditions which, through the ages, have brought imperishable glory to our empire, traditions which have carried our flag through the centuries, across the seven seas and to the far-flung corners of the earth. Our flag has always come back, untarnished and unsullied, because it has always stood for justice and freedom.

So to-day all hon. members who are war veterans have a double responsibility; for to-day the boys of the new generation are facing even greater odds than we faced in the last war. As members of parliament you now have the authority in your own hands; for this parliament is the only legal body in Canada clothed with authority to take the necessary steps to provide and supply all needed aid at once to our troops overseas. You now have the opportunity to protest in the house against this shameful betrayal of your comrades. You have the opportunity to place yourself on record as disapproving of this betrayal, and by so doing you will not be branded for the rest of your lives as persons who shirked their responsibility, as persons who failed in their duty to their war comrades. Can hon. members who are war veterans feel that they are holding high the flaming torch thrown to us from failing hands? Are we, as war veterans, holding that torch high? Are we living up to the high ethical code set by our former comrades who sleep to-day in foreign fields, under the nazi heel? We state that we fight for democracy, to preserve our way of life, our democratic way of life. One of the things we wish to preserve is our free parliament, one of the symbols of democracy. Yet we are asking those boys, who at this very hour stand guard at the outposts of our empire, the boys who man the ramparts of that little island called Britain, which has been described by one writer as the last outpost of freedom in the old world, boys who are willing to give their very lives that we may remain free men, to fight with their lives to preserve this parliament—a parliament without enough back-bone or courage to take at once the necessary action to ensure adequate support for those boys! I can easily imagine what the boys overseas will think and say when they hear about the plebiscite. I can hear their expressions of contempt and disgust for this parliament. No doubt, if the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) should visit the troops again, he would get a reception slightly different from the last one. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the whole question of national selective service can and should be settled by this parliament at once, and should not be submitted to a plebiscite.

Much has been said in this house during the past year about national unity, but I submit that if the plans for this plebiscite proceed, such a wedge will be driven through this country that we shall never again in our lifetime know what unity in Canada means. To hon. members who come from the province of Quebec, I would say that I have heard many speeches in the house and have read other speeches in the press delivered by leaders of your church and state in which they have emphasized the desire, the need and the right of the French race to preserve all those things of life which are so dear to them, such as your religion, your language, your customs, your culture and all the other traditions that made France a great nation. I do not quarrel with those speeches. It is only natural that you should wish to preserve those things, but I would point out that those very things you cherish so much are the things you will lose in the event of defeat; for under the so-called new order of Hitler and Mussolini there is no place for those things you wish to preserve. Your rights and privileges, which have been preserved and guarded under our democratic government, would vanish. Are they not worth fighting for to-day? No matter what your political leaders have told you in the past, the opportunity is given to-day for the two great races in Canada, irrespective of the material things which may divide them, to unite in this great crusade and side by side destroy this barbarian Hitler who threatens to destroy us.

An opportunity is given that may never come again to unite the whole of Canada. All our past differences, all our past hatreds, prejudices, self-interests, and quarrels may be forever eradicated in this new common sacrifice to preserve all those decent things of life that free men and women cherish. If we all unite in this crusade—all classes, all creeds, all races—we shall demonstrate to the world and to ourselves a unity that the years to come will never be able to break.

On the other hand if you refuse to join, and unreservedly place all your resources of wealth and man-power at the service of the state, in the common cause, such action in my opinion will only drive the wedge deeper through the national life of this country, and there will emerge after the war such bitterness, hatred, and division that no leader, no government or group will ever again be able to achieve even the semblance of unity in this Canada of ours.

The function of a government is to lead, and this government has failed in that vital respect. A government that promises its people and its allies a total war and a total war effort, and then for any reason fails to make it, is guilty of a betrayal, and is worthy of the disdain and contempt of all honest men. During the past two years we have seen so many governments fall, and, worse, betray their people into bondage, because they failed in the purpose of government, and failed to carry into action the fine promise of their words. All men in free-thinking countries to-day regard France as having been betrayed internally by a weak and blind government policy, by a government that talked and had great efforts on paper, and that was pitiably weak and rotten behind a Maginot line, also great and impregnable on paper. These men who betrayed France are condemned to-day, they are called traitors to their country. Is any man in any country who follows those policies of inertia and procrastination and talks instead of acts any less a traitor? I say that behind the Maginot line of the Pacific and the Atlantic this government is deliberately fostering the same supine belief in its efforts and programmes that led to the fall of France. Time and action are on the side of the enemy, and he who wastes time and leads astray the effort of his country is a traitor to his people.

To-day our kinfolk in Australia cry aloud for help, for men and material, and we, supposedly a proud nation, give her what? We give her words, not men; a plebiscite instead of weapons; resolutions instead of action. At Hong Kong those gallant boys from Canada added another name to the scroll in Canada's hall of fame. Against terrific odds those boys of Canada played the part of men on the world's stage. Were the men who fought and died or were taken prisoners at Hong Kong comforted in their dying or in their prison camps with the thought that the help they so badly needed may come some day, if and when our government can play the part of a government? Those gallant men who have been fighting in Malaya, dying in the swamps and jungles for lack of support, for lack of men and weapons, will it comfort them to know that after a plebiscite, after months of delay and waste, this government may give the total war effort it has pledged already to its allies?

Within two days after the attack on Pearl Harbour, our good neighbours to the south were further ahead with the allocation of man-power than we are after nearly thirty months of war. At this late date, with the yellow rats from Japan daily coming closer to our shores, we are to have a plebiscite to decide whether or not we shall do anything about fighting them before they reach our shores. How can we expect our good neighbours to the south to have any faith or confidence in us or respect for us as an ally? Are we Canadians the type of people who are content to sit quietly with folded hands and criminal complacency and allow our allies, the Russians, the Dutch, the Chinese, the Aussies, the New Zealanders, the British, the boys from South Africa and the Yanks to do our proper share of the fighting?

If this plebiscite is held, for years to come the people of Canada will be looked down upon with scorn, contempt, disgust and hatred by all decent free people throughout the world because of our cowardly action at this critical hour. Does the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) expect that the spending of millions of dollars on a needless plebiscite will help him in raising the needed money for the new war loan or help the future sale of war savings stamps?

In conclusion, I wish to place on record the expressed feelings of the citizens of my riding and myself as being absolutely opposed to this plebiscite. We condemn in every way the action of this government in having plebiscite which is a comtemptible, cowardly betrayal of our boys overseas and an abrogation of the rights of responsible government.

Mr. F. W. GERSHAW (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, in conformity with convention and in all sincerity I wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address upon their eloquence and the subject matter of their speeches.

During the last few months the hand of death has been laid upon this house. The honoured senior member of this house, Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, has passed on and has left a vacancy which will be hard to fill. He was a comparatively young man who had endeared himself both to the members of this house and to the people of this country. He had reached a high place in the councils of our land. It goes to show that—

The glories of our blood and state
Are shadows, not substantial things;
There is no armour against fate;
Death lays his icy hand on kings.

We are engaged in the greatest war in the world's history. Whatever causes there may have been for this war in its early days, it is now clear that it is one of aggression, that our enemies are out for the domination of the world. This throws upon people living in this age a great obligation, the obligation of resisting aggression in the name of religion, in the name of our way of life, in the name of the freedom and the liberties which we have enjoyed. Surely we are the custodians of what has been gained in the past, and we must save for posterity some of those precious rights which were gained by our forefathers at great cost. This is the critical stage, and those who may live in this world long after we have gone will look back upon our actions at this time. A great responsibility has been thrown upon us, but at the same time a great opportunity has been given to us. Perhaps I can express this in a few lines of poetry:

Ye that have faith to look with fearless eyes
Beyond the tragedy of a world at strife,
And trust that out of night and death shall rise
The dawn of ampler life;
Rejoice, whatever anguish rend your heart,
That God has given you for a priceless dower,
To live in these great times and have your part
In Freedom's crowning hour;
That you may tell your sons who see the light
High in the heavens—their heritage to take—
"I saw the powers of Darkness put to flight,
I saw the Morning break."

In this titanic struggle we have twenty-six nations banded together. We have the gallant fighters of Russia; we have the democratic English-speaking nations all in the fight together. At this time no one can doubt that the fostering of good-will, of friendship and of neighbourliness between Canada and the United States was statesmanship. No one can deny that Canada, acting as a liaison between the British commonwealth and the United States, was working out a great and glorious accomplishment. The one man who deserves striking credit for that accomplishment is the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King). The names of Churchill and Roosevelt will live long, but with them will stand out forever the name of the Prime Minister of Canada.

I believe I express the views of practically all hon. members in this chamber when I say that the ambition of the people of Canada is to contribute to this war to the utmost limit of their capacities. The only question is how this can best be accomplished. There have been those who have emphasized unduly certain aspects of the war effort, but we know that up to the present the organization has been magnificent. Pressing toward the goal we must make decisions in the light of the knowledge we have and of the circumstances that exist at the time. We are going to have a plebiscite, whatever the result may be; and surely in furtherance of our determination for an all-out war effort we should give those who are in the best position to know the facts a free hand to decide how best we can make our contribution.

I wish to take advantage of the latitude allowed in this debate to draw to the attention of the house certain subjects which are of interest to the district whence I come. The beet sugar industry is one of which I have spoken many times. The investment in this industry means a great deal to the irrigated districts in the drought-stricken area. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has promised that serious consideration will be given to the expansion of that industry. In rural districts the people are very active at this time. In the very smallest communities there are Red Cross organizations where you will find women knitting comforts for the soldiers, and war savings campaigns are carried on continuously. The people are also very much interested in the salvage campaign. Up to the present it has been difficult to accomplish very much because of the high costs of getting salvage from where it is available to the place where it can be made use of. Recently as a result of many conferences between the department and the railway officers a very reasonable freight rate has been arranged for carload lots of 30,000 pounds and upwards, and some sixteen sortation centres have been selected in different parts of Canada so that the salvage of rubber, bones, bottles, shoes, metals, paper, magazines and things of that sort can now go on, and there is reasonable prospect of making a contribution that is really worth while.

There is a great deal of discouragement and dissatisfaction among the farming people of this country. Within a few days, Mr. Speaker, a delegation of some 400 or 450 farmers, mostly from the province of Saskatchewan, will arrive in Ottawa. There has been col-

lected from people who have signed petitions something like $35,000 or $40,000 to bring two trainloads of delegates here. That in itself is one indication of dissatisfaction. Another is the indignation meetings which are held by the farmers from time to time. The statistics show that there is a very unequal distribution of income in this country. About 33.9 per cent of the able-bodied people of this country are engaged in the farming industry, and although that makes up one-third of the population, they received in the year 1940 only 11.1 per cent of the national income. There is a discrepancy there which should not exist, a discrepancy which is causing much dissatisfaction throughout the length and breadth of the country.

This government has tried to increase, by a system of bonusing, the revenues which the farmer receives. Quite a number of bonus schemes have been put into operation. There is the wheat acreage reduction bonus, a supplementary bonus of seventy-five cents per acre up to a maximum of 200 acres, and there is the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. Yet there is much disappointment because of the slowness with which these payments come through. I have stood at the post office and have seen farmers, poorly clad and certainly not well off, watch the mail come in, wait until it is sorted, and then stand up at the wicket hoping that their bonus cheque has arrived; and all too often I have seen them turn away very much disappointed because their cheque had not come. The postmasters tell me that this is a very common occurrence.

There are so many causes of delay. I might enumerate a few of them. Sometimes the proper description of the land is not given. Sometimes several members of the family have applied for the wheat acreage bonus on the same land. Sometimes there is a landlord's claim. Sometimes the officer has overlooked the notification; I know of whole districts which were denied the bonus because the proper official had not made the notification in time. There are 250,000 farmers and it takes a considerable time to get in contact with them all. The cheques are going out at the rate of 5,000 a day, but even at that rate it takes months to reach all the farmers. Then again some of them get a mere pittance when they expect a substantial sum. This may not be a tragedy to the average man in an office; it may not matter much whether he puts the cheque into one pigeon-hole or another, but to the man on the farm with no money and no credit, whose store bill is overdue, whose taxes are not paid, and who needs money badly for his family's requirements, it is indeed a very serious thing. So that while the people are grateful for these bonuses and feel that they are serving a good purpose, yet the slowness with which they come, and the technical details which must first be complied with, have caused a lot of disappointment among the farmers.

The cattle-raising people of the west have greatly benefited by the reduced duty on cattle going into the United States. There is a ceiling now on the price of meat sold in retail stores, and there is some doubt as to the availability of a sufficient quantity to meet retail requirements; but I do want to impress upon the government the necessity of not interfering at all with our tariff arrangements with the United States, because that is something that has given fresh life to the ranching industry. I do hope, notwithstanding the influence of other parties to the deal, that our market will not be curtailed or an embargo put on or a change in duty made.

The farmers are asking for two things, and they need two things in order to sustain their industry. One would be something approaching parity prices. If the man who grows wheat cannot recover his costs he cannot stay in business. The second thing that is needed is something for the man whose crop fails. We know something of the cost of cultivating an acre of land.

The cost of producing a bushel of wheat depends upon the production yield of that acre of land. Professor Hope, in 1938, gave these figures in dealing with the cost of producing a bushel of wheat, including interest charges. First, if the yield is 20 bushels to the acre, the half-section farmer can grow a bushel for 72 cents; the section farmer, 62 cents; and the two-section farmer, 51 cents. Twenty bushels is a tremendously large crop over a large part of that country. Suppose the yield is 13 bushels an acre, then the figures would be: for the half-section farmer, 99 cents; for the section farmer, 79 cents; and for the two-section farmer, 71 cents. Those are the prices at the elevator. The guaranteed price at Fort William is 70 cents for No. 1 northern, so that the present price is far below these estimated costs.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) has recognized that the man who has no wheat to sell must live and cannot be expected to live on charity or on relief, and so these bonuses have helped that man and made it possible for him to get along. But the tremendous task which faces the officers in Regina and Edmonton does make for delay, disappointment and discontent among a good many farmers.

For instance, take the practice of allowing land to rest fallow, where the land is light

and all blows away when summer-fallowed. The custom is to leave the stubble to hold the moisture during the winter and to do the ploughing during the following spring. It was definitely announced that if that happened to be the custom in a district, the summer-fallow bonus would be paid. Later on, the Department of Justice or some other department in Ottawa decided that it could not be done, and this was a hard blow for many who live on light land. In the meantime, in some way, some had been paid, and that made for more dissatisfaction. The minister and the committee have, however, succeeded in arriving at an arrangement by which some of the bonuses on this rest land can be paid, and it will be a great relief to many who have been dependent upon it to be paid at last.

In southern Alberta an area of about thirty miles square has been set aside as a British block. About 126 farmers who lived there for thirty years have been forced to move off that block, and they were paid a reasonable price for the buildings. They were given a reasonable amount to move their stock, but were given only $4 an acre for seeded land and $1 an acre for grazing land. They planned their spring operations, and many of them decided to cooperate with the government and reduce their acreage. Then they were moved off this land in June and July. The officials who bought that land from them, although they had no right to do so, indicated that they would be paid their wheat acreage reduction bonus. The Department of Agriculture accepted applications for that bonus, and yet when the farmers were moved off the land they were told that they did not qualify for the bonus. This was a harsh decision and it has caused much heart-burning. It is very unfair. Take the man who was patriotic and listened to the plea to reduce his acreage. He gets only $1 an acre for his unseeded land. Take the fellow who said, "I don't care what the government say, I am going to put in a crop." He has received $4 an acre for his land.

These men who, in good faith, entered into an agreement with the government and carried out their part of that agreement in so far as they could, should receive some consideration. Of course, they did not do summer-fallowing because they were not there, having been moved off the land through no will or desire of their own. This is an injustice which should still be reviewed in the hope of giving these people what in my opinion is their right. They became attached to their homes and lived there with their neighbours for thirty years, enjoying companionship and sociability in a splendid community, and now they are scattered like the Acadians described in Evangeline. They have not enough money to settle in other places. Many of them spent a good deal of the money they did receive, and altogether they have a grievance. I want to make this appeal to the minister to redress that grievance and give these people further consideration.

In closing, may I say that there is general prosperity throughout the urban parts of the country. People are employed; money is circulating very well, and yet forty-five per cent of our national income is going to war purposes—and we may have to increase our contribution to the war. My suggestion is that soldiers, farmers, munition workers, members of parliament, civilians and everyone else should get down to the same level, and to the same rate of pay, so that we shall be making a contribution in proportion to our ability to contribute. Then, when victory is won, let us maintain the high rate of taxation; let us maintain the high rate of employment, and instead of buying war supplies—we hope we shall not need so many—let us build roads and houses, clear slums and provide proper homes, a proper standard of nutrition and an adequate standard of health for the people. Then we shall emerge from this war in a better condition, and the sacrifices which we have made will not have been in vain.

On motion of Mr. Gershaw the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, January 29, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT

FREE RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION FOR MEMBERS OF HIS MAJESTY'S FORCES

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 6, to amend the Railway Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. CHURCH: This bill amends the Railway Act to provide that members of his majesty's forces shall be carried free on all railway trains in Canada for the period of the war.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

GASOLINE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT AS TO PROPOSED SYSTEM OF RATIONING EFFECTIVE APRIL 1

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Minister of Munitions and Supply if he is prepared to make a statement on Canada's gasoline rationing system, which it was announced some weeks ago was to go into effect on April 1. If not to-day, when may the house and the country expect a statement?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Preparations for the rationing of gasoline are proceeding, with the intention of bringing it into force on April 1. The need for this rationing is becoming more apparent every day as additional tanker tonnage is sunk along our coast and as the demands of the army services increase. The details will be announced shortly by the oil controller. It is a highly involved matter, and while I could bring the information to the house I think the purpose would be served equally well by the oil controller explaining the situation through the public press. I discussed the matter with him this morning, and I know it is his intention to take such action within the next day or two. If my hon. friend so desires I shall be glad to get the release and present it to the house before it is given to the press.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does the minister not think it should come to the house first?

Mr. HOWE: It is rather involved, and I doubt if a reading here would help very much.

REDISTRIBUTION

INQUIRY AS TO PROCEDURE IN VIEW OF CENSUS RETURNS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): In view of the announcement made yesterday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) regarding the population of the various provinces as revealed by the census, and in view of the effect thereof upon the membership of this house, will the Prime Minister inform us whether it is the intention of the government to proceed with redistribution at this session of parliament?

Perhaps I might be permitted to indicate my own view, in advance of his. It is that we shall probably have enough to do in attending to matters directly concerned with the war without undertaking this very onerous duty of redistribution.

[Mr. Church.]

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I may say to my hon. friend that up to the present the government has not considered the matter but will do so in the light of the observations he has just made.

WHEAT

REPORTED SALE TO UNITED STATES BUYERS FOR LATER DELIVERY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. E. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce based upon a report appearing in the issue of the Winnipeg *Tribune* which came to hand to-day. This report states that Canadian wheat is being purchased by United States buyers for shipment south of the line after the opening of navigation; that warehouse receipts are being taken by the United States buyers, and that, according to reliable authorities, the wheat is being hedged in the Chicago market.

My questions are these: From whom are these United States buyers securing these warehouse receipts, since it is cash wheat? Why is it being hedged in Chicago? What part did the Canadian wheat board play in these trades, and is there any possibility of this wheat coming into competition with the export of other Canadian wheat to the United Kingdom?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I shall be glad to give attention to the questions asked by the hon. member and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

PRAIRIE FARM INCOME PAYMENTS—ORDER IN COUNCIL P.C. 8126

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to draw attention to order in council P.C. 8126, dated October 22, 1941, but published only on January 23, 1942, in an extra edition of the *Canada Gazette*. My first question to the Minister of Agriculture is, why was the publication of this order in council so long delayed? What other steps were taken to bring its provisions to the attention of the interested public? The order in council provides for the expenditure of $20,000,000 by way of additional payments to increase the income of farmers in the spring wheat area of western Canada. I should like the minister to explain the real purpose of

this order in council, and the relationship of the payments to be made under it to the $35,000,000 provided under schedule B of Appropriation Act No. 4 of 1941. May I also ask him to tell this house why those provisions were made by order in council instead of being brought before parliament at its November sitting in the usual and proper manner.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I think I had better leave the answer until to-morrow. I am not familiar with the reasons why the document was not published at an earlier day.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

APPLICATION OF ORDER TO EASTERN SECTION OF CANADA

On the orders of the day.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State. It has reference to the question of daylight saving. I should like to explain at the outset that I am not personally opposed to daylight saving, but in view of the situation as I understand it in eastern Canada I believe this question should be asked.

On Monday, January 26, order in council P.C. 547 was passed under the provisions of the War Measures Act, whereby it was ordered that as from Monday, February 9 next, until otherwise ordered, the time for all purposes in Canada shall be one hour in advance of accepted standard time. The order recites that on September 20, 1940, daylight saving time was continued for the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, and that the Secretary of State reported that it would be advantageous to the war effort of Canada to have daylight saving time observed in all the time zones in Canada.

May I point out to the Secretary of State that the major part of that portion of Canada within the Atlantic standard time zone—roughly speaking, the portion of Canada lying east of the international boundary at the Saint Croix river—is now thirty-six minutes, as at Saint John, New Brunswick—ahead of true sun time; and to have Atlantic daylight saving time imposed in that zone will put practically all the people of New Brunswick, and a great portion of the people of Nova Scotia, ninety-six minutes ahead of true sun time. When the terms of the order were being considered, was any consideration given to that position? To-day we are in the happy position of substantially conserving daylight by thirty-six minutes, and are operating on the same time as the large central provinces, which is most convenient. It may be that other factors, such as transportation problems, time tables, and so on, affect the position; but as at present advised I suggest that the position be reviewed so far as it relates to the maritime provinces.

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): The leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) was good enough to give me notice of the question he has just asked. Unfortunately I have not had sufficient time to go into the technical matter he has raised, namely, the application of the order to certain sections operating on Atlantic standard time. There is one matter he suggests, however, which, I believe, cannot possibly be correct, namely, that whereas the western boundary of the zone of that portion of the maritimes which is on Atlantic standard time is thirty-six minutes faster than sun time, that condition would apply wholly throughout the maritimes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is because we are nearer that meridian. It goes out into the sea.

Mr. McLARTY: The thirty-six minutes would be accounted for by its being nearer the westerly meridian where the time changes. In view, however, of the concluding sentence of my hon. friend's question I believe it would be better if I were to defer my answer until to-morrow or until the earliest possible opportunity.

ANTHRACITE COAL

EXEMPTION FROM CUSTOMS DUTIES AND WAR EXCHANGE TAX WHEN IMPORTED INTO MARITIMES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a further question, directed to the Minister of Finance, and based upon order in council P.C. 394, dated January 20, 1942—just last week. This order in council, which was passed on the minister's recommendation, provides for the exemption from customs duties and war exchange tax of anthracite coal when imported into the maritime provinces between January 1 and April 30, 1942. I should like to ask the minister the reasons for the passing of this order in council, the reasons for restricting its operation to the maritime provinces, and also whether it is not anticipated that this exemption will discriminate against the coal producers and coal miners of the maritimes. May I ask also why this exemption, which expressly suspends a provision of an act of parliament, was made by order in council

one day before the session was resumed? Why was it not brought before parliament in the usual and proper manner?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, if I counted correctly, the leader of the opposition has asked four questions. I shall proceed to answer them.

He asks first why there has been an exemption of anthracite from customs duties on coal entering the maritime provinces. The reason is that the freight on anthracite moving by water is very much greater than it was a few months ago. If importers of anthracite coal are to be able to continue to sell anthracite under the price ceiling, something will have to be done for them. Assistance could be given to them either by way of subsidy or by way of tax or tariff remission. It was decided that tariff remission would amount to about the proper sum to enable them to continue to sell under the price ceiling. The same necessity does not exist in the case of anthracite into other parts of Canada, because it does not move by water as it does into the maritime provinces.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It does not all move by water to the maritimes.

Mr. ILSLEY: Pretty much. This applies only to anthracite moving by ship, waterborne coal which comes to seaports. It was considered it would be perfectly practicable to limit the concession to the maritime provinces, because there would be no danger of this coal coming into the martime provinces and then being loaded on cars and shipped to other parts of Canada.

With regard to any possible prejudice to producers of coal in the maritime provinces, as the hon. member knows, no hard coal is produced there.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Quite so.

Mr. ILSLEY: I believe anthracite will be no more dangerous as a competitive factor in the coal situation now than it was before, when the ocean rates were so much lower than they are to-day.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The fifty cents duty has kept some out.

Mr. ILSLEY: Oh, yes, but freights were very much lower when the fifty cents was imposed.

With regard to the final question, as to why it was done by order in council, I would point out that it was done in that way pursuant either to the War Measures Act or to the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act; I am not sure which. Anyway, there was ample statutory authority for proceeding, and it was done by order in council because it had to be done. If we had brought it before parliament on the first day of the session we would not have reached it for a long time. I do not know what else we could have done, because it was a budgetary sort of thing, and action could not be deferred until the spring or early summer. It had to be done right away.

RIGHT HON. ARTHUR MEIGHEN

PRESS REPORT RESPECTING RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE SENATE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): I should like to ask a question with reference to a news item which appeared in the press not long ago. Is it possible to learn whether all the formalities in connection with the resignation of the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen as senator have been completed; and if so, if his resignation has been accepted and, if so, if it is final?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, so far as I am aware, all formalities have been complied with. Senator Meighen's resignation was tendered to His Excellency the Governor General. His excellency asked my advice with respect to the acceptance of it. I advised its acceptance. It has been accepted, and so far as I am able to recall, all the formalities were completed over a week ago.

Mr. POULIOT: Thank you very much; very good.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ADJOURNMENT AT SIX O'CLOCK ON FRIDAYS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Prime Minister if the government has given any consideration to the question of Friday evening sittings?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would say to my hon. friend that for such time as I have been in this parliament the house has usually adjourned on Friday evening at the end of the first week of the session, and if it is accepted by the house that custom will prevail to-morrow by the government moving the adjournment. With respect to the session as a whole, I have every reason to believe that it would be advisable and would meet with the general approval of the house if we followed the practice of last session. Because of the war we are all working with a greater intensity of effort and

have a much larger number of problems to deal with than has been the case at any other time. On occasions the government may wish to have the house continue its sitting on Friday night, but unless there should be a special reason for doing otherwise it is the intention of the government to have the adjournment moved each Friday at six o'clock.

JAPANESE NATIONALS

RADIO RECEIVING AND TRANSMITTING SETS—CAMERAS AND FIREARMS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I should like to ask the Minister of Pensions and National Health a question which I understand comes under his department. Has the government taken away all receiving and transmitting sets, cameras and firearms from all the Japanese residing in Canada?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): That would not come under my department. The only connection I have with that matter is the fact that I acted as chairman of a conference between certain gentlemen who came down here from British Columbia and a number of permanent officials of various departments in Ottawa. The question of firearms, cameras and receiving sets was discussed at the conference and a recommendation made to the cabinet. The Prime Minister issued a statement in regard to receiving sets and cameras, but whether or not actual action has been taken by the mounted police upon that enunciation of policy I am not able to say at the moment.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Wednesday, January 28, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, before beginning my address I should like to read two telegrams which I have just received. The first is from Mr. Lidstone, secretary of the Toronto business men's branch of the Canadian Legion. It reads:

Toronto business men's branch of the Canadian Legion in meeting strongly urge you to oppose plebiscite and to support legion policy of total war effort including conscription for overseas service.

The other is from Colonel C. E. Reynolds, president of the Canadian Corps Association It reads:

I ask you to request our Prime Minister to beg Churchill, Wavell and Prime Minister Curtin to hang on. Canada is voting in three months.

After listening to the excellent speeches of the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, I could not help but regret that I too had not had the advantage of a legal training. May I congratulate them both upon the presentation of their cases. On the day that the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) spoke the press reported that both the Kiwanis club and the local council of women of Brantford had passed resolutions disapproving the proposed plebiscite. In addition the Brantford trades and labour council is reported to have wired the member expressing their disapproval. I venture to say that if he has had anything like the overwhelming mail I have had from my constituents he knows the extent of the support for compulsory selective service in his own riding. I think I am justified in saying that when the hon. member spoke on Friday last he was speaking as a supporter of the government rather than in his capacity of representative of those who elected him. I presume he spoke again for the government when he said, as reported on page 16 of *Hansard:*

Man-power for our army is not now our most pressing need.

If man-power for the army is not so urgent, why did the district commanding officer of military district No. 1, London, Ontario, write on January 6, 1942, to a married man with three children who had been rejected three times as unfit for service and put in category E, as follows:

1. Some time ago you offered your services for enlistment into the Canadian active army but were rejected as being medically unfit.

2. Recently, medical categories have been revised very materially and some causes for rejection completely eliminated.

3. Your previous offer of service is appreciated and as the need for men is now urgent, it is suggested you would wish to take advantage of this opportunity to have your medical status reviewed.

4. If such is the case, would you be good enough to present yourself at Wolseley barracks, London, or St. Luke's barracks, Windsor, at your earliest convenience.

5. If you have no way of getting to London, please advise this office or your nearest armoury, and an effort will be made to provide transportation.

Mr. CRERAR: May I ask my hon. friend to whom that letter was addressed?

Mr. BRUCE: The man does not want his name announced. This is the original paper from the recruiting officer.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend must know that he has no right to use communications in the house unless he is prepared to give full particulars of any name that will authenticate the document.

Mr. BRUCE: For obvious reasons this man does not wish his name revealed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend cannot give the name, then he has no right to use the communication.

Mr. BRUCE: I do not propose to give his name.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BRUCE: The other day the Prime Minister gave the figure for our active army as 260,000. I am reliably informed that of the so-called active army, at least 60,000 men are not available because they are employed as home guards or on the staffs of training establishments or hospitals. Surely it is improper to include those men. I should like also to call attention to the fact that in our coast defence forces we have many men who are known as "R" recruits, men who have been called up under the mobilization act but have failed to volunteer for overseas service. In my judgment it is a misrepresentation to suggest that those men are active service units.

Mr. RALSTON: I can assure my hon. friend that they are not included in the number on active service.

Mr. BRUCE: Of course I accept the minister's statement. In reply to a question which I asked yesterday as to whether units of the sixth division would be available to go to the assistance of the United States if they were attacked, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) said in part, as reported on page 109 of *Hansard:*

> I want to say to him, however, that the units of these brigade groups would be available if it were considered advisable and necessary to send men to the United States, less any home defence personnel who were in those units who did not volunteer for that duty.

In other words, the commanding officer of these units would take his troops to the United States boundary, call a halt, and ask all "R" recruits to take three paces to the rear and drop out, since he could not ask them to serve outside Canada. If amongst these units there were several signallers, the line of communication would be put into confusion and our force rendered useless. Can anyone imagine a more ridiculous or perilous position for our troops to occupy? Would Great Britain be mobilizing her women if she had not reached the limit of her resources in man-power? Would United States troops be landing in Ireland if man-power was not needed by Britain?

I am not unmindful of the contribution which has already been made by our factories and our shipyards and of the splendid part labour has played, and I wish to commend all concerned, which includes, of course, the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) for what he and they have achieved. But speaking as one who is trying to run a farm I have the greatest sympathy and admiration for the farmers who are still carrying on, producing foodstuffs in spite of the low prices and steadily mounting wages and the increasing difficulty in getting labour at all. Unless something is done for them it will have a serious effect on our food production programme—if we have one.

The hon. member for Brantford City compared our war effort with that of the United States. My answer to that comparison will be brief. The United States brought in universal compulsory selective service as soon as she declared war, and according to Mr. Winant, the United States Ambassador to Britain, speaking in London yesterday, the United States is now planning to have an army, not of 3,600,000, but of 7,000,000. The United States is preparing to attack; Canada is waiting to be attacked. Can anyone imagine a more humiliating position for any country to be in at this time of crisis, when within a few weeks the fury of the enemy will be descending upon us, to have its Prime Minister, knowing full well the needs after nearly two and a half years of war, transfer his responsibility to an uninformed electorate? When I heard the member for Brantford City supporting his chief, in spite of his declaration only a few days before that he was in favour of compulsory selective service, it reminded me of the story of another Macdonald, a Macdonald of revered memory at least on this side of the house. On one occasion when Doctor George Grant, then Principal of Queen's university, told Sir John A. Macdonald that he always supported him when he was right, Sir John replied: "The kind of support I prefer is that which is given me when I am wrong." Such a loyal supporter as the member for Brantford City must be appreciated at this time.

Referring to his western tour last August, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), as reported at page 47 of this session's *Hansard,* said:

> At the time of my tour of western Canada, prior to my visit to Britain, an attempt was made to raise the issue of conscription. A cloud no larger than a man's hand appeared in

the political sky at Calgary and in some other of the western cities. I at once recognized that this was not due to a spontaneous movement on the part of the people themselves, but was rather the manifestation of a political movement carefully organized by opponents of the government, to force conscription to the fore as a political issue.

I wonder if the cloud to which he refers would not have been larger if his vision on emerging from the train had not been obscured by a large banner stretching across the street calling for conscription. The hostile reception which he received in that city, plus the selection of a new leader by the Conservative party and his immediate announcement of policy, plus the recent activities of an Ontario committee for total war, are given as reasons by the Prime Minister why he finds it expedient to have a plebiscite. But then he went on to say that the place to fight out this question is on the floor of the house. And later on he announced the plebiscite. I must confess that I am unable to follow his argument.

In his speech the other day the Prime Minister also said, at page 48 of *Hansard:*

> Outside parliament altogether, the political skies have now become so overcast with controversy, promoted by high-pressure methods and highly financed publicity, that the nature and extent of Canada's war effort is not only being obscured, but is in danger of being seriously impaired.

No doubt the Prime Minister refers to the recent movement in the province of Ontario for total war by the immediate enforcement of unrestricted compulsory selective service. When the Prime Minister uses the term "political pressure," he means by that, I presume, pressure from his political enemies. Would he put Mr. C. L. Burton in this category, or Mr. James Y. Murdoch? I think I am correct in saying that they are both life-long Liberals, yet they were joint chairmen with Mr. F. K. Morrow, a patriotic citizen and a prominent Roman Catholic whose name will be found in every philanthropic organization. The committee was strictly non-partisan and represented practically every social and patriotic organization in the province. May I refer to just a few members of that committee?

There was Mrs. Wallace Campbell, president of the Ontario division of the Red Cross and dominion chairman of the Red Cross women's war work committee. I should like to pay tribute to the outstanding contribution made by Mrs. Campbell to Canada's war effort by the wonderful leadership she has given to many thousands of women throughout Canada. Other members of the committee were Mrs. W. B. Horkins, dominion president of the Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire; and Mrs. H. D. Warren, dominion commissioner of the Girl Guides of Canada; Mrs. Maud Miller, Ontario president of the Provincial Council of Women; Dr. W. E. Gallie, dean of the Medical Faculty of the University of Toronto; Dr. H. J. Cody, president of the University of Toronto; Bishop R. J. Renison, rector of St. Paul's Anglican Church, Toronto; Commissioner Orames of the Salvation Army; Sir Ernest MacMillan, president of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra; Hon. Mr. Biggs, a former minister of the Farmer-Liberal government of Ontario, Mr. Aubrey Davis, Mr. Elmer Davis, Mr. William Dryden, and Doctor Smirle Lawson, chief coroner for Ontario.

Do these names suggest political enemies of the Prime Minister and the Liberal party? I ask the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Mackenize).

In referring to the work of this group of patriotic citizens, the Prime Minister speaks of the controversy being "promoted by high pressure methods and high financed publicity." What about the government's own political publicity advertising? What about the pamphlets, speeches and other things which are distributed, we are told, to 400,000 people?

I listened most carefully to the long and laboured effort of the Prime Minister on Monday last to justify the course he is taking. He failed miserably in his attempt to convince the public, as is evidenced in reading editorial comments and letters in the press.

I think I have shown that this demand for compulsory selective service comes not alone from Conservatives but from many of the Prime Minister's own personal Liberal friends. Does he not realize that it arises from a growing feeling of apprehension due to the extension of the war to this continent? Remember that the call from Ontario for conscription for a total war came after Japan's entry into the war.

Although the Prime Minister speaks of having first heard of this subject when he went west, may I remind him that I proposed it several months before in this house, and for my pains was severely rebuked by the Minister of National Defence.

In my opinion it is criminal folly, both from the standpoint of delay and that of dividing the country in the face of the enemy, for the government to hold a plebiscite at this time. How humiliated we must feel that recent events have justified the cartoon in the Montreal *Gazette* of January 23, wherein the Prime Minister is portrayed as a fireman in charge of the hose in front of a great conflagration, saying to his helper who is about to turn on the water hydrant, "Let's take a vote

to see if we should turn it on full." Many of you have seen this cartoon; I do not suppose it will be reproduced in *Hansard*.

May I say again to the Prime Minister that conscription was not an issue in the last campaign. How could it have been an issue when both leaders were in agreement? To make it an issue, surely one party must oppose what the other proposes. I had no occasion during my election campaign to refer to or make any commitment on the subject of conscription. The question then was whether the country would trust the present government to carry on the war, and the argument which the electorate apparently accepted was that it would be better that they should do so rather than change horses in crossing a stream. One of their slogans, I would remind the house, was "King or Chaos." We now have both.

The Prime Minister emphasized again his oft-repeated claim of preserving national unity. While I agree with the importance of this I am not in agreement with his method of bringing it about. In my view there is nothing which would promote national unity more than equality of service and of sacrifice for all; and per contra, there is nothing that would bring about a greater feeling of bitterness and disharmony than the knowledge that some sections of the community were bearing a greater share of the burdens and dangers in the fighting forces than others. There is nothing which will bring people more closely together than to share intimately and equally in danger and sacrifice.

Enjoyment of the privileges of citizenship in Canada carries with it the obligation upon all of defending their country. I do not mean that all available youth should necessarily go overseas to fight, but by compulsory selective service they would be placed either on farms, in the factories, or in the forces, wherever their special abilities would be most useful.

Immediately following the Prime Minister's speech we had in this house striking evidence of disunity among his followers, and this in spite of the Prime Minister's announcement, following his three-hour caucus a few days ago, that "we have never had such a united and enthusiastic meeting". If this could be described as a "love-feast", what must the others have been like! I wonder what kind of "love-feast" they had at their caucus this morning.

I desire to commend the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Gray), as I know his constituents will do, for the courageous, manly course he took in following his conscience rather than the crack of the party whip. When he goes back home and faces his people he will be able to hold his head erect, knowing that he has faithfully done his duty.

[Mr. Bruce.]

Already the much-advertised unity of the Liberals shows three serious cracks. And, forsooth, we are to have yet another French-Canadian party, led by the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe).

The hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Brunelle) quoted a passage from my speech of last November, and from his remarks I take it that he did not know the meaning of compulsory selective service, which I thought I had made clear in June last. I will let one of his own countrymen reply to what he said in the house two days ago. I am going to quote from an open letter written by Captain Talbot M. Papineau, headed as follows: "In the Field, France, March 21st, 1916", and addressed to his uncle, Henri Bourassa, in which he says:

> Those of us in this great army who may be so fortunate as to return to our Canada will have faced the grimmest and sincerest issues of life and death. We will have experienced the unhappy strength of brute force. We will have seen our loved comrades die in blood and suffering. Beware lest we return with revengeful feelings; for I say to you that from those who, while we fought and suffered here, remained in safety and comfort in Canada and failed to give us encouragement and support, as well as from those who grew fat with wealth dishonorably gained by political graft and by dishonest business methods at our expense, we shall demand a heavy day of reckoning.
>
> We shall inflict upon them the punishment they deserve, not by physical violence, for we shall have had enough of that, nor by unconstitutional or illegal means, for we are fighting to protect, not to destroy, justice and freedom, but by the invincible power of our moral influence. Remember, too, that if Canada has become a nation, respected and self-respecting, she owes it to her citizens who have fought and died in this distant land and not to those self-styled nationalists who have stayed at home

If Captain Papineau had written from our present army overseas he could not have better expressed the situation as it exists today than he did in 1916.

May I suggest to the Prime Minister that there is still another way out. He must already know that it is unnecessary for him to be relieved of his promise by eight of the provinces of Canada; for he knows full well where they stand. The Gallup poll of the whole of Canada was taken by the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion, also the Toronto *Star*, and twenty-five other prominent newspapers of all shades of editorial belief, at the end of December last. The result was published in the Toronto *Star* as follows: sixty per cent would vote for selective service overseas; thirty per cent against; and ten per cent undecided or would not vote.

A recent survey by the *Globe and Mail*, with the cooperation of eighty-one weekly newspapers of the province of Ontario, was

made to test the rural opinion on compulsory selective service anywhere, with the result that ninety-five per cent of the rural papers gave it as their considered opinion that there would be no objection from the farmers to compulsory selective service if the government made provision for farm labour.

Mr. RALSTON: Will the hon. member put on the record the question that was asked? Has he the question that was asked?

Mr. BRUCE: No, I have not the question.

Mr. RALSTON: It is very important.

Mr. BRUCE: I will look it up.

Mr. RALSTON: There was a distinct "out" for the farmer, as I remember it. My hon. friend might also put on the record the editorial of the Ottawa *Journal* with regard to that same poll. It would be informative.

Mr. BRUCE: Why, therefore, go to the expense and the disturbance to industry of testing public opinion in those eight provinces? If the worst comes to the worst and Quebec refuses to cooperate, then why not consider the suggestion of the editor of Toronto *Saturday Night* and exclude Quebec from the operation of the compulsory selective service act?

An hon. MEMBER: Why exclude Quebec?

Mr. BRUCE: What a time for a plebiscite, corresponding as it does with the announced intention of Hitler to launch his spring offensive? The Prime Minister and the party caucus will not escape the shame and humiliation attached to this cowardly decision. After this, how many will be able to hold their heads high before their constituents? Why not ask this parliament for a vote, which I feel confident it would certainly give, to absolve the Prime Minister from his improvident undertaking? What justification is there for asking the thousands of Canadians who did not vote for him in the last election to release him from his pledge? They may decline to vote when they realize that this might be improperly interpreted as a vote of confidence in his handling of the war. I think I would myself decline to vote unless the Prime Minister gave a definite undertaking to bring in compulsory selective service if he receives an affirmative vote.

The Prime Minister must know that there is anger and bitter resentment on the part of thousands of Canadians for the humiliating position in which he has placed them. May I suggest that he is taking a very dangerous course which might very well cause the rise of another William Lyon Mackenzie to lead a movement for responsible government.

If the Prime Minister is committed on conscription he is equally committed against a national government; consequently, if he is bound to proceed with a plebiscite he should also ask to be released from his commitment against a national government. We are asked at this time, the most critical time in the history of the world, to spend millions of dollars and delay our war effort—for what? Simply to save the Prime Minister's face—not to save Canada, mark you, but to save the Liberal party. Is it worth the price? On Monday the Prime Minister said, "I am being asked to sell my birthright for their mess of pottage." If by this he means his right to prevent this country from doing its obvious duty of reinforcing our troops overseas by equality of sacrifice, then I say to him that the life of one of our soldiers overseas is of more value than the political life of the Prime Minister.

I invite your attention, Mr. Speaker, particularly to what I am about to say now. We must reinforce our own brave men. Are we going to face the problem of getting recruits with folded hands, by doing nothing? We have asked these gallant men to go to the front, and they are giving their lives for us. Are we going to abandon them now? The government talks as if we were going to support them, but acts as if we were going to abandon them when the reserves are exhausted. I believe the people of Canada have the courage and the patriotism to respond to the need if they are told by the government what the need is.

Parliament is now in session and can enact new measures adequate to the situation if only the government will take hold of things. Surely in a crisis like this, when our men are falling at the front, pouring out their life-blood this very day that Canada may be free, we are not going to sit silent, in apathy and helplessness. Men all over the country should make it known to the government that it is no longer our master but our servant, and that vigorous action must be taken to meet the situation.

Mr. RALSTON: Does my hon. friend know that nearly ten thousand men have enlisted voluntarily this month, including some five hundred only yesterday?

Mr. BRUCE: That is a very fine contribution. Now may I proceed?

There are many men all over the dominion, in every walk of life, men of both parties, who for two and a half years have been anxious to render war service, but the opportunity has never been given them by the government. In other countries they have used

the best brains of all political parties. In this country the government has not even attempted to use the best brains of its own party. How can the people of Canada put the war above every other consideration unless the government puts the war above all other considerations? Canada should have been doing a thousand and one things that she has not done to help the mother country, and she might still do some of those things if the government would only lead or get out of the way and let somebody else lead. Let each of us put those things first which will help win the war; for that is a thousand times more important than any political party or a hundred political parties combined.

I have concluded that portion of my remarks to which I invited special attention. It may surprise hon. members to learn that the words I have just used are not my own. They were taken from a report appearing in the *Globe* of May 9, 1917, of an address before the provincial Liberal association in my own riding of Parkdale on May 8, 1917, delivered by Hon. Newton W. Rowell, who was an old and trusted friend of the Prime Minister; who was appointed by the Prime Minister as chief justice of Ontario and who was entrusted with the chairmanship of the commission on interprovincial relations, a commission which bore his name until illness caused him to resign, when the vice-chairman, Mr. Sirois, assumed the chairmanship. I can only add that if the Prime Minister has not the courage to perform the functions of the high office to which he was elected, then in all conscience he should step aside, as Chamberlain did and as Mr. Rowell invited Sir Robert Borden to do, and let some other war leader take his place.

Mr. W. H. GOLDING (Huron-Perth): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few observations on the question now before the house, in the first place I want to congratulate the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) on the splendid way in which he pronounced the sentences which went to make up his carefully prepared essay. I think with practice his reading has improved very much, and if he continues to improve no doubt he will be able to give us leadership in how to read and how to pronounce the various sentences we have written out. He has done an excellent job in that regard.

Mr. BRUCE: Thank you.

Mr. GOLDING: I want also to congratulate the mover and seconder of the address for the splendid speeches they made in introducing and seconding the motion.

In the speech from the throne itself, as was to be expected there is very little sunshine; and it is quite evident that we are going to be called upon to make further sacrifices from time to time. When we read the speech from the throne it is also evident that the government is making preparations to meet any emergency that may arise. I have listened to quite a number of speakers, and so far there has been very little complaint about the contents of the speech from the throne, with the exception of that part which states that the government is going to submit a plebiscite to the people in regard to a release from all commitments made before the election, during the election or since the election.

I want to state briefly but definitely my position on this question. We have in the cabinet, I believe, eight hon. gentlemen who are veterans of the last world war, some of whom still carry the marks of the wounds they suffered in that great conflict. Some of these hon. gentlemen have badges which were given them for distinguished valour on the field of battle. Some of them have sons, as many of the rest of us have, in the army, in the navy or in the air force. I know this question has been considered, not just for a day but day after day, by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), by those members of the cabinet to whom I have referred, and by the other members of the government as well. They have come to a decision on what they believe to be the best course under the circumstances, and I am prepared to accept their judgment.

That is my first reason for supporting them in their proposal. I do not know why the Prime Minister should be singled out as the only one who has made commitments. Every member of this party, when he accepted the platform laid down by our leaders, by our cabinet, made commitments just as strong as those made by the Prime Minister himself. And for the life of me I cannot understand the position taken now by the hon. member for Parkdale. I believe he accepted the platform that was laid down by his leader, who headed a national government party; and having accepted that platform he made commitments just as strong as those made by his leader. I am in favour of this proposal because it not only relieves the Prime Minister of the commitments he has made but I would say it also relieves all hon. members on both sides of the house, though I cannot speak for the two independent groups, since I do not know what stand they took.

Under the circumstances I think it is the honourable and decent thing to do. I have been in public life in one way or another for some twenty-seven years, and I have always tried to be honest with the people who

elected me. I agree with the government in the action they propose to take now. It is up to the people themselves. If they want to relieve us of those commitments, well and good.

I should like also to take this opportunity to congratulate members of the cabinet upon the manner in which they are carrying on the work of their various departments. Especially do I commend the ministers who have been entrusted with the responsibility of organizing Canada's war effort. These hon. gentlemen are carrying loads such as perhaps few cabinet ministers have ever been called upon to carry. As a supporter of the government I take this opportunity publicly to express my confidence in them. I assure them we appreciate the effort they are putting forth to apply sound business principles in carrying out their task. We realize that if any scandal arose in connection with this tremendous job of prosecuting Canada's war effort, among others, the private members supporting the government would suffer. Therefore we should be grateful that we have in the cabinet men who stand solidly for honesty and integrity in the great task to which they have set their hands. In the ministers who have been entrusted with the responsibility of organizing our war effort we have a group of men who hold our entire confidence and have, I believe, the confidence of the great masses of the people of Canada.

I take this opportunity also of paying what I believe to be a well-deserved tribute to the Prime Minister, who has endeavoured to give us efficient and honest administration. Canada is fortunate at the present time in having at its head a gentleman with the experience, ability and honesty of purpose found in our present leader. It was no surprise to me when he and his government received such splendid endorsation at the last federal election. Notwithstanding, however, that remarkable expression of approval by the people, there were editors of some of our important daily papers who both before and since the beginning of the war have continued their sniping, and who apparently are definitely determined to try to destroy confidence in the Prime Minister and his cabinet colleagues. There are some exceptions to that condition, of course. For example the paper which comes to my home at the present time, the London *Free Press,* has been most fair. The editor of that paper, Mr. Arthur Ford, deserves commendation for the manner in which he has played cricket ever since the country declared war on Germany.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): May I ask the hon. member a question?—and I am sorry to interrupt.

Mr. GOLDING: Let me finish.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Would the hon. member also tell the house—

Mr. GOLDING: I would like to go on.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): —what the Stratford *Beacon-Herald,* in his own constituency, has had to say?

An hon. MEMBER: You will have a chance.

Mr. GOLDING: I do not complain about constructive criticism, because in my opinion it is the finest thing we can have. Anyone who represents the public will appreciate that kind of criticism. But the kind I have in mind is criticism which is not based on facts, or, as in many cases, criticism based on facts which are grossly misrepresented.

For example, on the occasion of my coming to Ottawa in November, 1940, for the continuation of the adjourned session, before I boarded the train at Toronto I obtained a copy of the Toronto *Globe and Mail.* One of the first articles which attracted my attention—it was on the front page—stated that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) was coming back from overseas empty-handed. It pointed out that he had been unable to come to any agreement with the United Kingdom government for the sale of our farm produce. Just what good was to be accomplished or what useful purpose was to be served by spreading a story such as that across the country at that particular time is something which for the life of me I cannot understand.

A short time ago, I believe about the middle of December, the same paper carried an editorial in which it pictured the Prime Minister holding out a delicious carrot, which represented senatorships, cabinet portfolios, judgeships and the like. It also described private members supporting the government as donkeys, crowding around, trying to get a bite out of the carrot. I would be disposed to say some nasty things about an offensive editorial of that kind, but I take the view that if they are not ashamed of it, then surely there is nothing I could say which would have any effect on them. In my opinion the Prime Minister has on many occasions been most unjustly and unfairly criticized.

Because of what is happening now I would like to refer to what has happened in the past. We see at the present time an organized effort which hurls a barrage of criticism at the government and the Prime Minister, and which is definitely harming this country's war effort. That is my reason for referring to past events. We well recall the incident in September, 1938, when the position with respect to Czechoslovakia was so acute. On that occasion many of the papers I have in mind persistently demanded that the Prime Minister make a

definite stand, that he should make definite commitments. We were repeatedly told that all the dominions, with the exception of Canada, had done that very thing. A careful review of the proceedings in those other parliaments reveals that not one of them had made any such commitments. This fact was clearly established by the proceedings in the British House of Commons, on the occasion of a question being placed on the order paper in which it was asked if any commitments had been made by any of the dominions. The question was answered by a definite "no" from the then prime minister.

It is also clearly established that Great Britain herself was acting only in the role of mediator at that time, and was particularly anxious that no action be taken or no word be spoken which would prejudice the success of their efforts.

In view of these facts—and they are facts—I have never been able to understand the sense of the tremendous barrage of criticism which was hurled at the government on that occasion. The Prime Minister had stated his position time after time, in parliament and out of it. He said that in the event of a crisis which might involve this country in war, parliament would be assembled, and parliament itself must make the decision on such a momentous question. This promise was kept to the letter, and as a result Canada entered the war a united people. That history is now written, and surely it must be a source of satisfaction to look back and, in the light of all circumstances, appreciate the soundness of the position taken then by the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister has been criticized, too, for not taking a definite stand on important questions. I agree at once that he has not danced to the tune played by some of these super-wise gentlemen who, because they have been entrusted with the responsibility of writing a few editorials, think it is impossible for them under any circumstances whatsoever to err. But he acted at the proper time and in the proper place according to his judgment. I think it is generally conceded that over the period of years that he has been Prime Minister his judgment has been most remarkably sound. When this parliament was assembled on September 7, 1939, under circumstances most serious, the Prime Minister stated his position briefly but definitely—page 21 of *Hansard*—as follows:

> We stand for the defence of Canada; we stand for the cooperation of this country at the side of Great Britain; and if this house will not support us in that policy, it will have to find some other government to assume the responsibilities of the present.

[Mr. Golding.]

I think it was a source of satisfaction to him when he saw how many members from all sides of the house rallied to his support and to the support of the government by the strong stand they took. From that time in September until January in the following year, the Prime Minister and his cabinet colleagues endeavoured, by means of radio talks and press releases, to keep the people informed as to what action was being taken to organize our war effort. The radio talks and press releases were appreciated by the great majority of our citizens, but there were those who ridiculed the whole effort as nothing but political propaganda. The situation in which the government found itself at that time was simply this: if they remained silent, they were criticized; if they endeavoured to keep the people informed as to what was being done, that was called cheap political propaganda. It was no wonder, therefore, that the Prime Minister definitely decided to dissolve parliament when we met on January 25, 1940.

It will also be recalled that at that time the Prime Minister was placed by his opponents in the same category as Hitler for having, as they termed it, scuttled parliament. If we will just re-read the brief debate which took place on that occasion we will find that the Prime Minister stated that charges had been made that his government had lost the confidence of the people. Some of those charges were made in places which could not be ignored. He believed that if the Canadian people felt there was another party or group who could manage things better than the government was doing, then they ought to be given the opportunity of voting for that party or group. In view of that democratic statement and that democratic action I could never understand the philosophy of those who placed the Prime Minister in the same category as Hitler. Since when have we heard Hitler tell the German people that if they were not satisfied with his leadership they would be given the opportunity to select someone else to guide their ship of state?

I am not going to review the charges and counter-charges which were thrown back and forth during the last election, but there are some aspects of that whole discusssion which I think should not be overlooked. Every hon. gentleman who was a member of this house in 1939 will recall that a determined effort was put forth by a section of our press to discredit the House of Commons and create want of confidence in every member representing the people at that time. During the election a determined effort was made to destroy confidence in our party system of government. I should like to say a few words in reference to that.

I think we all remember the formation of the "Leadership league" in the city of Toronto, which league was organized somewhat as the present "total war" committee was. The Leadership league apparently took unto itself the task of trying to improve the position of our people, which was of course a most commendable thing to do. Unfortunately it set out to accomplish that task by carrying on a campaign designed deliberately to create a lack of confidence in every hon. member who sat in this house at that time. We were called politicians and the whole trend of their effort seemed to be to make people believe that we were a species of humanity which should be immediately exterminated. Efforts were made to make the people believe that we were not to be trusted. Reading between the lines we could see that we were accused of being far more concerned with the welfare of our parties than we were with the welfare of those who had sent us here to represent them. Efforts were also made to make the people believe that we had all made promises at election time that we had not the slightest intention of even trying to fulfil. That is the sort of campaign that was carried on by this organization against the members of the house at that time, and it was directed at all members.

In reference to this criticism I may say that I have attended quite a number of public meetings in my day, and I have heard those aspiring to office give an outline of the policies they would support if elected. Generally speaking I think they did that very thing. In view of the criticism which was directed against the members of the house by this organization it is interesting to read the assurances that they themselves were giving, assurances which would make any of the speakers I have in mind look like pikers. I have here a clipping from the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of February 28, 1939, and I should like to read the following:

Count Your Problems

Government—How to reduce it.
Taxes—How to reduce them.
Public debts—How to reduce them.
Patronage—How to kill it.
Home ownership—How to save it.
Farming—How to revive it.
Unemployment—How to beat it.
Railways—How to make them pay.
Resources—How to develop them.
Defence—How to speed it.
Freedom—How to guard it.
Unity—How to get it.

How was that to be done? All you had to do was sign your name on a little slip of paper and, presto! these problems would disappear. Wonderful, was it not?

44561—10½

Mr. ABBOTT: Who was the head of that league?

Mr. GOLDING: I am coming to that. I think it will be recalled also that one of the present members of this house took a very active part in the formation of the Leadership league. This hon. gentleman had occupied a high and important position in the province of Ontario for quite a number of years, and I presume he felt that he had reached heights where as a statesman he could look down with pity on the weakness, the frailties and the ignorance of the ordinary member of parliament. I presume he felt that with his superior wisdom and knowledge he was the chosen one to lead us out of the darkness of the wilderness in which we were floundering, and into the light of the promised land. Naturally we expected a great deal in the way of leadership from that hon. gentleman when he came to this house; but if I am any judge at all, the house has been keenly disappointed.

Our first disappointment came when as a new member, sitting as a member of parliament for the first time in his life, and that only for a few days, he took it upon himself to suggest to the Prime Minister that he should retire from the high office he was occupying and had occupied for a great number of years. The hon. gentleman ignored entirely the fact that the Prime Minister and his government had recently received the greatest endorsation in the most democratic way that any prime minister and his government had ever received in this country. One can hardly understand the mentality of a person who ignores entirely the expressed opinion of the people and sets himself up as one to dictate who should or who should not be prime minister of this country. Not long ago I saw in the papers that he was even dictating to our Cooperative Commonwealth Federation friends, telling them what they should or should not do.

An hon. MEMBER: What a man!

Mr. GOLDING: I have been disappointed in the narrow, partisan speeches which he has made since he became a member of this house, the very thing he was denouncing when he was strutting his stuff in Toronto as leader of the Leadership league. We have been disappointed too in the fact that he has given no leadership at all in observing the rules of this house, which distinctly prohibit the reading of these orations of his from time to time.

Mr. CASSELMAN: How many members have spoken in this debate without reading their speeches?

Mr. GOLDING: We have all heard it said, Mr. Speaker, by those who are anxious to destroy confidence in our parliamentary system of government, that there is no difference between the two old parties, that they only put on a sham battle at election time in order to divide the people, so that the successful party can carry on its programme of political patronage and political racketeering. That is the idea which a section of our press and some of our people are trying to instil into the minds of our citizens. Let me say at once that in any attempt to create such impressions as these, there is far more danger to our national unity and the future welfare of this country than those responsible for it imagine. When confidence is destroyed in our whole system of government, when a deliberate attempt is made to destroy confidence in the men and women who accept positions in public life and the responsibility that goes with it, the very foundations of democracy and of responsible government itself are undermined, and when that is accomplished we may well ask ourselves: Where do we go from here?

It is true, of course, that there are those in public life who do not conduct themselves in a manner which would warrant our confidence in them or confidence in the party or group with which they may be associated. That has been so in the past and in all probability will be so in the future. But that in itself places a direct responsibility on our citizens to be extremely careful whom they select to represent them in the administration of our public affairs. In my experience in this house during the past ten years I have found, generally speaking, that the members of all parties and groups are exceedingly anxious about and deeply concerned with the welfare of the people. It is true that we have our differences of opinion in regard to the best methods by which we can assist the people, but they are honest differences of opinion, not based on political expediency alone, as many would lead our citizens to believe. If we study the political history of this country I am sure we shall not come to the conclusion that those who have been our leaders in the past or are our leaders in the present are the kind of citizen who could be placed in the category of political racketeers. The very opposite is the truth. Those who have occupied the office of prime minister of this country or that of premier of a province have all retired honourably from public life or have passed to their great reward with their praises on the lips of our citizens. Generally speaking they have endeavoured to give honest public service, and have been an inspiration to the young people of their day and generation.

But, sir, if a persistent effort is made to discredit everyone who accepts a position in public life, surely there can be no inspiration for our young people to fit themselves for the public tasks which someone must carry on.

I think a great deal of the criticism which is directed against governments arises out of the fact that in all too many cases governments are expected to do the impossible, that they are expected to do things for the people which the people should do for themselves, and would be infinitely better off if they did. I remember after the close of the regular session of 1939 reading an article in the press which stated that parliament had prorogued without solving any of the problems with which it was confronted, but the article failed to point out that parliament had passed legislation dealing with those very problems. Such critics apparently fail to appreciate the fact that parliament is not an administrative body but a legislative body. While it is true that it is in parliament that laws are passed and policies enacted, it is equally true that those laws and policies are administered through departmental officials and other agencies. I know of no government which has solved all of its problems, nor do I know of any business concern which has solved all of its problems, or of any private individual who has solved all of his, for the very reason that new problems are continually arising. Governments have to face these new problems as they arise from time to time. The press feel free to criticize everyone who accepts public office, and that is right and proper, but even the press do not contend that they have solved all their own problems. As a matter of fact every decade since confederation has brought new problems for the press of this country to face, and some of these problems have made it exceedingly difficult for the press to carry on. But parliament does and can and always will deal with the problems that confront it from session to session.

There is another type of criticism to which I shall refer. I want it distinctly understood there is nothing personal in this, but it is a type of criticism which I think should not be encouraged. I am sure the house was shocked when one of its new members in his maiden speech made the statement that farmers never had received fair treatment from any government, and he gave as his reason for that statement that all governments had accepted campaign funds from the big interests, that they were bought body and soul before they ever started to function. This is a serious indictment, one which involves not only the Bennett government and the present administration but previous governments whose

leaders have passed to their great reward—those of Sir Robert Borden, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir John A. Macdonald, and many others. It is a serious charge, and one wonders what evidence the hon. gentleman had on which to base such an indictment. One wonders, too, why anyone, particularly a farmer, should in season and out of season continue to support a party which he believes has never given the farmers a fair deal as a result of having been bought body and soul by the big interests.

No wonder that parliament as an institution is losing prestige and that respect for it is dwindling, when members will make such statements as these. The members making them have a conveniently short memory. We all remember how in 1911 Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government went down to defeat in an effort to improve the position of our farmers. At that time no one disputed that the so-called big interests were definitely opposed to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's policy of reciprocity. In our own counties of Huron and Perth there were five elected at that time, every one of whom was opposed to reciprocity, but I would resent the slightest insinuation that the people of those counties were bought or could be bought. As a matter of fact one of the things that has always made me feel proud to represent that constituency has been that its citizens cannot be stampeded in any way but think these things through for themselves, and then decide what is the best thing to do.

During the course of the campaign many catch-phrases were used, such as "No truck or trade with the Yankees". It was said that if reciprocity passed there would be two lines of rust running from the east to the west; and so on. These phrases and others of the kind did influence the people. I absolutely refuse to believe that the Canadian people or the Canadian government were "bought" on that or any other occasion.

In 1936, when the Canada-United States trade agreement was brought before this house for ratification, a lengthy and bitter debate took place. Every member of the official opposition opposed the agreement, but when the vote was taken it had the endorsation of the government, their supporters, and all the independents present. Will anyone suggest that the government, their supporters and the two independent groups in this house were bought body and soul when they voted as they did on that occasion? In 1939 we practically had a repetition of this vote. I remember well that one of those who vigorously opposed the passage of that agreement was the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol). I want to say that in my opinion there is no more honest and no more conscientious member in this house, and when he speaks for industry and the industrial worker he is speaking of something which is part of himself, because it has been part of his life's work. But, Mr. Speaker, nobody will make me believe that because he opposed those agreements the hon. gentleman was bought body and soul. This is a most unwarranted charge, one which could not be substantiated if a judicial investigation were held.

In the city of Toronto we have a financial sheet whose editors in my opinion have tried their utmost to discredit three outstanding veterans of the last great war, and so far as I know they are still carrying on in the same way. It is most unfortunate that when men and women are giving of their time and substance for the good of the country, the whole time of these people seems to be occupied in trying to discredit someone connected with the administration. About the only thing, it seems to me, they have to be thankful for as each day draws to a close is that another day has afforded them another opportunity to besmirch someone's reputation and standing. I am quite sure that if this government were bought body and soul by the big interests, opposition to them would not be coming from that particular source.

I have taken more time than I had intended to refer to these matters, but I feel very strongly about the prestige of parliament as an institution. I suggest to every hon. member that while we resent unfair criticism of the house and of its members, it lies within our own power to make this House of Commons a place which will have the respect and confidence of every one of its members and of every citizen of this country. I appeal to each and all to consider this his or her responsibility.

My advice to the government is to carry on efficiently and honestly, as they have been doing, the great task which has been assigned to them by the Canadian people.

There are many problems which, if time permitted, I should like to discuss, in connection with our farms, in the matter of taking boys off the farms, and as regards farm prices. But fortunately we have in the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) one who is a farmer in my own constituency, who is operating a farm and making a success of it, and I feel free to go to him and talk over with him any of these problems. I do not think, therefore, that I should take up the time of this house in stating the case for the farmers of my riding. Also the Minister of National

War Services (Mr. Thorson) and I were deskmates for four or five years. It seems to me, therefore, it would be time wasted for me to discuss these matters in the house when I have access to these ministers in the manner that I have.

I appreciate, too, the responsibility which rests on the official opposition. I believe that in general they are trying to carry out honestly and efficiently the duties which fall upon them in this critical time. The leader of the official opposition (Mr. Hanson) does occasionally hit below the belt, but I am not going to say anything more about that, and I know he won't expect me to say otherwise, because—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I should like to say that I have never been accused of that before.

Mr. GOLDING: Well, that is the way I feel.

I suggest to every party and group in this house that if we do what is expected of us by the Canadian people during this crisis, parliament as an institution and our whole party system of government will be honoured and respected.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, with the blare of political trumpets, both in the house and across the country, sounding out praise and condemnation of the government's plan of a plebiscite, it seems that other matters of importance have gone into the background. Perhaps if I were to give way to my immediate impulse, I would have something to say about this plebiscite business, but I think I shall wait until the bill comes down and, for the present, deal with another matter which I consider to be of vital importance at the present moment.

The matter I have in mind has so far not been dealt with in this house since the commencement of the war. I refer to the relationship between Canada and the United States in respect of that country's defence of its northern frontier state in the war with Japan. I refer, of course, to the United States territory of Alaska, our next-door neighbour to the north.

The house is aware of the fact that some years ago the President of the United States appointed a commission to investigate the possibilities of constructing a highway connecting the Pacific northwest with Alaska. I do not suppose that the United States in its administration is any more free from politics than is Canada or any other country, and I must confess that from my reading I have come to the conclusion that a good deal of political pressure was brought to bear upon that commission, appointed by the president in connection with its work. From my reading I have reason to believe that the work of the United States commission on this Pacific coast route to Alaska was complicated by political considerations. To say the least, it did not take into account any possibility of impending war with Japan. I am quite aware, of course, that the intention in the first place was to have a tourist highway connecting Alaska with the western states of Washington, Oregon and California. I know full well that the tourist idea was what all those who were interested in the matter were concerned about.

I should like to read the names of those who were appointed on the United States commission. Of course, this has nothing to do with us directly, though indirectly it has. The chairman of their commission was Congressman Warren G. Magnuson, of Seattle, Washington. There was also Doctor Ernest Gruening, director of division of territories of island possessions of the Department of the Interior at Washington. That was a good appointment. There was Donald McDonald, engineer, Alaskan Road Commission, Fairbanks, Alaska. Perhaps that was a good appointment. There was Mr. J. W. Carey, Public Works Administration, Portland, Oregon. I read these names only to show that the idea of the commission and its work was specifically to run this highway from Alaska to the western coast states of the United States.

Following that, a Canadian commission was appointed by the present government. This commission was appointed on December 22, 1938, pursuant, of course, to the United States action in appointing their commission. I should like to read the personnel of our Canadian commission. I think it is interesting. The chairman of that commission was the Hon. Charles Stewart, whose address is given as Ottawa, and there were Brigadier-General Thomas L. Tremblay of Quebec; J. M. Wardle, Department of Mines and Resources, Ottawa; Arthur Dixon, Department of Public Works, Victoria, and J. W. Spencer, whose address is given as Vancouver.

I am not going to criticize this severely, but I would point out that at any rate Mr. Spencer is secretary-treasurer, I believe, of the David Spencer Company of Vancouver and Victoria, one of the largest department store institutions on the Pacific coast. It goes without saying that these men are interested in having that highway go along the Pacific coast, through British Columbia, to the north, eventually reaching Alaska. Naturally, they are going to be interested from a business point of view, and perhaps no business benefits

from the tourist trade more than does the department store business unless it is the oil and gas business.

I discover in my study of this whole matter that no consideration whatever was given to any other route to Alaska than the British Columbia route. In fact, certain representations were made to our Canadian commission from people in Alberta, but the commission refused a hearing. This is from the report of the commission:

> Requests were also received for meetings at Edmonton and Fort McMurray to enable the representatives of those places to present the views of their people as to the advantages of a route through Alberta to the Yukon and Alaska. The commission found it impractical to accede to these requests, the order in council creating the commission specifically confining its consideration to routes through British Columbia.

That commission was appointed in December, 1938. It did not begin its work until July, 1939; the war broke out in September, 1939, and the government here, in setting up this commission, gives them strict orders to confine their investigation to the one route in British Columbia. They could not consider any other route. The government must have been aware that there were other routes to Alaska which were just as accessible and through which it was just as easy to put a highway as any route in British Columbia; yet once again, such was the lack of foresight of the government, that the commission was impaired in its work.

There have been developments since then. I know, and I have already recognized, that what was in the minds of both the United States government and the government here was to have a tourist highway. But as late as May, 1941, Congressman Magnuson of the state of Washington, who was chairman of the United States commission, recommended the immediate construction of this highway from a military point of view. I read from a press dispatch from Washington dated May 23, 1941:

> Immediate construction of a $25,000,000 highway from the United States through Canada to Alaska, approximately 1,600 miles, as a precaution against invasion from Siberia, was recommended to State Secretary Hull Thursday by the Alaska international highway commission. The commission's report, made public by its chairman, representative Magnuson (Democrat, Washington), said that Russia, if so disposed, could attack from existing bases in Siberia.

From that dispatch you will see, Mr. Speaker, that the chairman of the commission must have realized that there was impending danger of a military nature in connection with that northern outpost of America; yet his commission studied only the British Columbia route. What actually happened? General Marshall, United States army chief of staff, rejected the British Columbia route as being unsound from a military point of view.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Where is that remark of General Marshall's found?

Mr. HANSELL: I saw that in a press clipping, which I might read. This is a dispatch from New York dated December 17, 1941, in which these words appear:

> —General Marshall, army chief of staff, rejected the long-cherished dream of a highway to Alaska.

Of course that is just part of the dispatch. Mr. William Albee, who was considered a specialist on Alaska and the Yukon, and who was the author of the report of the Magnuson commission, was called before the federal planning board, and this is what he said, which, by the way, is from the same New York dispatch dated December 17, 1941:

> The Alaska highway commission's work was complicated by political considerations and took no account of war conditions. . . . Its primary objective was to build a road linking the important coast towns of Alaska with the American west coast area. It developed into a Seattle-to-Juneau log-rolling junket.

Further on, he says, referring to a route east of the Rockies:

> Our present estimate is that if the work of moving in the road-building equipment is begun before the end of January—

January is here now.

> —there can be a road built to the Bering straits and military trucks rolling on it at express speed before the winter of 1942. With the Russians doing the same kind of work on their side of the Bering straits—and I was given to understand in Washington that this is an integral part of the project—we can carry out an encirclement move against the Japanese from positions in Japan's front yard, back yard and side yard instead of from thousands of miles away as at present.

That was before the outbreak of war between Japan and the United States. Just what are the immediate needs? This entire matter must not be regarded too lightly. With Japan entering the struggle and the United States compelled to take action, let us make no mistake about it; the north American continent is in danger. I think British Columbia is in danger. I am glad to see the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie), who comes from Vancouver, in his seat. Perhaps he knows more about this than any of us. I said British Columbia was in danger. The Yukon is in danger. Alaska is in danger; and while I am dealing with this point, I would remind hon. members that it

would not take very much to isolate British Columbia completely from the rest of civilization.

I do not know if we altogether realize the position. Many hon. members come from Ontario and Quebec; indeed, from the point of view of membership, Ontario and Quebec control this parliament. But there are several great provinces out west. I wonder whether hon. members realize the situation. There are only two railways and one highway going into British Columbia. All that is necessary, whether it is done from the air or by sabotage, is to blow up a couple of bridges on those railways, or cave in one or two tunnels, and British Columbia is absolutely isolated from the rest of Canada. You would not be able to move a machine or a soldier to that province.

I do think—and I have had this in mind for some time—that this parliament should know exactly the situation that exists in British Columbia in relation to the entry of Japan into the war. I believe the Prime Minister should meet with us in a secret session and tell us exactly the situation that exists in British Columbia. He should tell us exactly what defences we have there. He should tell us exactly the number of men we have there in the army and air force. He should tell us the number of planes and equipment we have there. He should confide in this parliament in connection with these matters. I am exercised about this thing; it is serious business. Not only are these territories in danger —British Columbia, the Yukon and Alaska— but, as Mr. Albee said or implied, as a piece of military strategy the cooperation of the three nations, the United States, Canada and Russia, in carrying out an encirclement move against Japan by means of a highway to Alaska, is most essential at this time.

I do not wish to suggest in one breath that certain political pressure was brought to bear upon the governments and commissions, and be interpreted as going a bit political myself in the next breath. If I wished, I could recommend that such a highway run through southern Alberta, because that is where my constituency is located.

Mr. GERSHAW: It should be through Medicine Hat.

Mr. HANSELL: The hon. member for Medicine Hat says it should run through there. All right, I have no objection to that. If I liked, I could recommend that the highway run through my constituency and also through the rich Turner valley oil fields located therein. But I am not going to suggest anything of the kind. It does not make any difference to me whether the highway comes through Coutts or Sweet Grass and through southern Alberta, or whether it comes through North Portal and thence through Saskatchewan or, if you wish, through Emerson and up through Manitoba. But I do say that such a highway must connect with the industrial areas of the United States, and must run north by way of Edmonton.

Perhaps one of the greatest authorities on the north and defence projects in northern territories, a man who has been called in to advise United States defence authorities, without question favours the route from Edmonton, north. I refer to that eminent arctic explorer, Doctor Vihjalmur Stefansson. What does Doctor Stefansson say? I read from an interview with him reported in the Philadelphia *Record* under date of May 20, 1941. It states in part:

> Of the four routes to Alaska that have been proposed, any two could be built for less than half the cost of one battleship; the least difficult to construct could be built in half the time required to turn out a battleship. This latter inland highway, Doctor Stefanssen says, would reach Alaska via Edmonton, Alberta, and the Mackenzie river, and would be largely self-fueling, since it would skirt two extensive petroleum fields, the tar sands of the McMurray district of northern Alberta and the oil region of Fort Norman on the lower Mackenzie. . . . Impartial analysis of the four routes from the military defence point of view seems to indicate that, although one of the two coastal routes might be advisable for communication purposes if two roads are to be built, the inland route through Alberta would be by far the most valuable in the event of war and would most certainly be the choice of army officials if only one highway were to be built.

The article goes on with further explanation, and I am told from authoritative sources that there is no reason why that highway could not be started now. There are tractors going through that north country every winter, hauling huge machinery of one kind and another, while the ground is still frozen.

I would recommend that a new commission be appointed immediately. The old commission is now defunct; it is dead; it has finished its work. I do not know how much it cost, but in the light of events which have since occurred, its work was absolutely worthless. As a matter of fact, the commission itself is not certain as to whether or not it should recommend a highway. May I read one part at the conclusion of its report. This is contained in a press release handed out after the report was submitted:

> It agrees also with the opinion expressed by its engineering members that it is not practicable to offer a sound recommendation to the

government either as to the merits of any of the alternatives of the "A" route or the comparative value of the "A" route and the "B" route—

Both of which, by the way, are British Columbia routes.

—and it agreed with the recommendation that provision be made for further field work on the "A" route in the season of 1940, as outlined in the engineering reports.

In view of recent developments, there is no use in bothering with that commission now; there is no use even in thinking of putting a highway through British Columbia now. I would recommend, therefore, that a new commission be appointed immediately, that the members of such commission be entirely unprejudiced politically and from a business point of view. I would recommend, however, that the ministers of highways or their appointees in Saskatchewan and Alberta, and perhaps Manitoba, be on the commission, or appear in an advisory capacity. They know the machinery; they know the territory. Routes have been surveyed, and they are the men who can give information. I would urge that they be instructed to dispatch their business with the most careful thoroughness, but with the greatest haste. They should be instructed to see that the right machinery is moved in as soon as possible, while the ground is frozen, and that they seek to have the work done this year.

In the light of development in the Pacific, the importance of such a move cannot be stressed too forcibly. The danger is clear; no time should be lost. It is not sufficient to say that the United States fleet will protect the northern part of this continent. Since the war began, the unexpected has happened more than once. One of the greatest fleets in the world was outmanœuvred in one of the most surprising pieces of naval strategy. I refer to the invasion of Norway. Let us not be asleep or fooled in this matter. Let not the government blunder here. We have had our Hong Kong; we have had our Dunkirk. Let us be aware, and act now with respect to this highway to Alaska, lest we have our Norway on the north American continent.

Mr. J. M. TURNER (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on what seems to be the topic of the day, namely conscription, and also something about the plebiscite which will come before our people shortly for their endorsation or rejection. I do not, however, believe I could do any better to illustrate my views than to say that after studying public opinion for some time very closely I have found that it would require considerable research to discover the origins of what might be called the Toronto movement of uplift and control. There are probably traces of it right back to the days of muddy York. But it is within the last thirty years that it has really come into its own, attracting the attention of the outlying masses and drawing from them due and fitting comment and, at times, appropriate action. The full record of its activities must be left to the admiring historian, but in the short time at my disposal at least a note or two can perhaps be made.

It begins with 1935 when the best people, who are the life and soul of the movement, appeared on the streets and in the haunts which they frequent, wearing nice red, white and blue rosettes calling for national government. The laudable purpose for which national government was desired was to trim down the Canadian National railway by tearing up hundreds of miles of rails and to turn over what was left to the management of people of whom the movement approved. An unsympathetic public opinion failed lamentably to respond, and the great project failed.

But the dauntless spirit which inspires these drives did not long remain depressed. There followed, after a brief interval, the Leadership league. Surely this noble and inspiring experiment has not so soon been forgotten. This was directed towards creating in the outlying and dependent areas watchful committees which, under direction from the head office, would see to it that the elected representatives obeyed instructions—or else! In the latter event they would be replaced at the next election by more malleable material. How unfortunate it was that when an election occurred a little later, there was no Leadership league to exercise control and give direction, with the lamentable result that there were elected in large numbers members of whom the movement disapproves. But what had happened to the Leadership league? Why, it had died untimely of a combination of troubles—teeth-cutting, convulsions and infantile paralysis. Very sad, very unfortunate!

But again there was a rallying of the broken forces. This time it took the form of the Ontario voluntary constabulary association. Headed by one whose eagle eye can see treason and a disposition towards subversive action through any number of closed doors, it stripped for action with all the necessary accoutrements, uniforms, passwords, secret gatherings, training in manoeuvres. How it happened that despite the distinguished approval of the attorney general of Ontario, it wilted and died before it had a single scalp to its credit—not one person was landed in gaol—is a mystery, but this is indeed the melancholy fact. It only illustrates what a tough world this is for noble experiments.

But it is not altogether a record of failure. There are bright spots of achievement. Conspicious among these was the performance of the hijacking commando in its surprise attack upon the Conservative committee of organization in Ottawa in November. In a movement of rapid action, which puts to shame recent tactical performances in other fields, they took the committee into captivity, put chains on it, and provided it with a leader who embodies all that the movement yearns for and demands. Some lads from the west who went to Ottawa to deal with the business that the meeting was called to consider, have been showing a most mutinous spirit, writing to the papers in protest and that sort of thing. But they might as well understand that if they want to stay with the grand old party, they must wear the yoke of submission. Toronto will supply the leader, make the policies and, if the miracle of victory happens, distribute the spoils on the basis of rewarding home virtues first.

The zeal, alertness and determination with which subversive ideas and tendencies are detected and trodden on has often been demonstrated, and this has never been more in evidence than right now. The approved missile in these cases is the manifesto. A memorial with the names of a few leading figures attached is considered to be a formidable weapon; though it must be sadly admitted that the results do not seem to bear this out. Within the last few days it has been found necessary to issue such a manifesto. Within twenty-four hours of the appearance in the New York *Times* of a dispatch indicating that Canada was taking a direct part in the proceedings of the allied war council, there was action on the Toronto front, showing how watchful and determined they are in resisting revolutionary change. Let Canada send her representations to London in the good old colonial style, and if London graciously approved, they might then go forward to the allied council. Thus said the manifesto; such was the demand of the alert watch-dogs. Good old blimps!

All these movements and activities, all these champions of "what Toronto says must be done" have now come together in a grand crescendo of demand, affirmation and denunciation by the device of the committee for total war. All their names are appended to the latest manifesto. Here are to be found the signatures of the National government leaders, the Leadership leaders, the voluntary constables who rallied to save Canadian civilzation, the wrecking brigade that stormed the Ottawa Conservative meeting, the alarmists who issued the warning against Canada trying to act like a nation. Here they are pigging together, heads and points, in the same truckle-bed, as the eminent Mr. Burke would say. And with them, selected individuals from outside points who have joined in the great crusade.

The purpose of the great crusade is to do their thinking for the elected members of parliament, inform them as to their duties and instruct them in their performance when parliament meets. It is only necessary to see the two hundred names attached to the manifesto and to read its text, to realize that the Leadership league managed to leave a descendant.

It has to be recorded with pain that in calling in the outsiders, two slips were made. Two of the hand-picked membership turned out to be dissentient. One of these indicated an inclination to think that perhaps the members of parliament in intelligence and patriotism were the equals of their would-be instructors and could be relied upon to make their own decisions. But the gentleman who made these observations, only having served the country with distinction in both the Ontario legislature and the dominion parliament, and in the high office of attorney general of Ontario, was obviously not in the same class with the distinguished amateurs who had matters in hand. Moreover, he comes from Kingston, where the vice of independent thinking is still practised.

The other dissenting voice—that of a woman who had served at Ottawa in five parliaments—showed a similar lack of understanding of the technique of the movement. She actually had the crude idea that they ought to know who was putting up the money. Ought she not to know that this information is given only in camera? Clearly, it is a case of back to the wilds of Grey county for the lady—she is not yet acclimated to Toronto standards.

It is very regrettable that discordant voices should be raised not only in the gathering itself but outside in the waste spaces, in doubt, in derision and in repudiation. I have here, for instance, a newspaper which has the audacity to deny that the movement is the outcome of a spontaneous spasm of anguished patriotism—a low-down sheet that dares to say that the great rally "appears to have been just about as 'spontaneous' as the drafting of Mr. Meighen for the Conservative leadership." But this newspaper is published in Kingston and is under the blight of that town.

Meanwhile, the great movement is well under way with drums beating, flags flying and men shrieking. It has posh quarters in the

Royal York, which is a quite elegant hostelry. It is not thought there will be any trouble about the rent.

If I did not say another word and took my seat now, I think the whole story would be just about told of how a group of racketeers from a city named Toronto got together and I am informed by many people of Ontario that they have had that province in their hip pocket for some time and also have had the lead-off man in that province over a barrel so long that he has become warped. But that gang are not satisfied with that; they are aiming to get control of Canada itself. They are pounding away on the word "conscription" in order to rile up the people. They are using that method just as a means to gain their real objective, namely, the ousting of this government and the gaining of control at Ottawa. In all sincerity I question whether that group is as much interested in conscription as they are in gaining control. I might say that I am referring to the people in Toronto—I understand there are some good people there—and not to the members of the house. If the matter were brought out in the open from behind the bush, we would find that conscription is just camouflage, that the pay-off is control.

If ever we needed unity in Canada, we need it now. That was emphasized quite strongly by the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald.) But I shall have to be shown how we can have unity when one city is trying by every means possible to dominate and control the rest of Canada and is continually belittling and torpedoeing our war efforts, which the Right Hon. Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain, termed as magnificent.

Let us get right down to the marrow of this question regarding this countermovement organized by the so-called money manipulators. Why has this clique been continually out to get the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his government? What is their real reason? It is simply that they know full well that they cannot bulldoze, stampede, railroad and muscle in on our present Prime Minister. That is what is burning them up. That is what is eating out their hearts. He is not a "yes" man. For once they cannot get their own way regardless of how much money they have or control. That is the real reason.

If there is one quality our Prime Minister has, it is that he is always cool, cautious and careful. To some he may seem to be a little slow at times, but it is just as well that he is that way. He has those qualities, and I am proud that he has them, particularly during a period of war or any other crisis.

Now, a few words about the plebiscite. I have always been taught that a promise made is a debt unpaid. On many occasions the Prime Minister has said that he would not enforce conscription unless he first consulted the people. I made the same promise on many occasions during the last election. The Prime Minister and the government are now seeking to carry out that pledge and are appealing to the very people themselves. Is that democracy? What is wrong with it? Time and time again we and others have condemned Hitler and Germany for breaking pledges, treaties and pacts, but when this government seek to carry out theirs, they are condemned.

Let us never forget that the people are the highest court in this dominion, and that they are our masters and we are their servants. Should that situation ever change, then the heart and soul of democracy is destroyed. I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that holding a plebiscite is the honourable course for this government to take at this time, and I commend them for so doing.

Now I want to say, Mr. Speaker, what I think would take place in Canada if ever those sharks in Toronto got control here. About the first thing to happen would be the wiping out of the excess profits tax. Away would go the price-ceiling idea, and the sky would be the limit so far as profits on war equipment are concerned. On that very point let me say that maybe this is what that gang mean by "total war effort"—get everything out of this war that it is possible to get, because the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, whom this group has forced in as leader, speaking on that very subject in the other chamber on December 6, 1940, is reported by the Senate *Hansard* of that date, page 62 of the Senate Debates, to have said:

> I have no sympathy with those who would tax profits at 100 per cent. People will not work for nothing. Human nature is the same in war time as in peace, and instead of helping the war effort you are defeating it by stripping people of the stimulus to toil and run their business right. Leave the incentive, and make the reward greater the greater the toil and the greater the success. You have to do that. You do not do it under this bill. I do not exaggerate at all when I say that I have had business men by the dozen tell me that they are leaning on their oars; they have nothing to work for. They say: "We might just as well take it a little easier now, for we are only working for taxes anyway."

We are all familiar with the song, "Roll out the Barrel." You have heard it many times, Mr. Speaker. That would be played again if those gentlemen got into power; only then it would be, "Roll out the pork barrel," instead of the beer barrel, and I should be very much

surprised if under the control of Toronto our army would not soon resemble the Mexican army of a few years back when there were no privates and every soldier was a general or an officer. Those are only a few of the things which we might expect if the Toronto outfit should take control, but I am not afraid to trust the people of Canada to see that that shall never take place.

While I am on my feet, I want to pay a tribute to my district, which was well represented in the great battle for the defence of Hong Kong against overwhelming odds. Their stand in that battle will go down in history as equal to any made by gallant, courageous troops in any other war, past or present.

So much for the question of conscription and the plebiscite.

As food has been mentioned in the speech from the throne, I take this opportunitv to make a few observations with respect to wheat. I did not oppose the wheat policy of the government last year because I understood it was just a temporary policy, just trial legislation for one year only. But I must say to the government at this time, when we are all striving to preserve unity to the utmost in Canada, that we must, above all else, keep a proper economic balance right across the entire country, and I am sorry to say that that balance does not exist to-day. Due mainly to war contracts and government subsidies for plant extensions, and so forth, which I know are necessary, eastern Canada, particularly Ontario and Quebec, has the big end of it financially, and quite naturally they are having a great boom in business generally and are enjoying a period of prosperity. This is easily proven by a report in the Toronto *Globe and Mail*—there is Toronto again—of January 27, 1942, where I find this headline: "A surplus of $600,000 for Toronto." But, Mr. Speaker, what of the western provinces, those all-important wheat-growing areas? Almost the opposite is true. The farmers are striving and labouring to keep their heads above water, to keep going and stay off relief. That is what I refer to when I say that there is not a proper economic balance right across the country.

If we could weigh it on the scale, the indicator would show that the balance overwhelmingly favours the east. When a situation of that kind arises, it is up to the government immediately to take action. In addition to what I have already said, let me show how, by our action here in setting up a schedule of prices for labour on war projects, and so forth, and providing a minimum wage of forty-five cents an hour, plus cost of living bonus, which is little enough, we have automatically made it tougher for the farmer.

Here is the farmer's situation now as I see it. We first of all guarantee him seventy cents a bushel for his wheat, No. 1 northern, basis Fort William. That is not enough, particularly during war time. It will be noted that the price in the United States for May wheat is $1.30¾ at Chicago. We tell the farmer that he must sell his wheat only at the point of delivery stipulated in his permit. But we have done more than that. As I have just said, we have automatically raised the price of labour which the farmer must have, particularly during the all-important harvest season, to forty-five cents an hour. No farmer can pay forty-five cents an hour for labour on seventy-cent wheat, plus bonuses, but less freight and dockage. Therefore we are clipping the poor farmer at both the top and the bottom. He is being pocketed by our own action. Let me give an illustration.

I was present at the beginning of the harvest season last year when an order came through for 1,600 men at $3 perhaps $3.50 a day, plus board, et cetera, and not one man of the hundreds present came forward. I personally spoke to many of those men, and their answer was that they wanted to get a job in a munitions factory at forty-five cents an hour. During the harvest period last fall I took a trip through part of my riding, and on one farm I saw a poor old lady, sixty-five years of age, on top of a grain stack, working away there when she should have been at home listening to the radio or at least doing some easier job. On another farm, on the next section, I saw a little girl twelve years of age driving the tractor, while her father operated the power binder behind. He told me that he had tried his best to get help, offering $4 a day, but had not been able to secure it. That little girl should have been out playing. I am sure she must have been tired at night.

I suggest to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and to the government that the farmer be given, say, $1 a bushel for No. 1 northern wheat, not at Fort William but at the point of delivery. If all the farmers of Canada are taxed equally and contribute equally to the treasury of Canada, why should they not withdraw from that same treasury share and share alike? No farmer should be penalized by the difference in freight rates just because he happens to farm a little farther away from Fort William than another farmer. Just as a further suggestion, the government might, if it so desires, consider paying that $1 a bushel on the first

1,000 or 2,000 bushels only, and then scale the price down from there. Such a plan would certainly take care of the thousands of the smaller wheat farmers all over western Canada.

I know the Minister of Agriculture had a job on his hands last year when we had such a large carryover of wheat, and with the new crop coming in, nevertheless I think we should simplify our national wheat policy and make it easier for the farmers and everybody to understand by considering cutting out the wheat acreage reduction plan, bonuses, et cetera; and tell the farmer what he is going to get in cash on the line, and let him store his wheat, if he wants to, on the farm and pay him for it. The machinery set up under the wheat acreage reduction plan is all that is necessary to take care of the inspection and so forth that would be required.

Therefore, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the minister and to the government, and particularly to the Prime Minister, who represents a farming constituency in Saskatchewan, the province which produces the most wheat of any province in Canada, to give the poor farmers of western Canada the assistance necessary to keep up their very important end in our war effort and at the same time to bring about a better balance across the country generally, which in turn will create greater harmony and certainly a higher degree of unity in Canada from one end to the other.

Mr. DANIEL McIVOR (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, when there is something on your mind the sooner you get it off, the better for yourself.

In opening my remarks I should like to congratulate not only the mover and the seconder of the address, but also the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), who I am sorry is not in his seat and the leaders of the other groups, who have been so constructive in their suggestions that one would almost think they were Liberal-Progressives.

To touch first upon what, to me, is the most important subject, I will say a word on the plebiscite. Neither in the last war nor in the present one have I felt that I could tell a young man that he should sign up, nor have I ever allowed my better half, as far as I could control her, to send a white feather to anybody. First, God gave that boy his life and to God he is responsible. As the old Book says, "the dust shall return to the earth as it was, and the spirit....unto God who gave it"—not to the government. Second, because if you put a soldier's uniform on a coward you cannot make him a soldier against his will, any more than you can put a gown on a profligate and make a saint out of him, or by painting a pump, change the water. I would add, as another reason, that it has been my sad duty on more than one occasion to break the painful news of a loved one missing or gone beyond. Just before I came to Ottawa I had to bring the news to a young wife, to the mother and father and family of one of the finest young men at the head of the lakes—where they are as good as any in Canada—a Christian young man and a first-class athlete, that he was missing, and when I saw the effect on the parents and the wife, I felt that I was not going to take the responsibility of telling anybody that he must enlist. But I was extremely proud that my own boy enlisted before he told me of his decision, and whether, when he goes into the air he comes safely down again, or his spirit soars up and beyond, is less to me than the consciousness that he is "white" all the way through. But it is my duty to support every young man who goes overseas in everything which will make him a soldier battling an accursed thing, and everything that the government can give those young soldiers it is our duty to give them. As I have said, if a boy is not a soldier at heart, if he hasn't "got it under his belt", you cannot make him a soldier. But I admit there are certain things that we must do. We must show the need. In our own way we must act whole-heartedly.

I should like to congratulate the government upon its choice of the new Minister of Labour, Mr. Mitchell. I worked with the Hon. Humphrey Mitchell and with the late Hon. Norman Rogers on the youth training scheme, which was one of the most constructive measures that a Canadian government ever put into effect. I know that from Fort William not hundreds but several thousands of young men have passed through that youth training and are now engaged in war work or overseas —on the land, in the air and on the sea. Mr. Mitchell himself was a worker. I believe that any man who is Minister of Labour should know how a man feels, like after a hard day's work. How can he best legislate for the toiler without some personal knowledge of the man's problems?

I admit I am biased in favour of labour. You can trust the workers through thick and thin; they are the cream of Canada, and, with labour willing to do its best, we as a government should give them the best possible leadership. In the interests of an all-out war

effort there should certainly be some equalization of wages and results. I know something of the difficulties which come to those whose task it is to handle men. I realize that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) and his fellow ministers have a terrific job. I would suggest that they throw out some inducement to men to join the infantry, because to-day service in the air or in the navy holds superior attractions for many of our young men. If the pay of the foot soldier were increased from $1.30 to, say $1.50, it might facilitate recruiting in that arm of the service.

When I think of the war work of Canada I am not just sure whether we have enough men to supply all our various needs. Recently a farmer who had spent $10,000 in equipping a splendid herd told me that he was sending them to the butcher because he could not get help. Perhaps there are not enough men in the country for every phase of war work, but to my mind it is the duty of the government, and they should have a free hand, to say whether a man can serve better on the farm or in the machine shop or elsewhere.

Public opinion changes rapidly. The other day, when I saw that a United States army had landed in Ireland, I thought, "Boy, they are in for a fine time over there. Once they get a peek at the cruelty and the devastation which has been wrought in Belfast, that most beautiful city in the British empire, they will get a taste of the thing they need to open their eyes." And knowing something of Ireland and its characteristics, I think they may be taught the rudiments of how to take care of themselves and how to learn to fight and to beat the enemy.

As I have said, public opinion has changed quickly. In a letter from my brother, a member of the cloth, a real soldier and a real man, who is on the coast of Washington, he says that a little while ago public opinion there was anti-Churchill, anti-British, anti-Canada and anti-Roosevelt, but since Pearl Harbour was attacked they are going "all-out" in order to show that they are anti-Hitler and against everything that supports Hitler.

This change in public opinion reminds me of my own attitude towards Russia. I have been guilty of reading everything that I could get hold of about Russia. Some of it was true; some of it was not, but my attitude towards that country and its people, and towards communism as well, has changed. To be called a "red" to-day is no disgrace. Some time ago I visited Tim Buck. I did so because he had been through a bad wreck. I did so as a minister; for, if I had not, I would have been like the priest and the Levite who looked and went by, fearing lest public opinion might criticize. I know what I had to meet during the dominion election because of that action. I was called a communist. But my constituency knew me perfectly well, far better than my critics, and they voted accordingly. I would advise the government to have reexamined all those who are interned as opposing our war effort. I think they should be given an opportunity of getting into our war work, because, as I understand the government, it is not their desire to keep men in prison but rather to give them an opportunity of doing their best.

Canada is doing a great job. Among those engaged in our war effort is the former leader of the opposition. When I think of former members of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party and of the Conservative party contributing to our war effort—and this includes the Hon. Dr. Manion, who was chosen to lead his party at an all-Canadian convention—I cannot help believing that the best brains of Canada to-day are engaged in this country's war effort. I suggest, therefore, that we have in reality a better national government than we could otherwise hope to have.

When a man wishes to serve, I think it is wise that he should be given an opportunity to serve in that capacity which he is best fitted to fill. It is not fair to put him to serve where he is not best fitted to serve. Take a trainee who has signed with the air force; he has spent years fitting himself for service in that force; he wants to fly. Well, you hurt that man if you do not give him an opportunity to fly. Another man wishes to join the navy, let us say, and he, too, is a trainee. He should be allowed to serve in that capacity, because he will make a good sailor and he will not make as good a soldier; he will not be a soldier of the same calibre as a sailor, if he were allowed to go to sea. I think, again, of the premiers of our provinces who are willing to go all-out in their own way, whether we think they are right or wrong, in supporting the government, and in this regard I would make a suggestion. I think there are some things the provincial governments can do to help the war effort.

It may surprise you, Mr. Speaker, to know that I made my rounds of the beer parlours of the city of Ottawa. I was not surprised that I did not find a member of this house in any of them, either man or woman, but I did find these places crowded, and I think the premier

of this province would do well to try to settle his own affairs and not leave it to the dominion government, because that traffic does coarsen life and unfit soldiers, muddling the brains of men.

Another thing is this. The provinces should do something with regard to old age pensioners. The sum of $20 a month is not very much to-day. Pensioners need a bonus; so do soldiers' wives and soldiers' widows. In my opinion the provincial governments could very well exert themselves and go all-out in their own way.

I notice that in most of the countries at war there is a seven-day week, twenty-four hours a day, in the production of war materials. Well, I have been taught from my youth that the human body needs one day in seven, and if a man does not take one day in seven he will certainly take all his Sundays in a row. I might mention our own car works in Fort William. Girls have gone in there to work with strong healthy bodies and vigorous minds, and I have known of several instances in which they were compelled to retire from their jobs for a month or two on account of ill health. If you do not take your Sabbath day you will pay for it. I would remind hon. members of the old proverb, drawn from the Bible, that if you break the moral law, the moral law will break you. We must "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." A man who toils six days a week needs a day off in which he can get something spiritual to help him in his work. The greatest leaders in every age have recognized the need of one day's rest in seven, and I am sure the Minister of National Defence agrees with me in this regard. After a man has worked for six days, he needs the seventh day to rest. Of course, what he does on the Sabbath makes all the difference in the world. If he rests, in order to build up his mind and his spiritual powers, he will be the better fitted for the work he has to do. If he does not, so much the worse for him.

A famous physician, Sir James Crichton-Browne, said:

> We doctors in the treatment of nervous diseases, are now constantly compelled to prescribe periods of rest. Some periods are, I think, only Sundays in arrears.

The eminent conductor, Sir Landon Ronald, discontinued his Sunday concerts in 1928 on account of his health, saying: "I can no longer work seven days a week."

Gladstone attributed his long life to his rigid observance of the Lord's day.

President Coolidge was asked: "Cannot I worship God in the green fields?" He replied: "You can, but you don't."

Of course, I believe that the place of prayer is the place for a man to spend part of his Sunday, because he will hear something there that will put him in communion with the Master Workman, who will give him that stimulus necessary to fit him to play his part in life's work.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, when one has been in this house for a time, one can sense the feeling, the atmosphere that prevails in this chamber. I am convinced, and I think you will agree with me, that at this session there is a tenseness, an earnestness and a depth of feeling which I hope and believe goes even deeper than partisan feeling in the minds of members of this house. And I hope this feeling will be allowed free rein by the ministry, because if that is done, decisions may be reached, right here in parliament, which will point the way for the Canadian people during this dark, yet challenging period in our national life. Therefore, believing the house to be in such a frame of mind, may I state quite frankly at the beginning of my remarks that to-night my aim is to point out to my fellow members, and through them to the country, that Canada, our nation, of which we are justly so proud, is in deadly peril. I repeat those words; Canada is in deadly peril; and I aim also to convince members of this house and the people throughout the country that certain things can, should and must be done.

I speak as a representative from Canada on the Pacific. Canada is a two-ocean nation. I am always intrigued by that verse which is carved over the main door of this building, and which is as follows:

> The wholesome sea is at her gates,
> Her gates both east and west.

On the east we have those old provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec, forming Canada on the Atlantic. But on the west coast, constituting Canada on the Pacific, we have only my own native province of British Columbia.

Since the house met last November, war has come to the Pacific. The fires of war are raging round that great ocean. War is the grim business of killing and being killed. Those of us who served in the last war are

only too well aware of that fact. But this war is far more grim than the last one by reason of the development of the bombing aeroplane, which has made possible the slaughter of thousands upon thousands of civilians, men, women and children, and because the war in which we are engaged is a war of extermination. Nowhere will it be fought with more savagery than on the Pacific. That was made perfectly clear on December 7 last, when Japan struck at Pearl Harbour while her envoys were still negotiating with the envoys of the nation she attacked. Japan struck and crippled the United States fleet. Crippled the United States fleet! Those are ominous words for Canadians on the Pacific, because year in and year out we have been told that our defence on the Pacific was the United States fleet, and that, in fact, was the truth.

In the seven weeks that have intervened, the British fleet in the Pacific has also been crippled by the loss of those two great battleships, the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse*. Various strategic islands have been seized. Hong Kong has been taken, wiping out our courageous but ill-fated, ill-equipped and ill-trained Canadian sacrifice force. Hong Kong! Members of this house and all Canadians must burn that name into their memory, for we have a score to settle with the Japanese over Hong Kong. And it must be settled not in North America but on the far side of the Pacific.

These seven weeks have seen Manila taken and the Americans fighting a last-ditch stand for the Philippines; Malaya overrun, with the British fighting a last-ditch stand for Singapore; and Singapore, whether it stands or falls, no longer effective as a great naval base. Bases have been taken in Borneo and in the Celebes for an attack on Java, which is the heart of the Netherlands East Indies. Bases have been taken in the Australian islands, as a prelude, the Australian people believe for an attack on their mainland. May I point out to hon. members that Canadians on the Pacific have great sympathy for Australia. We have a keen understanding of their attitude, because we realize that Canada may eventually be placed in exactly the same position.

In short, these seven weeks of war on the Pacific have placed Japan in control of that ocean. As my authority for that statement, I quote none other than the Britist Prime Minister, Right Hon. Winston Churchill, who, in his speech on January 27, only this week, is quoted as having said:

> For a time, therefore, naval superiority in the Pacific and the Malayan archipelago passed into the hands of Japan. How long it will remain in Japanese hands is a matter on which I do not intend to speculate, but it will be long enough for Japan to inflict many heavy and painful losses on all the united nations who have possessions in the far east.

[Mr. Green.]

Further on in his speech, referring to the United States as well as Great Britain, he said:

> I expect and I have made no secret of it that we shall both receive severe ill usage at Japanese hands in 1942.

So Canadians on the Pacific find themselves closer to war than any other Canadians, and more directly involved. I do not wish to make light of the peril in which our fellow Canadians on the Atlantic find themselves. They too are in great peril, but on the Pacific ocean there is no island fortress of Great Britain between Canada and the enemy. There is as our only protection a crippled United States fleet. There is an enemy—not without a fleet, as the German Reich, but an enemy with a first-class navy; an enemy with a first-class and very strong merchant marine, an excellent air force, and an army that has had experience in warfare for the last ten years. And there is an ocean—the Pacific ocean, such a vast ocean that there is plenty of room for fleets to operate without their being discovered.

Canadians on the Pacific coast have already experienced that sudden warning which can be appreciated only by those who have heard it in their homes. They have heard coming suddenly over their radios—"An enemy attack on the Canadian coast is imminent"—and then the radio station shuts off. The attack, presumably, was expected from aircraft carriers off the coast. Sooner or later that attack will come. It did not come at the time we received the warning, but I am convinced that sooner or later it will come, and our coastal cities and hamlets will be bombed. The people of British Columbia are not whining about that. They are not of the type who whine, any more than are any other Canadians. We are not a whining nation.

They realize, too, that the United States has bases in Alaska. To the north and northwest of us there are great United States bases which afford considerable protection to us, but at the same time those bases are a great menace to Japan. The base on the Aleutian islands is, I believe, the nearest hostile base to the shores of Japan. Therefore those Alaskan bases may be—"may be" I repeat—the next in line for attack by Japan. It may be that included in the objectives of such an attack would be our own city of Prince Rupert, the Queen Charlotte islands, and even Port Alberni. These may be sought by the Japanese as nuisance bases, or even as invasion bases.

Should they be taken by the Japanese, it would be possible from them for the enemy to bomb our coastal cities at short range; they would be in a position to bomb our shipyards, our war industries. The greatest shipbuilding industry in Canada is on the Pacific coast. Our heaviest merchant-shipbuilding programme is being carried out on that coast. It would be possible to bomb United States coastal cities where, again, are naval bases and great aeroplane plants. I believe 90 per cent of United States aeroplane factories are located on the Pacific coast. It would be possible to make the whole of British Columbia a battle-ground, and even to bomb the prairie cities such as Edmonton and Calgary.

This is not just an idle fancy of my own. I should like to read to hon. members dispatches from Japan published on January 9 of this year, only about two or three weeks ago. I quote this report of an article in the Japan *Times and Advertiser,* controlled by the Japanese foreign office:

> The Japan *Times and Advertiser,* controlled by the foreign office, declared to-day it was within the realm of probability "that the armed forces of this country will land on the American continent" . . . "The contention that the United States cannot be invaded" the article declared "is as much a myth as that the Maginot line could not be taken or that Singapore and Pearl Harbour are impregnable. . . . The fall of both the Philippines and Singapore was forecast soon. After that, the newspaper went on, "It will be for us to say when, where and how we will strike."

Let us not forget that the shortest route from Japan to San Francisco is by the Aleutian islands and the coast of British Columbia—much shorter than by way of the Hawaiian islands. Let us remember that Vancouver is closer to Yokohama than is Sydney, Australia.

Canadians on the Pacific coast know, also, that the Canadian armed forces on that coast are hopelessly inadequate to deal with an attempted invasion. They know that large numbers of our troops on that coast are home-defence troops, called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act. This means that fighting troops from Prince Rupert could not go, as a unit, to the neighbouring panhandle of Alaska, should Alaska be attacked. Fighting troops from units defending Victoria at this time could not go to neighbouring San Juan island, or across the strait of Juan de Fuca to Port Angeles. It means that the fighting troops guarding the city of Vancouver could not go across the line to Bellingham, should Bellingham be attacked, because many of them are home-defence troops. Our units could not go across to aid United States troops —joint defence council or no joint defence council. On the other hand, if you please, young Americans could and doubtless would be sent to help us, should we be attacked.

That is an intolerable position. It is intolerable for a brave and proud people. It is intolerable for a nation which in the last war sent out fighting men who proved themselves on the battle-field the peers of any men on this globe, a nation which in this war has sent abroad young men of the same breed.

Canadians on the Pacific coast know, too, that what forces we have are not all adequately equipped. For example, we find this press dispatch on the front page of the Vancouver *Province* of January 3, nearly a month after Japan had declared war:

> Guns coming here within few weeks.

The dispatch goes on to say:

> A number of anti-aircraft guns have been allotted to the Vancouver defence area, and on their arrival here within the next few weeks will be mounted at strategic points through the district, an army spokesman announced to-day.

And as for rifles for the reserve army—some of them have no rifles at all. Those who have, I believe, are, or were within the last few days, using old United States rifles with red bands round the top, signifying that they were not fit to be fired.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend must not say that. If my hon. friend knows anything about the matter at all, he knows they are perfectly fit for service in every way. I suggest to my hon. friend that he get the facts. If he would come to my office and get the facts, instead of making statements of that kind in the house, he would be doing better service for the defence of Canada, and not bringing comfort to the enemy.

Mr. GREEN: I am making my speech, and I ask that I should not be interrupted.

Mr. RALSTON: I appeal to my hon. friend. I do say to him that if he would get the facts before making statements of that kind, it would help considerably in the defence of Canada, and certainly would not afford the comfort to the enemy that a speech of this kind is bound to do.

Mr. GREEN: That is old talk, about helping the enemy. The enemy have known for a long time. And as for the rifles—it might be possible to fire them a few times, but it is a bad thing when the men who defend the Pacific coast have to do so with old United States rifles that were made twenty-five years ago; when they have not modern rifles.

Mr. RALSTON: I suggest that my hon. friend does not even know the first rudiments in reference to the supply of rifles. I suggest that he come to my office and find out before he makes a statement of that kind.

Mr. GREEN: I think the minister is going a little too far.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend is going a little too far.

Mr. GREEN: I do not propose to try to follow the minister along that line. It is the lives of our families, our relatives and our people that are at stake in this matter. I did not come here to make cheap political talk; I am worried about the people on the Pacific coast. The men who are defending us are entitled to the best equipment that can be obtained in Canada.

Mr. RALSTON: Hear, hear. And if my hon. friend will find out about the availability of equipment, it will be a different story. He should also find out with regard to the efficiency of these rifles about which he is speaking.

Mr. GREEN: There are men in the active army on the coast who have no rifles at all. These are not men in the battalions, but in other branches of the active army. Every soldier on that coast should have a rifle and should be trained to use it. He should be trained to fight regardless of what branch of the service he happens to belong to. And again, Japanese fishermen on the Pacific coast have been made to turn over their boats. I think this was a wise move on the part of the government, but Canadians out there see these Japanese fishermen who naturally may be embittered, going back to their villages up and down the coast. There are eighteen hundred of these fishermen, and if they saw fit they could guide enemy naval forces to every bay, every landing place and perhaps every gun on the Canadian coast. Meanwhile the government ponders what is to be done next. And they see that this government has done everything possible to foist the responsibility for air raid precautions upon the provinces and the municipalities, although it is clearly a problem of defence and should be handled by the dominion.

To sum up, the Canadians on the Pacific coast are restless; they are worried, they are annoyed. Now they are given a plebiscite in which the following question is asked:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

What will go through their minds when they are voting on that question if there happen to be air raids threatened at the time? The Prime Minister talks of unity, but this plebiscite will not create unity among the people on the Pacific coast. So much for the peril in which Canada finds herself.

I shall now go on to suggest certain things which can, which should and which must be done. First of all, let us cast out from our minds at once the thought: It cannot happen here. That has been the curse of democratic countries in this war. Let us replace it with the thought: It can happen here; right here in Ottawa, in Halifax, in Toronto, in Vancouver, or in any other part of Canada. No thought will make us more realistic, no thought will help us more to avoid reverses and to gain victories.

For example, I am convinced that the ministry have not given serious consideration to the possibility of a Japanese invasion of Canada. If they had, they would not risk the delay and confusion that will be caused by this plebiscite. I am convinced further that the staff on the Pacific coast and the staff here in Ottawa have not considered what they would do in the event of invasion. Our new chief of staff is reported in the Vancouver press of December 18, less than two weeks after Japan had declared war, as follows:

> "Canada's Pacific coast defences are, I believe, capable of coping with any probable attacks that we may have to face", Lieutenant-General Kenneth Stuart, chief of the Canadian general staff, said this morning on his arrival here following a three-day inspection of defence areas on Vancouver island.
>
> "I have no doubt," General Stuart added, "that I will be accused of complacency in this regard, and yet that is far from correct. We are fully aware of the dangers that have developed with Japan's entry into the war and we are adjusting our forces to meet these dangers."
>
> The chief of staff stressed the possibility of hit-and-run attacks along the British Columbia coast. "I do not say we can prevent these attacks but I do think we are in a position to deal with them."

Further on, the report states:

> The possibility of a Japanese invasion here, he believed, is extremely remote.

That reminds me of the words of Air Marshal Sir Robert Brooke-Popham, who said in Singapore on December 8, the day after Japan struck:

> We are confident. Our defences are strong and our weapons are efficient. We had plenty of warning and our preparations are made and tested.

Words which unfortunately held more of hope than of fact.

If this invasion attack should come, probably our generals would make another of these strategic retreats with the remnants of our forces to the mountains, leaving the people on the coast to their fate, and in the result thousands of Canadians would have to die to get back what need never have been lost. Let us make up our minds now; let us tell our commanders and our people that not one inch of Canadian soil is to be yielded without a fight.

My second suggestion as to what should be done is that we should give our commanders armies that can fight anywhere. At the present time we are giving commanders in Canada units made up of two kinds of soldiers, those who can be taken beyond Canada and those who cannot. That makes it impossible to build up here an efficient fighting force. Let us go further and make certain that we can keep these armies reinforced with fully trained troops, not troops who have had less than sixteen weeks training. I believe at the present time, and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) can correct me if I am wrong, that even the fourth and sixth divisions are not up to full strength.

Mr. RALSTON: I may tell my hon. friend that the fourth division, which is an armoured division, is up to full strength for an armoured division. I cannot remember just the number it was below for an infantry division, but I think there were one or two units that were not mobilized. With regard to the sixth division, I think the strength is about 10,000; that is nearly the strength of three brigade groups.

Mr. GREEN: Then the fourth is not up to strength.

Mr. RALSTON: It is up to strength for an armoured division. I stated that, as an infantry division, I think there were one or two units that were not mobilized.

Mr. GREEN: The announcement that this was to be turned into an armoured division was made only a couple of days ago.

Mr. RALSTON: Does my hon. friend get my point? There were a couple of units which had not been mobilized. That is the correct situation. It was not up to strength on that account.

Mr. GREEN: My suggestion is that we make certain that there are ample reinforcements, and that means conscription. Why should we dodge this issue of conscription as a means of organizing our man-power? I was greatly impressed by the report of a Gallup poll taken in Great Britain where the common people of Great Britain were asked what advice they would give to the common people of the United States about the war. One of these suggestions was that man and woman power should be organized efficiently and at once, that they should not take half-way measures. Why should we in Canada hesitate? In Great Britain we had Prime Minister Churchill saying these words this week:

> It looks as if we were in for a very bad time. But, provided we all stand together and provided we throw in the last spasm of our strength, it also looks more than it ever did before as if we were going to win.

Canada should throw in more of her strength and not leave it all to Great Britain. This government, I believe, feels much the same; otherwise it would not be calling for a plebiscite. Let us have conscription, and let us have it without delay, but let us make it complete conscription of all our resources right down the line, including industrial and financial resources, as advocated, for example, by the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League.

My third suggestion is that things must be done now, without delay. We should pay more attention to timing. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) when he spoke on Monday, gave us a little curtain-lecture on the importance of timing. Well, the principal thing about timing in this war is not to be too late. Let us realize that in this war every day is precious. Japan struck nearly two months ago, and this government rushed in to be the first to declare war. Apparently it is going to be the last to rush in to take up the fight. The ministry should have moved at once to put this nation on an all-out war basis. But they did not. Now, although they see the need, they are taking time out to hold a plebiscite, which means, at the minimum, a delay of three months. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is making a mockery of talk of a total war effort. We must wage war now—not a matter of months hence.

Finally, I have suggestions with respect to the Pacific front. The Pacific coast is a front, and should be treated as such. It is a war front, and on that Pacific front we should have one supreme commander. I believe that we now have three commanders—and the ministers will correct me if I am wrong. I believe that the army commander, the navy commander and the air force commander work together by cooperation rather than any one of them being in command over the other two. That was the situation at Pearl Harbour, except that instead of three commanders there were only two. But Canada,

almost two months after Pearl Harbour, still has a triple command on that Pacific front. Also let us make it a fighting command where we shall put, not one of our older generals, but one of our most aggressive commanders with experience overseas in this war, and with a fighting staff built up on the same basis as those in Great Britain. We may see fighting on the Pacific coast before our troops in Great Britain get into action.

Then let us build up a striking force, not a force that will merely sit there to defend, but build up on the Pacific coast a striking force which could be an expeditionary force. For example, why should Canada not have air troops; trained and in position on that coast? They would be of the greatest advantage in recapturing any point of the coast that might be attacked and captured. No troops would be of more use, but apparently we have none in Canada at the present time. I suggest that the government obviously is treating the Pacific coast as a secondary theatre of war. The Prime Minister said the other day that perhaps—perhaps—there was nothing certain about it—we would raise another new division to help defend Canada after the fourth division had gone to Britain. Again, yesterday, when I asked him whether Canada was to be represented on the new Pacific defence council, he said he did not know anything about it at all, that it had only to do with the far, far away southern Pacific, and apparently he was not very much interested.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend has said one thing which I must correct. He said that Canada was treating the Pacific coast as a secondary theatre of war. I say that Canada in our defence plans is treating the Pacific coast with the greatest seriousness, with the seriousness which it deserves. Within a very few days after war was declared with Japan, the chief of the general staff went out to the Pacific coast himself to inspect the defence positions all up and down that coast. My hon. friend has read from his statement, but the fact that he does not agree with the chief of the general staff as to the technical and strategic position does not mean that we are treating the Pacific coast in any secondary way at all. My hon. friend knows, if he knows anything, that the dispositions made out there indicate that we regard the Pacific coast defences as of unquestionable importance, and I would add that the Pacific coast has defence, in certain items of equipment, that no other part of Canada has.

Mr. GREEN: That is not very much for the government supporters to applaud because there it should be. The Pacific coast is the portion of Canada most likely to be attacked.

Then I suggest that the government should give leadership in organizing the people in the matter, for example, of air raid precautions, in organizing home guards and arranging for insurance against bomb damage. There has been talk of that for months, ever since Japan struck, but no plan, so far as I am aware, has been announced. No minister of the government, including our minister from British Columbia, has been on the coast since war was declared on December 7. There should be a minister of this government resident on the Pacific coast during this present crisis.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I will support that.

Mr. GREEN: I did not say that necessarily we want our own minister there.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It will never be left to your judgment, thank heaven.

Mr. GREEN: There is another grave danger on the Pacific coast. Canadians on the Pacific are entitled to and insist on getting complete protection from treachery, protection from being stabbed in the back. The rest of Canada, under successive dominion governments, failed to listen to our representatives from British Columbia when they asked for an end to Japanese immigration. But now what British Columbia members for the last thirty-five years have been telling other members of the house would happen has come to pass, and the rest of Canada must do its part. It must now come to our help. I appeal to private members on the government side of the house to see that the ministry do come to our help in this matter. We have at least 24,000 of Japanese origin in our province, all in the coastal area—fishermen, men working in our woods in the lumbering industry, men farming on both sides of the great Fraser river valley, which means that they are astride both of our transcontinental lines. There has been treachery elsewhere from Japanese in this war, and we have no reason to hope that there will be none in British Columbia. If we were in a similar position, if we were Canadians in Japan, we might feel much the same; we would be only too willing to assist British troops should they attempt to land on the Japanese coast. The only complete protection we can have from this danger is to remove the Japanese population from the province. I believe that the commanders of the fighting forces on the coast and the special committee on the Japanese problem set up by this government have advised that at least all Japanese

males be removed from the coastal areas. The ministers will correct me if I am wrong. This government announced on January 14 that it would define certain areas as protected areas and move out from those areas Japanese nationals—not saying whether they would move out the Japanese born in our province or those who have become naturalized, and no man can get a fishing licence without taking out naturalization papers. But it has not yet been done, and British Columbia is waiting, waiting rather impatiently, to know whether this was just a stall, to know just what this government intends to do and when it intends to do it.

Mr. RALSTON: I may say to my hon. friend that the protected area has been defined. It is a matter for the concurrence of the Minister of National Defence and the Minister of Justice. I am satisfied that the submission to council has already been signed and that the protected area will be declared at once.

Mr. GREEN: May I ask the minister, what it is?

Mr. RALSTON: It is defined by a line hundreds of miles long. It is a matter for reference to a map.

Mr. GREEN: The whole policy on the Japanese question should be announced without further delay. We ask that we be given complete protection.

In conclusion, the situation as I have stated it is as I see it and, I believe, as it is seen by the great majority of the Canadians on the Pacific. I am in deadly earnest because I believe that this nation is in dire peril, and also because I believe that at this time, as never before, the members of this parliament hold in their hands the future of the Canadian people. In this dark and challenging time Canadians look to us here in the Canadian parliament. Let us rise to the occasion and give them the bold and far-seeing leadership to which they are so justly entitled.

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, the members of this house, are extremely fortunate to-night to have the privilege of hearing, not just one, but two members from British Columbia. I realize that some hon. members from the rest of Canada have long awaited this privilege; I have been looking forward to it myself. I did not know that I was to have the good fortune to follow the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green)—a good personal friend of mine, though we may disagree politically.

I want, for a few minutes, to discuss the war effort, particularly in so far as it concerns the conscription issue; the Japanese situation, of which I have heard a little during the last few minutes; and agriculture.

In days gone by, all of us used to hear of the famous "Four Hundred". Coming from a farm, I never had the privilege of living among them, but I have read a little about them in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* or some such paper. More recent interest is in the famous "Two Hundred". Most of the "Four Hundred," I have understood, wear diamonds; they are invited to the houses of the Vanderbilts and similar mansions. Now, having heard of the famous "Four Hundred", I wanted also to discover what I could of the "Two Hundred". One of the good things that the Dominion of Canada does is to provide a library in which one can get information concerning all the leading-lights of Canada and the world at large. I repaired to the library to get some information. I recommend to hon. members, or some of them, that they spend a little of their time enlarging their information, as I do. In the library there is a shelf of biographies of the great men of Canada, and of history, and I want to commend the librarian, whoever he may be, whether appointed by the last government or the present one, for his discerning talent in selecting books. The first book I found on the shelf was a life of Winston Churchill by Robert Sencourt. Nobody can find fault with that selection; Mr. Churchill is one of the greatest men that ever lived, one of the outstanding figures of this or any other generation. Then I found "Roosevelt, A Study in Fortune and Power". Can anybody name a man who has contributed more to the allied cause than Roosevelt? And no man has done more for the British empire in cementing the friendship between Roosevelt and Churchill than has Mackenzie King.

Naturally, being a modest and unassuming young man from the far west, I hesitate to tell you of the next book I found in the library on the shelf of lives of famous men. I hope that my hon. friend the member for Vancouver South is listening carefully. I will mention, first, the name of the author, Blanchard Jerrold. It is a little red book, well bound; its title, standing as the book does on that shelf of lives of famous men, is "George Cruikshank". Any hon. member may get this book, and I shall be happy to autograph a copy.

I shall not take up much time, on such a serious occasion as the present in congratulating the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne,

although I claim that I may have a greater knowledge of such speeches than many hon. members who are sitting in this present session. If the Speaker would permit me—I do not know whether I would be in order or not—I could divert now and give half of my speech in the Japanese language; let me say that if conditions in the west are allowed to continue as they have been going, everybody in British Columbia will, in a few years, be speaking Japanese.

I am very proud to say that my roommate is now serving overseas, and I have the privilege of looking after his riding as well as my own. I say I consider it a privilege, because he is where a good many men ought to be who are talking about conscription. Just this evening, while the hon. member for Vancouver South was speaking, I received a cable, which I will read to the house because it concerns two hon. members from British Columbia who are supporters of the present government, and I have full authority to speak on their behalf in this connection.

Mr. George Cruickshank, M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Met Alan Chambers in town and heard Churchill in parliament yesterday. Advise you join the army and come over.

James Sinclair, M.P.

I want to say to this committee of Two Hundred, "Join the army and go over; don't try to send others over."

As I said, I have heard something in connection with speeches made in the house by those who move and second addresses in reply to speeches from the throne. My roommate made his speech so often in my hearing that, before he was through, I could have repeated it in English, French, Japanese and Esperanto and done it better than he did, so far as being word perfect is concerned. One word which I heard frequently in that speech and which possibly some of my friends in the party to which I belong do not like particularly, was used by him with regard to the war effort of Canada—the word "complacency". He chose that word, and it echoed and re-echoed from one end of Canada to the other.

Let me assure the house in all seriousness that I support a great deal of what the hon. member for Vancouver South has said with reference to the Japanese situation in British Columbia. Let me make this statement, in fairness to myself and to those whom I represent—and I may say that I represent with the hon. member for New Westminster, 75 per cent of the Japanese population in British Columbia. We are not satisfied, and under our democratic system we have a right to say so in the houses of parliament. We are not satisfied with the action that has so far been taken in my riding, at least, with regard to the Japanese situation.

I would rather enjoy it if any member of this house or anyone else were to question my patriotism or loyalty; but much as I love my country, I love my family more. I live in the Fraser valley where we are surrounded by Japanese. I have read all about Pearl Harbour, and I can tell the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) what our views are out in that part of the country. I want to tell him emphatically what we think, and I say this with all respect to him; for with only one exception, so far as this House of Commons is concerned, that exception being the Prime Minister of this dominion (Mr. Mackenzie King), I revere the Minister of National Defence more than any one else. I say to him, however—and I am speaking my own opinion as a member from British Columbia, and one who should know something about the Japanese situation—that he has been ill-advised with respect to the situation in our province.

We cannot afford to wait; we cannot afford to take chances after Pearl Harbour. I wish to make my position clear, and it is my duty to do so. I was never consulted by the so-called committee—not the Department of National Defence, but the so-called committee, who know nothing about the Japanese situation in that province; nor was any other member from that province consulted. I regret the mistakes that have been made in that connection, and I have expressed my views on every platform on which I have spoken. I am not, however, worrying about mistakes made in the past so long as they are not repeated in the future. I want to warn the house and the Minister of National Defence—and I do so in all sincerity, irrespective of party—that there are no people living at present in the city of Ottawa who have any greater or more intimate or more thorough knowledge of the Japanese situation than is possessed by the members elected to parliament from that part of the country in which is to be found the "Japanese peril."

Let me pass on now to the subject of agriculture. I like to talk about that subject, because the only people who, I understand, have made any money in agriculture in the last few years are some of the farmers in Ontario. One of my hon. friends—I could call him by name, but I am not permitted to do so, and I have forgotten his riding—has a couple of race horses. I am ignorant about race horses; the only one I ever bet on came in last. I do

not know anything about that sort of farming, but I do know something about agriculture, British Columbia agriculture at least. It is true that we are not getting a better price for our agricultural products than we did get; it would be foolish to deny this. But I should like to refer hon. members to the Vancouver *Daily Province*, a representative British Columbia paper. On the day I left British Columbia, that journal carried fourteen advertisements under the caption "milker wanted", in each of which the pay was stated to be $55 to $65 a month and board.

I realize that many members of the house cannot know a great deal about farming. That is natural. As I say, however, there were fourteen advertisements for "milker wanted", paying from $55 to $65 a month. To digress for a moment, I may say that for the first time since I have been in Ottawa I approve of one of these officials that have been appointed. I refer to Mr. Gordon, a man who knows his business and is administering the price-fixing plans. He has the courage of his convictions, and it is only men of that type who should have such responsibilities.

When we were getting a certain price for milk we were paying from $20 to $25 a month for labour, and now we are paying $55 to $65 and board and cannot get labour. I want to keep my record clear on this question. I do not blame labour; it is not getting what it is entitled to. But labour will agree with me, I believe, when I say that the prices which were set, so far as agriculture is concerned, were not set on the same basis as in the case of labour. So far as labour is concerned, they were set in accordance with high prices; this was not so with regard to agriculture.

Let me point out to my hon. friends to the extreme left, for whom I have great admiration, that the greatest safeguard labour has in Canada, or in any other country for that matter—I hope the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) is present—is organized agriculture. That is the greatest safeguard that labour can fall back upon. You could not keep a union going to-morrow if you did not have agriculture to fall back upon, and it is in the interests of labour as much as it is in mine to see that agriculture gets a fair break. As my respected leader said, agriculture is as much an integral part of the war effort as tanks, guns, or anything else. Everyone, I believe, agrees with that; but you cannot carry on a true war effort until such time as you put agriculture on a sound basis. I repeat, you cannot establish a true war effort until you put agriculture on a parity with labour and industry, and no one can tell me that this has yet been done.

Let me quote a few head-lines from the Ottawa *Citizen:*

> Controlled price for butter urged by dairy farmers.

Here is another:

> Proper proportion of guns and butter held victory aid.

As you will see, I am leading up to conscription.

Here is one point to which I think the government should pay particular attention. I strongly disapprove of the policy of bonuses. I am not from Saskatchewan or Alberta or Manitoba or any of the desolate countries, and I strongly disapprove of the policy of bonuses. I want to quote a head-line that appeared in a prominent paper last night, and to repeat something I said in the first speech I made in this house. The greatest asset Canada will have to offer when we come to discuss peace terms is our vast store of food. I do not think we should curtail the production of wheat; I think we should encourage it. I would far rather see more wheat grown in Canada than more gold produced in Kirkland Lake, British Columbia or anywhere else. This is the head-line that appeared in last evening's *Citizen:*

> Bread Selling in Athens for $15 per Loaf.
> Famine conditions in Greece are so acute that two thousand persons died in Athens alone in a single day, and bread sells for $15 a loaf, the *Journal de Geneve* reported to-day.

I need not read the rest of the dispatch; but is it not reasonable to expect that food will have more to do with the peace terms, after this war is over, than guns, tanks or anything else? I am firmly of that opinion, and I believe it is nonsense to curtail the production of foodstuffs. I think the government should pay the prairie farmer an adequate return on a reasonable acreage for as much wheat as he can produce, and let him produce it.

For a moment I want to turn to conscription. You may call it a plebiscite or anything you like, but that is what it amounts to. I honestly consider myself a friend of every man and woman in this house; at least I should like to think I am. I do not claim that I am more patriotic than any other hon. member. I do not claim that the party to which I belong is any more patriotic than any other party. I think we are all sincere in what we do, and so I hope what I have to say in this regard will be taken in good part, because I do not wish to give offence to anyone. In this, however, I speak as a veteran of the last war, as a farmer and as a member of parliament. For good and sufficient reasons

many men were unable to serve in the last war; they were physically unfit, or something else prevented them from serving. But I must say—and in doing so I speak as a member of the Canadian Legion, and as a veteran accept full responsibility for what I am saying—that I think it ill-timed and ill-advised for any man to advocate, preach or talk conscription of the other fellow if he himself is under the age of sixty, if he did not serve in the last war, and has no son serving in this war. I am expressing my opinion, whether or not some people like it. I think it ill-advised for any man who is physically fit, of military age and not in uniform, to advocate that his neighbour's son be taken for this war. That is my opinion, and I stand by it. A great many of the men who have been talking about conscription know nothing about it. In the last war I served all the way from a private to a company commander; and I will take one volunteer in preference to any ten conscripts in any war. During my election campaign I said I believed, and I still firmly believe, that from the start we should have had compulsory selective service. It is the fairest way. But I want to repeat what I also said during the campaign, that it must be accompanied by the compulsory service of wealth and industry. That is what I said on every platform; that is what I still believe, and I speak as a returned soldier who is not afraid to go back to his riding at any time and face his electors. I believe in compulsory selective service from start to finish, but I believe that it must be accompanied by the conscription of wealth and industry.

I do not believe in red herrings, Mr. Speaker. I do not know where I heard it, but somewhere I heard that in some districts they can their lobsters and sell them, while in other districts they elect them. I am prepared to support any party that will come out with a legitimate proposition to help in winning this war; but when it is brought out as a red herring, as was the case with this famous committee of Two Hundred from Toronto, representing financial and vested interests, that is another matter. I will not say I am ashamed, but I am surprised that my good friends of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, whom I greatly admire, should even associate themselves with an amendment that will further such a dastardly attack on the democratic rights of the people of Canada.

Mr. COLDWELL: But we have not.

[Mr. Cruickshank.]

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Thank you; I am glad to hear that. I for one stand by my pledge, and will continue to stand by it. That pledge was given also by my leader and even by Doctor Manion, who said that before conscription for overseas service would be introduced, the people would be consulted. I am asking my friends in the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation to remember that. This government is doing the only honourable thing in asking to be relieved of the pledges it gave in good faith. You may question whether or not the pledges should have been given, but they were given. So I am asking my friends in the extreme left corner—not too extreme; half-way down—to get out and work for this plebiscite, as I intend to do, and to vote for it, as I intend to do. As a member supporting the government, I firmly believe that if we break our pledges, we lose all we are fighting for. Then, after we have been released of our pledge let my friends of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation ask me to vote with them for the conscription of wealth, industry and man-power.

It has been said of the Liberal party that we would not take other people into the government. I do not know how much time I have left, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps you could check up and let me have a few more minutes anyway.

I want to point out that we as a Liberal party have been criticized because we did not form a national government. That is all this committee-of-two-hundred smoke-screen is, with respect to national government. That is all Tory stuff. They think it should be a national government of a few mining interests, a few financial interests; that is all this smoke-screen of conscription is about. They have not the courage to come out, as did the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, and declare their stand. They are hiding behind the smoke-screen of conscription, and yet they ask us to bring in members of all parties, or members from outside the government, and persons outside the House of Commons.

Yesterday I listened to the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth), and I heard his objections with respect to the new Minister of Labour and the new Minister of Justice who are to be brought from outside the House of Commons. But it will be remembered that during the last two sessions hon. members in my hon. friend's party were demanding that we bring in the best brains of the country from without the house, or from anywhere. We all know that; they demanded it.

We now bring them in—and what do they do? They say, "Oh, you did not take them from your own little house around you." I may get around in time; maybe I should be over there on the government benches. But they blamed us when we did not take them from within, and when we have not taken them from without. What do they want us to do?

I want to say here and now that I have the greatest respect for the Conservative party, but I have not the slightest respect for the Tory party. Yes, I have great respect for the Conservative party. To be frank, I would not be here to-day if I had not had some friends in the Conservative and Cooperative Commonwealth Federation groups. I am willing to admit that. But I must point out that the Conservative party, when they asked us to form a national government did not have a man to offer. I would naturally assume that when they asked that, they wanted us to take a Conservative into the cabinet, but they frankly admit they had not one to give us. Yes, they admitted that they had not one to offer us, and they cannot deny it. I defy one of them to rise in his place and deny it. They had not one to offer us, I repeat, for the simple reason that they could not even get a leader among themselves. They had to go outside the party to get one. So, how could they give us one?

I want to tell hon. members—and I defy contradiction—that not a solitary Conservative western member voted voluntarily for Arthur Meighen to lead the party. He was not elected. I have had disputes with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), but I respect him. He is the leader of a great party, and he is a sincere man who was elected by the popular vote in his riding. He was chosen by the vote of his members to lead his party. But the new leader was not elected at all; he was appointed by George McCullagh, and a few others. We cannot get a member to come into this cabinet; and if we cannot get a prominent Conservative among the forty or so elected representatives in the House of Commons—and how so many people made that mistake in Canada, I cannot say—I want to ask: Where will we get a Conservative to come into this so-called national government, governed and directed by the *Financial Post* of Toronto and a man named McCullagh? Where would we get them? We cannot get a prominent Conservative across the Dominion of Canada to come in, because if he has not been elected, he is a dollar-a-year-man, or a prominent official in the Department of National Defence. Where are we going to get him, I would like to know—and I hope the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) is in his seat.

I still have confidence in the youth of Canada. I believe I have made myself clear on the matter of conscription; even the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation will agree that I have made myself clear. It is my opinion that we can get sufficient volunteers at the present time. If the time ever comes—and it may—when we have to enforce conscription, then, party or no party, it must be done. I am a Canadian and a Britisher first; party comes last, so far as I am concerned.

I do not believe it is necessary yet to enforce conscription, but I must point out that if voluntary enlistments have not been what they should have been, nothing is more to blame than the Department of National Defence. At the time of the last war we had what was known as the intelligence branch. In this war, in so far as my private opinion is concerned, we have what is sometimes called the recruiting branch. I call it the "stupidity branch," and that is the reason we have not more volunteers.

I should like to describe one case in the principal city of my constituency. This has reference to a young chap who earned a gold medal in his senior matriculation year at high school. He had the leading record in British Columbia, so far as graduation is concerned. This boy went to a Royal Canadian Air Force recruiting office. I must add, in passing—and I say this in all sincerity—that he was a Tory, I am sorry to say. I should have preferred him to be a Social Crediter, or something else. However, he was a Tory. Remember, I am not drawing on my imagination, because I could give the boy's name. He went to the recruiting officer appointed by the Department of National Defence—I am sure he must have been an officer appointed to keep them out. Do you know what he said? Well, he said, first of all, "Where are you from"? and the boy replied that he was from the farm. Well, God help the day when any son from a farm in Canada is not as worthy of consideration and respect as any other man—even if he may come from the city of Toronto. This recruiting officer said to the young man, "Oh, you do not want to join the Royal Canadian Air Force; you would not be at home in the officers' mess; look at your hands." That boy had earned his way through high school, even to the point of winning the gold medal, and yet he was told that he would not feel at home, because his

hands were rough. But that boy bombed Germany on several occasions, and after a raid over Berlin he is now missing.

There is great stupidity in the recruiting offices, and that is the reason why we have not more volunteers. Then, there is another constituency I happen to represent, during the absence of my roommate. I refer to the constituency of Vancouver North. The second largest shipyard in Canada is in that constituency, and it is operated by a man having millions of dollars. That man has three sons, two of whom are twins nineteen years of age. The other is twenty-one years old. This boy is missing somewhere over Germany. The other two boys are serving to-day in England in the Royal Air Force. Some stupid, ignorant representative of this select outfit—God knows who selected it—called up the mother of this lad who is missing. The father of this boy is quite a wealthy man and has been doing a marvellous job in his war work. This stupid, ignorant appointee of some official who has undermined the government and undermined the war effort called up this lady and said, "I am sorry to tell you, but you have not a God's chance of ever seeing your son again." Why did he want to tell her that? These are the stupid asses who are to be found in that building not far from here. If you are short of recruits, I could get enough to fill ten divisions from the Jackson building, the national defence building or the dollar-a-day men.

Mr. A. J. BROOKS (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) will excuse me if I do not try to follow the many arguments he has presented to-night. There is, however, one thing I must say. The speech you are going to hear now will not be half as good as the one you have just heard. Following two hon. members from British Columbia, the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), and the hon. member for Fraser Valley, I cannot help realizing, as I am sure all other hon. members do, the grave situation that exists on the western coast. I would, however, point out to these hon. members that we in eastern Canada have realized for the last two years that the situation was very serious. Perhaps it is the newness of the situation on the western coast that has impressed the hon. members so emphatically during the last few weeks or months.

I agree that the western coast is in danger and that every effort should be made to meet that danger. I am aware also that we have been in danger on the eastern coast for over two years and are still in grave danger. This simply emphasizes the fact that Canada is a great and large country, and I am sure that Canadians, whether they come from the east, from the middle or from the west, are interested in one thing only—the defence of Canada as a whole.

Any remarks which I make this evening will of necessity be quite brief. I have heard only a little of this debate because I have been here but a few hours since the session opened, having had other duties to perform during my short stay in Ottawa. I understand the mover, (Mr. Fournier, Hull) and the seconder, (Mr. Macdonald, Brantford City), of the address made eloquent speeches. It is just what I would expect from both of those hon. gentlemen because I have been with them in the house for the past six years, and I know they are able debaters. As to the substance of their remarks, there is naturally a great difference of opinion. From what I have heard I do not think I can agree with the substance of the remarks of either one of them.

I was surprised at the attitude taken by the hon. member for Brantford City. Brantford is one of the most patriotic cities in the dominion, and I do not believe his remarks represent the opinion of the people in that splendid city.

We have heard a great deal about the promises that were made in the election of 1940, and this will be the chief topic of my remarks this evening. I believe both the senior parties made a great mistake by stating as planks in their platforms that they were not in favour of conscription. If we had been honest with the people of Canada, as we should have been when a war was on, we would have told them that if conscription were necessary, we would be in favour of it. We find ourselves in our present position because we neglected to do that. In the light of present events it would have been both an honourable and a proper attitude for these two parties to take. Being wrong, then I contend that we only perpetuate the wrong by calling for a plebiscite. Two wrongs have never made a right, and I do not think any argument that can be presented now will make them right.

I saw a report of some remarks made the other day in Montreal by the premier of Quebec. He was addressing a mass meeting, and there was a clamorous cry against conscription. Young men who should be in khaki were clamouring against conscription to defend the country in which they live. The argument used by the premier of Quebec was that we should consider the position in which Australia finds herself to-day because she sent so many of her men out of the

country. A good many of those men were volunteers. The fact that a man volunteers for active service does not mean that he will be sent out of the country; it is up to the Department of National Defence to say whether he shall be sent out of the country. If he is needed in Canada, he remains here; if he is needed overseas, he is sent overseas. To say that because we have conscription all our men will be sent out of the country and will not be here to defend the country if needed, is not a logical argument. It is one which should not have been used before an intelligent audience by the premier of Quebec.

I agree with the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. White), who spoke yesterday and said that there was an implied promise on the part of the government. Sometimes an implied promise is stronger than a spoken one, and in this case there is no doubt which is the stronger. It is a more binding promise than anything that could be said in the heat of an election. Then there was a definite promise by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King)—all hon. members heard it—to the effect that we must wage a total war. What does total war mean? I would say it means that we must wage war to the limit of our resources, both material and man-power. I believe that is the definition which the Prime Minister himself would give.

The Prime Minister says that he wishes to keep a promise which he made in the heat of the election to the people of the Dominion of Canada. He went on to say that the condition in which the world finds itself to-day is due to broken promises. That is just one of the reasons, and, I would say, the least. The present-day condition of the world is not due entirely to broken promises. It is due to the fact that the democratic countries of the world ignored those broken promises of Germany and Italy. They knew that the enemy countries were arming but they made no effort to arm themselves or prepare in any way to meet the terrible crisis which is now upon us.

I am opposed to this plebiscite being held, and I have four reasons for opposing it. First, I think it is unnecessary and unfair. Second, I think the money being expended for this purpose should be used for other purposes where it would do more good. True, it may be only a matter of $3,000,000 or $4,000,000, but every dollar counts at the present time, and there is no reason why we should waste one dollar or three million dollars. Third, it is a waste of valuable time. If the Prime Minister intends to bring in compulsory service for overseas—I think it is fair to assume that he does because otherwise, why hold the plebiscite?—why should we waste three precious months? Now is the time to act, and time is very valuable to men who are being trained for our armed forces. Two or three months may make all the difference in the world, and on that count I say it is not fair or just that we hold a plebiscite at this time. My fourth reason is that to hold a plebiscite is shelving responsibility. We, the elected representatives of the people of this Dominion of Canada, if we have the intelligence we should have, are the ones who should decide this question, and here in this house is the place where the decision should be made.

Why do I say that this plebiscite is unnecessary? The reason is that I believe the people of this dominion would be behind the government if they declared that compulsory service overseas was necessary. We need only look at the press of this country from one end to the other. I believe that the press reflects the opinion of the people and that the people of this dominion to-day would be behind the government in imposing compulsory service on this country if it were necessary. Furthermore, the government knows the actual circumstances, and the people do not. We in this House of Commons do not altogether know the whole situation. But the government hear reports every day from every sector in which the war is being waged and know the facts. Let them tell the facts to this House of Commons, and then place the responsibility on the elected representatives of the people to decide what shall be done.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that a plebiscite is unfair. Why? Whom are we asking to decide this question? We are asking the mothers with sons of military age who would have to go overseas, mothers who do not know the actual facts. It is they whom we are asking to go to the polls to put their ballots tremblingly in the box to send their own sons away, and without knowing whether it is necessary or not. On that count I say a plebiscite is not fair. The same applies to the fathers of these young men, and to the sons themselves. But these young men, I believe, would willingly go if the great necessity for men for active service were pointed out to them.

As to recruiting, I am proud to say that I have good results in my own province of New Brunswick. About eighty per cent of the men who served under me have enlisted for active service. That is not true of every other section of this dominion. I do not know the facts, of course, relative to all the other

sections, but I do know that there are sections which have done wonderfully well, and other sections which have failed miserably so far as enlistments are concerned. I have had young men say to me, "If they want us and we are needed, why does the government not enact legislation to that effect?" After the thirty-day training period the young men of this country were compelled to go into the service for the duration of the war and I can say without fear of contradiction that very few of these young men, who were told they had to stay in the service for the duration, complained. I could count on my fingers the young men who went through my training camp and complained of having to stay in the service after taking the thirty days or four months training. Nearly all of them accepted the situation as a necessity, and I believe that if the government had told them that it was necessary for them to serve not only in Canada but in any other part of the world where their services were needed, they would just as gladly have accepted that fact as they did the other form of compulsion.

I have also had young men come to me and say that they were willing to enlist if they could first go home and consult their parents. I have had them come back to me after discussing the matter with their parents and tell me that they were sorry but they had to change their minds. These young men were humiliated and ashamed. But had their parents known that it was necessary for them to serve, these young men would have been spared that humiliation, and I am sure the parents would not have felt very badly about it either.

As I said a few moments ago, we are proud of our record in recruiting in the little province of New Brunswick. We have more than filled our quota on every occasion. That is also true of other sections. The little province of Prince Edward Island has a record of which it may justly be proud. I think most men have enlisted from a spirit of patriotism. I am quite satisfied of that. And may I point out to hon. members that in New Brunswick we have a mixed population? We have in the north our Acadians, of whom we are justly proud, and then we have in the south the descendants of the Loyalists, the Scotch, the Irish and the English. All these races in New Brunswick have been doing and are doing their share. The Acadians from the north have come to my camp in large numbers, splendid young men, as have men from every other section of the province.

There is another reason why possibly we have had more enlistments in my province, and this is not such a creditable one. We have not the war industries in New Brunswick that are to be found in other parts of Canada. I shall not take the time of the house to go into that to any extent, but I should like to give the following facts which were obtained in a study prepared for the Dalhousie University Bulletin on Public Affairs for the year 1940.

On a per capita basis, Munitions and Supply contracts to the end of 1940 amounted to $63 per person for Canada as a whole, but only to $19 for the maritimes. Conditions have changed somewhat for the better since then. Again, on the basis of $1,000 invested in industry, the figures show $205 for the dominion as a whole and $112 for the maritimes.

Government grants to industry for capital equipment have gone 42 per cent to Ontario, 41 per cent to Quebec, 10 per cent to the prairies, 4 per cent to British Columbia—since then that figure for British Columbia has greatly improved—and the remaining 3 per cent went to the maritimes, Nova Scotia getting 2.75 per cent, leaving New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island practically neglected. That may be another reason why the young men of our province have enlisted in larger numbers than men in other sections of Canada.

My own constituency of Royal has done well. Most of our farmers are dairymen and they find it very difficult to carry on at the present time on acount of the great number of young men, trained dairymen, who have left that part of the province.

Another great plea that was made by the Prime Minister was for national unity. It is hard for me to understand the conception of national unity in this dominion. I have not defined it for myself, and I do not propose to undertake to do so for others, but I would ask this question. Is it unity when many of our young men from one section of this dominion go and fight the battles of Canada and very few men come forward from some other section? I do not think that sort of thing tends towards unity. I do not think that is the sort of thing we may expect to find in a united country. I might also ask is it unity for all the sons to go from one particular family—and I know of families where practically all their young men have enlisted—and to have other families with four or five sons not one of whom has volunteered? That sort of thing does not tend towards unity in a community nor, when multiplied to a great extent, does it tend towards unity throughout the nation. Will it make for unity in Canada when this war is over, for thousands of our men who have fought overseas to return and

meet the thousands of young men who were on home service and home defence? There will be a barrier raised between those two groups, and I foresee much discord and disunity so far as the young men of this country are concerned.

We talk of equality of sacrifice. I have mentioned the young men from New Brunswick serving in the army, alongside, of course, men from other parts of the dominion, and getting their $1.30 a day. But one can go through towns and cities and see thousands of young men, after working hours, parading the streets in their best clothes. Those young men are working in the factories and getting $5 to $6 a day. I contend that it is unfair that young men from one section of the dominion have to fight Canada's battles for $1.30 a day, while thousands of others, taking no such risk, are receiving four times as much for working in factories. Such conditions do not make for unity. It may be asked, what can be done about it? Well, we might arrange, if there are no industries which can be established in the smaller and outlying districts of the dominion, to take the men to the industries. Bring the men from New Brunswick to Quebec and Ontario; they would be willing and glad to help in industrial work; and let Quebec, Ontario and other provinces supply their due proportion so far as service for overseas is concerned.

We have heard Abraham Lincoln quoted in this house during the present debate. I happened to see not long ago a statement regarding conditions during the civil war in the United States from 1861 to 1865. This question of compulsory service is not new; it is as old as history. The issue has been fought in parliaments for a great many years in many countries. Lincoln, in the United States, had his own troubles. At the time to which I refer, in 1863, they had the voluntary system, and it was not working well. The war which broke out in 1861 had so far resulted in an almost unbroken string of victories for the Confederate army. Early in the war the southern armies had pushed within thirty miles of Washington. The Union army was in a chaotic condition. Generals quarrelled; armies fought like undisciplined mobs; there was every indication that the Union would fail. Up to that time the Union had depended upon the voluntary system. In some states the militia would not even go outside the boundaries of their own state, and men were called up for service for only six months. As I have said, the situation was chaotic. Lincoln, in speaking about the voluntary system at that time used these words; whether they are appropriate to conditions at this time is for us to judge:

> Voluntarism is the unprincipled dodge of cowardly politicians. It has ground up the choicest seed corn of the nation. It has consumed the young, the generous, the patriotic, the intelligent and the brave. It has wasted the best moral, social and political elements of the republic, and left the cowards, the shirkers and the money-makers to stay at home and propagate their kind.

That statement, I say, may be worthy of consideration by the members of this house.

A few weeks ago we had the honour of listening in this chamber to the Abraham Lincoln of the present day. I believe hon. members all know to whom I refer. We heard Mr. Churchill say at that time:

> If anybody likes to play rough we can play rough too. Hitler and his nazi gang have sown the wind; let them reap the whirlwind. Neither the length of the struggle nor any form of severity which it may assume shall make us weary or shall make us quit. . . .

Of "the broader world which lies beyond," he said:

> We have to win that world for our children. We have to win it by our sacrifices.

He did not tell us then that it would be easy. He is not telling his people to-day that the road is easy. What is happening in England? What happened in England to-day? When Churchill came before the British House of Commons for a vote of confidence, the vote stood 464 to 1—practically unanimous. Why? Because Churchill makes and leads public opinion in that country. It was a magnificent tribute to a great leader and a great statesman, a man who tells his people what is needed and sees that those needs are carried out, as far as is possible for him to do so. He offers no apologies or excuses. He said to them, "I make no promises". I commend that to the people of this dominion and to the members of this house. We make too many promises. If we had not made promises which we could not fulfil, we would not have been in the position in which we are to-day. A wise man is Mr. Churchill. He makes no promises, and he holds no plebiscite in his country during war time to find out whether he should be relieved of those promises to satisfy new conditions. He told us, as I said a moment ago, that the road was not an easy one. He assured us it would be hard. He told us also:

> We cannot for a moment afford to relax. On the contrary, we must drive ourselves forward with unrelenting zeal. In this strange, terrible world war there is a place for everyone, man and woman, old and young, hale and halt. Service in a thousand forms is open.

And he reminded us:

There is no room now for the dilettante, for the weakling, for the shirker or the sluggard.

Man-power is needed in this country. We have no less an authority for that statement than the adjutant-general in the Department of National Defence. He told us not long ago, and I believe what he said is correct, that man-power is the only power which will defeat Hitler. Let us, then, not be shirkers. If man-power is needed, if it is needed now, let us of this House of Commons not shirk our responsibility. Let us stand up and vote for conscription if it is necessary, and not throw the responsibility upon women and men and boys of this country who do not know the facts. I ask hon. members that when the amendment of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) comes before this house, they give it their full support.

Mr. G. H. CASTLEDEN (Yorkton): Mr. Speaker, these are dark days for Canada and for our empire. The history of this war so far has been such as to create gloom, yet also to arouse many people from apathy and cause them to search and question among themselves, what is it that is wrong? To-day Singapore is in imminent danger. It is one of the last barriers in the far east; if it falls, Australia and New Zealand will be in grave peril. I hope that a message has gone forward to the people of the sister dominions telling them that while Canadians still live, they will never permit the heel of nazism or the Japanese tyranny to reign over those parts of our empire.

It is my intention to use the time allotted to me to deal with an element of total war which, in my opinion, has been sadly neglected by those who are directing our effort. I speak of morale. In any effort the first requirement is vision. It appears to me that those responsible for Canada's total war effort have lacked sufficient vision to see the importance of morale. It is too essential an element in total war to be disregarded. Apparently they do not understand that ideals and ideas are of the importance that they are and that, if we are to succeed, they go along with the tanks and troops. Hitler's highly organized forces were led on by brutal ideals and perverted ideas; but, brutal and perverted as they are, they led a desperate people forward in the factory, in the troops and on the farms. In Russia to-day the people are fighting for their homes and their lives, for an economic system in which they believe, a system for the people of Russia. Those people in Russia have gained economic democracy; they have yet to gain political democracy. To those people no sacrifice is too great. They will burn down their homes and their crops; they will destroy their dams and their industries in those areas where they might fall into the hands of their enemies. It is the morale of those people which is saving the democratic way of life to-day, and has been saving it for months. The Russian front news is the most hopeful that we have had during the past dark days from any part of the war front.

In Canada we have a form of political democracy, but we yet have to gain economic democracy. We in Canada do not need to be told what we are fighting against; what we do want to know is what kind of life we are fighting for. "V" for victory! Yes, but victory for what kind of life and what kind of reorganized Canada? We hear people in all parts of Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, saying, "Well, things will be different after the war." I am sure every hon. member here has heard that. Then let us get a vision of what things will be like after the war. Of course, I know there are some who say that we have not time for that now. But we must have time for it. We must give our people some hope of a vision for the future. That is what is necessary in order to get our people, as they do in Russia, to go out for total war. What they want to see in Canada is action which will give equality of sacrifice, if such a thing is possible in Canada to-day.

The vision that this government should give is a vision of a better life. When that vision and that morale are supplied, Canadians' contributions will be doubled. If that vision had been given by this government for the past two years, there would be no need for a plebiscite. No one suggests, in talking about a reorganized Canada, that we are going to ask the boys who crawled out of box-cars and out of the jungles and who went into the forces, to get back into those box-cars and jungles when the war is over. No one suggests that the million people or more who were on relief in 1938 and 1939 are going to be sent back on relief when this battle is won.

What is this government telling the people of Canada? What assurance is it giving those boys who have come out of the box-cars as to what is going to happen in Canada? This government has shown itself fearful of great ideals and new ideas. It is apparently afraid to present the people with a vision, which it should have done long ago. The spirit of Canada is great, but this government should give a vision which will arouse that spirit. The men and women who came to this country in the early days travelled in their carts and wagons and faced fearlessly and boldly the difficulties of forest fires in the east and prairie fires and blizzards in the west. In that way

a great nation was developed. These elements were fought, and the people suffered and worked and planned—why? Because they had a future. They had a vision of bright things to come. That is what is needed to-day.

Our people throughout the country feel to-day that they are being driven down a blind alley in darkness instead of being led out with a clear light ahead of them shining on a reorganized and reconstructed Canada worthy of the sacrifices that are being demanded and are being made. Morale is needed in every phase of our war effort: in our army, navy and air force; by the workers in our factories, in our mines and on our farms. Why this murmuring from agriculture? Mr. Speaker, the back-bone of any nation is the great mass of common workers and toilers, the people in the factories and on the farms, the people in the lumber camps and in the mines, the fishermen on the sea, the toilers who produce goods and wealth. These are the back-bone and being of any nation; and when the nation fails these men who supply the troops in time of war, it is failing the men who take the steel. The nation which forgets and neglects these people is failing deeply and inwardly. It failed them in time of peace, and it is failing them in time of war.

According to the statement given by the department, 260,000 men of Canada have offered on the altar of national sacrifice their lives, their blood, everything they hold dear. I want to know whether one thousand industries have volunteered even to lend their factories for the duration of the war. We do not ask that these factories be completely destroyed, but can any sacrifice equal that of a mother who gives her son? Why on earth cannot one big industry; why cannot all the industries of Canada, place their buildings, organization, managerial ability on the self-same altar of sacrifice on which 260,000 men of Canada have offered to place their lives and everything they have? We are not forgetting that industry in this country refused to touch contracts even when a profit of 5 per cent was offered to them. Canadian industry is turning out great quantities of materials these days at its own price. There is unfortunately too much evidence to show that too many people in this dominion look upon war as a harvest time, the time when they feel they are legitimately entitled to amass great wealth and property for themselves. With their usual callous inhumanity and disregard for moral obligations, they fail to see that the harvest they are reaping is a crop grown on soil which is fertilized with the blood of their fellow men.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Can the hon. member name any of those men? Name one.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: One what?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): One man reaping any benefits.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Any coupon-clipper who to-day reaps profits out of this war; those who demanded their profits in time of national crisis. They endanger everything that is worth while in our domocratic way of life. With everything we have we oppose such an outlook and such a philosophy as dangerous in a time like this. We are opposing that philosophy in the constituency of York South to-day. Perhaps the attitude of industry can be no better revealed than in a speech made on December 6, 1940, by the new leader of the Conservative party, speaking in another place. I quote what was said by Right Hon. Mr. Meighen, speaking on the War Exchange Conservation Act, as reported at page 62 of the Senate debates:

> I have no sympathy for those who would tax profits at one hundred per cent. People will not work for nothing. Human nature is the same in war time as in peace, and instead of helping the war effort you are defeating it by stripping people of the stimulus to toil and run their business right. Leave the incentive, and make the reward greater the greater the toil and the greater the success. You have to do that. You do not do it under this bill. I do not exaggerate at all when I say that I have had business men by the dozen tell me that they are leaning on their oars; they have nothing to work for.

A lot of work they do!

> They say: "We might just as well take it a little easier now, for we are only working for taxes anyway." You will get that result in any case if you take away all incentive to work. But leave the incentive and let it grow as profits increase, and increase taxes as profits increase. There is no other way I know of to get results.

Mr. POULIOT: Did he go as far as that?

Mr. CASTLEDEN: These are his words, from the Senate *Hansard* of December 6, 1940.

Mr. POULIOT: It is awful.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: It is a sad commentary on the national life of this country that in the hour of need, business men by the dozen should be resting on their oars, with our men at Hong Kong needing equipment that was not there. Have we Quislings among the industrialists of Canada? Then the Toronto *Daily Star* of yesterday, January 28, quotes Right Hon. Mr. Meighen as having said :

> If we have to conscript wealth to win the war we will, but people of common sense don't advocate that until the last gasp.

This man is particularly anxious to conscript the man-power of this nation now, but he says that wealth must be conscripted only as a last resort. Blood should go now; wealth only at the last! In effect he says, "People, give your sons that we may keep our gold." May the people of York South do a service to the common mass of the people of Canada by sending here a representative who will work and strive along with those who say—and I quote from our amendment—"place the war industries, accumulated wealth and the financial institutions of Canada at the same time and on the same basis of sacrifice as the suggested extension of conscription of man-power."

That is the policy the people of Canada want, and this adminstration ought to know it. I do not think a plebiscite is necessary; but if this administration is anxious to know what the people from one end of Canada to the other want, I challenge it to place upon the plebiscite a question in the terms of the amendment to the amendment: "Do you want industry, the war industries, the accumulated wealth and the financial institutions of Canada placed at the same time and on the same basis of sacrifice as the suggested extension of conscription of man-power?" This administration has passed more orders in council in less time, with parliament sitting, than any other government in the history of Canada. Now it goes to the people with a plebiscite and asks for an expression of opinion merely on the conscription of man-power. People are having their lives restricted by these orders in council in a way they scarcely dreamed of a short time ago. The cost of living is frozen; wages are frozen at a lower level, and agricultural products are frozen at a still lower level. The cost of production on the farm continues to increase, but the value the farmer will get for his products is frozen. What is happening is this: you are freezing servitude on labour and peasantry on the farmer. Sons are being taken from the farms; mortgage and loan companies are foreclosing and driving the parents off the land.

On February 1 a delegation will arrive in this city from the west, to protest even in these times of strife, against this treatment. These people do not ask for profits; they merely ask that they be allowed to continue to work their farms and produce the foodstuffs so urgently needed both now and for the period of reconstruction. Britain is severely rationed to-day. Our Department of Agriculture says, "Grow less wheat and help win the war." Food is going to be needed as it has never been needed before. Those engaged in agriculture in Canada wish to make their contribution. They wish to be allowed to continue to make their sacrifice and do their bit to help save Canada.

In the west, as in other parts of Canada, the people turned to cooperatives as a means of protecting themselves against exploitation by the privileged who were stealing the substance of their production. They found that the banking institutions and the loan, mortgage and insurance companies were bleeding them white. The packing companies amassed their millions out of the unprotected producer and unorganized consumer. Implement and oil companies continued to charge what they wished. The grain exchange continued to steal its millions, yes, hundreds of millions from the producers. So the people organized themselves cooperatively.

In Saskatchewan the cooperative pool elevator company own over a thousand elevators which they use to handle their own grain, and they reached the point where they were handling almost fifty per cent of the grain produced in that province. But what happened? For two crop delivery seasons the car allotment committee, set up under the government grain board, effectively forced the producers to use the old line elevator companies and deliver their wheat to those companies and, through them, to the grain exchange. No cars could be obtained by the pool elevators beyond the allotment, which was based on the permanent storage capacity. To meet this regulation, the pools built temporary storage. This took them through 1940 fairly well, and they were planning to do the same thing for 1941; but the building of temporary storage, which had saved the pools the year before fairly well, was stopped by order of the lumber controller, and the cooperative organization was crippled. In many places it had to close its doors for months during the delivery season. Tens of millions of bushels of wheat were thus directed through the old private and corporate business institutions, and through their channels to the grain exchange. Government agencies of this administration directly or indirectly effectively prevented the cooperative institutions from operating.

The people of Canada resent this deeply. Special privileged groups in the economic life of Canada have kept on exploiting the resources of this dominion to the point where the situation can no longer be tolerated. The people of Canada will not permit their cooperative institutions to be ruined in this way —and that goes for all of Canada. It goes for the Okanagan apple growers in British Columbia, for the western wheat farmers,

for those who produce the cattle and beef, for those who provide materials and food stuff. It goes for the cooperatives in Ontario and Quebec; it goes for the cooperatives in Nova Scotia and the other maritime provinces.

This delegation of over 400 people coming here under the organization of the Saskatchewan wheat pools are coming to protest against the treatment of agriculture, and particularly against the treatment of western grain growers. Farmers across Canada have not been sufficiently well organized to make effective protest, and certain forces for years have been working to keep them from organizing. People do not come down here in war time for pleasure; they are not coming here to cause trouble. These are patriotic Canadians of good character. They are people who have fought and suffered, people who have helped build Canada. They are protesting against the treatment of agriculture, and they would not come here if conditions were not desperate. Those conditions are desperate. This administration has turned a deaf ear to the voices of these people, or those who spoke for them. One after another, ministers of agriculture in this house have betrayed the people of the west, and far too often have broken their pledges. Saskatchewan is withering and dying on account of the failure of this government to provide adequate legislation to protect the people of Saskatchewan.

Recent figures from the bureau of statistics show that the population of that province is decreasing from year to year. People just cannot exist out there. They are driven away from their province; they are driven off their homes. They are driven off the farms on which they have lived for possibly twenty or thirty years. This is the reward meted out by the administration to a people who have produced by billions the wealth of this dominion. They are a betrayed people.

This delegation coming to Ottawa is a living symbol in protest of that betrayal. People and homes are more important than profits. That should have been recognized in peace time; it should be recognized more fully in war time. Mothers' sons are more important than profits, and that should be recognized now. That delegation is coming here to speak for the masses in agriculture; it is marching here with a bill of rights; the government cannot disregard them. This is a demand for justice, and they are bringing it to the foot of the throne. That demand is coming from about two million people. Donations of dimes and quarters, a few dozen eggs, a few pounds of butter, or a chicken were made. And 160,000 or more people have signed their names to a petition of protest to the government. I would suggest that the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar), who was associated with the grain growers institutions for some years, might explain to them the great battle which is being fought for them. I wish Mr. Dunning were here to speak to them, and I would be pleased if the ex-Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Motherwell, could do so. I hope the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) in the present government will hear these people, and the justice of their cause. They come asking for bread.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): They will get a stone.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: To return to the problem of reconstruction. During November I had the privilege of visiting an area in Canada where men of vision are providing leadership in a real way. I refer to that small university known as St. Francis Xavier in Antigonish, Nova Scotia. Through its extension department it has taken education to the masses of the people. When education went to the people light dawned and fear disappeared. They caught the vision of a better land; they learned that they could run their own institutions. Miners and fishermen, farmers and steel workers are running their own businesses, doing their own financing, operating their own packing plants, and in a cooperative way building their own houses. They have consumers' cooperatives, producers' cooperatives and wholesale cooperatives. For the first time they are learning the meaning of the word "exploitation." They are learning what is wrong with the plight of the common man, and how the fruit of his labour is stolen from him.

These people have learned about a system which has displaced profits as a motivating force. Cooperation must displace competition as a way of life. Service for one's fellow man is more efficient as a motive than profits for the few. Cooperation creates character, whereas competition destroys it. Cooperation builds the character of those who work with it, but competition born of the jungle, ruins, with poverty and slums, the exploited toilers and with corruption of too much wealth, those who steal from the workers.

Cooperation has created a vision of a society where economic security can reign, and with it democracy can live. Those people, marching forward, have a vision of a world in which Canada can make its contribution, a world where profit shall cease. Peace will be possible, because some day the profits of war will be eliminated. And when the profits of war are eliminated throughout the world, that curse which now returns to us every twenty years will cease.

To get the necessary morale established in Canada I would ask the government to do a few things. Immediately it should establish courageously and boldly some equality of sacrifice. It should start now with the conscription of industry and accumulated wealth. Then it would have some right to ask mothers to place their sons on the altar of national sacrifice. Place agriculture on a basis where it can play its part. Give to labour that degree of democracy it should have. Give Canada a vision of a reconstructed land where social justice shall reign, and economic security shall drive fear from the hearts of our people. This will give us the morale for victory which, I say, does not exist to-day.

Mr. G. RUSSELL BOUCHER (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak at this time may I be permitted to join those who have previously spoken in paying my compliments to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

We are going through momentous days; we are facing grave problems, we are almost at the turn of the way. I should like to read an excerpt from page 45 of *Hansard* of last Monday with respect to the war effort. It is:

> These demands will intimately affect the lives of many men and women. They will also effect the life of the nation in the following way: there will be a further very definite curtailment of the amenities we have hitherto been able to preserve. These demands will not affect physical health or that contentment of spirit that comes from serving great causes, but they will make further inroads upon the comfort and convenience of very large numbers, and upon the character and aspect of our daily life.
>
> It must not be supposed that there are large reserves of idle people leading a leisurely existence who can now be called to the national ranks. The entire adult Canadian population, with very few exceptions, gets up in the morning, works all day, and goes to bed tired out at night. In our form of society people have been accustomed to find their own jobs to a very large extent, thus saving vast government machinery.
>
> If all the efforts of everyone were really devoted solely to making war, there would be no food, or fuel, no transport, or clothes. We have to recognize the fact that a very large proportion of the population, particularly women, is occupied in ministering to the needs of the more actively engaged population, and that that number has increased since the last war with the increase of population who have to be ministered to.
>
> The process which is now to be applied—and has, indeed, been continuously applied—much more vigorously, is not the calling of idle people to work, but the sharpening and shifting forward of a proportion of their effort into work which is more directly related to the war.

Those are the words of the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King) repeating the words of the Right Hon. Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of England. I commend them to this parliament. The morale of the public of Canada was referred to by the previous speaker, and this feeling is echoed through this chamber and throughout the length and breadth of Canada. How many of the amenities of life has this government asked the Canadian people to forego in order that we may have a national all-out war effort? How many inroads have been made into the comforts and expenditures of our people? What has been done to take up the reserves of idle people? Since coming into this house this session, we have heard hon. members from western Canada say that unemployment is still plentiful in that part of the country, and then we have heard hon. members from eastern Canada, particularly from agricultural constituencies, tell us of the need for farm labour. But we have not heard any policy announced by this government to cope with the situation. The service rendered by the women of Canada in administering to the needs of the unfortunate, in caring for the sick and wounded of our fighting forces, is well worthy of the Canadian morale. The war effort of these women has been performed valiantly and with a devotion to duty. As Mr. Churchill said, the process which is now being applied is to be more vigorously applied.

A number of our members have been overseas, and they have come back and told us of what they saw. We have heard of the shortage of agricultural products, of those things of which we have such a surplus. How much of this has been brought home to the Canadian people? What has been done to make the Canadian citizen sensitive to his or her responsibilities? What has been done to increase the cooperation between our citizens and those who are fighting to stem the tide of war away from our continent?

In the speech from the throne we are told that it is now proposed that a plebiscite shall be taken to grant pardon or absolution to the Prime Minister and to the government for promises made before the last election. A lot of water has flown under the mill since the last election. Times have changed since then. What will be the morale of the Canadian people; what will be the condition in Canada when this vote is taken? If this plebiscite is taken, it will probably be around the first of April, although the date has not yet been announced. Do we know what the state of the world will be by April 1? Do we know what will have happened in Singapore by that date? In what condition will Australia be by April 1? What about New Zealand and the Philippines? What will Hitler and his hordes be doing in Asia and Africa? What

will our kinsmen in England, Ireland and Scotland be doing? They are now facing a dire situation. The German and Italian hordes will probably be attempting an invasion of their country. In what mood will the people of Canada be to vote upon a plebiscite to release the Prime Minister, to grant absolution for a wrong? Obviously it was a wrong commitment.

If that commitment was not wrong, why this plebiscite? The Prime Minister has stated that the one point at issue in the plebiscite is the question of compulsory military service for overseas. If compulsory service for overseas is not necessary now, why the plebiscite? If compulsory service for overseas is necessary, when will the relief from that restriction be brought into effect and we in Canada be given an opportunity to do our whole part in this war? As I say, this plebiscite cannot be taken until on in April. The soldier is entitled to vote. How long will it be before a complete record of the plebiscite reaches Ottawa?

Assuming that the plebiscite is one hundred per cent satisfactory to the Prime Minister and his government, how long will it take them to put the machinery of compulsory service overseas into operation? Will he put it into operation? How long will it be before the men will be ready to commence training? How long will it take to make a soldier capable of serving overseas? When we look at things from that perspective, and consider that length of time, we can only come to the conclusion that it will be into next winter before we shall have results. Anything can happen between now and then.

What is this plebiscite? The Prime Minister has stated to the house, as reported at page 51 of *Hansard*, that the plebiscite is going to be worded thus:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

His statement to this house was that such was the bone of contention. Is the plebiscite being placed before the Canadian people to ask them if they are in favour of sending men by compulsory selection overseas? Is that what this plebiscite states? Why does he not ask parliament, and not the people, is it in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men? The plebiscite states "for military service." It does not say "overseas service". What is the answer to that question? Is it not asking this question: Are you willing to exonerate the Prime Minister and the government from any commitments they ever made in any manner with respect to sending men into the military forces?

The people of Canada are to be asked that question at one of the most critical times that you and I, Mr. Speaker, or any other member of this house could conceive of. If that plebiscite is necessary, if any pardon is necessary, we have here in this House of Commons 245 members elected, with great responsibility, to do a terrific task and to represent the people who sent us to parliament.

What are the duties of the private member of this house? They are certainly not to formulate policy. Our task, to judge by the past performance of this administration, is not to pass legislation, because we sat here for thirteen days in November without any legislation before us. The principal policy announced in the speech from the throne this session is that the country be asked to forgive the government for its past commitments with respect to raising men. We had the price-ceiling legislation passed a few days before parliament was called into session and we have orders in council passed every day whether parliament is sitting or not. What better authority can I quote than the Prime Minister himself for my statement that parliament should decide this question? I shall quote passages from statements made by the Prime Minister as far back as March 30, 1939, when speaking in this house he said, as reported at page 2612 of *Hansard:*

> If Canada is faced by the necessity of making a decision on the most serious and momentous issue that can face a nation, whether or not to take part in war, the principle of responsible government which has been our guide and our goal for a century past, demands that that decision be made by the parliament of Canada.

Again, from the same page:

> Whether it has been in reference to the application of sanctions under Article 16 of the covenant of the league or to participation in wars apart altogether from the league, Canada's position has been the same, namely, that in either case the approval of parliament will be required.

Again!

> The Canadian parliament reserves to itself the right to declare, in the light of the circumstances existing at the time, to what extent, if at all, Canada will participate in conflicts in which other members of the commonwealth may be engaged.

Again the Prime Minister comes back with the same thing on the same day, as reported at page 2618 of *Hansard:*

> My immediate purpose in quoting the statement, as will be apparent from the context, was to emphasize the continuity of Liberal policy as regards parliamentary control, the view which was held then and which we as a

government hold to-day, that in the great as in the small issues of a nation's policy, the policy of self-government which we have followed for a century makes it essential that parliament and no other body should decide.

Yet the policy for a century must now be discarded and this question referred to the people of Canada!

Again, as reported at page 48 of *Hansard* of Monday last the Prime Minister said:

If the issue of conscription for service overseas is to be fought out, the place for it to be fought out is on the floor of this parliament.

Again, as reported at page 49 he said:

In a world situation so involved, with enemies on every front, with no one able to say what the outcome of battle in other parts of the world may bring of immediate and increased danger to our own land, the government feels strongly that it should be perfectly free to recommend to parliament whatever course of action it deems essential to the security of our own country, and to the preservation of freedom in our own and other lands.

I quote these passages to show that in this parliament some responsibility must be assumed by the members, some questions of national import must be dealt with, some duties must be performed. Is it not our duty to deal with the question raised in this plebiscite? But instead we have a plebiscite by which the people are asked to decide.

What is the purpose of the plebiscite in any event? What would happen if the plebiscite were answered in the negative? Will the government stop raising men? Will it stop using compulsion to raise them? Will it stop using the selective system? Will it go to the enemy and ask forgiveness, saying: "We meant to declare war, but we did not mean to raise men to fight that war." What would happen if some sections of our country vote overwhelmingly "yes", and some other sections overwhelmingly "no"? Will the government still claim to be the champion of national unity? Will the government still feel that to preserve national unity they must take no course at all lest they offend either the yeas or the nays? Why does not the Prime Minister in his plebiscite put this further question to the Canadian people: Are you in favour of the plebiscite being taken at all at this time? If he wants to interpret the plebiscite as an endorsation of his policy and as approval of his administration, what better question could he ask? If the Prime Minister has any doubt as to whether the people of Canada will release him from his pledges—and he does not seem to have any—why not find out from their elected representatives in this parliament whose duty it is to reflect the opinions of the people, and let us get on with the war? Possibly the answer should be the formation of a government under a man who is not manacled or handicapped by his previous commitments. What was his answer to that? I hesitate to repeat what I interpret it to be. As reported at page 51 of *Hansard,* in dealing with that very question he said:

In other words, I am being asked to "sell my birthright for their mess of pottage", and to destroy whatever confidence the people of Canada may possess in my honour as a public man, and, in doing so, also to destroy the confidence the people possess in the honour and integrity of the government.

Are we still in the days of the Tudor kings, of the Jameses, and of the policy of the divine right of kings, or has it just come down to the divine right of King?

Apart, however, from the wisdom, the folly or the blunder of a plebiscite at this time, I should like to express what I take to be the opinion of the agriculturists in my riding. The farmers of my riding are to a large extent men operating farms of from 100 to 400 acres. Their pursuits are the dairying industry, the hog industry, the beef industry, and egg production. Like most farmers, for the last ten or fifteen years they have gone through very difficult times. Many of the farms have been left idle. Within the last few years, conditions, through the increased demands for their supplies, and through federal and provincial government subsidies of one kind or another, have greatly improved. They have not sufficiently improved, however, to attract to the farms the help which is required, or to keep on the farms the men who are already there. Go through the rural centres in eastern Ontario and look for young people, and you will find that many of our rural centres are like Goldsmith's deserted village. School attendance has greatly decreased from what it has been at any time within the past twenty years. Aggravating this condition is the policy of calling to the armed forces farmers' sons and farm help upon short notice. Repeatedly and almost constantly I have found agricultural workers being called for military training and given ten days to apply for postponement when seven or eight of the ten days have already elapsed before the notice is received. It is annoying and, I say, alarming to see how many boys are being called for military service when they are the sole persons running the farm or the main help on that farm, and are totally indispensable to the production of milk, cheese, beef, bacon and eggs.

When national registration was taken, information was given to the military authorities and to the government to indicate what

men were available with least impairment of our war effort. The Prime Minister has himself stated that agriculture is a very essential part of our war effort. Something will have to be done to provide labour in view of the increasing demand for food, involving greater production. If that is the situation, and if this information has been made available through national registration, why should men have been called up who are the only help on the farm and where they are essential to necessary agricultural production? Truly, postponements can be granted. To my own knowledge many have been granted. But any man who appreciates the problems of the farmer will realize the difficulties of putting in a crop, of growing the produce required, without some assurance as to the help which will be obtainable for reaping it. The farmer must plant his crop from the viewpoint of the available help, not at present, but six months, a year, or even two years ahead. Many farmers to-day, even within twenty miles of this capital city, are being compelled to reduce their stock, and even to quit their occupation, on account of shortage of help. I believe that this essential part of our farm problem, coupled with our war problems, should long before now have been taken into consideration by parliament. A broad and comprehensive scheme of calling men to military service in some order, with some certainty, should have been placed before our people. It may not be possible under such a scheme to state just when a certain man is going to be called, but the order in which men are to be called in relation to their occupations should be announced. I believe it is the policy of the government to call up men in accordance with age and marital status. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the occupation of a man in civilian life is an important factor. If a man is engaged in a productive capacity in an essential war industry, that point should be taken into consideration, and he should have some certainty as to the necessity of his appearing for military training, and as to those who should appear before he does.

Any man who has knowledge of the agricultural industry—and there are few here who have not—will realize the amount of foresight and planning required to produce the products which are so essential to our requirements, and how difficult it will be, under the present policy of this government, for a farmer owning anywhere from 20 to 160 head of cattle, as is the case with many in my riding, to operate his farm if his son or his hired man is called for military service, given ten days to apply for postponement, and does not know until, perhaps, two or three days before the time for reporting, whether he is to report or whether the postponement is granted. What is the farmer to do if postponement is not granted, when help cannot be had? If postponement is granted, it is to the first of April, the first of May, or the first of July—right at the busiest time. No wonder agriculturists are very much discontented; no wonder our production is not what it should be, when consideration in such matters as this is not given to our agriculturists. Remembering that we are in the third year of the war, I believe the time is long past when a broad and comprehensive scheme of calling men to the service should be placed before the country. If the time when certain individuals are likely to be called to service cannot be announced, the order in which men are to be called in relation to their occupation should be made known. The age group and the marital status should not be the only order of calling.

I believe that for a total war effort there is plenty of work within the confines of the army, the navy and the air force for men of almost every possible classification of health and physical condition, and in my opinion these matters should long before now have been taken into consideration and placed before the people. Lack of information along this line has caused a great deal of dissatisfaction among our people, who are anxious to have some guidance in these matters. If it is necessary to prepare for the shortage of sugar, as announced in to-day's papers, or for the shortage of gasoline, which has been talked about for three or four months in advance, why is it not equally important to consider the primary industry of agriculture, and why is it not equally important to discuss or to consider the necessity of getting our man-power armed, trained, equipped and placed for service overseas?

On motion of Mr. Pouliot the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Friday, January 30, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

CONSIDERATION OF SPECIAL ORDER SUSPENDED TO PROCEED WITH QUESTIONS AND MOTIONS FOR PAPERS ON MONDAY NEXT

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

That consideration of the special order relative to the debate on the address to His Excellency be suspended on Monday the 2nd

February, 1942, until the house has proceeded with the orders respecting questions and notices of motions for the production of papers standing on the order paper.

Motion agreed to.

"FAIRMILE FUDDLE"

REFERENCE TO EDITORIAL IN THE JANUARY-FEBRUARY ISSUE OF "BOATING MAGAZINE"

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): I should like to direct the attention of the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services to an editorial appearing on page 4 of *Boating Magazine* for January-February of this year, under the caption "Fairmile Fuddle". I shall not read the editorial, because I presume the minister has a copy of the journal. I should like to ask these questions: First, where are the five boats which are reported to have left Midland early in November, 1941 and, second, was a qualified officer in charge of those boats?

Hon. ANGUS L. MACDONALD (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not give notice of his question, and as I have not seen the article I should like to read it and get the information for him.

PRICE CEILING

APPLICATION OF REGULATIONS TO SPECIFIED COMMODITIES—SEASONAL GOODS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. H. BENCE (Saskatoon City): I should like to address a question to the government, for attention of the Minister of Finance. My question has to do with a news item appearing in yesterday's Ottawa *Journal*, headed "One hundred commodities are not affected by price ceiling." Will the Minister of Finance give to the house within the next few days an explanation as to the reason for removing the price ceiling on the one hundred odd commodities referred to in that item? Will he at the same time state whether or not there will be a similar removal in connection with other so-called seasonal goods, such as those which are purchased for winter purposes only?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I shall direct the attention of the minister to the hon. member's question.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

NEW GLASGOW STEEL WORKERS—APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Prime Minister. I am in receipt of a copy of a telegram sent to the Prime Minister under date of January 29 by the New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, Union of the Steel Workers Organizing Committee. The wire indicated that the workers in that area are disturbed over the refusal of the government to honour the principles of collective bargaining laid down in order in council P.C. 2685, particularly in the case of the Kirkland Lake dispute. The wire also indicates that stoppages of work may take place in other essential industries in Canada unless the government insists that without delay the mine operators of the Kirkland mines accept the principle of collective bargaining.

Has the Prime Minister replied to the telegram of the New Glasgow steel workers, and would he tell the house the nature of his reply?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the telegram to which the hon. member has referred was handed to me just as I came into the house. I have not had time to read it through.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I received a similar telegram at midnight last night.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The morning has been pretty well occupied through deliberations with the cabinet, and other matters. The result is I have not had a chance to see some of the communications which have come in. I shall endeavour, however, to answer this one as soon as possible.

SHIPBUILDING DISPUTES—ANNULMENT OF AWARD BY BOARD OF CONCILIATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I should like to ask a question of the acting Minister of Labour. I have a telegram from John W. Bruce, international organizer for the Plumbers and Steamfitters Association, a group identified with the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Bruce complains about an order in council passed on Monday last, on the recommendation of the Minister of Labour, annulling an award of the board of conciliation acting in respect of certain shipbuilding yards in Ontario and Quebec. Would the minister explain the procedure in this matter, and will he table the order in council mentioned?

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (for the Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the telegram received by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) was not called to my attention. I should not like to give a

detailed answer as to the effect of the order in council passed on Monday last in connection with shipbuilding plants. The hon. member is aware that a board of conciliation was appointed to investigate one particular plant, whereas the commission was appointed to investigate all plants as a group. My impression is that the order in council referred to deals with the report of the commission; I was not aware that it dealt with the report of the board. I shall be glad, however, to make further inquiries and advise the house and the hon. member in connection with this matter.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Thursday, January 29, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fitting first to remind the house of a gentleman who died not long ago, who formerly sat upon the treasury benches of this house for several years, acting in various capacities, particularly as Minister of Public Works and Postmaster General. I refer to the Hon. John Campbell Elliott. Mr. Elliott was liked by all and was a very good minister. One of the joys of his later life was to have my chief, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), ask for his advice, particularly concerning Ontario. I cannot forget one beautiful summer day, a Sunday in 1934, when a mass meeting attended by 10,000 people was held in the town of Trois Pistoles. This part of my constituency was taken away from me by Viscount Bennett. There were many speakers, among them our late lamented friend, the former Minister of Justice, the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe; Mr. Elliott was there as well. There is in the vicinity of Trois Pistoles a summer school which is attended by many students from Western university in London who go to that school to learn French. Mr. Elliott spoke in French, but he did not mention the redistribution, nor did he refer to the gerrymander. He made a beautiful speech about good understanding, bonne entente. I offer my deepest sympathy to all my colleagues, to the members of the Senate and to the members of his family.

The government has suffered another great loss in the death of the former deputy minister of public works, Mr. J. B. Hunter. Mr. Hunter was civil servant No. 1 following the death of Sir Arthur Doughty, who created our archives and placed at the disposal of every student in Canada official documents pertaining to Canadian history.

This House of Commons is not the same at all since the death of the gentleman who was praised so highly on February 21, the man who was the right arm of the Prime Minister, who was a Liberal to the core, and a true disciple of Laurier. I refer to the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. It was most fitting that a special tribute should be paid to him, and I was deeply moved by all the speeches that were made on that occasion. That was not the time to contradict anyone, but I remind the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) that he made a slight error—this is important to me—when he stated that the late Mr. Lapointe had been born in Kamouraska county. Mr. Lapointe was born at St. Eloi, which was never taken away from Témiscouata. If it had been, there would have been a riot.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I regret the error in my geography.

Mr. POULIOT: I know my hon. friend did it in good faith, but if he would consult me before making his speeches he would never make mistakes.

We have heard many interesting speeches. We live in a free country, and some of our colleagues hold certain views, while others hold altogether different views. That is their business. I do not intend to say anything unpleasant to anyone because he is in favour of conscription for overseas service while I am against it. That would be his right. But I do not want anyone to tread on my toes. I have sincere convictions and they are well known to all my colleagues. I quote:

> If a member dislikes the government . . . he ought to have the manhood to testify to his opinions. Nobody need be mealy mouthed in this debate. . . . No one need be chicken-hearted in the division lobby. I have frequently voted against governments which I have been elected to support and, looking back on it, I have sometimes felt very glad I did so. Everyone in these rough times must do what he considers his duty . . . Surely the hon. gentleman is not a man to be frightened of the whip.

That is fine language, but it is not mine. I could have made it mine with a slight change. I have never voted against my party, although I have been near doing so at times. The man who said those words sat in this very place a short time ago, the Right Hon.

Winston Churchill. I was honoured to notice that Mr. Churchill sat right here when he was received in this chamber. I quote again:

> Whoever speaks for Britain at this moment must be known to speak not only in the name of the people—and that I feel pretty sure I may—but in the name of parliament and, above all, the House of Commons.

I have said already that I am a Liberal to the core. I shall always be a Liberal and be true to the doctrines laid down by my late lamented leader, Mr. Lapointe, when he spoke at St. Roch de Quebec in his own constituency and said that if reforms were to be advocated, they should be advocated within the party. I believe the Liberal party is in good health, although it has two decayed teeth. If they are removed, its health will be splendid.

There are more important things, there are more urgent things, than a plebiscite. It is to make certain that democracy remains supreme in this parliament and that no one on the treasury benches shall be blackmailed or terrorized by any leader of any party. As I have said, opinions are free, and it is our common privilege to express them. But there is something very important, and that is that no leader of any party shall forget that he must always think, speak and act first as a Canadian, and as a good one.

Last summer I witnessed the ceremony held at St. Patrick, commemorating the anniversary of Sir John A. Macdonald, who spent twenty-seven summers in my constituency. At the same time a similar ceremony was being held at Kingston, the riding he represented for so long, and on that occasion the man who was at times Prime Minister of Canada spoke thus of Sir John:

> Never at any time did he lose sight of or subordinate to a selfish Canadian purpose the oneness of our interest, the oneness of our security, and the oneness of our destiny with the British empire.

I am not anti-British; I am pro-Canadian, and in my humble view the interests of Canada must be considered first in all our dealings, whether with Great Britain, the United States or any other country in the world.

Let me speak now of the by-election in York South, and I have very good news. I cannot give it all at once but am giving it bit by bit in due course, and the members of parliament will get great comfort from it. I am not going to tell anything new. I just want to remind my colleagues in the House of Commons that the people of York South are just as sound-minded as the people of any other constituency in this country, and to say that Arthur Meighen will be beaten on the ninth of February worse than he has ever been beaten before at the polls. I have a right to speak in this way because he is no longer a member of the Senate, and I can express my views about what is going on. It is the fight of democracy that is being waged in that constituency, and if Canadians look at it in that way, the by-election interests not only the electors of York South. We heard a lot about the leader of the opposition in the Senate, although his name was never mentioned. He was described as a very great man, and, of course, if a man is to be judged by the position he holds, undoubtedly he is a great man from the fact that he has been Prime Minister of Canada two or three times, although in that capacity he has never been elected by the Canadian people. The Canadian people turned their thumbs down on him every time he came before them because they did not trust him.

It appears that the Conservative party held a caucus, consisting of a handful of men, some of whom are very fine gentlemen—those are the Conservatives—and some others who are not such pleasant gentlemen—they are the Tories. It was rumoured on a Friday that they had made their selection and that Mr. Meighen would be the leader of the Conservative party, but it was only on the following Thursday that he accepted the position. What was the reason why Arthur Meighen did not want to represent such a fine group of gentlemen as I see in front of me? He was fearful; he was not sure of himself. It was not the voice of the people that chose him; it was just a handful of men, and he was preferred to my hon. friend the member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson); he was preferred to my hon. friend the member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce), to my hon. friend the member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) and to all the other gentlemen who were there. It was a discovery. They were like Archimedes. They had found a marvel. They were also like Diogenes. They were out hunting with a lantern, and they went to the Senate door, where they found a man who had courage. Oh, courage, maybe, but no brains.

The first thing that was done under the instructions of Arthur Meighen was to play petty politics—petty politics, I repeat—in the press by resurrecting a few days later an incident that had arisen a few days before in the House of Commons when I had complained of the way in which my leader the Prime Minister had been greeted by some of the troops in England. I shall not insist on that. But after Arthur Meighen was selected as leader, something very funny happened, and that is that only two members

out of the forty Conservative members of parliament offered him their seats—two out of forty. So evidently they liked him, but they did not want him to take any of their seats in parliament.

Here I have a clipping from a very interesting paper edited by one of the brightest journalists of our time, Miss Judith Robinson, daughter of the former editor of the Conservative Toronto *Telegram*. The article is headed "Tory patriot offers leader costly seat," and to my great surprise none of the Conservatives have protested against this article since the commencement of the session.

An hon. MEMBER: Because it is beneath notice.

Mr. POULIOT: Oh! The article goes on to say:

> The Conservative party has a great history. But something happened to it in that election of March, 1940. The group of men elected to the House of Commons, particularly from Ontario, do not represent the Conservatives who voted for them.

Hear, hear.

> At least it is hoped they don't, for if they do the Conservative party is unwilling to make sacrifices; is unwilling to do anything but hold on to what it has and let someone else bear the burden.
>
> The two men who offered their seats to Mr. Meighen were Col. Alan Cockeram and Earl Rowe.
>
> Mr. Meighen did not want Rowe's seat—

And so forth. It goes on, referring to Col. Cockeram:

> It isn't that Cockie doesn't like being a member of parliament, and his $4,000 per year. He believes Arthur Meighen, if he does nothing else, will give Mr. King the hot foot.

Oh, ho!

> Other Ontario Conservative members were willing to step aside for their leader and do the cause some good. But one wanted $12,000 on the line, and Meighen's men refused to stand for blackmail. Others just disappeared. No answer to the telephone. No answer to wires.
>
> Then there was this Ontario Tory who has one of the safest seats in the house. He isn't much as a member, never will be.

This is an appreciation by a good Conservative!

> But he is a great patriot. He wouldn't step aside for anyone except his leader. Yes, he would for his leader, because it was his duty as a Britisher and a good Conservative. But he would have to have—

How much?

> —$20,000. And only for Meighen would he do that. The big-hearted soul.

I do not blame Conservative members for not having offered their seats to Arthur Meighen. I praise them for that; and when there was a rumour that the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris) would give his seat to Arthur Meighen, I said that the new leader would not fill the gap caused by the retirement of the hon. member for Danforth. No; I do not blame those hon. members for having refused him their seats. I cannot conceive how sound-minded men, as they seem to be, should have been disturbed to the extent of selecting him as their leader, even temporarily.

At the time of the Tory convention last November an item appeared in the press that the Conservative caucus did not want the present leader of the opposition to declare himself for conscription overseas. Yet Meighen did it without further authorization. Now here is something interesting, which I take from the *Le Canada*, of Montreal, under date of January 21. After it was decided that Mr. Meighen would get Mr. Cockeram's seat in York South, he wrote to the Department of Justice asking the law clerks if they were not of opinion he could remain a senator until the election was over—showing that he was not sure of himself, that he was afraid he would lose his election. Of course the answer at that time was sensible; it was "no". It was the right answer. The answer was, "resign as a senator if you want to stand for election as a member". There is a corridor between the House of Commons and the Senate, but it is not for a member of the Senate who wants to run in an election. Then the Hon. Leopold Macaulay, a Tory of the Tories, a former member of the Henry government, said, "Let everyone vote for Arthur Meighen. All of those who have been Conservatives at any time in their lives must vote for Arthur Meighen. There is not a vote to spare." This shows that he is not very well accepted by the Canadian people.

But there is more. I remember very well what was said on February 7, 1933, by Mr. Mitchell F. Hepburn, then hon. member for Elgin West. He said, as reported in *Hansard*, page 1867:

> Mr. Speaker, the morning papers contain the personnel of the newly appointed tariff board, naming Mr. Justice Sedgewick as tariff chairman at a salary of $12,000. I should like to know if this is the same Mr. Justice Sedgewick who as an appointee of the Ontario government was the chairman of a commission which investigated the Ontario hydro commission and gave that body a complete whitewash.

Who was a member of the Ontario hydro commission at that time, one who has been similarly censured by Mr. Hepburn himself? It was the very same Arthur Meighen, and in my ears I still have the sound of the voice of Mr. Hepburn denouncing the dealings of Mr. Meighen with the Abitibi power company. If, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Meighen was not good

enough to be a hydro commissioner of Ontario, if he had to be denounced by the present premier of Ontario for wrong dealings with the Abitibi power company, how can he be accepted as leader of a great party and a prospective prime minister of Canada?

There were other statements, and I am not afraid to refer to them. I do not want any hon. member to say, "here is a French-Canadian from Quebec who is dealing with Ontario matters". I do not know whether the leader of the opposition is aware of it, but I may tell him that I have more friends than he thinks among the English-speaking members of his party—although it is a small one. Not only that, but some of my best friends are from Ontario. No less a gentleman than Doctor Edwards, former leader of the Orangemen, was a very dear friend of mine. When he died I came here to give the news to the then leader of the opposition, Mr. Bennett. I saw to it that Doctor Ross, of Kingston, came up to take care of Doctor Edwards, and I gave my room to Mrs. Edwards and to Mrs. Macdougall, wife of the then hon. member for Inverness. Moreover, I have in my room a letter, written in French in his own hand, by Doctor Edwards, which shows that in his later days he was thinking differently from what he did before. Apart from this, I had very dear friends in Ontario. One of them was Mr. Hepburn, who is still my friend, and the friendship started at the time when we were the two members of parliament whom Mr. Bennett hated most. This is the reason why I made the campaign for Mr. Hepburn. No member of parliament was invited to speak in a larger number of constituencies in Ontario in 1933 and in the provincial campaign of 1934 than the member for Témiscouata. I was delighted to meet good friends, and I returned afterwards at the time of the general election, saw old friends whom I had met there before, and spoke in the constituency of the hon. member for Huron-Perth (Mr. Golding). I was a Liberal speaker at the convention of the Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty), and I went to different places, meeting good English-speaking and French-speaking Canadians, and supported Mr. Hepburn because I thought he was a good man. And both of us, indeed all of us, regarded Arthur Meighen as one of the calamities of the world.

Therefore I am not a stranger in Ontario, although I do not now speak there very often. I have many other good friends in that province. Besides Doctor Edwards, there was Mr. Alison Young, of the Windsor *Star,* a close friend of mine, and dear Harry Anderson of the Toronto *Globe,* one of the finest citizens of this country. There are many others whom I have not the time to name.

Well, here is Arthur Meighen, the Charlie McCarthy of the Bergens of high finance in Toronto. He decided to run in that district, and immediately afterwards we saw a full-page advertisement published in the newspapers of this country, headed "Total war effort", signed by about two hundred persons—I have not counted them, but I know some of them —who want to substitute themselves for the elected members of parliament. They say that they want total war. We want total war, too, but we do not want to use total war as a pretext for some schemes which are shameful and which they try to hide under the flag.

One of them is the completion of the amalgamation of railways; and I have here official copies of the two speeches published by the king's printer, which had been delivered before in the Senate—one by Arthur Meighen, and the other by Senator Beaubien. The title of Meighen's speech is "United management of railways". Was it sent to me by Arthur Meighen? Was it sent to me by Senator Beaubien? Who sent it to me?

They have not yet succeeded in performing their operation. The idea is not at all to wage total war; the idea is to speculate in Canadian bonds, and that is all that is behind that move. That is why they are against my leader, the present Prime Minister. It is because he is not the man of Bay street and St. James street. They want their own tool here in the House of Commons at the head of the Conservative party, and they want him as the head of the government. They want to prevent the members of parliament from expressing their views, and they call them unpatriotic when they differ from them. Arthur Meighen and his gang—whether the members of his gang are in the house or outside—are the depositories, the only depositories, of pure patriotism—the purest!

To show the insincerity of that man, let us judge his own acts and his present words, comparing his behaviour with his speeches. In the *Citizen* of January 23 I find:

> Never believed government capable of such an act. Right Hon. Arthur Meighen asserts plebiscite on conscription is admission of its necessity.

I do not want to say anything unpleasant about Mr. Hepburn, for whom I have great respect. I think he has rendered numerous services to the party. Although at times he was not satisfied with what was going on, we have remained friends. I cannot say anything unpleasant about him. Whatever he does, whatever he says, I shall continue to respect

him. On the other hand, his position will be very difficult. Senator Meighen says a referendum is a necessity; Mr. Hepburn is opposed to it. How will they explain it to the people? The other day I listened with great interest to the speech delivered by my friend the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Gray). He said, "I am for conscription at once; that is why I am against a plebiscite." He will vote against the plebiscite if he is logical with himself, and there he will meet another gentleman who holds entirely different views. He will meet my hon. friend the member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe), the father of the new Canadian party. Both will vote on the same side, although for different reasons.

Now, sir, speaking of insincerity, I find this:

Meighen deplores failure to give armed forces vote.

Is it possible to have less tact than that? There is no man in Canada who is more tactless than Arthur Meighen. When he said that, he forgot the War-time Elections Act, that miserable piece of legislation for stealing votes in order to get power against the will of the people. There is one sentence that was used outside the house by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), which I will now quote. It is most appropriate. He was referring to the loan:

I know the Canadian people will not grudge that money. It is necessary to save the most precious life in the world—the life of liberty.

That is, liberty, freedom—freedom of speech and freedom of vote.

I have here a telegram that was sent by the same Arthur Meighen, who wants the soldier's vote now. This telegram was sent in 1917 and was read at the Liberal convention which selected my leader in 1919. It was read by Judge Adamson.

Mr. POWER: It is on *Hansard*.

Mr. POULIOT: The telegram reads:

Winnipeg November 30, 1917. Robert L. Borden, Ottawa, Ontario.

Would like one thousand soldiers' votes at large for Manitoba, of which 300 for Selkirk, balance divided between Provencher, Macdonald and Springfield, or same proportion of division, no matter what our allotment may be.

Arthur Meighen

This is the man who wants more soldier votes. Here is something else he said:

"Present system needs reform," Meighen says.

That appeared in the press on January 17; he said it on January 16. To continue:

Conservative leader, in by-election speech, calls for end to baseless aspersions and stop to fomenting of class antagonisms.

He made that statement in Toronto. I have here another telegram which is signed by a well-known citizen of the world with regard to illegal arrests in Winnipeg. It is dated June 17, 1919, and is a telegram from Mr. Meighen to Mr. Andrews:

Notwithstanding any doubt I have as to the technical legality of the arrest and the detention at Stony Mountain, I feel that rapid deportation is the best course now that the arrests are made, and later we can consider ratification.

The meaning of that is that the law did not authorize him to keep these men under arrest in the penitentiary. Nevertheless, as he says, afterwards we will ratify it by changing the law and making it valid. This was quoted by no less a man than the Hon. Peter Heenan, now a minister in Mr. Hepburn's cabinet, on June 2, 1926, as reported at page 4004 of *Hansard* of that year.

Is it surprising that after Mr. Meighen's speech of January 10, we had this news item in the press:

Fredericton, January 11. "Mr. Meighen's speech speaks for itself," said Hon. R. B. Hanson, acting Conservative house leader, when asked Saturday if he had any comment to make regarding the speech of Right Hon. Arthur Meighen at Toronto last night. "He is the leader of the Conservative party in Canada and I commend his views to the Canadian people," said Mr. Hanson.

The correspondent of the *Gazette*, a very distinguished journalist, Mr. Mears, wrote on January 12 that Mr. Meighen simply refused to admit that the present conflict is not a continuation or repetition of that of 1914-1918. Mark you, sir, the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) is not the leader of the opposition. He is acting leader of the opposition. His accepted leader is Arthur Meighen, who is now a candidate and who will be defeated on February 9.

The other day I, a Liberal member, said that the Minister of National Defence should resign. It was my right to say so, but should have been said before by the acting leader of the opposition. Arthur Meighen's supporter, Colonel Drew, made a statement in Toronto about Hong Kong. And when I spoke, the leader of the opposition said: "Order," meaning by that that he did not want me to express freely my opinion about that. How can he explain that? How can Arthur Meighen complain about the government when every time I have complaints about the government, the ministers were not defended by their colleagues, they were defended by the leader of the opposition himself, who was like Ferdinand the Bull and had a flower in his mouth for every cabinet minister on this side of the house?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. POULIOT: I withdraw at once.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Surely this exhibition has gone far enough.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Speaker, I have the floor, and I do not want my time taken up.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): This is a point of order. I object to the language being used by the hon. member, and I do not know why he has not been called to order before now, and especially by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crerar) who is now leading the house. Do I have to listen to a comparison like that, from the hon. member for Témiscouata or anyone else? I call upon you, Mr. Speaker, to make him withdraw every word he said about me, and I call upon the leader of the house—

Mr. POULIOT: I withdraw Ferdinand the bull, nothing else.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): —to end this state of affairs.

Mr. CRERAR: I have not followed all the speech of the hon. member for Témiscouata because I was required to be out of the chamber for two brief periods. But from what I have heard I think the hon. member's remarks were in order until the last statement he made, which he has already withdrawn.

Mr. POULIOT: I shall read from an editorial in the Toronto *Evening Telegram* of January 23. It is headed:

Opposition forces the door to open inquiry into incompetence.

The editorial begins:

It is not often that it is possible to agree with J. F. Pouliot, M.P., the effervescent member for Témiscouata, yet in his statement that the Minister of Defence should resign over the Hong Kong affair—a statement that was drowned by cries of "Order!"—he appears to have been the only member of parliament who recognized the gravity of the situation revealed by the admissions of Hon. J. L. Ralston.

That concerns what I have said. There is one thing should be done; it is that all Canadians should unite to perform a national and patriotic duty to "squeeze" Arthur Meighen on February 9. I remember very well the day in the special session of 1939 when my leader, the Prime Minister, was speaking, through the chair, to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth), and he said: "There is no man for whom I have more respect in this house." But at the present time it is not a question of accepting all the views of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation; the question is to defeat Arthur Meighen so that the big financial interests and the "two hundred" in the city of Toronto do not rule this country. That is all I have to say for the moment.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, my first words must be of congratulation to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply, the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald). They indeed had a great opportunity in having seen Britain, resolute and fearless. The inspiration that came to them from that opportunity was reflected in their words. The Empire Parliamentary Association is to be congratulated on having invited these hon. members to Westminster. I would make the suggestion that the government of Canada might well consider inviting a group from the congress of the United States to visit us, and at the same time the parliamentary association might arrange that some hon. members of this house have an opportunity to go to Washington, thus indicating to the United States of America our appreciation of the efforts they are putting forth as our allies and the magnificent assistance they gave us long before the actual outbreak of hostilities between the United States and the axis powers.

As I listened to the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) it came to me once more what democracy in this empire and this country means: That in the midst of war, when all of us are worried and concerned, an hon. member may rise in his place and make the type of speech he made to-day. That is freedom of speech—the opportunity to express one's view in parliament.

I am not going to endeavour to follow the hon. member in what he has said. I think now is not the time for me to endeavour to enter into any defence of our new leader. That may well be left to less perilous times. As I apprehend my responsibility as a member of parliament it is this, not to indulge in personalities, or in recriminations as to what took place in 1917 or since, but to try to place before the house and the country any ideas I may have that might be of assistance at this time.

The speech from the throne confined itself in general to an expression of the intention on the part of the government to extend the

war effort. But throughout the entire speech there is only one definite promise, contained in the following paragraph:

> My ministers accordingly will seek, from the people, by means of a plebiscite, release from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service.

Two amendments have been proposed. The only point of conflict that I see between these amendments is that that proposed by my hon. leader is clear and unequivocal; we challenge the right of the government at this time in our history to submit a matter of life and death to the people of the nation in this way. On the other hand the subamendment, while agreeing with all that we say in our amendment, suggests that provision should be made in the plebiscite for an additional question. Let me ask at once: is there any hon. member in this house to-day who denies the proposition that treasure should be mobilized with blood? Could it ever be said that Canada would conscript her sons but not her wealth? No hon. member would say to-day that large profits should be permitted in time of war. We all admit that in war time large profits are indefensible and unjustifiable.

What is the amendment we propose? In essence it is this, that we should completely mobilize the wealth and material resources and, on a selective basis, the full man and woman power of the nation, to the end that the nation may wage total war in any theatre of war, and that we should supply the needs of agriculture and industry and the fighting forces and prepare for the post-war period.

I point to the order in which these requisites are referred to in the amendment—that we mobilize wealth and material resources, and mobilize on a selective basis the man-power of the nation.

Let me make just a reference to agriculture. We are asking that the imperative needs of agriculture shall be met. For almost two years in this house we have called attention to the situation of agriculture in western Canada. Population records now tell the story—parts of western Canada depopulated in large areas because of the fact that in part the government has failed to realize that there is a problem in so far as western agriculture is concerned.

We on this side of the house have taken the stand consistently that so far as the wheat grower is concerned, as of right he should be entitled in this time of war to a parity price. Finally, the farmers of Saskatchewan, in desperation, knowing that there was no hope from this parliament unless they showed themselves here, will arrive on Sunday next. On November 27 the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) was interviewed, and rather ridiculed the projected trip. His words were:

> Asked about the plan Friday, the Hon. J. G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture, said if such a delegation does come they will no doubt be received and listened to attentively. I am afraid they will have left the impression that money is more plentiful in western Canada than most of us believe it to be.

They are coming, Mr. Speaker, to demand their rights. They come in no threatening mood, but rather as individuals who to-day find themselves in a position bordering on economic slavery. The farmer must have parity prices for farm products, and I believe that when they do come, and when this government realizes they mean action—and by that I mean political action—the government will see the light and do that which it has not done, in spite of the representations made from this side of the house, during the last year. That is all I am going to say at the moment about agriculture. Our attitude is this—and it was the attitude of Mr. Meighen adopted when he accepted the leadership: our stand demands every sacrifice, whether of time, money, property, income as well as men for the army, so long as the laws making these demands are equitable and fair and apply to everyone without discrimination.

Here we are, Mr. Speaker, in the darkest period of the war. All of us to-day admit the peril to freedom. What the people of Canada are asking for is not a reference; it is not a consultation. What they are asking us to give is a plan, definite, comprehensive and fearless in its operation. They demand that. They have no way of getting it other than by asking for it, and by requiring their representatives in the house to stand up and make their demands on their behalf. Our responsibility as members is to give voice to their demands.

Great changes have come over the world in the last few weeks. The freedom-loving nations are banded together to forge the greatest chain for the preservation of liberty the world has ever known. They are banded together—1,720,000,000 people, as compared with 293,000,000 under the axis, and 215,000,000 in countries under the scourge of Hitler. They are banded together with over seventy per cent of the world's natural resources.

Wealth unused, man-power unmobilized and potential resources unless utilized avail nothing. We were told by Mr. Churchill when he was here that the period of consolidation is ending, that the pattern of victory is being designed. Yet even to-day Germany is spend-

ing $25,000,000,000 a year, while the British empire as a whole is spending approximately $23,000,000,000. I am not one who deprecates our war effort; it is fine, so far as it goes. We are all Canadians, but, Mr. Speaker, there are dangers which must be met. Hong Kong was to Canada its Dunkirk. Hong Kong was another example of that principle of "too little and too late"—"too little" in numbers, "too little in forces" and too late as to transport and armoured vehicles. I suggest to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) that whoever was responsible for making the errors at Hong Kong should be punished and removed from office.

What will be necessary, I ask the minister, to awaken the people of Canada to immediate action regarding man-power? Will not the foreboding news of Singapore or the repulse in the Libyan campaign to-day? The answer of the government for not acting is that "national unity," must be preserved. Is "national unity" being used as a shibboleth to avoid responsibility, and as an excuse? I ask you, Mr. Speaker, will not the common danger which faces this empire to-day, which faces this country, and which was so admirably pictured last night in the eloquent speech of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), bring national unity in Canada?

Is Canada's war effort to be like a convoy in the Atlantic, the speed of which is to be determined by the slowest ship in the convoy? The Prime Minister says he believes in total war, and he has used striking words in that connection. He has said this:

> There is only one way to meet total war, and that is by total effort, not for a day or a week or a month, but every day until victory is won.

Must we in Canada wait until every person agrees that the government in its good time takes action? The great majority of Canadian people are asking for and pleading for action, and the government seems to be hobbled by those who ask for moderation in the extent of Canada's war effort. It is no time for discouragement. It is time for courage, for action, and above all for a banishment of political considerations. It is time for us to take stock of our resources and to act resolutely. Once and for all we must determine that the days that are gone, are gone. 1917 is gone; the last election is a thing of the past. We remember what Churchill said, —"If we wrangle about yesterday we have lost to-morrow."

I make this appeal to-day: let us forget recriminations, forget the past and the mistakes which have been made: forget partisanship and forget jockeying for votes, with an eye on the ballot box of the future. Let not Canada's effort be circumscribed by political considerations. What the people are asking for is not partisanship. They ask for psychological rearmament, rearmament of hope and faith.

The heroes of Hong Kong went out into the night, a night of certain sacrifice. They went with courage unexampled, because they knew they would be avenged, that others would take their places, and that Canada represented by its parliament would not fail them. The foundation of morale is faith and knowledge —faith that those who serve will not be deserted, an appreciation of the eternity of the principles for which this empire stands, the knowledge that there will be no surrender by those who survive, and that though life is lost there will be others to take their places.

Lose morale and you court disaster. Who is the custodian of our morale? The responsibility rests upon parliament. The Canadian people can do nothing, they are helpless, they are shackled. However willing they may be to serve, they can be frustrated by a parliament that will not act. What happened twenty-four years ago has nothing to do with the question to-day. Our duty, our obligation, our trusteeship as members of parliament is to see that no man who serves is sacrificed unnecessarily, and that the wealth and resources of this nation are mobilized.

I think the time has come when the members of this house have the right to ask of the members of this government what their plans are, and to have the answer. What of the balanced programme that was referred to in the speech from the throne regarding increases in our armed forces and in the production of munitions and foodstuffs? Is Canada's main contribution to be materials? In the armed forces is the first consideration to be to secure men for the army, the navy or the air force? Instead of saying to the young men of this country, "we need you in the army, we need your services", a regulation goes out making provision for a new suit. In other words, the man shall determine where he will serve. This is not decided upon the basis of need according to government plan, it is decided by the individual upon the basis of whether or not the suit suits. Have we achieved maximum production? What is the plan for the mobilization of agriculture to assure producers a fair and reasonable return for their products? What is the plan regarding selective allocation of men to the places where they will give the maximum service to the war effort?

Are our objectives known? Except for the British empire training plan, which was worked

out a year and a half ago, our objectives have been announced piecemeal. We are told that there is a shortage of gasoline, that our forces need gasoline, and we are given a rationing scheme that is a sham. The people of this country are being allowed to drive for pleasure a total of 5,500 miles. We hear about a rubber shortage, but what is being done to mobilize the available resources of this nation? We have heard a lot about a salvage campaign, about the need for iron and steel and scrap iron. A plan was evolved under which the people of Canada patriotically endeavoured to supply the needs of the government. But does the government accept that scrap iron? No, it goes to the clearance centres for its needs.

One instance comes to my mind. The farmers in the vicinity of Strongfield, in my constituency, believing that cast iron was needed, went out in their fields and removed all unnecessary parts from their machinery. They got together a total of 138,000 pounds, but they found there was no market. They finally got an offer of a certain price per ton which they had to accept although the price was low. They shipped the scrap iron and received a net amount of $400 upon the basis of a ton of 2,250 pounds. The purchasers pointed out that a ton of scrap iron is that weight according to the decision arrived at by the government last summer, but later on made up the difference in price.

Are men needed? When Mr. Churchill introduced his man-power bill in the British House of Commons extending compulsion to men up to fifty-one years of age and to women for the auxiliary services, he said this:

> The crisis of equipment is largely over and an everbroadening flow is now assured. The crisis of man-power and woman-power is at hand and will dominate the year 1942. This crisis comes upon us for the following reasons: The great supply plants have largely been constructed; they are finished; they must be staffed. We must maintain the powerful mobile army we have created with so much pains both for home defence and foreign expedition.

General Auchinleck says that the empire needs men; Mr. Roosevelt says that the United States needs men, but the government of Canada says that there is no need. I ask the government to tell us what system they have for the mobilization of man-power.

Mr. RALSTON: That is not so.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: How are they to be the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) said that they were getting enough men. That is the record of the last few days.

Mr. RALSTON: I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: How are they to be obtained? What is our system of mobilization? Conscription for service in Canada penalizes the youth from twenty-one to twenty-four years because of his age. Every day one receives complaints from young men who are in the service about the coercion that is being used, young men who say they are being browbeaten and intimidated in an effort to get them to go overseas. Records can be given. Let the government investigate the situation in military district No. 12. Farmer boys have been called up whose brothers are already serving overseas. They leave their homesteads when there is no possibility of securing the necessary labour to work them. They are brought into the city and placed in a position where enlistment for overseas is forced upon them. And the government calls this voluntary enlistment!

Why have we no planned coordination in the empire? Why are we not represented in an imperial war cabinet? I suggest that it would be fitting to take one of the ministers of national defence in Canada and send him over to England to cooperate with the ministers from other parts of the empire. The other parts of the empire have asked for this but the Prime Minister says that we are getting along as well as we need to at the present time. What is the psychological effect going to be in Australia, in New Zealand, in south Africa, if Canada persists in this action? I cannot understand the attitude of the government in refusing the offer of a place for Canada in a war cabinet as proposed by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. The membership was not refused directly, but acceptance has been postponed indefinitely.

Australia is fearful and afraid. Has any good reason been given why Canada is not a member of the Pacific defence council? The failure in Hong Kong apparently arose because the government was not aware of the probability of Japan coming into the war. If they had been, they would not have sent untrained men over there. We have a joint defence council for Canada and the United States headed by Mayor LaGuardia. Did he not tell Canada of the danger? That the danger was known in the United States is revealed in the report of Mr. Justice Roberts on the Pearl Harbour disaster. He said:

> As early as October 16, the commanders were warned of the possibility of an attack by Japan on the United States and were directed to take precautions and make preparatory dispositions in the light of this information. A significant warning message was communicated to both the local commanders on November 24. On November 27 each responsible commander was warned that hostilities were momentarily possible.

The warnings indicated war and war only. What was the reason the munitions did not arrive in Hong Kong? Was it that there was no appreciation of the danger? Was it that they were shipped in a slow ship? Is that the explanation? I am glad the whole matter is to be investigated, and I express the prayer and hope there will be no more Hong Kongs.

Why not mobilize man-power now? The Minister of Agriculture is authority for the statement made on September 12 last that Canada could still muster a million men without interfering in any way with the production of primary products and industry. He went on to point out that 1,198,000 single men between the ages of eighteen and forty-four are still available. But the excuse given to-day is that we cannot do that because we have not the necessary man-power for industry and we would not be able to equip the troops. Well, we have the answer to that in a speech delivered by the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) on September 11, 1941, when he said:

> As a matter of fact the problem of equipment for our Canadian armed forces is one that no longer gives concern.

He went on to point out that we had almost reached the limit of Canada's industrial production. He said:

> The Department of Munitions and Supply has been entrusted with the task of mobilizing Canada's full productive capacity for the manufacture of munitions and war supplies. As minister of that department I feel that I can now report practical fulfilment of that task.

Mr. RALSTON: If my hon. friend will permit me, he has used the word "munitions" twice with reference to the Hong Kong expedition. Probably he misunderstood. The munitions went with the ship. It was the mechanized vehicles that did not reach there. Perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to make that correction.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That is perfectly true. I was referring to the mechanized equipment.

Mr. GARDINER: Perhaps the hon. member will also permit me to put the record straight. As a matter of fact my statement was this: If a million men are necessary, the other seven million could do the work necessary to keep them there.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is not what the press said.

Mr. GARDINER: That is what the press said, if I was reported properly.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Here is what the Minister of Agriculture said as reported by the press:

> Canada can muster 1,000,000 men for the armed forces and still attain the necessary production in farm and factory, Agriculture Minister Gardiner said last night in a Reconsecration Week speech on the national network of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.
>
> If 1,000,000 men were called to arms, he said, there would still be 7,000,000 persons over 16 years of age left and these "properly organized and determined to stand behind the armed forces can operate all our farms, our factories and places of business in a manner which will give us the production required."

Mr. GARDINER: If my hon. friend will permit me, because this matter has been referred to three times in the house already, in the last sentence he has read he has quoted what I actually said. But before that in the first sentence he read the newspaper lead.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The Minister of Agriculture made the statement as reported by the press.

Mr. GARDINER: I made the statement as reported in the last sentence that was read.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Who is making the speech?

Mr. GARDINER: I am making a correction.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The record speaks for itself, but as usual the Minister of Agriculture, after making one statement, finds it necessary to withdraw part of it when challenged later on.

Mr. GARDINER: I am not recalling any part of the statement I made. My statement is reported in the press and properly reported, but I am not responsible for the reporter's lead.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: We are not going to get into an argument over reporters' leads, except to say that this reporter's lead summarizes exactly what the minister said.

Mr. GARDINER: It does not. Read it again.

An hon. MEMBER: The minister has never denied it until to-day.

Mr. GARDINER: I corrected it last session when the same speaker was speaking. I made him read it a second time.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, surely the minister knows the rules of this house much better than that. If he wants to make a correction, there is a proper time and place.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member does not wish to have any interruptions, I would ask hon. members not to interrupt.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): By all the rules the proper time to make a correction is when the statement is made.

Mr. GARDINER: The speech was read over the radio; it is on record and can be produced at any time.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I am not concerned about the interruptions, Mr. Speaker, but if the Minister of Agriculture has a speech to make, let him make it, because the people of Canada want to know whether the Minister of Agriculture who spoke in September last has the same views to-day that he had then.

Man-power is necessary, and it can be secured. The speech from the throne admits inferentially that there is need of man-power in our war effort, in the armed services, in industry and on the farms. And what does the government do? It holds a plebiscite, a sop to public opinion, to be acted on, I presume, as was the referendum on prohibition in 1897. The majority voted in favour of that plebiscite, but the government failed to act for fourteen years.

Mr. GRANT: I thought the hon. member was not going to go into past history.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Your situation, Mr. Speaker, is a difficult one when a member refers to matters that are not to the liking of the government. As I was about to say, what does the government give us to-day? A plebiscite. I would not contest so seriously the government's action if they were frank enough to inform the people of Canada that if there is an affirmative vote on the plebiscite, they will act and mobilize the man-power of this country, that is, of course, provided that the pledge of the Prime Minister and the other members of the government is such that they find it impossible to be released therefrom in this parliament by the people's representatives. But they will say nothing about what they will do after the plebiscite is taken. The Prime Minister says he will give no commitments. I ask the ministers who have been interrupting me: What will you do? I ask the Minister of Agriculture now: If the Canadian people come out in favour of releasing the government, what will you do? I ask the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar): what will you do? I ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock): what will you do? I ask the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) and the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services (Mr. Macdonald): what will you do?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Do the right thing.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Do our duty.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: No, Mr. Speaker. The government give no undertaking. They say: relieve us of our responsibility and we will do what is best. What is best? The best is a matter of interpretation according to the whims of the person voting on the plebiscite. The hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) says: The government will act. The hon. member for St. Antoine-Westmount (Mr. Abbott) says: The plebiscite will allow troops to be sent overseas. But the premier of Quebec says: no; it means nothing of the sort. The Prime Minister denies that he gave Mr. Godbout any authority to make such a statement. Then where did Mr. Godbout get his authority to make a statement such as that? Again I ask the ministers of the crown: Did they give authority to Mr. Godbout to make that statement? Have hon. gentlemen read in the press to-day that every member of the Godbout government is opposed to conscription? I ask the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar): What would he do if the plebiscite passed, in view of the speech he delivered in the city of Winnipeg prejudging the matter?

The Prime Minister claims that a plebiscite is the only way available to him to secure release from his pledged word. Mr. Chamberlain, when Prime Minister of Great Britain, found himself in a like position, by reason of the pledges of Mr. Baldwin, and himself appealed to parliament for release using these words:

> The Prime Minister, whatever his declarations have been, is deprived through external circumstances of the ordinary constitutional methods of escaping from a difficulty of this kind. Therefore, he is bound to act in accordance with what he believes to be the national needs and safety. That is the supreme pledge which is tacitly and unspokenly given by all those who hold first office in the state. I should like to point out, that, looking back on the past, this is exactly what happened in the great war. We were all pledged against conscription in the great war. The most fiery speeches were made by all the members of that government before the war and at the election preceding it. I certainly declaimed against it with the utmost vigour. When, however, the crisis of the war was reached and it was found to be absolutely necessary to have conscription, hardly any of the ministers found the slightest difficulty in voting for it.

But what did the Minister of Mines and Resources say when speaking in Winnipeg? The government claims the right to consult public opinion and yet the Minister of Mines

and Resources said that you cannot depend on public opinion. This is his statement as reported in the Winnipeg press:

I have never ignored public opinion but in my experience and observations there are times when public opinion may not be well informed.

Then he goes on, in these significant words:

And I have not a great deal of admiration for the public man whose ear is always to the ground so that he may trim his sails according to the wind. . . .

Mr. CRERAR: Does my hon. friend quarrel with that?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Wait till you get the rest of the story.

I say frankly that if I were convinced that conscription of men for overseas service is the one best contribution Canada can make I would be for it.

An hon. MEMBER: What about answering the question?

An hon. MEMBER: How are you going to vote on the plebiscite?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask hon. members not to interrupt the speaker. If they do not agree with his statement they will have an opportunity afterwards.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The Prime Minister has often spoken of the supremacy of parliament. In this case he substitutes uncertainty for constitutional responsibility. If he would say frankly to the people of Canada that he wanted to take this step, I and every person in Canada would believe him, and there would be no opposition. But, no, we are to have procrastination and delay for another two or three months, to see what is going to turn up. I suggest this, bring in a resolution to the house, or give the private members an opportunity, through the restoration of private members' day, to introduce a resolution for complete mobilization of wealth, man-power, and resources. Let the Prime Minister and each of his ministers get up and say to their following—as loyal and patriotic as any in the house—"Vote according to the dictates of your conscience." Allow the members of parliament to vote on this question. Do not submit the question to the people of Canada, for in my opinion the taking of a plebiscite at this time may well destroy the unity of Canada. How will the people know how to vote? If they vote to release the government, what is the government going to do? God forbid that the proposal be defeated! But if so, what harm will be done to a united war effort? Is parliament to be sovereign, or is it to become a political juke-box which is to be voiceless unless the token of public opinion is inserted, and public opinion, on inserting that token, is still uncertain and uninformed as to the tune the government will play as a result? Let us have certainty. Let us know what the government's attitude is and what its plan is. The Prime Minister referred the other day to taking the people into their confidence. I say, yes, do that, and take the members of the House of Commons into your confidence! Tell us what you are going to do. Why allow the issue involved in the plebiscite to depend upon the uncertainties of interpretation by each and every individual who votes on it?

My time is almost exhausted, but I wish to deal with one other matter—the mobilization of man-power within this House of Commons. Here are 245 members in touch with the needs of their constituents all over the dominion. There are the members of the government who to-day are overworked. We all have some appreciation of the load of responsibility which they carry. But the rest of the members, with the exception of a few who are on committees, have nothing to do, no work to engage them.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I have too much.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, the hon. gentleman represents, he says, two or three constituencies. It may not be a suggestion in accord with ordinary democratic principles, but we are at war. Mobilize the brain-power of this house. Divide the membership into committees; let us get together, not on the basis of committees over-loaded with government supporters, but as members each of whom is endeavouring to see the other man's point of view. Set up a committee on the mobilization of our resources, so that all the machine shops throughout Canada will be used, so that we shall be assured of getting the necessary oil production. Set up a committee on agriculture; it is two years overdue. Set up a committee on labour, to be sure that labour is receiving proper treatment. In passing I should like to suggest that representation on various war administrative boards be given not only to dollar-a-year men but to representatives of agriculture and labour as well. Set up a committee on home defence to deal with air raid precautions and the like. Set up a committee on rehabilitation problems. Set up a committee to utilize the services of veterans all over the dominion, the men who served in the last war and, who, but for age and other handicaps, would be serving to-day. Mobilize these veterans, through a committee of this house, to replace young men in service to-day in Canada. Seventy-five per cent of the members of this

house get no opportunity whatever, except through criticisms and suggestions, to assist the government at this time.

One thing more, Mr. Speaker. The people of Canada are asking that civilian expenditures be reduced to a minimum. Yet what has happened during the past few sessions? Estimates in millions and millions of dollars have been brought in during the last day. Give us an opportunity, by bringing them in earlier, to sit down and pare millions and millions off those estimates, to the advantage of our war effort.

As I see the situation, there is a challenge which comes to every one of us in these terrible and trying times. I saw the other day a quotation, in one of the articles sent out by the Department of National War Services, "God grant that no brave boy shall lose his life because I falter." That is the message for all hon. members of this house. Our duty is to assure the people of Canada that her effort will be such that no man in our armed forces will lack for a plane, a tank or a boat; to make sure that it will never be said of the members of this parliament, on whom the responsibility rests, that we have been "weighed in the balance and found wanting."

I warn you that the people of Canada are in no mood for trifling. They are prepared to sacrifice, to pay increasing taxes, to reduce their standard of living, to do all, but they demand that service be equalized and that wealth as well as man-power be mobilized. Parliament is more than a sounding board. It symbolizes the hopes and aspirations of all the people of Canada, whose eyes are on us. If we allow partisanship to govern to-day, parliament will become nothing but a voiceless vassal of the government.

We on this side of the house are sometimes ridiculed for our criticism. If it had not been for the criticism that came from the member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce), would tanks be built in Canada to-day? Would a great shipbuilding project have been undertaken? What about the acceleration of production of aircraft? What about the acceleration of the war effort? Criticism has come from this side and not from government members in general and it was met in many cases by ridicule at first but later was accepted.

"Politics as usual," with its companion, "business as usual," is a dangerous partnership in time of war. Canada to-day is asking her men to do and to give their all, and they ask us to make our objective victory and not votes. Let us forget our partisanship, which we have shown in the past. All of us have been guilty. Let our party drums cease to rumble, and let not party declarations stymie us from our goal of a total war effort, stultifying the national war effort and stagnating the people's morale and their will to do and their desire to serve.

Mr. F. D. SHAW (Red Deer): There can be, I think, absolutely no division of opinion on the assertion that we have at this time passed into one of the gravest periods in the world's history, a period wherein British institutions, British ideals of justice and liberty, in fact, the whole British way of life are all threatened by a combination of evils which aim to subjugate and eventually to exterminate our empire and everything for which it stands. At this particular time we are satisfied, I am sure, that it is more essential than ever that we in Canada should take stock with a view to ascertaining whether or not we are doing everything which it is necessary to do in order to meet the impending danger. I believe, further, that in every quarter of this country people are realizing more and more that every aspect of our Canadian life must be more highly coordinated and organized if ours is to be the most effective war effort.

In my humble judgment, the energies of the members of this house, the members who are the responsible representatives of the Canadian people, should be directed toward one main objective, namely, that this government and those responsible for the direction of this effort should use every measure necessary in keeping with the needs of the hour. We must take it upon ourselves to make it abundantly certain that partisanship, the desire for party advancement, must, for the moment at least, go by the board.

I am one who personally believes that actions deliberately designed to create complications tend only to frustrate and impede and have no place in the present and the immediate scheme of things. The major portion of this debate has centred round the avowed intention of the government to take a plebiscite in order that the government may be relieved from any commitments which it made in the past regarding the method of raising men for military service. A vote at this time is not a vote for or against conscription, but it has precipitated a heated debate on the question of conscription.

It is, in my opinion, extremely regrettable that this government ever allowed itself to be manoeuvred into a position where a course of action such as that which is contemplated need ever have been considered. It is a most

unenviable position in which it finds itself, and I believe it is going to be a most difficult position out of which to extricate itself.

I am taken back to that hectic March of 1940 when what courage, vision, or foresight the government may have had at that time was sacrificed on the altar of political expediency. Verily, in my opinion, it would appear that for them at least the day of judgment has at last arrived. It is also extremely regrettable that our vociferous friends of the Conservative party, inspired, I believe, by the scent of political blood, are endeavouring to move heaven and earth with their incantations, forgetting all the while that they, too, made ample use of that altar in 1940, though without very much success.

That this plebiscite is to be taken is, in my estimation, a certainty. I presume we may just as well reconcile ourselves to that fact. Since, however, it is to appear in this house as a formal issue to be debated as such, I shall refrain from making further reference to it at this time. With war convulsing the greater part of the world, with our own shores in imminent danger, as has already been indicated by many members, with that grim spectre of Hong Kong staring us in the face, it is probably timely that some of us say to the government, "Let us really get down to business and battle and thus set an example to all of our Canadian people." We are asking our Canadian people to gird themselves for war; but if we expect results which will be most highly satisfactory, it is essential that we set an example for them to follow.

I do not propose to comment upon the extent of our war preparations. I encounter a good deal of difficulty in arriving at some basis upon which I am able to criticize. We hear the reports of the various ministers. We are obliged to take their word for what they say. We have no way of knowing whether those reports are exaggerated or not. Therefore it becomes extremely difficult for us to speak in definite terms with regard to the extent to which we should expand in the production of machines of war.

There are, however, many matters about which we are familiar. In the first place, if I were to level any charge at all at the government, it would have to be this: I believe that we lack a definitely coordinated plan. I say that for this reason: We see, at this late stage, the spectacle of agriculture still in an unfortunate position; we witness the spectacle of thousands yet unemployed; we see certain cross-sections of our Canadian people still not having been given the consideration which is overdue. I have in mind, for example, the old age pensioners of whom I spoke here a few months ago. We have those unskilled workers, who, because of the fact that they are unskilled, seem to be unable to find a corner or a niche into which they might be fitted in the war effort. We witness men being taken out of essential industries and put in uniform, thus impairing the efficiency of those industries and retarding our production. I believe that it will soon be necessary for the government to set up a board or a commission, or whatever they wish to call it, for the purpose of establishing a definite, clear-cut plan for the prosecution of the war.

Let me speak of one group of Canadian citizens who are rendering most valuable service at this time even though they are unheralded; a group who have been given thus far practically no consideration by the government. That group, the teaching profession must have their views aired here. I feel competent to deal with this matter inasmuch as I have spent more than one-third of my life in that profession, and I realize from first-hand experience the difficulties they are encountering. I might be asked, "Why do you bring it up here?" Recently the government of Canada passed drastic regulations restricting certain wage increases, and granting cost of living bonuses to those in certain professions. This legislation or order in council, obviously designed to prevent inflation—which incidentally was supposed to arise only under proposals which we advocated —was intended to prevent inflation and also to ensure that all essential Canadian workers should be enabled to maintain life at a level compatible with physical and moral efficiency. The government, however, failed to take into consideration the teachers of Canada. I know the government may have regarded this as a provincial matter or a municipal responsibility. We know the government believed that the suggestions set forth in the order in council would be recognized by employing bodies. Nevertheless many of these municipalities, many of these smaller areas, failed to appreciate the valuable services performed by the teachers and the extremely necessary nature of their work. There are in Canada over 30,000 teachers in rural districts who, during the year 1940, received less than $1,000 a year for their services. There were 19,000 such teachers in the dominion who received less than $625 a year, and there were approximately 13,000 who received less than $525 a year. Outside Canada, in other parts of the British empire, we find that inexperienced women teachers enjoy an average income of from $700 to $800 a year with guaranteed increments for experience and satisfactory service.

I also have in mind that in Great Britain, when regulations were adopted granting bonuses, there was absolutely no question about the teachers being included; they were included. Unfortunately, there are all too few people in this country who appreciate the nature and the value of the work carried on by the teaching profession. Unfortunately, that profession, like many others, has been relegated to a minor position. It is high time that we gave proper appreciation to the value of education, if for no other reason than in order that the rising generation may be a little more competent to deal with the problems which confront them than we have been to deal with those which face us. I have seen during recent months hundreds of our most competent and efficient teachers move from their schools to factory centres because the rates of pay offered there are far more satisfactory than those they were getting. All this is to the detriment of the children.

From coast to coast, we have witnessed the spectacle of schools closing on account of the inability to secure teachers. In recent weeks we witnessed the spectacle of many inexperienced youngsters, if I may so describe them, without sufficient training being taken out to teach school in many rural communities. We cannot afford to allow our standard of education to become a third-rate standard. We cannot afford to see our teachers submitting themselves to economic degradation. We cannot afford to allow a semi-illiterate generation to come forward, charged with the responsibility of solving the problem which we shall pass on as a legacy to them. The terms of the order in council should be broadened to enable the teachers of Canada to demand and to secure cost of living bonuses which are necessary, if they are to continue to perform the type of service we require.

For a moment I should like to refer to the matter of salvage. I am quite satisfied that if Canadians are given a clear-cut understanding of the need for salvage, there will be no reluctance on their part to do everything within their power to provide the materials which are available and are required. The more recent aspect of our salvage campaign has had to do with the salvaging of paper. If there is a shortage of paper, as has been indicated, and if it is the desire of the Department of National War Services that paper should be salvaged, the first thing that department must do is to indicate to our people that it is prepared to set an example.

I have before me a notice which I presume appeared recently in all Canadian newspapers. It bears the heading "Bullets for Britain", and then, in large type, it states:

> Waste paper is a valuable war material—don't throw it away or burn a scrap of it. Canada needs it —needs it badly—needs it now!

And so on. It has come to my attention in my own home town, through the chairman of a committee set up to salvage paper, that recently various papers and publications have come into his hands. After examining them, he has come to the conclusion that he cannot be inspired to go forward with any great measure of enthusiasm, because he can see no evidence on the part of the government that it is anxious to conserve supplies we already have.

For example, I hold in my hand a copy of a publication sent out to newspaper editors in Canada. It is headed "Press censorship", and comprises twenty-four pages, sixteen of which are absolutely blank. When this information becomes known to the people in any community, they are not going to be enthusiastic about proceeding with this or any other type of campaign. Sometimes I wonder why the salvage organizer, as I believe he is described, for Alberta and British Columbia has not been able to get more than four or five people to attend meetings held in centres of 1,100 or 1,200 population. I believe the condition I have set out affords a definite reason why he does not secure better results. The government must indicate that it is going to practise conservation.

One further observation in that regard. Our people have not been directed as they should have been in connection with the disposal of salvage. Probably I should say that they are not satisfied that the salvaged materials are going to the sources at which they are required, without certain persons or groups of persons profiting unduly as a consequence of the operation. I am not making any accusation, but I do state that the position should be made clear to those who are called upon to salvage materials.

Not so many years ago there was set up in Canada an organization known as the air cadet league of Canada, and I should like to make one or two statements about it. I do so because in my constituency we have one of the largest air cadet squadrons to be found outside the larger cities in Canada. Squadron No. 7 at Penhold is composed of about 186 cadets. I approve the idea of an air cadet league, and it is my belief that great good will come from it. As the months roll by, we shall be in a better position to appreciate

the vision of those who took the first steps toward establishing an air cadet league in Canada.

Let me place on record this paragraph from a little booklet in which the regulations are set out:

> The desirability of providing organized elementary training in aviation for Canadian boys and young men was apparent to many people long before the war. It has taken the present conflict in all its seriousness, however, to focus attention, both public and private, not only on the desirability but the necessity of creating such an opportunity for the youth of our country. From youth itself has come an overwhelming and irresistible appeal for this training.

At one point the regulations state:

> The air defence cadet corps of the United Kingdom organized in 1938 by the air league of the British empire—

—was a tried and proven plan to use as a guide. It continues:

> The achievements of this corps, and its ever-increasing contribution to the war effort in the mother country are an inspiration and a record to which the air cadet league of Canada pays a sincere and grateful tribute.

In making this reference, I am not being critical at all. I offer suggestions because I believe in the idea of an air cadet league. I have witnessed the operation of the air cadet league corps in my constituency, and I believe the idea is first class. But this is what we are up against: Under the present system of organization we find that, with the exception of meagre assistance, the squadron is left pretty well to its own resources, as far as financing its operations are concerned.

It is true—and we are grateful—that old aeroplane parts, certain other used equipment such as rifles, and a per capita grant of one dollar a year are provided. But to provide a uniform requires about $20 per cadet, and our 186 cadets could not be provided with uniforms for less than about $3,700. I know we are supposed to appeal to our people for money to meet this cost, but by reason of other calls being made upon their resources at this time we find that many of our youth, after a number of months in the corps, are still without the required uniforms. Since the Department of National Defence for Air is more or less the godfather of this organization, I would recommend that the Royal Canadian Air Force take over immediately the general supervision of the air cadet league of Canada. They should supervise all organization work, the provision of uniforms and officer personnel. I am sure that in a few years, or in possibly a few months, we shall realize to what extent the Royal Canadian Air Force depends upon the air cadets as a source of air crew.

[Mr. Shaw.]

It is a recognized fact that many of these young men are leaving the air cadet league to join the active service. There have been eight from the Penhold squadron. It is also a well known fact that an air cadet is able to complete the Royal Canadian Air Force course in approximately two-thirds the time required by a young man without similar preliminary training. I urge that consideration be given to the recommendation I have made.

I do not propose to take up much more of the time of the house, but I should like to point out—I referred to this a moment ago—that I believe the unskilled labour which is still drifting from place to place should be given training immediately. Many men have come to me and reported that they have tried to enrol in the war emergency programme section of the youth training scheme, but that for apparently no reason they have been rejected. Daily we hear of the need for manpower, and yet in many instances these young men, when making application for training, do not receive even courteous consideration. A number of young fellows of about eighteen years of age came to me and stated that they were anxious to receive some type of training, but had been advised they would not be eligible unless they could produce proof showing that they had been rejected for or discharged from military service. We cannot permit a condition of that sort to continue. Our unskilled labour should be given an opportunity to become skilled. We shall require them if production in this country is to be in keeping with the needs of the armed forces.

These are dark days. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, we are being threatened by the most evil type of forces who would restore the dark ages if they are successful. It is essential that we should forget all those things which have hitherto divided us, that we give sane and sound consideration to our country's needs, and that the one and only concern at this time should be the needs of our country and the needs of our nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS G. ROSS (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate, may I first congratulate the mover (Mr. Fournier, Hull) and the seconder (Mr. Macdonald, Brantford City) upon the splendid speeches they made. I had supposed that they would give some credit to the administration for Canada's war effort, but I think we should pay a tribute to the men and women of Canada who have put forth such magnificent efforts in this connection. There are thousands of men and women who have made considerable sacrifices, who appreciate the realities of the present time.

I am sorry that I cannot congratulate the government upon that portion of the speech from the throne which deals with the proposed plebiscite to save the political face of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his ministers. Under the guise of national unity it is proposed to hold a plebiscite in order to endeavour to preserve the solidarity of the Liberal party. There are several aspects of the speech with which I shall deal later; at some future time I intend to discuss increases in old age pensions, veterans' allowances and certain other matters, but to-day I shall confine my remarks mainly to the question of the plebiscite. I come from Toronto, and I must say that I listened with considerable interest to the speeches of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) and the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) who both gave the house some first-hand information in connection with the serious situation that exists on the west coast. In passing, I should like to add my protests about the lack of interest the government seems to have taken in this situation.

I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Gray) upon the magnificent contribution he made to the debate. His was a well constructed and powerful speech, and I hope each hon. member will read it carefully. The speech from the throne tells us:

> . . . that the magnitude and balanced nature of Canada's war effort is being obscured and impaired by controversy concerning commitments with respect to the methods of raising men for military service which were made prior to the spread of the war to all parts of the world.
>
> The government is of the opinion that, at this time of gravest crisis in the world's history, the administration, subject only to its responsibility to parliament, should in this connection and irrespective of any previous commitments, possess complete freedom to act in accordance with its judgment of the needs of the situation as they may arise.

With that I agree. To my mind the government have always had complete freedom of action, subject to its responsibility to parliament. Pledges given prior to an election are not binding upon the government as far as the people are concerned. It is within the jurisdiction of parliament to free a government of any of its pledges so given. On many occasions the Prime Minister has told us that parliament is paramount, and that is the view I take. I was elected to represent the people in my constituency, but I was elected also—hon. members will find this in Beauchesne—to represent the people of Canada. At the time I was elected I told the people of Canada that I would endeavour to further their interests to the best of my ability. I imagine that is the position of most hon. members. But I also told them that I would use my own judgment as to what I thought was in the best interests of my constituency, and I intend to do so now. I said at that time that I did not think compulsory service for overseas was necessary then. But times have changed, and I shall use my own judgment, as every member of the house must, as to what is in the best interests not only of our constituents but of Canada as a whole.

The conduct of the worst war in the history of the world is in the hands of the Liberal government. They have decided to remain in power alone, to share responsibility with no one who has ever dared to criticize the Prime Minister. They are now faced with the question of conscription. It calls for courage, but they must do their duty, and that duty cannot be done by holding a plebiscite. A plebiscite is the evasion of duty.

What is the position of the government with regard to the pledges so given? Those pledges were given at a time when circumstances were entirely different, when the people of the country were not war-minded. Those pledges were given for political expediency. Has the government not given pledges before, Mr. Speaker, and not kept them? The Prime Minister, when seeking votes in the election of 1935, said in Quebec on September 28:

> I say that Mr. Bennett has no right to commit Canada in any way directly or indirectly or to take any action whatever as regards the possibility of war. The people of Canada do not want war and a war in such a distant part of the world holds no interest for Canada. Mr. Bennett has no right to commit the country without consulting the people by means of a plebiscite.

The Prime Minister was speaking at that time on the imposition of sanctions in connection with the Ethiopian war. Here was a clear commitment by the Prime Minister that he would not take the country to war without a plebiscite. Yet in 1939 parliament met, and without any plebiscite at all we declared war.

Again, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin), speaking in a by-election in St. Henry in January, 1938, said:

> I have already so stated. Canada will not participate in wars beyond its territory. Canada will do nothing in wars beyond its territory.

That was a definite commitment given by a responsible minister of the crown. I could make many similar quotations from *Hansard*, but that is sufficient for my purpose. As I said, parliament did declare war, and we did not have a plebiscite.

But now we are asked to determine by plebiscite a question which, to my mind, is not half as serious as declaring war. The way

to declare war is the democratic way, by parliament declaring it, and the way to settle this question of compulsory selective service for any theatre of war is for parliament to thresh the question out here on the floor of the house, and not by appealing to the people of the country. Were hon. members pledged in 1939 not to declare war without a plebiscite? If they were, the country has certainly exonerated them from those pledges. Two wrongs do not make a right, but I just wish to say that the Prime Minister and his ministerial colleagues have not always been so meticulous in carrying out the pledges they have given to the public as they would have the country believe at this time.

In the last war we had conscription, and it was opposed by the Liberal opposition of that day. The anti-conscription cry has been used by the Liberal party to win elections, and now the government finds itself faced with this hurdle which must be jumped. It proposes to get over the hurdle not by taking responsibility and deciding the question itself, but by throwing the responsibility on the people to decide by way of a plebiscite. In 1917, as I said, the opposition was against conscription. The issue then was conscription for overseas service. The need then was great, but who will say that the need was anywhere as great as the need to-day, in view of the magnitude of this war? To-day the issue hinges round compulsory national selective service for any front. There was no lack of courage displayed by the government in 1917, when the opposition was opposed to conscription. But now we have an opposition in support of that issue and we have the spectacle of a lack of courage on the part of the government. What good is a government if it will not act according to the needs of the country without seeking the opinion of the people before it acts? The members of this parliament will back up this government in whatever steps it believes to be necessary, and we know the steps that are necessary to be taken at this time from the very fact that the government is endeavouring to be freed from the pledges it gave at election time. But the principle involved in this plebiscite is simply that of asking the people to take a responsibility which the government should rightly take itself. In view of all the support which has been indicated in this parliament to-day for freeing the government's hands, there is no need to put the country to the expense of a plebiscite. The government can quite properly take whatever methods it thinks are justified, and the members of the House of Commons will exonerate it from all its pledges. Is it not unthinkable that such a thing as a plebiscite or a general election should be considered at such a critical time as this, particularly in view of the expenditure it will involve at a time when every dollar counts?

This is not just Canada's fight or Great Britain's fight. It is the fight of what I like to call the new commonwealth of the democracies of the world, and their crying need is for men. It is not only the waste of money which is involved, but the waste of valuable time, which can be measured only in the sacrifice of thousands of lives. I hope hon. members will take this into consideration before they think of holding the plebiscite. Now is the time for the government to introduce any measures which will fully mobilize us for total war. The Prime Minister must implement his pledge for total war with total action. Time has been given us to mobilize. Time—so precious—has been won by the gallant stand of those United States patriots at Guam and the Philippines; the brave stand of our brothers of the various nations of the commonwealth in Singapore—an act which will live forever in history; the stand which has been made in Libya; the stand made by our gallant allies the Russians, the Greeks, and others; the stand of our heroic allies in China; the stand of the Dutch; the stand of our own Canadians at Hong Kong—which helped to win more time for us—and the stand of our own brave men in the army in Great Britain. This time has been won for us, and now it is proposed to waste two or three months of it and plunge this country into a state of turmoil and controversy.

Let me remind you of a little history of the recent past. It may be useful if we are thinking of sheltering behind some kind of Maginot line to-day:

1940

April 9: Germany overruns Denmark and occupies Norway.
May 10: Invasion of the Netherlands and Belgium.
May 14: Netherlands army surrenders.
May 28: Belgian army surrenders.
May 29: Allied troops withdraw from Dunkerque.
June 9: Norway surrenders.
June 10: Italy declares war on Britain and France.
June 22: France collapes.
Sept. 7: Air blitz attack on London begins.
Sept. 27: Japan joins the Axis.
Oct. 28: Italy invades Greece.

1941

March 1: Bulgaria joins Axis.
April 23: Greece overrun.
June 1: Allies withdraw from Crete.
June 22: Germany, Italy and Roumania declare war on Russia.
July 24: Japanese troops invade French Indo-China.
Dec. 7: Japanese attack Pearl Harbour.

Dec. 7: Japanese invade Malaya.
Dec. 8: Japanese attack Philippines.
Dec. 17: Borneo invaded.
Dec. 19: Penang taken.
Dec. 23: Fall of Wake Island.
Dec. 25: Japanese take Hong Kong.

1942

Jan. 13: Celebes and Tarakan captured.
Jan. 16: Burma invaded.
Jan. 20: Bismarck archipelago invaded.
Jan. 21: New Britain and Solomon Islands invaded.

This is a grim chronology of twenty months of war. Are we not in a position to-day similar to that of the Netherlands and Belgium, Norway and France and Denmark? If they had had leadership and realized what was going to happen to them, would they too not have fought right from the start and mobilized everything right from the start? We cannot let our allies down. Nothing but the best is good enough. We must be realists. We do not want to have to defend Canada on Canadian shores. If that happens, it will be too late. The sad record of all these countries shows that. We may not have sufficient equipment now, but we will have it by the time we get all these men partly trained.

National selective service is long overdue. It will be approved by the House of Commons and by the people of the country.

Now, again with regard to pledges. The hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald), in seconding the reply to the speech from the throne, said in effect that if the government broke these pledges it would be in the same position as Germany before the world war. No parallel of the kind can be drawn. The present government gave these pledges, as did some hon. members, at a time when they believed they would never have to forgo them. The government know it must be done now. They must have a free hand. Not so with German pledges; for at the time Germany was giving pledges the German nation was accumulating men and materials on the borders of the nations which they had pledged never to attack, and was preparing to attack them when these pledges were given. There is no comparison along those lines; the circumstances are entirely different.

As I said before, the people of Canada would be behind the government and would exonerate them; there would be more unity, too, if the government took this action themselves rather than tried to appeal to the electors.

The motion picture of the progress of events has changed too. All these years the world has thought in slow motion. Now we are in high speed with supersensitive film; high speed of the rapidity of moving events and the supersensitiveness of the public, jittery and nervous with regard to the world situation, which is obscured by lack of knowledge of facts and lack of leadership, prone not to believe that any crisis is upon them; their supersensitiveness increased by two classes, those who have selfish motives, and the hidden army of fifth columnists within our midst. The government must smite both out of the country.

The stakes are not only life and death. They are worse. The alternatives are life or a living hell. The government knows this, and still it proposes a plebiscite!

The Prime Minister, arguing in his speech, says:

> It must not be supposed that there are large reserves of idle people leading a leisurely existence who can now be called to the national ranks.

I agree with him to a certain extent, but there is developing a certain class of idle people in this country, and there will be more because of control legislation. These people must be reallocated to war jobs. It may be difficult. Vast numbers of them are white-collar men. They probably will have to become blue-overall men.

Again he says:

> The entire Canadian population, with very few exceptions, gets up in the morning, works all day, and goes to bed tired out at night.

This may be and probably is so, but I have no doubt in my mind that many people do just this in connection with non-essential war work. They should be available, and are available in a great many instances, to the country's war effort.

The Prime Minister says further:

> In our form of society people have been accustomed to find their own jobs to a very large extent, thus saving vast government machinery.

But we have the machinery. It is set up, but it has not been functioning very well. These people must be directed to their work where they can be spared, and I am sure they are willing to do the jobs.

I could give many instances in which people could be spared right at the present time. Where are they listed? They are not listed in the national registration. What accounting is there of those people who might be available? Do we know just what number of men and women are available for this balanced programme? So far as our war effort is concerned it is not a question of comparison with the war effort of some other country. The question is whether we are doing everything we can and whether we are going to do everything we can.

We must move with courage and thoroughness. We cannot leave a single citizen, man or woman, not doing the job he or she ought to be doing. If we want some comparison, it might be measured in monetary terms. Britain alone is spending this year £4,000 millions, or $400 per capita. A comparative figure for Canada on a population basis would be about $4,500 millions or $400 per capita. We are spending in Canada this year, in the words of the Prime Minister, $3,000 millions, or about $250 per capita. Britain will produce 45,000 guns, with corresponding ammunition. They are well up to their needs and if they had no one else to take care of, their position would be fairly satisfactory, but they have to give away about half of their supply.

So far as man-power is concerned, our problem is this. For a balanced effort there are so many people in this country. Some of them are trained for special jobs, and some are not trained, having, however, the natural strength and ability to become trained. Some are men of military age, while some are too young to fight and others too old. There are so many women, some married with children, others married without children, some young and others old. This is a vast pool of brawn and brain to draw from. On the other hand, there are so many jobs that have to be done. Obviously some of these people must be diverted towards the preservation of those physical amenities of life, the supply of food and shelter and clothing, transport and so on, which cannot further be shrunk or restricted. We have also huge numbers of men and women for the army, the navy, the air force and the merchant fleet.

As regards war production itself we have the factories and we have now the tools, and if we are to do the jobs we must keep the factories going three shifts. The government's job is to see that the efforts of the millions of people in Canada, between the ages of 14 and 65, are directed to the particular tasks for which they are best fitted.

Total mobilization on the basis of equality of sacrifice would knit together the people of this country in closer bonds of brotherhood than ever before. It would be a long step toward the realization of the new and better world which everybody is wishing for after victory. It would show by this act of the government, backed by parliament, sincerity of purpose beyond all shadow of doubt, and our soldiers, sailors and airmen would have renewed confidence.

Man-power is the paramount need for 1942. So said Mr. Churchill. Every part of Canada must bear its fair burden in producing for our war effort. Surely we must all recognize this, and it can be done only by compulsory national selective service. I have listened with great interest to the arguments put forward against compulsory selective service. They are not convincing. Those arguing against it seek to compare our effort with that of other countries—how many men we have serving in comparison with those of other countries. The comparison serves no useful purpose. The main point is this: What is our capacity, and how shall we get 100 per cent of that capacity?

The hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Brunelle) made this statement, at page 94 of *Hansard:*

> They say that we will maintain production, in spite of conscription, by employing women. Without further discussing the question of the employment of women, let me say that it will create an overwhelming after-war problem. At present in England an organization is being formed to protect men's jobs against what I might call the infiltration of women into the domain formerly almost exclusively occupied by men.

What an argument against conscription, compulsory selective service, to say that we must limit our effort because of the danger which might come after the war from over-employment of women in men's jobs! If we are to have an after-war problem—and we shall have one—we must win the war first and then face the problem. If we lose, however, slavery will be our fate and the problem whether men are in women's jobs or women in men's jobs will not make much difference.

It seems to me that those who are arguing against conscription are merely in favour of seeing what we can do or what our efforts should be so that we can still get by and save our faces. The axis is asking for total war and they will give it to us. We have to give it back to them. These are facts.

We have our men overseas and we have an obligation to keep them reinforced and not let them down. That is our most sacred duty. We must defend our country wherever it can best be defended. We must raise an army for service anywhere. There must be no restriction; there must be no party politics.

I listened with interest to the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) when he formed his own party—Canada only, I think it was called. Wait, is he not responsible to members of the human race other than Canadians? Are we not all? Did he raise his finger when Mussolini slaughtered his Christian brothers of Ethopia? Did he raise his finger when Japan raided China? I must admit that we were all more or less in the same position when we allowed the international gangsters a free hand, when we allowed these acts of banditry to go unpunished. We

laid the groundwork then for the arch bandit, Hitler, and we have the consequences with us to-day.

Peace at any price—that was the downfall of France. That was the lesson taught in the French schools. That was the propaganda work of fifth columnists. The French politicians told their people that Britain's neck would be wrung in three weeks, as Mr. Churchill said, and his famous words stand out —"Some chicken! Some neck!" There was similar propaganda in Great Britain and in Canada as well. That is not what we want here. We want a total effort.

I am going to make an appeal to my French-Canadian compatriots. I understand their difficulties and I think that the situation with them is a psychological as well as a political and racial problem. For upwards of 180 years the whole mental attitude of the French-speaking population of that province has been a defensive one, rightly or wrongly. For the people of that province acknowledged that, as a result of former British policy, and as their spokesmen have taught them, they have had all the rights and privileges and liberties of other Canadian citizens, in some cases possibly more; but their basic attitude is still one of resistance to any concessions of these privileges or rights.

They are willing to give, but they resent the shadow of compulsion coming from other provinces. I assure them that the other provinces do not wish to compel them to do anything; they only wish to persuade them. The Quebec Liberal representatives have accepted the plebiscite proposal and promised to support it on the government's demand for release from past pledges, with few exceptions I suppose; then let those hon. members support the government in parliament. We do not need a plebiscite. Let them go to their people and tell them what they have done. Loyalty—I have heard the word spoken many times by hon. members from Quebec, as if we on this side of the house sought to cast any aspersions on the loyalty of the people of Quebec. Of course they are loyal. As I have said, they enjoy all the rights as well as the privileges of citizens of other parts of Canada. If they want to retain these rights and privileges they must, as General LaFleche and others have said, fight for them. If we lose this war they can rest assured their rights will be taken away. They must bear their full share of the burden if they wish to enjoy the fruits of victory.

If we have leadership I believe we have at the present time in embryo a united nation. Unity can be obtained by the government taking full responsibility and enacting all necessary measures for the safety of the state. The opposition have promised to support and will support the government; of course it reserves its right of critcism. But the opposition support cannot be obtained by such cries as come from some of the government benches when criticism is offered—cries of "sabotage". Our criticism is not offered in that way.

In the speech from the throne we find these words:

> The conflict can have but one of two outcomes. Either tyranny, based on terror and brutality, must be overthrown; or the free peoples of the world, one and all, slowly but eventually, will be reduced to a state of bondage. Upon the outcome depends, for generations, the future well-being of mankind.

Are there any hon. members in this house who do not believe these words? The peril is now. Some hon. members evidently do not believe those words. They talk about some people in this dominion as extremists. Those who advocate an all-out war effort are being called "extremists". No one can be called an extremist for advocating any measures that are necessary as a result of his belief in Mr. Churchill's pronouncements, or if he believes the words I have just read. These people are realists. You cannot be too extreme in days of perils such as this. Here are Mr. Churchill's words spoken in this chamber: do hon. members believe these words, or do they just give lip service to them? I quote:

> We have to win that world for our children. We have to win it by our sacrifices. We have not won it yet. The crisis is upon us. The power of the enemy is immense. If we were in any way to underrate the strength, the resources or the ruthless savagery of that enemy we should jeopardize not only our lives—for they will be offered freely—but the cause of human freedom and progress to which we have vowed ourselves and all we have. We cannot for a moment, Sir, afford to relax. On the contrary, we must drive ourselves forward with unrelenting zeal.

Yet some hon. members call these patriotic men "extremists."

Now a word with respect to compulsory service. What are the people of Canada saying to-day? They are saying that we have recruited so many men here in certain places, and the fellows in other places are not holding up their end. As a consequence national prejudices and jealousies are being set up. If we have compulsory national selective service that will stop, and one more step towards unity will be taken. What are the young men saying?—and this to my mind is one of the greatest arguments in favour of compulsory selective service. I know one young Canadian who supports his mother. He is willing to enlist, but he asks why he should

give up his job to an element in our midst who are chasers of dollars and not doing their duty. He says, "My chums and I feel that there is only one fair basis, compulsory selective service anywhere from everyone." These boys also feel that they want some method of removing any chance of future stigma on their name which might be caused by their being in some particular job.

What do the government hope to gain by a plebiscite? At best the government get a respite of two or three months. Meantime there are all kinds of turmoil. When the three months are up there will be the same pressure for action. This proposal of a plebiscite is an affront to the rights of parliament and an undeserved reflection on the people of this country, of whatever race or creed. It will get nowhere. If the proposal carries it will not get rid of the controversy, and it will leave uncertainty as to future action; if it fails to carry, our troops will be abandoned to the uncertainties of voluntary enlistment. In either case the country is humiliated and disgraced.

Let the government say to the country that the interests of Canada demand compulsory service anywhere. Let the government, after giving hon. members the facts and making plain the necessities which may arise, demand that hon. members give them their freedom and a vote of confidence. What did Mr. Churchill do in the House of Commons the other day? He demanded a vote of confidence and he got it. He did not ask for anv plebiscites during this war, no matter what controversies arose or what difficulties he had. There is no necessity to split this country in two by the wholly unfair method of asking those who do not know, who have not the opportunity of knowing the facts, the mothers and fathers and the boys, to vote to conscript themselves. It is a cowardly act.

On motion of Mr. MacNicol the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at six p.m.

Monday, February 2, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

SHIPBUILDING—BASIC RATES IN ONTARIO AND QUEBEC PLANTS

On the order for motions:

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): I should like to lay upon the table copy of order in council, P.C. 629. I may state that this is the order in council requested by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) on Friday afternoon. It deals with the basic wage rates in shipbuilding plants in Ontario and Quebec.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR COOPERATION IN MATTERS OF HEALTH AND HEALTH INSURANCE

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 7, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1940.

He said: This is a reintroduction of a bill which was not reached last session. The purpose of this bill is to provide that the Unemployment Insurance Commission created by the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1940, shall cooperate with other authorities in the dominion or provinces for the purpose of collecting information concerning any plan for providing medical care or compensation in cases of ill health.

These provisions were found in the Employment and Social Insurance Act, chapter 38 of the statutes of 1935. This act, having been declared to be ultra vires by majority of the supreme court, and subsequently by a judgment of the privy council delivered January 28, 1937, was repealed in 1940 by section 103 of chapter 44 of the statutes of that year, being the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1940.

The competency of parliament to legislate in regard to unemployment insurance has been now settled by the amendment to the British North America Act of 1940. It is highly desirable to reintroduce these health provisions into our dominion law.

Mr. POULIOT: This is a waste of time.

Mr. HOMUTH: Not as much as you have wasted.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

DIVORCE

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF 1930—JURISDICTION OF COURTS IN PROVINCE OF MARRIED WOMAN'S DOMICILE

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 8, to amend the Divorce Jurisdiction Act, 1930.

He said: This bill was passed by the senate at the last session and given its first reading in this house, but because government business was given precedence all through the session, public bills were not reached. I may say that I discussed this bill with the late Minister of Justice before introducing it. We went over

it carefully and he agreed that it was necessary and wise legislation. Therefore I introduce it again.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

RECOGNITION OF SOVIET UNION

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. What decision has the government reached regarding the recognition of our present ally the U.S.S.R.?
2. If recognition has been decided upon, will the government exchange representatives with the Soviet Union?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has been advised as to the reasons which make it desirable to let this question stand for the moment.

Question stands.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Prime Minister has stated that he has communicated to the hon. member who asked this question the reasons why it was not being answered at the moment. Is there any reason why the house should not also be given the reasons now? This is a matter of considerable public importance.

Mr. POULIOT: Say it with flowers.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sure my hon. friend will realize that there may be public reasons why it is inadvisable to answer a particular question at one time rather than another. There were reasons why it was thought inadvisable that this question should be answered at this moment, and those reasons were communicated to-day by the Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs to the hon. member who has asked the question. The Under-Secretary having communicated those reasons to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), and the hon. member having agreed that they were sufficient reasons for not answering the question at this time and being quite satisfied that it should stand for the reasons given, I think that ought to have sufficed. I do not mind telling my hon. friend what the reasons are. The government has undertaken negotiations in this matter and at the present time we are awaiting word from the Russian ambassador in London who unfortunately I understand has not, because of illness, been in a position up to the present time to send the desired information. I think it would have been as well if I had not had to make that explanation. I would ask my hon. friend and other hon. members of the house, at this time of very delicate relations between different parts of the world, that the government be allowed to reserve its answers to certain questions where it may be assumed it is in the public interest to reserve them without its good faith in the matter being open to question.

Question stands.

SOLDIER SETTLERS' DEBTS

Mr. FAIR:

1. What was the cost of administration of the soldier settlement board each year from 1930 to 1941, inclusive?
2. What was the total amount owed by soldier settlers at the beginning of the year 1930?
3. What was the total amount owed by soldier settlers at the end of the last fiscal year?
4. What was the amount of accrued interest at the end of each year since 1930?
5. What was the amount of (a) principal, (b) interest paid by soldier settlers each year during the above period?
6. What is the amount written off soldier settlers' debts by way of (a) bonus, (b) farmer's creditors arrangement boards, (c) other ways, during the years 1930 to 1941, inclusive?
7. What is the number of settlers still in debt to the board?
8. What is the amount of their indebtedness?
9. What was the original number of settlers?
10. What was the original debt?
11. What percentage of such settlers still in debt and on the land have a reasonable chance of making good?
12. How many of such settlers have been dispossessed because of inability to meet financial obligations since the inception of the soldier settlement scheme?

Mr. CRERAR:

1. Fiscal year

1930-31	$1,300,327 55
1931-32	1,035,474 51
1932-33	818,325 27
1933-34	740,692 80
1934-35	741,504 89
1935-36	757,507 95
1936-37	730,298 44
1937-38	709,278 38
1938-39	734,047 97
1939-40	699,489 70
1940-41	648,916 05

Note.—The above figures include the cost of a wide variety of services for the Departments of Finance; Pensions and National Health; National Defence; Labour; Secretary of State; Lands, Parks and Forests Branch, Immigration and Indian Affairs Branches of the Department of Mines and Resources; also war veterans' allowance board; dependents' allowance board; Canadian farm loan board and Canadian pension commission.

2. Soldier settlers.....	$39,162,173 99
Civilian purchasers.....	8,212,354 90
Total.....	$47,374,528 89
3. Soldier settlers.....	$12,645,256 54
Civilian purchasers.....	7,690,170 22
	$20,335,426 76
Less deferred bonus....	262,892 82
Total.....	$20,072,533 94

4. Accrued interest—soldiers and civilian purchasers—

Fiscal year	
1930-31.....	$1,644,859 90
1931-32.....	1,798,292 15
1932-33.....	1,812,837 74
1933-34.....	1,812,603 68
1934-35.....	1,701,200 19
1935-36.....	1,686,352 94
1936-37.....	1,404,220 78
1937-38.....	1,329,647 53
1938-39.....	1,207,352 79
1939-40.....	760,491 22
1940-41.....	676,800 81

5. Repayments—soldiers and civilian purchasers—

Fiscal year	Principal	Interest
1930-31.....	$1,237,045 95	$642,910 30
1931-32.....	741,988 26	637,547 90
1932-33.....	499,372 00	551,358 52
1933-34.....	724,560 53	471,134 88
1934-35.....	609,068 78	768,323 80
1935-36.....	691,718 62	684,779 68
1936-37.....	596,180 59	608,048 30
1937-38.....	716,825 74	730,302 38
1938-39.....	838,295 37	523,145 14
1939-40.....	1,141,717 80	669,506 56
1940-41.....	1,126,605 91	752,954 42

6.

	Soldier settlers	Civilian purchasers	Total
(a)	$3,426,153 32	$1,512,619 04	$4,938,772 36
(b)	6,343,109 45	2,362,857 87	8,705,967 32
(c) Land revaluation—			
	$1,130,750 59	.....	1,130,750 59
30 per cent reduction—			
	$11,303,283 26	.....	11,303,283 26
1932 interest remission—			
	$1,308,623 38	585,305 85	1,893,929 23

7. Soldier settlers, as at December 31, 1941, 7,661; civilian purchasers, as at December 31, 1941, 5,528; total, 13,189.

8. Soldier settlers, as at December 31, 1941, $11,412,145.44; civilian purchasers, as at December 31, 1941, $7,513,003.30; total, $18,925,148.74; less deferred bonus, $134,204.75; grand total, $18,790,943.99.

9. 25,017.

10. $104,502,821.41.

11. From 65 per cent to 75 per cent.

12. Practically none. It has never been the policy of the department to dispossess a settler for the sole reason of inability to pay. Dispossessions result from quit claim deeds due to a combination of factors, including inability to pay, or from cancellation proceedings due to a combination of factors, including failure to pay.

Number of original soldier settlers, 25,017. Loans repaid in cash and by time sales, 3,831; soldier settlers' loans still active, 7,661; number of completed adjustment cases, 12,470; number of adjustment cases held for resale, 1,055; total, 25,017.

LEGATIONS—JAPAN

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has the government a foreign legation in Japan?

2. If so, where is it located, who compose the staff and what are their salaries, and other allowances?

3. What functions does such legation perform in war time?

4. Who now looks after Canadian nationals in Japan?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Legation premises are occupied by the staff who are still in Tokyo although the legation has not been functioning since the outbreak of war with Japan.

2. The address of the legation is: 16 Omote-Cho, Sanchome, Akasaka-Ku, Tokyo. The staff now in Japan, with their salaries and allowances, are as follows:

E. D. McGreer, first secretary and chargé d'affaires—Salary, $4,940; allowance, $4,260.

H. F. Feaver, second secretary—Salary, $3,420; allowance, $1,350.

E. H. Norman, third secretary—Salary, $2,520; allowance, $1,575.

R. Martin, stenographer—Salary, $1,500.

At present on the staff of the Canadian legation at Tokyo is Mr. M. T. Stewart, acting Canadian commercial attaché. His salary is $2,940 and his allowances are $2,475.

3. None. The legation premises will be closed as soon as arrangements for the evacuation of the staff are carried into effect.

4. Argentina is the protecting power, and the Argentine legation is looking after all Canadian interests in Japan.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—WHEAT ACREAGE REDUCTION REGULATIONS

Mr. FAIR:

1. What is the cost of inspection under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act and wheat acreage reduction regulations in each of the municipal districts of Streamstown No. 511, Vermilion Valley No. 482, and Merton No. 451, in the province of Alberta?

2. Who are the inspectors in each of the above districts and what amount did each receive for (a) salary, (b) travelling allowance, (c) miscellaneous?

3. On whose recommendation were these men appointed?

Mr. GARDINER:

1939

1.	Prairie Farm Assistance Act
M.D. Streamstown No. 511	$369 52
M.D. Vermilion Valley No. 482	774 00
M.D. Merton No. 451	9 55

2.	Salary	Travelling allowances	Misc.	Total
G. A. Forster (in M.D. 511)	$180	$101 00	$88 52	$369 52
G. A. Forster (in M.D. 482)	315	212 27	246 73	774 00
G. A. Forster (in M.D. 451)	5	2 80	1 75	9 55

3. Mr. J. H. Irving, supervisor, Lethbridge, Alberta.

1940

1.	Prairie Farm Assistance Act
M.D. Streamstown No. 511	$331 73
M.D. Vermilion Valley No. 482	769 08
M.D. Merton No. 451	10 25

2.	Salary	Travelling allowances	Misc.	Total
G. A. Forster (in M.D. 511)	$160	$ 91 00	$ 80 73	$331 73
E. E. Morton (in M.D. 482)	285	193 17	290 91	769 08
G. A. Forster (in M.D. 451)	5	3 25	2 00	10 25

3. Mr. J. H. Irving, supervisor, Lethbridge, Alberta.

1941 and 1942

1.	Prairie Farm Assistance Act	Wheat acreage reduction
M.D. Streamstown No. 511	$499 84	$236 89
M.D. Vermilion Valley No. 482	350 49	497 82
M.D. Merton No. 451	162 18	150 99

2.	Salary	Travelling Allowances	Misc.	Total Prairie Farm Assistance Act	Total—Wheat Acreage Reduction
M.D. 511					
E. E. Maxwell ..	$ 75 00	$71 48	$31 30	$177 78	
Lon Neary	140 00	89 85	92 21	322 06	
O. H. Quist	140 00	78 49	18 40		$236 89
M.D. 482					
O. H. Quist	160 00	130 04	60 45	350 49	
N. McClellan .. .	275 00	135 20	87 62		497 82
M.D. 451					
Arthur Saville ..	70 00	59 28	32 90	162 18	
Matt Alsager .. .	57 50	50 07	43 42		150 99

3. On the recommendations of supervisors Forrester and Fitzpatrick after consultation with municipal officials.

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY—PURCHASE OF EELS

Mr. ROY:

1. Did the Department of Munitions and Supply, during the year 1941, purchase a quantity of eels from certain agents, merchants or cooperative societies in the province of Quebec?

2. If so, did the provincial Minister of Commerce cooperate in such transactions?

3. What amount was paid for such fish, to whom and on what date?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Purchase of canned eels was made during 1941 by the Department of Munitions and Supply from Les Conserves Fido Ltée., Quebec, to the amount of $1,211.58, as follows:

January	30	$ 167 59
February	4	446 55
February	15	193 50
February	17	235 19
February	24	168 75
		$1,211 58

PUBLIC INFORMATION—COST OF PAPER AND PRINTING

Mr. BRUCE:

1. In what way is the mailing list compiled for the distribution of speeches and information?

2. Must application be made for the material before it is sent out?

3. What is the cost in paper and printing per month of the information service?

4. Has the question of economy in paper been considered? If so, will this service be, (a) discontinued, or (b) greatly reduced?

Mr. THORSON:

1. Generally speaking, the distribution of printed matter by the office of the director of public information is based upon either direct or indirect requests. There are some twenty main lists—some large and some small—arranged to provide the most economical and most efficient distribution of different types of material. The basic request list originated with some 50,000 letters asking for copies of the let's face the facts broadcasts (summer, 1940). Since that date many thousands of additional letters have been received from individuals asking that their names be added to the mailing lists. Indirect additions to the mailing lists result from requests made by individuals, corporations, associations, churches, the army, schools, boards of trade, etc., etc.

2. Generally speaking, yes. An exception is one list of important government officials, dominion and provincial, who are assumed to have a natural interest in the material sent out. On rare occasions, when it is decided that wider distribution is desirable, the post office departmental list—based on professional and business addresses—is used.

3. The cost varies greatly from month to month. An average for the first nine months of the current fiscal year is $15,000 per month.

4. Yes.

4a. No.

4b. Yes.

WORKING HOURS IN FACTORIES PRODUCING WAR SUPPLIES

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow-River):

1. How many factories in Canada, producing war supplies are working 24 hours per day, 365 days in the year?

2. How many factories in Canada producing such supplies are working 24 hours a day, 6 days a week, throughout the year?

3. How many factories in Canada producing war supplies are working less than 6 days a week, 24 hours per day?

Mr. McLARTY: Except in connection with certain industrial disputes the hours of labour in industrial employment are a matter of provincial jurisdiction and no comprehensive statistics exist to answer the above questions.

Under the recently established national and regional war labour boards, however, the dominion and provincial governments are cooperating in the handling of most matters relating to employment conditions.

In this connection there is being established a joint system of inspection and reporting which is designed to produce the data requested.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. BRUCE:

1. What is the estimated cost of administering the price control board?

2. What are the estimates of deficits to be absorbed by the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. It is impossible at this time to furnish a complete estimate of the cost of board's administration.

2. Cannot foretell.

GOLD PRODUCTION AND EXPORT

Mr. QUELCH:

1. How many men are employed in the gold mines of Canada?

2. How many in all other branches of the gold mining industry?

3. What was the value of gold produced in Canada in (a) 1940; (b) 1941?

4. To what countries was this gold exported and what amount to each country during each of these years?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, before tabling the answer to this question I feel it advisable to make a statement to the house concerning questions of this kind. It will be recalled that during the last session members sought information with regard to our exports to various countries. At that time I stated that it was not in the public interest to reveal certain information, but I added that if any hon. member desired information for his own personal use and accepted it upon his own responsibility, I was prepared to give it to him. With reference to part 4 of this question, it would not be in the public interest to make public the information asked for. Otherwise the whole question is answered, as follows:

1.—Auriferous quartz mining industry, 1940

	Number
Underground	18,760
Surface	7,648
Mill	2,339
Salaried employees	2,658
	31,405
Alluvial gold mining	840
Total	32,245

2.—Answered in No. 1.

3.—(a) 1940 ..... $204,479,083
(b) 1941(*) $204,906,000
(*) Preliminary estimate.

4.—Not in the public interest to release this information.

THREE HILLS, ALTA., 1941 VICTORY LOAN

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River):

1. How much was subscribed to the Victory loan of 1941 in the Three Hills, Alberta, area?
2. What was the amount of commission paid in this area?
3. To whom were commissions paid and how much to each individual?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I ask that this question be dropped.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

CANADA'S OVERSEAS AUXILIARY SERVICES

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has any interim or final report been received from the commissioner appointed, in 1941, to visit Britain and report on Canada's overseas auxiliary services in war time?
2. Was any overlapping found, and is there anything in the report regarding delivery of parcels to soldiers in Britain and prisoners of war, and what changes, if any, were recommended?

Mr. RALSTON:

1. A full report was submitted by Colonel Manion on his return to Canada.
2. Some duplication of effort was reported due to the following reasons:

(i) The fact that in the field the four organizations operate independently despite a great deal of cooperation and mutual assistance;

(ii) In the case of some of the organizations there was an absence of preparation or training of the men chosen to be supervisors for the units in the field;

(iii) The fact that certain of the organizations felt that they could not carry out as extensive a programme of service as could others;

(iv) The failure to pool supplies of certain articles such as sports equipment (for example), of which some organizations had provided themselves with a greater supply than had others;

(v) These causes led to an unevenness of service and resulted in some units being better cared for than others;

To overcome these inequalities the report recommended that:

(i) A joint board of organization headquarters officials, in London, be set up to deal with all problems affecting the services in the field;

(ii) That supervisors selected for service with the organizations be given preparatory training in Canada before being sent overseas;

(iii) That equipment and comforts distributed by the organizations be pooled and an equal distribution to all units be made.

These recommendations have been followed out and the joint board composed of organization representatives, and the pooling of available facilities has led to a more even distribution of supplies, to better cooperation and more unity of action by the organizations.

Organization supervisors are now given experience in the militia and air force camps in Canada before being selected for overseas service, and this has resulted in better service to the men in the units.

There is no mention in the report regarding delivery of parcels to soldiers in Britain or to prisoners of war. These matters come under the Canadian postal corps.

OTTO STRASSER

Mr. REID:*

1. Has the attention of the government been drawn to Mr. H. G. Wells' statement that one Otto Strasser is now in Canada raising an armed force to save Germany from bolshevism, and that he is getting arms while many of Britain's air fields are still short?
2. If so, what action will the government take in the matter?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, may I answer this question orally? With reference to question 1, "Has the attention of the government been drawn to Mr. H. G. Wells' statement", I should like to say that much depends upon what my hon. friend means by the attention of the government being drawn to a matter. His question, of course, draws the attention of the government to the matter, otherwise I am not aware that the attention of the government has been drawn to the point which he has raised. In that connection I would like to point out that it is very difficult to answer questions of the kind because, without conferring with all departments of the government to ascertain whether any communications of the character mentioned have been received, it would not be possible to give a definite reply of yes or no. I would like to suggest with reference to questions where a particular point of information is sought that the specific matter on which information is desired be set forth. The indefinite form, "has the attention of the government been drawn to certain communications" invariably creates some difficulty in the preparation of a reply.

Answering question 2, Mr. Strasser is not receiving any arms and he is not raising any armed forces, so there is no action which the government could take or will take in the matter. While I am speaking of this question I should also like to refer to question 36.

Mr. MARTIN:*

1. Under what conditions was Otto Strasser permitted to enter Canada?

2. Is the government aware that Otto Strasser applied for a visa to reenter the United States and that his application has been refused?

3. Is it true that Otto Strasser is raising an armed force in Canada in connection with his leadership of a so-called free Germany?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Part 3 of question 36 is practically the same question that I have just answered, "Is it true that Otto Strasser is raising an armed force in Canada in connection with his leadership of a so-called free Germany?" If I might be permitted to answer that question now, I would say that it is not true.

Answering questions 1 and 2 I would say that there were certain reasons of public policy which governed the matter of Mr. Strasser's admission to Canada, and if the hon. member who has asked the question would seek an interview with the Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Robertson will be pleased to let him see the confidential correspondence on the matter.

[Mr. Reid.]

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—LICENCES

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. How many individuals or firms in Canada failed to obtain a licence as originally ordered by the wartime prices and trade board?

2. How many firms were: (a) prosecuted, (b) convicted, for failing to obtain a licence?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. As individuals and firms have been given until March 31, 1942, to comply with the order, the answer is, "none".

2. (a) None. (b) None.

PURCHASE OF BUILDINGS IN HALIFAX COUNTY

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. Has the Department of National Defence for Naval Services, or any other department of the government, purchased two hotels or similar buildings, in Halifax county, Nova Scotia?

2. If so, who was the vendor in each case?

3. What was the total purchase price paid for each hotel or building?

4. What accommodation is available in each hotel?

5. For what purpose will the hotels, or similar buildings, be used?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. The Department of Transport has acquired what has been known as the Gainsborough Hotel at Hubbard's, Nova Scotia. Only one property has been purchased, not two.

2. Mr. A. W. Shatford.

3. Purchase price $15,250, covering the hotel itself, and adjoining house known as the annex, the barn, and all appointments, including complete furnishings. In addition, the purchase price includes a wharf and the adjacent land, as well as a building used as a yacht club.

4. There was accommodation in the hotel for about 60 or 70 people, but alterations and additions are being made to increase this accommodation to approximately 150.

5. The hotel and buildings, when converted and adapted, will be used as a Sea Training school where young men volunteering to go to sea will be taught the rudiments of seamanship, with a course of instruction approximating 12 weeks. This is a war effort rendered necessary by the need for recruiting men for the merchant navy.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANTS

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. Are there any synthetic rubber plants in Canada?

2. If so, where are they located?

3. If not, is there any encouragement or direction being given to the establishment of synthetic rubber plants?

Mr. HOWE:

1. No.

2. Answered by 1.

3. The establishment of a synthetic rubber plant or plants is receiving full consideration.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—DOMINION LOANS

Mr. FAIR:

1. What amount has been loaned to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by the government of Canada?
2. What rate of interest is charged?
3. When were such loans made and what are dates of maturity?

Mr. ILSLEY: Details of loans to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are set out in Appendix No. 24 of the Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1941, Pages 131-135.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD—ADVISORY BOARD

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. What are the names and addresses of the present members of the advisory board set up in 1940 to assist the Canadian wheat board?
2. Have any changes been made in the personnel of this board since it was first set up?
3. If so, what changes have been made and upon whose authority and recommendation?
4. What jurisdiction is exercised to-day by the parliament of Canada over this advisory board?
5. How many meetings of the board have been held to date during the year 1941-42?
6. What remuneration, both by way of salary and travelling expenses, was paid each member of this board since it was first constituted?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. The following are the names and addresses of the Advisory Committee of the Canadian Wheat Board set up in 1940 as they were listed in The *Canada Gazette*, No. 10, Volume 74, of September 7th, 1940, at page 783:

Vancouver—Mr. Fred H. Clendenning, Vancouver.

Alberta—Mr. Lew Hutchinson, Duhamel, Alberta (Chairman, Alberta Wheat Pool); and Mr. Paul Farnalls, Halkirk, Alberta, (President, Western Union of Municipalities).

Saskatchewan—Mr. J. H. Wesson (President, Saskatchewan Co-op. Wheat Producers), and Mr. J. A. McCowan, Summerberry, Sask.

Manitoba—Mr. D. G. MacKenzie (1st Vice-Pres., United Grain Growers Ltd., Winnipeg.

Ontario Producer—Mr. Fred Pettypiece, Auld, Ont.

Quebec Consumer—Mr. Rosario Messier, Contrecoeur, P.Q.

Line Elevators—Mr. A. C. Reid (Western Grain Company), Winnipeg.

Millers—Mr. D. A. Campbell (former President St. Lawrence Flour Mills Co., Toronto, Ont.).

Exporters—Mr. R. C. Reece, K. B. Stoddart & Co., Winnipeg.

2. No changes have been made in the personnel of the committee since it was first set up.

3. This question is answered by the answer to question 2.

4. The Advisory Committee is set up under the Canadian Wheat Board Act, 1935, as amended 1940, and is appointed under section 6 (1) by the governor in council during its pleasure.

5. Seven meetings of the Advisory Committee were held during the crop year 1940-41 and three meetings to date during the crop year 1941-42, the dates of the above meetings being as follows:

1940-41—
August 26 and 27, 1940.
September 30 and October 1, 1940.
November 18 and 19, 1940.
December 18 and 19, 1940.
January 13, 14 and 15, 1941.
February 17, 18 and 19, 1941.
May 12, 1941.

1941-42—
August 27, 1941.
December 8 and 9, 1941.
January 12, 13 and 14, 1942.

(Question 5 only requests the number of meetings to date during 1941-42, but in view of the extent of question 6, all the meetings of the committee since it was set have been enumerated.)

6. Remunerations by way of salary and travelling expenses since the committee was first set up have been paid to the individual members as follows:

	Honorarium	Subsistence	Travelling	Total
Campbell, D. A.	....	$560	$1,268 99	$1,828 99
Clendenning, F. H.	$480	480	382 65	1,342 65
Farnalls, Paul	630	630	722 63	1,982 63
Hutchinson, Lew	430	420	500 41	1,350 41
McCowan, J. A.	450	450	271 76	1,171 76
MacKenzie, D. G.	210	37	50 45	297 45
Messier, R.	140	140	549 15	829 15
Pettypiece, Fred	510	510	823 61	1,843 61
Reece, R. C.	220	....	....	220 00
Wesson, J. H.	250	250	314 06	814 06
Reid, A. C.	....	30	90 30	120 30

DAIRY PRODUCTS BOARD—STORAGE OF CHEESE

Mr. SENN:

1. Were any firms in Ontario found to be buying and storing cheese contrary to the regulations issued by the dairy products board during 1941?
2. If so, was such cheese confiscated by the board or any of its officers?
3. Have charges been laid against any firm violating the regulations in this way?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Yes.

DAIRY PRODUCTS BOARD—PURCHASE OF CHEESE FOR EXPORT

Mr. SENN:

1. How many firms in Ontario made application for permission to buy cheese for export during the year 1941?
2. How many firms were granted such permission?
3. How many were refused?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Nine.
2. Eight.
3. One.

STOCK YARD AGENTS

Mr. CARDIFF:

What is the name and salary of each of the stock yard agents employed in the stock yards at, (a) Toronto; (b) Montreal; (c) Winnipeg?

Mr. GARDINER:

(a) C. C. Lyster, district supervisor, live stock marketing, $3,000 per annum; F. J. Bridel, stockyard agent, grade 1, $1,920 per annum; A. H. Hepton, stockyard agent, grade 1, $1,920 per annum.

(b) S. N. Chipman, supervisor, stockyards, $2,880 per annum; J. A. Deguire, stockyard agent, grade 2, $2,520 per annum.

(c) C. E. Bain, supervisor, stockyards, $2,880 per annum; E. J. Johns, stockyard agent, grade 2, $2,520 per annum; J. Maddox, stockyard agent, grade 1, $1,920 per annum.

DAIRY PRODUCTS BOARD—SHIPMENTS OF CHEESE

Mr. SENN:

1. Did the dairy products board prohibit the shipment of cheese from Ontario in the period from May 1, 1941, to November, 1941?
2. Were any permits issued during that time for shipment of cheese to Winnipeg and areas west, in violation of any regulations as above?
3. If so, to what companies and in what amounts?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. No.
2. No permits were issued in violation of any regulation.
3. Answered in No. 1 and No. 2.

[Mr. J. A. MacKinnon.]

FIRST AND SECOND WAR LOANS

Mr. TUSTIN:

1. What was the amount, by provinces, subscribed to the first and second war loans?
2. What was the amount subscribed to the first and second war loans in each city having a population of more than 20,000?

Mr. ILSLEY: This information is not available. The records of the first and second war loans were not maintained in such a way as to show the amounts subscribed by provinces and cities.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

WARTIME HOUSING LIMITED

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. How many houses have been constructed by Wartime Housing Limited at each of the following places: (a) Fort William, (b) Halifax, (c) Hamilton, (d) Welland, (e) Peterborough, (f) Wrightville?
2. What was the total cost of construction, including purchase of land and providing water and other services, at each centre?
3. What was the total cost per house in each place?

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. Did Wartime Housing Limited give a contract in 1941 to erect houses or other buildings in or near New Glasgow, Nova Scotia?
2. If so, to whom, stating value of said contract, and if not carried out, the reason for termination?
3. Did Wartime Housing Limited negotiate with Eastern Woodworkers of New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, in 1941, with respect to building construction?
4. If so, to what extent?
5. Did Eastern Woodworkers have a subcontract in 1941 from any contractor of Wartime Housing Limited to build or supply materials for prefabricated houses in Nova Scotia?
6. If so what was the amount of such subcontract?
7. Did Eastern Woodworkers have a contract during 1941 from Wartime Housing Limited to erect houses in any part of Nova Scotia?
8. If so, state locality, the number of buildings and the total contract price?
9. What was the average cost of each class or model of such buildings completed, including streets, side-walks, sewerage, plumbing and all other expenses?
10. Did Wartime Housing Limited have any land surveyed in 1941 for proposed prefabricated houses or other buildings in or near New Glasgow, Nova Scotia?
11. If so, where was such land situated, who was the owner or agent, what was the price, who did the surveying and what was the expense?
12. Did Wartime Housing Limited negotiate with Mr. A. D. McCormick, New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, for the purchase of any land in or near New Glasgow, Nova Scotia?

13. If so, where was such land located and what was the price asked?

14. Who recommended to Wartime Housing Limited that they negotiate with Mr. A. D. McCormick?

15. Did Wartime Housing Limited pay or receive any accounts for costs of excavation for sewerage or other expenses on account of any land in or near New Glasgow, Nova Scotia?

16. If so, by whom were such accounts rendered; and what amounts and to whom were payments made?

CANADIAN FARM LOAN BOARD

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. Who are the officials of the Canadian Farm Loan Board (a) in the head office at Ottawa, (b) in the different provinces in Canada?

2. What were their respective salaries during the last fiscal year?

3. What were the total expenses, exclusive of salary of each official?

4. What are the total amount of loans in each province?

5. What were the total collections made in each province during the last fiscal year?

6. What was the total expense in connection with this board, legal and otherwise, during the last fiscal year?

Mr. ILSLEY: Return tabled.

RUBBER TIRES

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. Who is eligible to buy rubber tires in Canada?

2. What is the procedure in regard to purchasing rubber tires?

Mr. HOWE: Return tabled.

CONTRACTS FOR EQUIPPING SAINT JOHN, N.B., HOSPITALS

Mr. HAZEN:

1. What contracts have been awarded by the government for the construction and/or equipping of hospitals or similar buildings in or near Saint John, New Brunswick, since September 1, 1939?

2. What is the total amount of each contract?

3. Were tenders called in each instance?

4. If so, who were the tenderers and what was the amount of each tender?

5. For what purposes are the buildings to be used?

6. Did the government purchase land upon which these buildings were erected?

7. If so, from whom was the land purchased in each instance and what was the total purchase price paid?

COST PLUS CONTRACTS

Mr. BENCE:

1. How many cost plus contracts have been awarded by the government since the outbreak of the war?

2. To what persons, firms and corporations have such contracts been awarded?

3. What is the total amount of such contracts?

4. How many management fee contracts have been awarded by the government since the outbreak of war?

5. To what persons, firms and corporations have such contracts been awarded?

6. What is the total amount of such contracts?

DEBERT AIRPORT AND MILITARY CAMP

Mr. PURDY:

1. How much land did the government purchase in connection with the development of (a) Debert airport; (b) Debert military camp?

2. From whom was this land obtained and what price was paid in each case?

3. Are there any parcels of land acquired by the government in this area which have not as yet been paid for?

4. If so, who were the owners and why has settlement not been made?

CAPITAL ASSISTANCE TO PRIVATE CORPORATIONS

Mr. CASSELMAN:

1. What is the total amount expended by the government by way of capital assistance to private corporations?

2. What is the name of each corporation to whom capital assistance by the government has been granted?

3. What is the total amount granted to each such corporation?

4. What is the purpose for which each such grant was made?

5. Is the government committed to make additional grants by way of capital assistance to any of such corporations?

6. If so, what is the additional amount of such commitment in each case and what is the purpose of the additional grant?

7. Have any payments other than grants by way of capital assistance been made by the government to any private corporation for the purpose of expanding the production of such corporation?

8. If so, what are the names of the corporations to which such payments have been made?

9. What was the amount of each such payment?

10. What was the direct purpose of each such payment?

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY—GOVERNMENT-OWNED CORPORATIONS

Mr. CASSELMAN:

1. What is the total of the expenditures which have been incurred by each of the government-owned corporations created under the Department of Munitions and Supply Act?

2. What advances or other payments have been made to each such government-owned corporation?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

COMMODITY PRICES STABILIZATION CORPORATION

Mr. STOKES:

For a return showing:—1. The names, addresses and ordinary occupations of the directors and chief officials of the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation;

2. The total remuneration paid by way of salary, honorarium, living allowances or travelling expenses paid to each such director or chief official;

3. A statement of the authority, duties and functions of the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation;

4. A statement of the actions taken by the said corporation since its organization.

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—COMMODITY PRICES STABILIZATION CORPORATION—STAFF

Mr. STOKES:

For a statement showing the names, previous occupations, salaries, honorariums or living allowances of each person appointed to a position under the Wartime Prices and Trade Board and/or the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation since the first day of October, 1941.

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. TUSTIN:

For a return showing the names of all government corporations which have been organized to carry on any work in connection with the manufacture or purchase of munitions or supplies, together with a statement showing the names, addresses and ordinary occupations of the directors and chief officials of each such corporation; and also the total amount paid by way of salary, honorarium, living allowances and travelling expenses to each such person.

COST OF RECRUITING

Mr. TUSTIN:

For a return showing:—1. The total cost of recruiting for (a) the army, (b) the navy, (c) the air force, since the outbreak of war;

2. The total cost of the recruiting campaign conducted in May, June and July, 1941;

3. The total cost of the building and preparation of camps used for the purpose of training men under the National Resources Mobilization Act;

4. The total cost incurred by the Department of National War Services in calling up men for training under the National Resources Mobilization Act;

5. The total cost incurred by the Department of National Defence in training men called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE, 1914-18

Mr. TUSTIN:

For a return showing:—1. The number of men who enlisted in the Canadian expeditionary force during each month of the great war 1914-18;

2. The number of men serving overseas with the Canadian expeditionary force at the conclusion of each month during the great war 1914-18;

3. The total number of enlistments by provinces and/or military districts for active service during the great war 1914-18;

4. The total number of men, by provinces and/or military districts, who served overseas during the great war 1914-18;

5. The total number, by provinces and/or military districts, who were drafted pursuant to the Military Service Act during the great war 1914-18;

6. The total number of men, by provinces and/or military districts, who were drafted pursuant to the Military Service Act and who served overseas in the great war 1914-18;

7. The total number of casualties sustained by the Canadian expeditionary force during the great war 1914-18;

8. The number of casualties incurred by the Canadian expeditionary force in each month of the great war 1914-18.

CANADIAN ARMY—ENLISTMENTS, ETC.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

For a return showing:—1. The total number of men, by provinces and/or military districts, who have enlisted with the Canadian active army as of the latest available date;

2. The total number of men, by provinces and/or military districts, serving overseas with the Canadian army as of the latest available date;

3. The total number of men, by provinces and/or military districts, who are attested for overseas service and who are now serving in the Canadian army as of the latest available date;

4. The total number of men, by provinces and/or military districts, who are serving with the Canadian army reserve as of the latest available date;

5. The total number of men, by provinces and/or military districts, included in the statistics in question number 4 above who were posted to reserve units after receiving training under the National Resources Mobilization Act.

Mr. RALSTON: This raises a question which I have had up with my hon. friend; that is to say, whether we should disclose the number of men serving. I have tried to meet the convenience of, and provide information for, hon. members as far as possible, by giving round figures—that is to say, upwards of so many, rather than giving actual figures. I trust the house will accept that as being sufficient in connection with matters of this kind.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the minister takes that attitude at this time, but I would suggest to him that this is a substantial change of policy, and possibly of very recent date. On November 12, 1941, as reported in *Hansard*, page 4322, in answer to a question relating to the total number of men now serving in overseas theatres of war, the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power), then acting as Associate Minister of National Defence, gave the exact figure,

indicating that, as of October 25, 1941, 110,209 were serving in all theatres beyond Canada. As a matter of fact, the minister himself, in the course of a speech on November 5, and in reply to a question from my colleague the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Casselman) stated that there were over 110,000 serving.

If the minister mentions that these figures can only be given in round numbers, I should like to point out to him that his margin of inaccuracy was only 209.

Similarly, at page 4323 of *Hansard*, November 12, 1941, the Associate Minister of National Defence gave the exact figures of the total number of men then serving in all branches of the Canadian Army.

It is apparent that the objection which is now taken to furnishing statistics of strength represents a very recent change of policy, and I do say that the minister should give us a reason for that change. I should like to make it clear that I am not at the moment quarrelling with the policy; I want to know what it is, and the reasons therefor.

While I am about it I might also refer to Nos. 8 and 9 under Motions for Papers on the order paper. No. 8 deals with the air force, and No. 9 with the navy. I might say that I helped draft these motions, and in these cases inquiry has not been made regarding the number serving overseas, because I understood it was the policy of both the naval and the air force departments which they have consistently taken and maintained, that these figures should not be furnished. Now there is a change of policy on the part of the Department of National Defence regarding the army. I should like to know the reasons for that change so that they may be considered, having regard to the fact that heretofore we have been given exact figures.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend knows that in only the one case to which he has referred were the actual figures given.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: I may say to my hon. friend that that was a slip. That should not have been done. The house will realize, I am sure, that you can no more get those figures in England than you can fly to the moon. They won't give them at all. Unfortunately we adopted in the one instance the policy—which I think was wrong—of giving figures. I am willing, although here I may be going too far, to give figures of enlistments even. I only want hon. members to realize that in withholding figures we are acting simply in the interests of security. I do not see why we should publish on the pages of *Hansard* the exact size of our army, our navy or our air force. It is all very well for the enemy to guess about it, but there is no reason in the world why responsible ministers should stand up in their places and give that information. I do not believe that precise figures were ever given before. The hon. gentleman cited the case in which I spoke of "over 110,000". If it had not been that the previous figures were given there might have been a wide margin and that would have been the minimum, whereas, if you give the exact figures it discloses of course the maximum as well.

It might not be objectionable to give hon. members individually the exact figures, although there, perhaps, I may be going farther than I should. Let me say that I would have no objection to giving exact figures to some hon. member who wishes to check them to make sure he is not being misled, and I do propose to give the house "upwards of so-and-so", or, as I said in that case, "over so-and-so".

I hope the house will accept that suggestion as being, to say the least, not too restricted, and going perhaps further than ministers would go elsewhere.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have no desire to pursue the matter: I have asked the minister for his reasons, and he has now given them. I may point out, however, that in the United States the policy to which he takes exception is being followed; the nation is being told from time to time what the strength of the army is.

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, then, I do not read the newspapers aright.

Mr. RALSTON: The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) reminds me—I had thought it applied only to the air force—that we had representations from the British government in regard to this very matter of giving the strengths of our various forces. The Prime Minister tells me that that was with regard not only to the air force and the navy but with regard to the army as well.

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE—ENLISTMENTS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

For a return showing:—1. The total number of men by provinces, who have enlisted in the Royal Canadian Air Force as of the latest available date;

2. The total number of men, by provinces, who are now serving with the Royal Canadian Air Force.

ROYAL CANADIAN NAVY—ENLISTMENTS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

For a return showing:—1. The total number of men, by provinces, who have enlisted in the Royal Canadian Navy, the Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve and the Royal Canadian Naval Reserve since the outbreak of war;

2. The total number of men, by provinces, who are now serving with the Royal Canadian Navy, the Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve and the Royal Canadian Naval Reserve.

NATIONAL RESOURCES MOBILIZATION — NUMBER CALLED UP AND TRAINED—ATTESTATIONS FOR OVERSEAS SERVICE

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

For a return showing:—1. The number of men by provinces and/or military districts who have been called up and received training pursuant to the National Resources Mobilization Act;

2. The number of men by provinces and/or military districts called up for service under the National Resources Mobilization Act who have volunteered and been attested for overseas service;

3. The number of men, by provinces and/or military districts called up for service under the National Resources Mobilization Act, who have not volunteered for overseas service but are serving in Canada for the duration of the war;

4. The number of men, by provinces and/or military districts, who have received training under the National Resources Mobilization Act and who have been permitted to return to their civilian occupations.

ENLISTMENTS IN CANADIAN FORCES BY MONTHS

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

For a return showing:—1. The number of men enlisted for active service (a) in the army; (b) in the navy, (c) in the air force, during each month since the outbreak of war;

2. The number of men serving overseas in the Canadian army at the conclusion of each month since the outbreak of war.

Mr. RALSTON: The answer to No. 2 will be subject to what I said with regard to the other motion of the hon. member.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In that connection may I point out to the house that in this booklet which is issued monthly by the director of public information, under the authority of the Minister of National War Services, there is a statement progressively of the numbers who have enlisted voluntarily for service anywhere and for home defence. As revised to December 1, 1941, the statement is made on page 15 that the Canadian army has expanded greatly since the outbreak of war, as indicated "by the following figures", and then it gives the pre-war and to-day's figures under both headings, showing voluntary enlistments for service anywhere, more than 240,000, and enlistments for home defence, more than 160,000. These figures are approximately correct, I assume, and I do not see that there is very much force in the minister's statement. I do not see why the exact figures cannot be given.

Mr. RALSTON: The only alternative is for me not to give anything. I am going as far as I can and I do not think my hon. friend should complain.

Mr. SPEAKER: Carried, as qualified by the Minister.

PUBLICITY OR PUBLIC RELATIONS—EXPENDITURES—STAFF APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

Mr. MacKINNON (Kootenay East):

For a return showing:—The total expenditures incurred by the Department of National Defence, the Department of National Defence for Air, the Department of National Defence for Naval Services, on publicity or public relations work for the fiscal years ending March 31, 1940; March 31, 1941 and the present fiscal year to date.

Mr. AYLESWORTH:

For a return showing: (a) name; (b) date of appointment; (c) previous occupation; (d) salary, honoraria; living allowances and allowances for travelling expenses of each person engaged in publicity or public relations work for any department of government, or any agency of the government including government-owned corporations.

NATIONAL RESOURCES MOBILIZATION—ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Mr. MacKINNON (Kootenay East):

For a copy of all orders in council passed pursuant to the National Resources Mobilization Act.

CEILING ON PRICES AND WAGES

Mr. AYLESWORTH:

For a copy of:—1. All orders in council dealing with the ceiling on prices and wages;

2. All orders, regulations, rulings or formal decisions of any kind made by the Wartime Prices and Trade Board and/or any official thereof in connection with the ceiling on prices;

3. All orders, regulations, rulings or formal decisions of any kind made by the Minister of Labour, the National War Labour Board, the Regional War Labour Boards, the Department of Labour and/or any official thereof with reference to the ceiling on wages.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL UNDER WAR MEASURES ACT AMENDING REVENUE LEGISLATION

Mr. AYLESWORTH:

For a copy of all orders in council passed pursuant to the War Measures Act or any other act which amend, alter, suspend or in any way affect the Customs Act, the Customs Tariff Act,

the Excise Act, or the Special War Revenue Act, together with any regulations, rulings or formal decisions made by the Minister of National Revenue and/or any official of the Department of National Revenue or the War-time Prices and Trade Board or the Commodity Prices Stabilization Corporation and/or any official thereof, pursuant to such order in council.

CANTEEN FUNDS

Mr. BENCE:

For a copy of the report made by the committee appointed under order in council P.C. 7520 for the purpose of inquiring into the utilization and custody of canteen funds, together with a statement of the action which has been taken by the government to implement such report.

CANADA PACKERS—DISMISSAL OF ADAM BORSK

Mr. GILLIS:

For a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the Department of Labour and Canada Packers Limited, Toronto, and between the Packing House Workers Organizing Committee and the Department of Labour, relative to the discharge of Adam Borsk, an employee of Canada Packers, on December 23, 1941.

CANADIAN FORCES—RELIGIOUS AFFILIATIONS

Mr. HOMUTH (for Mr. Church):

For a return showing the number of officers and men serving in the active service forces of the army, navy and air force, with their religious affiliations as set out on their attestation papers.

Mr. RALSTON: I wonder if my hon. friend, who moves this for the hon. member, will allow the motion to stand. This means another running through the Hollerith machines of all cards with respect to attestation papers, having regard particularly to religious affiliations. The hon. member will see how serious this is, and I should like to consult the member in whose name the motion stands to see whether he thinks this time, labour, expense and material should be incurred for the purpose of this particular return. As my hon. friend can see, it means that they have to go over all the cards, mark them, and go through the Hollerith machine, and it does take a great deal of time. Unless it is urgent, I would ask that it stand.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Has this been done up to a certain point of time?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have no objection to the minister's request, but I have an idea that it has been done up to a certain point of time and it only means coming from that time to the present. I had no communication with the hon. member for Broadview about this question.

Motion stands.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. MARSHALL:

For a copy of all recommendations made to the Canadian wheat board or the government by the advisory committee of the wheat board for the year 1941-42 and the year 1942-43.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): I should like this matter to stand until I look into it further. It may not be in the public interest to table all the papers that have been requested.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

Mr. HOMUTH: Shall we have a plebiscite on dollar wheat?

WARTIME HOUSING—PREFABRICATED HOUSES

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

For a copy of all correspondence and telegrams exchanged during 1941 between Hon. J. H. MacQuarrie, Attorney General of Nova Scotia and the Hon. Mr. Howe, or the Department of Munitions and Supply, and Hon. Mr. Ilsley or the Department of Finance, and Hon. Mr. Macdonald or the Department of Defence Naval Affairs in connection with the proposed building of prefabricated houses in Pictou county, Nova Scotia, by Wartime Housing Limited.

Also a copy of all correspondence and telegrams exchanged during 1941 between Warden F. H. McNeil, chairman of Victory loan committee for Pictou county and the Hon. Mr. Ilsley or the Department of Finance in connection with the Victory loan and the proposed building of prefabricated houses in Pictou county by Wartime Housing Limited.

INCOME AND CORPORATION TAX—CORRESPONDENCE WITH PROVINCES

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams or other documents, exchanged between the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance, or any official of the government, and the provincial treasurer or other official of any provincial government, relating to the proposed vacation of the fields of income and corporation tax.

DELEGATION OF MINISTERIAL AUTHORITY

Mr. TUSTIN:

For a copy of all instruments or other documents signed by any minister of the crown purporting to delegate authority vested in such minister or any act of parliament, or otherwise, to a deputy minister or person holding the rank of deputy minister or any other official of the government.

Mr. McLARTY: This motion is an extremely broad one. I am advised that the amount of work entailed will be very large and the delay will be very great. I was going to suggest to the hon. member in whose name the motion stands that perhaps we could limit it. For example, it requires returns from all

departments, and a motion could be made which would doubtless give the hon. member the information much more quickly than he would obtain it if this motion were to pass as it stands at present.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I cannot appreciate the minister's statement that it would involve a lot of work. I think every minister could ask his deputy to get this. I happen to know one department where this has been done, much to my astonishment. I think it was without any legal authority or justification. If each minister would ask his own deputy he would soon get the answer. I do not think it is universal in all departments, but I know of one or two where it has been done. Well, I limit it to since 1940.

Mr. McLARTY: I wonder if the hon. leader of the opposition has given consideration to the provisions of the Interpretation Act with regard to the delegation of authority by ministers.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is a legal question.

Mr. McLARTY: I think a motion could be framed which would elicit the information required without being nearly as broad in its terms, because this as it stands could, I suppose, go back to confederation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motion stand.

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY—AGREEMENTS WITH GOVERNMENT-OWNED CORPORATIONS

Mr. BENCE:

For a copy of all agreements entered into between his majesty and/or the Minister of Munitions and Supply and any government-owned corporation created pursuant to the Department of Munitions and Supply Act.

KIRKLAND LAKE LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr. MacINNIS:

For a copy of all orders in council relating to the dispute at Kirkland Lake, Ontario, dated from October 14, 1941, to date, as well as a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents in connection with this dispute, during the same period, passing between the Minister of Labour or any officer in the Department of Labour and, (a) any officer of local 240 of the United Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers' Union; (b) any officer of the Canadian Congress of Labour; (c) any one of the owners or management of the mines concerned; (d) any officer or representative of the Mine Owners' Association or Federation.

Also a copy of the minutes of any meeting of the national war labour board at which the question of the said labour board acting as the arbitrator in the said dispute was discussed.

[Mr. McLarty.]

EXPENSES OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS TRAINING FOR MEDICAL SERVICES IN H. M. FORCES

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, briefs, statements, memoranda and all other papers passing between the medical profession, any medical society or any university medical faculty in Canada, or any officer or officers or members thereof, or of any students of medicine, or any other person, and the government of Canada, or any officer thereof, regarding a loan or grant towards the annual expenses of medical students in university who are also training for medical services later in his majesty's forces.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON SHIPBUILDING—LABOUR DISPUTES

Mr. MacINNIS:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, orders in council and other documents in the possession of the government, relating to the appointment of the Royal Commission on Shipbuilding in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, as well as a copy of any recommendations made by the said royal commission, and any report or reports of boards of conciliation and investigation under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act in relation to disputes between any or all of the companies mentioned in order in council P.C. 629, January 26, 1942, and the employees of such companies.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) whether facilities will be arranged for the later consideration of notices of motion for the production of papers which it has been asked should stand? Under the order, as I understand it, these might not be reached again without some special facilities being granted.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It might be understood that if as the result of conference between the hon. member asking the question and the minister concerned with the order any agreement reached between them might be regarded as equivalent to the order being passed. The papers could be made ready and the order formally passed at another time.

MILITARY SERVICE

PROPOSED PLEBISCITE—PROCEDURE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to direct some questions to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) with respect to the proposed plebiscite. My questions arise out of a press report which appeared in the Ottawa papers, stating that the machinery for holding the plebiscite is already being set up, presumably in anticipation of legislation which will be introduced to give effect to the government's proposals,

if, as and when they are approved by this house. The report divides this into two major portions:

First, that the proposed vote is to be taken on the lists used in the last general election, without any revision. I can scarcely believe this, as these lists are two years old, and many thousands of young men and women must have come of age since the last election. Also many thousands of persons eligible to vote in March, 1940, are now deceased, and in addition, thousands have moved from a constituency in which they voted in 1940 to other constituencies, in many cases too far distant for them to return to vote.

Second, and more startling to me, is the report that the ballots cast from all over Canada are to be brought to Ottawa, dumped into a huge national pool and counted without reference to province or other locality. May I ask the Prime Minister if there is any truth in either of these reports?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): If I were to begin to answer questions relating to reports with respect to the plebiscite appearing in the papers, I should have nothing else to do. The house will be informed in due course of the procedure the government intends to adopt. May I say that I think the procedure we shall take will commend itself to hon. members on all sides.

"COMMITTEE FOR TOTAL WAR"

PRESS ADVERTISEMENT—BY-ELECTION IN SOUTH YORK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): I hold in my hand an advertisement which was widely publicized in the press. It is entitled "Total War".

Mr. HOMUTH: Oh, that is old.

An hon. MEMBER: It is old and dead.

Mr. POULIOT: It is signed "Committee for Total War". I would ask the government whether it is possible to ascertain how many of the two hundred "Tailors of Tooley Street" who signed that proclamation are qualified voters in South York.

CANADIAN ARMY

ENLISTMENT IN NAVY OR AIR FORCE OF MEN IN TRAINING UNDER MOBILIZATION ACT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. I am advised that in one of the basic training camps a notice was posted on the bulletin board to the effect that those who were called up under the National Resources Mobilization Act would not be permitted to enlist in the navy or air force. I made some inquiry and I understand that men who have passed the first basic training period, shall I say, of two months, and are in the second basic training period, are now not given the option of applying for enlistment on the completion of their four months' training, or whatever it may be, in the navy or the air force. But has a rule now been promulgated under which young men in the first basic training period no longer have the option of going into the navy or the air force? The bulletin to which attention was directed does not make that clear.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): I have no knowledge whatever of any such rule having been promulgated or order made. I do not know whether it is an individual case, concerning some particular basic training centre. But I may tell my hon. friend that there has been some difficulty on one point, a matter between the services. That is to say, I think there was a feeling that officers from the other services come to the basic training centres at inopportune times and perhaps interrupt the training in order to find out whether there are any recruits for them. This has now been cleared up, but I should be very much surprised if any such order as my hon. friend referred to had been issued with regard to the first basic training period. The situation is different with regard to the advanced training centres. The army feels that it has done its share for the other services when it has given the basic training and then allows the men to transfer to the other services. When the men have gone on to advanced training it is felt that they should remain with the army.

"COMMITTEE FOR TOTAL WAR"

PRESS ADVERTISEMENT—BY-ELECTION IN SOUTH YORK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Owing to the fact that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) butted in before my revered leader could answer, would the Prime Minister be kind enough now to reply to my question about the two hundred "Tailors of Tooley Street" in Toronto?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): If I understood aright the purport of my hon. friend's question it was whether this advertisement, which

appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* of Monday, January 12, 1942, and which has appeared in a number of other newspapers throughout Canada, was not really intended to be part of the literature of the present campaign in connection with the by-election in York South.

Mr. POULIOT: Exactly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And, as such, whether it should not bear on its face something to identify the parties who were responsible for having it issued.

Mr. POULIOT: Exactly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have no doubt that is probably correct. However, the Election Act deals with that matter and provides means whereby action may be taken with respect to any violation of its provisions, if that is thought advisable.

HONG KONG

INQUIRY AS TO FURTHER WORD CONCERNING CANADIAN CASUALTIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Could the Minister of National Defence indicate to the house when the country may expect further word regarding the casualties sustained at Hong Kong?

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): I am sorry that I cannot.

CHEESE

QUESTION AS TO THE SHORTAGE OF BOXES AND MILK CANS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): On January 28 I was asked a question by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Senn), which I agreed to answer at a later time. The question was:

It has been drawn to my attention that there is danger of a serious shortage of cheese boxes, owing to the failure of the controller to release material for manufacture. It has also been drawn to my attention that the same condition exists in regard to milk cans. It is pointed out that there is an insufficient quantity of tin to coat the cans. Have any representations been made to the minister on this subject, and if so, does he intend to take action?

The answer is that there may be a temporary shortage of cheese boxes at some points during the present winter, owing to the heavy increase in the production of cheese as compared with the same period one year ago. The total gradings of cheese last week exceeded those of the same week one year ago by 889 per cent, while the increase in the accumulative gradings since December 1 last is 207 per cent. Many of the cheese box manufacturers had not provided for the manufacture of any quantity of boxes during the winter months, and, owing to the increase in the production of cheese, there is a temporary shortage of properly seasoned material for making boxes in some sections. It can be stated, however, that officials of the timber controller's office, also officials of the dairy products division, have investigated the cheese box situation in Ontario and Quebec with reference to a supply of boxes for the coming season, and it is expected that there will be sufficient boxes available to meet the requirements throughout the year.

With regard to milk cans, the tinned iron used in the manufacture of large thirty-gallon milk cans is imported from England, and it is understood that supplies of such material in Canada are satisfactory. The heavy black iron used for making milk and cream cans of five and eight gallons, also for reinforcing the large milk cans, comes from the United States. The General Steel Wares Limited and the Canadian John Wood Company, Toronto, placed orders in the United States for material some time ago, and while only part of their orders has been filled they expect to get priority rating, which will enable them to secure the balance of their orders. The tin situation in Canada is tight; meetings have been held between the agricultural supply board and the officers of the metal controller's office, and action has been taken in an effort to secure the necessary tin to meet the requirements of the dairy industry.

Mr. M. C. SENN (Haldimand): If I am not accused of infringing upon the rules of the house, I should like to add for the minister's information that the condition I spoke of in regard to cheese boxes prevails in western Ontario. The condition which prevails in regard to milk cans, particularly the smaller sized cans of five to eight gallons, is due partly to the fact that they are unable to get tin with which to re-tin and recondition these cans. I just draw this information to the minister's attention so that he can deal with it.

WHEAT

PRAIRIE FARM INCOME PAYMENTS—ORDER IN COUNCIL P.C. 8126

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): On January 29 the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) asked me a question, as follows:

I should like to draw attention to order in council P.C. 8126, dated October 22, 1941, but published only on January 23, 1942, in an extra

edition of the *Canada Gazette.* My first question to the Minister of Agriculture is, why was the publication of this order in council so long delayed? What other steps were taken to bring its provisions to the attention of the interested public?

The answer to that question is that the War Measures Act does not require the publication of orders in council passed under the act. The practice in this department has been to publish such orders in council when it is desired to bring, through the *Canada Gazette,* the information contained in the order to those to whom it is intended to apply. In the case of this order more direct communication was the means of conveyance. This took the form of press and radio announcements and press advertisements. Following this publicity a number of applications were received for copies of the order and, since it was apparent that a considerable number would likely be required for distribution through this department and the treasury department, it was decided to have the order printed in the *Gazette* and the necessary copies obtained for distribution.

The next question was:

The order in council provides for the expenditure of $20,000,000 by way of additional payments to increase the income of farmers in the spring wheat area of western Canada. I should like the minister to explain the real purpose of this order in council, and the relationship of the payments to be made under it to the $35,000,000 provided under schedule B of Appropriation Act No. 4 of 1941.

The answer is that the amount of money, $20,000,000, provided in the order in council, was for the purpose of supplying additional income to wheat farmers who had harvested a much lighter crop during the past year than was expected at the time the policy was laid down last spring. There is no direct relationship between the $20,000,000 and the $35,000,000. The $35,000,000 provided under order in council last year was for the purpose of encouraging a reduction in wheat acreage. That reduction was made, and there was also a reduction in the crop because of the unusual weather conditions this summer, which cut down the revenue from wheat sufficiently, as we thought, to warrant the government in voting an additional $20,000,000 for that purpose.

The last question was:

May I also ask him to tell this house why those provisions were made by order in council instead of being brought before parliament at its November sitting in the usual and proper manner.

As is indicated, the order was issued on October 22. The regulations under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act require that all applications for payments be in before December 1; and in order to get information out to the farmers in sufficient time to allow those applications to be in by December 1 it was considered necessary to take this action immediately rather than wait for a sitting of the house.

Mr. E. E. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): Pursuant to the reply of the minister to the leader of the opposition with respect to orders in council providing for certain bonuses, I wonder if the minister would indicate to the house what percentages of these bonuses have been paid already? I have had many inquiries as to when the balances of the wheat acreage bonus would be paid and also when the first payment would be made on the $20,000,000 bonus. Would the minister care to indicate where these bonus payments stand now?

Mr. GARDINER: I think it would be better if a question were placed upon the order paper in order to get the exact amounts, rather than my attempting to recite them from memory. I would say that by far the greater part, approximately five-sixths, of the money under the wheat acreage reduction plan has been paid. Probably more than that has been paid; I have not the recent figures. In so far as the prairie farm income payment of $20,000,000 is concerned, a considerable amount of that has been paid out. Only 60 per cent is payable after December 1, and 40 per cent is not payable until after March 1, so that a considerable part of this would not be paid up to the present. As far as prairie farm assistance is concerned, payments have been going out since some time in December. I am not in position to state exactly how much has gone out, but if a question were put upon the order paper I would get the figures up to date.

"FAIRMILE FUDDLE"

REFERENCE TO EDITORIAL IN THE JANUARY-FEBRUARY ISSUE OF "BOATING MAGAZINE"

On the orders of the day:

Hon. ANGUS L. MACDONALD (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): On Friday the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce), as reported in *Hansard,* page 193, addressed a question to me orally in the following words:

I should like to direct the attention of the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services to an editorial appearing on page 4 of *Boating Magazine* for January-February of this year, under the caption "Fairmile Fuddle." I shall not read the editorial, because I presume

the minister has a copy of the journal. I should like to ask these questions: First, where are the five boats which are reported to have left Midland early in November, 1941, and, second, was a qualified officer in charge of those boats?

I stated to my hon. friend when he asked the question that he had not given notice of it. I find now that he had written to me. His letter reached my office about one o'clock on Friday, but at that time I was in attendance at a meeting of the cabinet council and did not return again to my office before coming into the house at three o'clock. So that I did not have my hon. friend's letter when I answered his question. I have it now, and having looked into the matter, I should like to make the following statement.

In late November, arrangements were made for two Fairmile motor launches from Midland and two from Penetanguishene to sail in company to Toronto, a distance of approximately 600 miles. One great lakes pilot was employed for the Midland group and another for the Penetanguishene group. All four motor launches had commanding officers who were lieutenants, Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve, who had experience ranging from two years' war service in a Canadian destroyer to one year's service in motor torpedo boats, as well as peace time experience in handling small craft. In addition, a senior officer was appointed in this group of four Fairmiles for the passage. This officer, Lieutenant-Commander McQueen, R.C.N.V.R., has a master's great lakes ticket and was a great lakes pilot for vessels in his own company during peace time. In addition this officer served during the last war as an officer in the Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve, originally in submarine chasers and later in the salvage branch of the Admiralty. Therefore, it can be taken that this officer was not merely competent, but was an officer of very great experience.

The two Fairmile motor launches from Midland, Q-058 and Q-051, sailed at eight a.m. on November 24. Q-058 had on board a great lakes pilot and Q-051 was instructed to follow close astern. Unfortunately a very heavy blizzard set in almost immediately. Q-051 lost sight of Q-058, got into shoal water and struck one propeller on a rock. There was no damage to her hull and she eventually proceeded in company with the other three vessels. This Fairmile was eventually hauled up for repairs at Sarnia, which is roughly half way between the point of departure and Toronto, where it was found that a new shaft and propeller would be required. The total cost will not exceed $1,200. The remaining three Fairmiles proceeded to Toronto where they arrived safely on November 30.

On this date the weather conditions in the lower St. Lawrence were so severe that it was considered that no further Fairmile launches could be sailed to Halifax this season owing to the probability of damage from ice. Instructions, therefore, were given for these three to be laid up at Toronto for the winter and the fourth at Sarnia. Slight damage to Q-072, not exceeding $270, occurred while she was being hauled out at Toronto. The total repairs will cost less than $1,500, it is estimated, to ships that are worth $600,000, or a repair cost of about one quarter of one per cent. These repairs are not properly classed as "extensive and costly", the words used in this editorial.

The Fairmile motor launches are of wooden construction and could not be employed where they would encounter ice. All thirty-six Fairmiles will be in commission by early summer. They will be extremely usefully employed in anti-submarine patrols off the coast of Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, Labrador, and in the gulf of St. Lawrence. It would not be possible to spare any for use in the Mediterranean.

PRICE CEILING

APPLICATION OF REGULATIONS TO SPECIFIED COMMODITIES—SEASONAL GOODS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The hon. member for Saskatoon City (Mr. Bence) asked a question on Friday about a report that 100 commodities are not affected by the price ceiling. This report was incorrect. Seasonal goods are definitely under the price ceiling, as the board and its administrators have repeatedly stated, and there is nothing that this board has said or done to warrant any misunderstanding in this connection. The report has no foundation whatever.

Seasonal spring and summer goods, not similar to goods sold during the basic period, September 15 to October 11, 1941, are subject to the general rule that they may not be priced higher than they would have been priced if they had been sold in the basic period. This means that in the spring of 1942 seasonal goods may not be sold at more than the price charged in the spring of 1941, plus an increase equivalent to the increase between the spring of 1941 and the autumn of 1941, in the price of year-round goods of the nearest similar classification and intrinsic value.

For the practical application of this general principle, the board has issued a list of seasonal goods, has advised manufacturers that their 1942 prices must be approved by the administrator of their industry in consultation with the administrator of retail trade, and has advised wholesalers and retailers that they may buy at approved manufacturers' prices and add the same mark-up as they did during the corresponding season in 1941.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

APPLICATION OF ORDER TO EASTERN SECTION OF CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): On Thursday last the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) asked what effect the order in council advancing time one hour would have upon the Atlantic standard time zone. He pointed out that in that portion of Canada within the Atlantic standard time zone already the mean or sun time was in advance of the actual time and suggested that a great portion of the people of Nova Scotia and all the people of New Brunswick would be ninety-six minutes ahead of true sun time.

Generally speaking, the width of a time zone is 675 miles. The farther westward a point is within this zone the greater the amount by which the mean time varies over the actual time. To illustrate this: Halifax, for example, is 14 minutes ahead of mean time; Moncton, 19 minutes; Saint John, 24 minutes; Fredericton, 27 minutes, and Woodstock, 30 minutes.

This situation, of course, applies not only in the case of Atlantic time but throughout the various time zones in Canada. For example, Ottawa is 3 minutes ahead of sun time; Toronto, 18 minutes; Windsor, 32 minutes, while Fort William is 58 minutes ahead of sun time. Such a situation exists in every time zone, and to attempt to reconcile mean and actual time would, of course, obviously create an impossible situation.

In his question the leader of the opposition correctly stated that other factors, such as transportation, might affect the position. I communicated with the Railway Association of Canada as to the transportation problem which would be involved if any changes were made in the order. On Friday afternoon I received the following reply:

> Your message yesterday re adoption daylight saving time in maritimes. Deflection from true sun time at points in maritimes would not be any more excessive than deflection at many other points throughout Canada. Transportation difficulties resulting from adoption new time in maritimes are not any greater than in any other time zone. Would point out that in 1941 Halifax, Saint John, and Moncton voluntarily adopted daylight saving time from May 4 to September 27. In circumstances we urge that there should be no modification of order in council 547 exempting the maritimes as such modification would result in voiding all public time-table and working time-table arrangements already completed on basis of order in council. Also modification would result in disruption of through and local train connections and railway arrangements cannot now be altered.

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY

POLICY RESPECTING PUBLICATION OF LISTS OF CONTRACTORS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. K. HAZEN (St. John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Prime Minister or to the Minister of Munitions and Supply. A Canadian Press dispatch which appears in one of the morning newspapers states that the Department of Munitions and Supply announced on Saturday that it has decided to discontinue the practice of issuing individual lists of contracts awarded by the department, either as press releases or in printed form. I presume that statement is correct, and my question is (1) will the Prime Minister or the Minister of Munitions and Supply tell us why it has been decided to change this practice, and (2) what means the public and members of parliament will have of knowing what contracts have been let and how and where the country's money is being spent for munitions and supplies?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): The new policy adopted in relation to the publication of lists of contractors is as stated by my hon. friend. The change of policy was made in Canada as a result of representations made in a letter by the High Commissioner for the United Kingdom in Canada. At the same time the policy of the United States was changed, also I believe on representations from Great Britain. It has not been the policy in the United Kingdom to publish lists of contractors for war munitions, and Great Britain herself has objected to either Canada or the United States doing so.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What about the second question?

SUGAR

INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TAKEN TO INCREASE BEET SUGAR CAPACITY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, on January 28, in answering a question which I had asked with respect to beet sugar, the Minister of Finance indicated that he was taking steps to cause an increase in beet sugar production during 1942. Would he tell the house (1) how many acres of beets have already been promised to him in Canada in excess of last year's sugar beet acreage; (2) how many new sugar factories have already been planned with his consent to be opened in 1942, and (3) how many new factories are already planned to be opened in 1943?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that questions of this kind be put on the order paper. We are taking a large part of every afternoon in answering questions which under the rules should not be asked in this way. Before the hon. gentleman puts his question on the order paper I would suggest that he read again what I said on January 28, because I certainly did not give any basis such as he indicated for the questions he has just now asked.

Mr. BLACKMORE: After the long list of questions that have been asked this afternoon, I think Mr. Speaker, that my question ought to be answered. Why should my question be picked out and I be told to put it on the order paper?

Mr. ILSLEY: It was the first question of the kind asked me.

Mr. BLACKMORE: It is a question which the country wants to have asked and answered right now.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ADDRESS IN REPLY—NECESSARY OCCASIONAL ABSENCE OF PRIME MINISTER FROM CHAMBER

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I understand that my hon. friend the member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) is to be the first speaker in this debate this afternoon. He is, as I think hon. members are well aware, a close personal friend of my own and I had hoped to be in the house while he was speaking, but I may say to him that I have not yet had an opportunity to-day of so much as looking at the mail that has come in over the week-end. The morning has been taken up with other matters, among them the representations of important delegations which occupied my time exclusively from 10.30 this morning until after two o'clock this afternoon. I have been in the house from three until now twenty past four. I am trying to give all the time I possibly can to the very important matters immediately connected with the war effort of the country. That involves of necessity my absence from the house a good part of the time during the course of the debate. I know my hon. friend will excuse me if I am not present when he is speaking. I raise the matter because I noticed that by some of the press attention had been drawn to the fact that one day of last week when the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) was speaking I found it necessary because of an engagement at the time, made before I knew at all that the hon. member was to speak, to leave the house and keep that engagement along with others which I had for the afternoon. I hope the house will realize that I am anxious to be as courteous as I can be to every hon. member, but it will be recognized that in addition to all the matters in connection with the war effort to which the government is obliged to give attention there is a good deal in the way of political controversy both in and out of parliament. I hope it will not be thought that any actions of mine are intended to be a reflection in any way upon those who may be taking part in political discussions.

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, may I very briefly make a somewhat similar statement. The members of the wheat committee of the cabinet have an appointment at four o'clock this afternoon to meet the Saskatchewan wheat delegation, which will necessitate our absence from the house.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Friday, January 30, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I must first thank the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) for his very kind reference to myself and assure him that I know he has a tremendous load to carry and cannot be in the house at all times. I must also thank the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) for his kindly remarks.

There has been enough said during this debate to convince me that many of the members of this house and many outside this house apparently are not yet seized of the stern and grim realities of this war and of the fact that this empire of which Canada, in my opinion and that of many others, is an indissoluble part, irrespective of the statute of Westminster and any other statute, is engaged in a life and death struggle which can have only one ending, either victory, freedom and life, or defeat, bondage and death.

We are receiving from all across this empire reports from the generals commanding our armies on the far-flung battle-line that more fighting battalions and more munitions are required if the empire is to be saved. I have heard here, from men in high places, that fighting battalions are not now and have not been the matter of major importance. I will ask each hon. member to cast his thoughts across the seas. Last year our armies retired from Libya. Now they have again retreated. Why? Our armies evacuated Greece and Crete. Why? Our men were captured at Kowloon and Hong Kong. Why? Our troops have now retired from Malaya. Why? To me the answer is very clear: our armies have not had, and have not now, sufficient fighting troops and munitions.

The speech from the throne, as I read it and understand what is behind it, lays bare the stern fact that more fighting battalions and munitions are required. But it does not say that these battalions and munitions will be rapidly provided. It proposes that there shall be a delay, at least as regards the provision of the battalions, until a plebiscite is taken—a matter of perhaps three months—a plebiscite which will be both costly to the country and heart-rending to the people.

My honoured leader in a brilliant speech pointed a way to relieve the situation I have mentioned, which, at least to me, is clearly indicated in the speech from the throne. He advocated an amendment to the speech from the throne in which he called for a prompt mobilization of all our material resources and, on a selective basis, the full man and woman power of the nation. I am not in favour of a plebiscite but am in favour of the amendment. According to the press—which may not have the facts—a plebiscite will cost this country anything between $800,000 and $3,000,000, altogether too large a sum to spend when the government itself is asking the people of this country to economize in every way they can, and has even ordered the cutting down of sugar rations; when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) is going out for one of the largest loans in the history of this country—a loan which must be subscribed; nothing should interfere with that—and when nearly everybody in this country will shortly have to pay the most staggering income tax which they have ever had to meet, and that a month earlier than on any previous occasion. In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, this is not a time to spend up to $3,000,000 in taking a plebiscite.

When I was home a few days ago I was greatly alarmed as to what might be the effect of the decision to take a plebiscite on the minister obtaining, from several sources, contributions to the war loan. A number of parents told me that their children, school children, had said that if the government is going to squander $3,000,000 or so in taking a plebiscite, they will refuse to buy any more war savings stamps. I hope it does not have that effect on the school children of Canada, because one of the things on which I can congratulate the government is their having persuaded children to buy war savings stamps. It has three good effects. It teaches school children thrift at an impressionable age; it inculcates patriotism, which they learn in contributing their pennies for stamps; and it turns a lot of money into the treasury of this country. Returns from the Toronto public and secondary schools show that subscriptions by children between September, 1940, and December, 1941, both inclusive, amounted to $434,641.08. That is in addition to contributions by them of almost $50,000 to some thirty-eight other war service organizations, of which amount $16,929.25 was given to the Toronto *Telegram* war victims fund, and $13,271.43 to the Red Cross fund. I hope the controversy caused by the taking of a plebiscite will not affect children's donations, because, if it does, I would fear it would affect the purchases of war savings certificates by their parents—purchases which have had a good effect on the average humble parent, teaching him to save his money against the rainy day which may come. I hope that the government will not proceed with the taking of a plebiscite, but will find some other way to accomplish what is required to be done.

We are told that the government will have to break a promise. Well, a bad promise is always better broken than kept; and it was, in my humble opinion, a bad promise. It is bad because it was made, years ago, to retain political strength in this country; it is bad because it should not have been made, particularly in war time, for none can tell how war will go. Generals who expect to win for their side endeavour to place the most men and the most machinery at the point of fighting, first; but we are now undertaking to enrol an army for the purpose of taking a

plebiscite across the country, while we should be enrolling men and providing fighting battalions, to be sent wherever the fight is taking place.

A bad promise, as I have said, is much better broken than kept. It is humiliating for a government that has the great following behind it that this government has, the largest in the history of the country, to be placed in the position, through a political promise made in war time, of being compelled for a time to cease its work in the raising of battalions and the making of munitions in order to take a plebiscite. It makes me think of the giant of antiquity, made of metal but with feet of clay. Here we have a government, the strongest government the country ever had, throttled by a promise. Its feet are so tangled up by its promise not to enrol men for overseas, either on a selective or on a compulsory basis, that it can do nothing in that regard.

Let me discuss for a few minutes something else in connection with the government's prosecution of the war. I refer to the high cost of recruiting under the present system, which would all be saved under a system such as that in force in the United States. I was in western Ontario recently and spent a couple of days in a small village. There I saw on the lawn of the town hall a tent and a couple of recruiting officers—there may have been more. There were two during the day, but whether that was the total number I do not know. I engaged them in conversation. I asked them how many recruits were coming forward, and they told me that they had been there ten days and had obtained two recruits. What a big price to pay to obtain two recruits! They told me that in a town ten miles west of that point there was also a tent on the lawn of the town hall with two officers in charge of recruiting, and that in the space of two weeks they had obtained only one recruit.

I have seen a similar situation in many towns across Canada, and I have no doubt it is true of the country as a whole. We are paying a staggering price to obtain small results. I saw a long cavalcade of trucks—I do not remember exactly how many—going up Yonge street, Toronto, on one occasion, and I inquired where they were going. I was informed that they were on their way to northern Ontario to carry on a recruiting campaign. Well, that was a large number of men and trucks to send to northern Ontario for that purpose. It would be rather expensive, for there were billboards here and there as well as advertisements, and there would be the cost of the trucks, the gasoline and so forth.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

Mr. RALSTON: Does my hon. friend think it would be justified, however, in connection with the victory loan campaign for the purpose of getting money? Does he think a long cavalcade of transport on the road would be justified for that purpose?

Mr. MacNICOL: I am talking about the conduct of the war by the department.

Mr. RALSTON: I am talking about this war too.

Mr. MacNICOL: I was informed afterwards, when I made inquiries as to what results had been obtained from that costly northern Ontario expedition, that the number of recruits obtained was not very large. I stood one day in front of a large plant in the town of Mount Dennis, adjacent to Toronto, and there I saw two recruiting officers cajoling young men in front of the plant when they were out having their lunch at noon and resting. These young fellows kidded the officers, and more than one observed "When you make it universal, we will all join." They are not slackers. Many of them sincerely resent the present system of enrolment.

I have in mind a widow with four sons. Scottish blood runs strong in their veins—the martial blood of old Scotland. Every one of these four sons enlisted. This lady's husband was a veteran of the great war and he has passed on. Not far away there is another family with four sons and none of the four has enlisted. But they are not slackers; I spoke to all of them. They all said to me, "Mr. MacNicol, we are not going to leave our jobs for Tom, Dick and Harry to take them over, and this and that, but we will go when the government calls us all to go." There is something there. You cannot call a young fellow a slacker under those circumstances.

A young man came to see me the last day I was at home. He was an expert toolmaker—and I know something about toolmaking because I have made tools myself. He was a very valuable man. He told me that he had enlisted in the artillery. "What," I said, "you a toolmaker enlisting? I know the government wants expert toolmakers." "Well," he said, "I may be conscripted if I don't enlist now, and I will enlist now."

I am sure that a selective system of enrolment would not have taken all the four sons of that widow because they had martial blood in their veins, nor would it have taken that young toolmaker from his toolmaking machines.

I do not want to say anything unkind. I know what a load the government is carrying, and there are many things upon which I could

compliment them. While I am criticizing at the moment, I am not doing so for the purpose of passing censure. I want to try to improve rather than to obstruct. I know the government are doing a good deal, but I am convinced from what I have seen that the present system of recruiting is all wrong, and it is extremely expensive. If I had not been convinced of that before the minister made his statement on Hong Kong, I would have been convinced then.

What did the revelations with regard to Hong Kong show? They showed that on September 19 the British government asked for only one or two battalions. That is a very small number of men to ask for, but they did not get word for ten days thereafter—on September 29—that we could send them two battalions. If the British government had asked for ten battalions, to be sent immediately, that would not have been anything out of the way, after two and a half years of war, when we are told that we have enlisted for overseas—some here and some overseas—240,000 men, of which number over 100,000, between three and four divisions of fighting men, are in the old land. Why did they take ten days to scurry around, in that hectic time, trying to find two battalions? Worse than that, I know some of the boys who were among the 138 men—about seven per cent of the less than two thousand—who were trained for less than from three to four months. I saw some of the names in the newspapers, and I went to see their fathers to console them. I went to see six families altogether, and from five I learned that their sons had not been in the army for more than three to four months. Yet they were sent to one of the most vital bastions of this empire, which, before it was captured, I and every other hon. member felt was perfectly safe. I do not know that the fact that seven per cent of our men were largely untrained had anything at all to do with its loss, but perhaps if we could have sent these battalions immediately, it might have helped in prolonging the fight there, and every day counted. Frankly I was surprised. The minister has great ability, and I could not help believing, when I looked at him and heard him talk, that if only he could have had his way, with the experience and knowledge he has behind him, he could have done a great deal better job than he was able to do under the circumstances. Others have the same opinion.

Hon. members cannot discount the statement of the premier of Manitoba when he comes all-out against taking the plebiscite, for various reasons. Nor can they discount the importance of the legislature of Manitoba which has come out for an immediate all-out war effort. Nor can they discount as much as some perhaps would like to, the fact that the premier of the greatest province in Canada, the richest and most populous in any event, Ontario, denounced the plebiscite and comes out for an immediate all-out war effort. I cannot predict what the Ontario legislature will do, but I shall be much surprised if it does not come out one hundred per cent behind the stand of the legislature of Manitoba.

On Saturday last I read a report that the premier of Alberta and his party were altogether opposed to the taking of the plebiscite. The opinions of all these men, great men, and these three legislatures, are certainly worthy of some consideration, and I do not feel that I am in very bad company when I say that I, too, am opposed to the waste of time and money for taking this plebiscite.

Then two statements were made in this house to which I wish to refer briefly. I shall not say much, because I like both of the men concerned very much. The first was made by the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Gray). All I can say about him is that it took courage to do what he did. I commend him, whatever that is worth, for what he did when he came out definitely in this house for an immediate all-out war effort, and opposed the plebiscite. I am very sorry that I cannot also commend the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald). I was greatly surprised at his attitude because, just a few days before he spoke here, he had made a ringing address in the town of Waterloo—it will soon be a city, judging from the way it is growing—to the board of trade there. He came out very strongly there for compulsory selective enlistment, but in this house he hedged to the extent of delaying it for the period of three months—

Mr. HOMUTH: He swallowed himself completely.

Mr. MacNICOL: —which will be required to take the plebiscite. A few days ago I saw in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* a picture of the Ridley family in the city of Brantford—one of our best industrial cities. This picture showed two sons and two daughters, all four of whom have enlisted and one of whom is in the army in Great Britain. I was surprised that the hon. member for Brantford City, having seen what he saw in Great Britain, could come back and take the stand he did, not to send without a plebiscite immediate help to Lieutenant Kenneth Ridley, his townsman, whom he perhaps saw or who, in any event, is in England. I was surprised and sorry, because I have a very warm feeling for the hon. member for Brantford City.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) recently made a statement that I endorse. I cannot say very much about the Minister of Agriculture at any time, because I know little about agriculture. I am not like some hon. members who know a great deal about agriculture and at the same time know all about what it took me thirty years to learn, the manufacture of iron and steel.

An hon. MEMBER: You are not a lawyer.

Mr. MacNICOL: I was not referring to lawyers; I was referring mostly to certain hon. gentlemen to my left.

The Minister of Agriculture, in a speech delivered, I believe, on January 10, stated that this government would not fail to send strong support—let me quote his words:

> We are also going to take our part in manning the bastions of empire in any part of the world.

I was pleased to read that, and I hope the minister will speed up the sending of support to these bastions of empire, not delay it as in the sending of it to the great bastion of Hong Kong.

Last summer I was in Saskatchewan, and on the day I was in Regina, September 11, I was affected by reading a page in the Regina *Leader-Post* giving the pictures and names of heroes of that province, of whom twelve were killed in the navy, sixteen in the army and forty-nine in the air force. We have always thrilled with pride at what our army has done, and I have on more than one occasion read of some famous fighter from Saskatchewan, whose name has slipped my mind for a moment, but across the skies over France and Germany these Saskatchewan fighters have blazed a bright trail of glory that will never fade. I could say the same about my own province and every province, but as I come from Ontario perhaps it is not out of place for me to say a word about my own province, because we hear so many unkind things said about it in this house—it rolls off my back like water from a duck's back; the most sticks are always under the best apple tree, and I take it in that way. My own city of Toronto with its suburbs has sent more men to the army in this war, as it did in the last war, than any other equal community in this country. My own riding sent more men overseas in the last war than any other riding bar none, and to-day the sons of the heroes of 1914-1918 of Davenport riding have enlisted in their thousands to fight anywhere in the world. Most of their parents, I might say, are old country stock.

Something has been said by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), and I was sorry he said what he did, because I have a very warm feeling for him, for reasons about which I do not care to speak. But the other day he said something about the so-called committee of Two Hundred. And they have been spoken of contemptuously by an hon. gentleman on my right who did not know anything whatever about them, and by an hon. gentleman to your right, Mr. Speaker, who perhaps knew less. That committee consists of two hundred or more outstanding men and women. They come, not from Toronto alone but from most of the towns and cities of Ontario and perhaps every county of lower Ontario at least, if not every county in Ontario. They did not sign as Conservatives or Liberals. I have not looked to see what they are politically; many of them I know, and I give them credit for being sincere. We are all entitled to be regarded as sincere. Many of them have sons overseas. I do not blame them a bit for doing what they can to shake the government out of its complacency; someone has to do it, and I am sure that if the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) could only have his fling, he could do a much bigger job than he is doing to-day. It is no fault of his; I will add that.

I see my time is going. I should like to talk a little now about munitions, because iron and steel have been woven into my very fabric from boyhood. A couple of years ago I offered in this house the suggestion that this government at once initiate measures to increase the production of iron in this country. At that time I said the day would come when Canada might not have the iron it needed to make munitions. I hope that time is not approaching, but the situation looks very serious. For some time we have had a delegation at Washington coaxing the steel controller there to permit us to get some iron and steel, and at last he has consented to give us two million tons of iron and steel. That is not very much for the programme outlined by the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe); but what about next year?

I beg this government to delay no longer but immediately to promote the production of pig-iron. My suggestion two years ago was that this government grant a bonus to encourage that production, but I was turned down; my words fell on deaf ears. But thanks to Premier Hepburn, who has been denounced here so frequently, some action was taken. He carried out the programme first initiated by the Ferguson government, and granted a bonus of $2 a ton on the production of pig-iron. I am happy to say that in the county in which I lived when I was a young man, the county of Algoma—it was the district of Algoma then—the Algoma steel company at

Sault Ste Marie is now producing considerable quantities of pig-iron from a low grade ore possessing, I believe, less than fifty per cent iron content, and requiring to be beneficiated. I have not been able to obtain the latest figures, but I believe the annual production is something like four or five hundred thousand tons. That is a substantial production. I ask the government now to do what it can, by means of a bonus to the Algoma steel company or any other company, to double the production of pig-iron, because next year we may not be able to obtain any from the United States, whose reserves are being rapidly depleted. I made a careful study of this matter some years ago, and according to the best figures the reserves in sight in the United States amount to about five billion tons. This year they are producing some eighty-five million tons, while the production next year probably will be double that if they carry out their vast programme. We may not be able to get any iron from the United States if this war continues and they go at it as they are planning to do.

We have plenty of iron ore in Canada. We have a high grade of hematite at Steep Rock. I do not know what is being done about that, or how soon we may take advantage of it; but the government should see to it that Steep Rock comes into operation just as soon as possible, because that is a really high grade ore. Then we have billions of tons of low grade ore as well. In the United States they are now looking for low grade iron ore, because the Ford company has developed an electrolytic process by means of which iron can be economically produced from ore with a content of from twenty to thirty per cent, which heretofore has been considered of no account. In the Hudson bay basin we have billions of tons of low grade ore; and if they can use it in the United States, we can use it here. So I urge the government to take steps to bring about a much greater production of iron in this country.

There is one other item about which I should like to say a word, namely, magnesium metal. I raised that question on June 14 last. At that time the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) did not seem to know much about it; he said some company was going to build a plant on the Gatineau river, but that plant was for making magnesium oxide, not for magnesium metal. The United States is going into this in a big way, and Germany has been producing large quantities of this metal. It may be that their planes have been able to do the things they have because they have so much magnesium metal in their construction. It weighs one-third less than aluminum and has approximately the same tensile strength. A plane made of magnesium metal will go faster and carry a larger load of bombs further. I urge this government to get into the business. We have one of the greatest deposits in the world of dolomite limestone, from which magnesium metal is made, together with any amount of electrical horse-power, which is essential in the manufacturing process.

I want now to say a word about Canadian manufacturers, because they deserve the unstinted praise of this house and this country for what they have done, commencing even before the war. At their annual spring meeting in 1939, before war broke out, the Canadian Manufacturers association decided to send a committee overseas to consult with the British government and British manufacturers in order to demonstrate what Canadian plants, Canadian workmen, Canadian technicians and engineers could do. And they did go overseas, at their own expense, and, I am glad to say, with the blessing of the government. When they came back, the Prime Minister was very kind; he spoke very nicely of their efforts and gave them due credit. On September 8, in a press release, the Prime Minister said:

> With the concurrence of the governments of Canada and the United Kingdom, a delegation organized by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and widely representative of Canadian industry recently visited the United Kingdom to study on the spot all forms of armament and munitions production with a view to the expeditious adaptation of Canadian industry to these forms of production.

They came home and went to work, and they played a major part in organizing this country for the production of munitions. As the Minister of Munitions and Supply has said, Canadian industry did a wonderful job with his help in providing orders, I am happy to say. I have not time to mention the names of all these outstanding men, but I think some of them should appear on our records; I believe they deserve that recognition. Among these business men were: E. Holt Gurney, Toronto; H. G. Bertram, Dundas; E. Winslow-Spragge, Montreal; John E. Goodison, Sarnia; A. R. Goldie, Galt; Victor Drury, Montreal; and Chester Hamilton, Toronto, and John T. Hepburn, Toronto, who were over in Britain, and many others.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe every man or woman in this house is ready to do what he or she can to support the government and the country in order to win this war. It is imperative that we do this. As far as I am concerned, I will go anywhere and do anything the government feel my long experience in industry and manufacturing qualifies

me to do in order to assist our war effort. I do not suppose I could go to fight, though if I were placed in a fort, behind a parapet, I might be able to shoot as straight as most people, because in my day I could shoot pretty straight. We have wonderful examples to inspire us. On Sunday, January 25, I went to Grove preparatory school at Lakefield, where a window was unveiled in memory of Sergeant Stuart Dunn, W.A.G., R.C.A.F., a young hero from Quebec city who served over Germany and France for months but who lost his life on a return trip. I liked the spirit of the ceremony. This boy's father, Major C. G. Dunn who had gone to this school also as a lad, and a large number of boys attended the service. Those young men sang most earnestly the following words, with which I shall conclude:

I vow to thee, my country—all earthly things above—
Entire and whole and perfect, the service of my love.
The love that asks no questions; the love that stands the test,
That lays upon the altar the dearest and the best;
The love that never falters, the love that pays the price,
The love that makes undaunted the final sacrifice.

In memory of what the glorious young heroes from every province of this country have done, it is our duty to send fighting battalions and munitions as speedily as possible to the armies of the empire, no matter where they are.

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I must first of all commend the government for the announcement in the speech from the throne regarding the contribution to Great Britain of vast quantities of munitions, foodstuffs and supplies, estimated to be worth at least one billion dollars. May I at the same time commend my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) and his advisers for making the financial arrangements necessary for this transaction. I should like to point out to him and to them that I am pleased to see that they are at least moving forward and to the left. I trust they are beginning at last to realize how restricted and narrow so-called orthodox finance has been in the past. I would remind them also of an age-old truth, that so long as the sun shines and the rain falls, so long as we have labour, land and materials in abundance, many things which were deemed impossible a short time ago are now possible. I trust that after this war these will include social justice and social security for all our citizens.

[Mr. MacNicol.]

I have listened with a great deal of interest and care to the speeches which have been made so far in this debate, and I have wondered why, in speeches made by the opposition, so little has been said about the great contribution which Canada has made in this war of men, munitions, food, ships and money, as well as other war materials. In the eyes of impartial competent observers, such as the New York *Times*, this is considered as one of the most astounding accomplishments arising out of this war. This is the way in which they refer to Canada's great contribution of munitions, supplies and other materials.

Prior to coming east for the session, I visited Seattle in connection with a meeting of the international Pacific salmon fisheries commission of which I am chairman. I found many of the people in the state of Washington to be loud in their praises of what Canada has done and is doing, but they were extremely critical about their own President Roosevelt. Coming back to Canada, I found numbers of our own people enthusiastic about President Roosevelt, but critical of our own Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and of Canada's war effort. I am coming to the conclusion that many persons in Great Britain, the United States and Canada are to-day suffering from an affliction which for lack of a better name might be called "far-off pastures look greener affliction," and which, to quite an extent, is affecting their vision of the actual accomplishments of their own country. I suppose others would diagnose this condition as war nerves.

Speaking about leaders, I am not altogether surprised at the attitude of the Conservative party toward the Prime Minister, the leader of this government, especially when I consider the number of leaders the Conservative party has had during the past number of years and how harshly some of them were treated. Let me take one example only. The best and most capable leader they had in late years, one for whom I have still some admiration, the Right Hon. Viscount Bennett, they forced to leave Canada. No one will deny that the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett was and still is a great Canadian. The hearts of that party, however, now incline toward Meighen, but in my estimation Meighen cannot equal Bennett in ability. In passing, may I compliment the present house leader of the Conservative party (Mr. Hanson). Personally I think he has done well as leader. He has certainly worked hard and ably since assuming the responsibility of leader of the opposition; his speech last week was a splendid one, and I wish to compliment him upon it.

In paragraph (c) of his amendment the leader of the opposition regrets that additional

measures for the post-war period were not recommended in the speech from the throne, and before dealing with the question of the plebiscite I should like to remind him that Canada has given more thought and extensive study to post-war conditions and is now further ahead on plans for the post-war period than Great Britain, the United States, or any of the other dominions.

Regarding the matter of holding a plebiscite, may I say at once that I do not like it. When, however, one looks at this matter from a national viewpoint instead of merely a provincial or sectional one, when one faces all the facts he must be convinced that the action proposed by the government, with all the circumstances and facts before them, is the logical one to take. Whether or not we like the plebiscite, its taking has been definitely decided upon by the government, and so the matter should be expedited as speedily as possible. It is unfortunate that at this particular time so much feeling should be aroused or stirred up throughout Canada over the taking of this plebiscite. I do not agree with those who say that the taking of the plebiscite is retarding our war effort.

My personal view on this matter is that there should be complete mobilization of every resource we have in Canada, including finance, natural resources and man-power for service anywhere when considered necessary. So far, the only real sacrifices which have been made by any of our people in this war have been made by those who have given of their lives, who have offered their services to the army, navy or air force, or who are the wives or parents of these boys. Equality of sacrifice is to-day spoken of freely, but we have much further to go in this direction before it becomes an actual reality in Canada. The government have to-day, under the National Resources Mobilization Act, all the powers they require to mobilize finance and industry as well as man-power. I am pleased that the government have intimated to parliament that they are going to do more under these powers than what has been done, splendid as that has been. In my opinion it will require a total all-out war effort to bring victory.

Whilst we are turning out munitions and supplies of all and every kind in commendable quantities and of splendid workmanship, in my opinion we have not yet reached our maximum effort. In certain ways we could do much more than we are doing, and this is especially the situation in British Columbia. In saying this, I have particularly in mind our shipbuilding programme. It is true that we have a programme providing for about $500,000,000 of steel merchant ships, corvettes, destroyers and other miscellaneous boats, but this is not nearly the total Canadian capacity for producing new ships provided the government, and particularly the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe), would only consent to the building of wooden vessels. Will anyone deny that the allies are in need of ships?

It may well be said that the losses at sea so far in this war have not been as heavy as they were during 1914-18, but we should not forget that our ship tonnage is less to-day than it was during the last war, and we have the further disadvantage of a war in the far east with Japan against us. It is well known that lack of shipping has considerably handicapped Britain's war effort. More and more ships are required to carry vital military supplies and food, not only to Great Britain, Egypt and the near east, but now also to the far east. It is my opinion that Canada's present programme of steel ships cannot now be much further expanded, if at all, owing to the United States war expansion programme recently outlined by President Roosevelt for 1942 and 1943, which programme will require many more million tons of steel than the United States herself required in 1941. Great Britain is crying out for more ships. Great Britain is at the moment short of lumber, to mention but one of her many requirements. Great Britain is at the present time getting lumber from Russia by way of Archangel because she cannot procure all the Canadian lumber on account of lack of ships. Let me read a recent article in the *Commercial Intelligence Journal* of the Department of Trade and Commerce, of January 17, of this year. The article is headed "Canadian Timber Favoured" and reads:

> Examples of the dislike of timber men in Britain to change when once they have become accustomed to certain materials or certain methods of trading are always occurring. When this country began to change from the almost exclusive use of European softwood to the importation of British Columbia pine and hemlock, criticisms about the qualities of this Canadian wood were almost abusive. Many importers stated that they would not have it in their yards; that it was not suitable in building, that it split when nailed, was liable to rot, et cetera. Further, that their workmen disliked it. However, prejudice was gradually overcome, the import grew by leaps and bounds, and owing to circumstances over which the trade has now no control Canadian wood has since the war constituted our main source of supply. The trade has, in fact, become well accustomed to the wood. Now after a long interval Russian wood is beginning to arrive, but so used to British Columbia pine and hemlock have importers and merchants become that there seems to be no urgent wish to change again. The Russian wood is dearer and this may, of course, have something to do with the

disinclination to purchase when British Columbia pine or hemlock are available. When joinery quality is required, No. 2 common and better British Columbia pine seem to answer all necessary purposes.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that after getting the British people used to our Canadian lumber and after building up our lumber trade with them, we are at the present time faced with the loss of this trade as a result of the lack of boats. Allow me, sir, to inform the house what we did with regard to ships and wooden shipbuilding during the last war. During those years a total of sixty-nine wooden steamers were built in Canada, twenty-seven of which were built in British Columbia. Every one of these ships carried lumber to Great Britain, taking one and a half million board feet of lumber on each voyage. They were built at a cost of $150,000, compared with five or six hundred thousand dollars, which is the cost of the steel merchant ships being built in Canada at the present time.

When the hon. Minister of Munitions and Supply tells us that wooden ships are too slow, I wonder whether he is overlooking the fact that the wooden ships built for service during the last war, and which we could build now, made an average speed of 10 or 10½ knots an hour. When one considers the average speed of convoys, and the time we had to wait before a ship was available to take military equipment necessary for the Canadian troops for the defence of Hong Kong, and that when that ship was procured her average speed was only 8½ knots an hour, one wonders what really is the chief reason for the opposition to the building of wooden ships. The story of Hong Kong might well have been a different one had we, prior to the fall of Hong Kong had Canadian ships available.

Another instance of where Canada is losing out for lack of ships is in connection with available trade between Canada and South American countries. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) paid a visit to south America last year with a view to bringing about better trade relations and better relations generally between the peoples of south American countries and Canada, and his mission was, I believe, an unqualified success. He did a great work for Canada on that occasion. However, like many other things we do, we sometimes fail to follow the matter up, and we made a mistake, I believe, in not sending one of our highest officials to represent Canada at the Pan-American conference held a short time ago instead of sending or designating someone to sit in at that conference with what is known to the lawyers as "a watching brief" only. What I want to mention particularly, however, is the fact that although good trade results were obtained through the visit of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, manufacturers and others in British Columbia cannot carry out the orders which are on their books from south American countries because there are no ships available to transport the goods and articles ordered. In the light of all these facts, I plead with the government, and particularly with the Minister of Munitions and Supply, as earnestly and sincerely as I can to proceed with the building of wooden ships to augment the programme of steel ships now being built. In British Columbia there are hundreds of idle men ready and competent to work on these ships, both carpenters and caulkers, the two chief types of artisans used, and we have likewise the lumber and other materials in abundance in my province for this class of ship, which is something that cannot truthfully be said with regard to steel.

Since we last met, Canada has declared war on Japan, which now brings the war to Canada's Pacific shore as well as the Atlantic. We in British Columbia are perhaps more directly faced with this menacing situation than are those in the central provinces of Canada, and so, Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to devote a few moments to dealing with some of the problems confronting Canada generally but affecting particularly the people of British Columbia, who to-day are faced not only with the possibility of attack but also with the problem of a resident Japanese population totalling, according to the recent registration, 23,461. First of all, I want to assure the house of my desire to be fair and tolerant in all I have to say in connection with the Japanese dwelling within our country, and I should like to point out that so far I have endeavoured to refrain from making any public statements which might in any way incite racial feelings amongst our own people, realizing, apart entirely from a sense of common justice to the Japanese, how dangerous such feelings might become, realizing also that one had to remember that many Canadian citizens were still living in Japan, likewise the fact that numbers of Canadian soldiers were prisoners of war at the hands of the Japanese in Hong Kong.

First of all, let me commend the government for the speedy action it took, following the declaration of war with Japan, of ordering every Japanese fishing boat to be taken into custody. Over, 1,100 boats have been collected by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the naval authorities, close to 900 of these boats being moored in the Fraser river at New Westminster.

While it would only be fair to say that the standing committee appointed by the government did some good work, in conjunction with

officials of the external affairs department and others, under the chairmanship of the hon. Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie), it was unfortunate, I believe, that members of parliament from British Columbia, particularly members from the coast districts, had not been consulted in the matter. It was certainly strange that their advice was not sought on such an important matter.

The government is perhaps not so much to blame as are some of the Ottawa officials in the government service who, it would appear, were determined to ignore any advice or help from the people's elected representatives, who are more aware of the facts of the situation than were most, if not all, of these officials.

May I say to the government that the decision not to issue any fishing licences to the Japanese was well received by the people of British Columbia; but no sooner had it become known that the Japanese fishing fleet was being taken into custody and that no fishing licences would be issued to Japanese for the duration of the war, than representations were made by certain interested parties asking for the release of the boats to the Japanese again.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Who were those interested parties?

Mr. REID: Well, I can name one. My information is that the head of British Columbia Packers, Limited, who is also chairman of the wartime merchant shipping board, was one who was very active.

I want to warn the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Michaud) against what I believe might happen under the present policy whereby all Japanese are being allowed to sell their individual boats. These boats are worth from eight hundred to five or six thousand dollars, according to the size and class of boat; and any sales made, so we understand, must be on a strictly cash basis. The fleet consists of about eleven hundred vessels, and worth, in the aggregate, between two and three million dollars. It is hardly likely that all of these boats will be sold, especially when actual cash for them has to be found, and so we might again witness some of the fish packing companies acquiring ownership, through finance, of large numbers of these boats and, with this ownership of both boats and fishing gear, largely controlling the fishing industry in British Columbia. This is at least what happened in the past and, it is to be hoped, will not be allowed to happen again.

It has been intimated that the government intend to move certain numbers of able-bodied male Japanese between certain ages only, and from certain designated military areas. The age limit proposed is between that of eighteen and forty-five years. What the designated military areas are to be has not yet been made known publicly. My advice would be, if the government is going to move every able-bodied male Japanese citizen, not to leave any over the age of forty-five; and further, the entire British Columbia coast as well as Vancouver island, Queen Charlotte and other islands should be military prohibited districts for the Japanese and enemy aliens. Considerable concern is felt in British Columbia concerning where the government intends removing the able-bodied Japanese to, and I believe most people in British Columbia would agree with the statement that no community in British Columbia really wants them. One suggestion would be that in view of the shortage of farm labour in Ontario and other eastern provinces, the government send three or four thousand east and so provide farmers in the central and eastern provinces with all the farm help they require. This would save considerable expense to the country compared with the proposed scheme of road work in British Columbia whereby the government proposes to pay them for this work. The people of Ontario, especially round Ottawa, and other provinces have always evinced a more kindly feeling towards these people than the people of British Columbia. We in that province would not mind their departure. I feel sure that if they leave British Columbia, there is one song we would not sing, and that is that splendid old Jacobite song, once sung for Prince Charlie, and now sung when dear friends are departing, "Will ye no come back again?"

The problem of the Japanese in Canada has been principally one of British Columbia's problems, and one which should never have occurred but for the action of the federal government in days long past. From information which we have it would appear that in the year 1894 Great Britain concluded a commercial or trade treaty with Japan. It was simply a treaty for trade purposes only, but one of the clauses of that treaty was to allow Japanese citizens to enter, travel or reside. This particular clause did not affect Great Britain, and at that time she had little interest as to whether the Japanese settled in the British colonies or not. Objection to the clause was made by Australia, so Great Britain offered to negotiate a new trade treaty without a clause of this kind being inserted, and restricting the entry of Japanese nationals into the various countries of the self-governing colonies. Canada preferred to accept the clause as it stood; Australia would not. The acceptance by Canada of that clause in a

trade treaty has been a most unfortunate one for British Columbia, and I believe for Canada generally, for the people of that province have had forced on them an unassimilable race of people, who cannot in the strict sense become truly Canadians. The people of British Columbia have long been protesting to Ottawa against the peaceful penetration of the Japanese in that province, but all protests have been of little avail. In fact, apart from some changes made in the gentleman's agreement from time to time, our appeals to the federal government have been met with almost complete indifference.

At one stage of our history British Columbia endeavoured to emulate Australia, which country successfully defied the attempts of Great Britain to force the entry of orientals on them, but the action of British Columbia was vetoed at Ottawa. It is well known that the pressure of certain Montreal financial interests had something to do with the matter, for back in those years they wanted to have plenty of cheap labour on tap, especially in British Columbia.

There are no doubt many loyal Japanese in Canada, but who can tell the loyal ones from the others? Would anyone say regarding any of our missionaries, or of other Canadians of British stock who have lived from upwards of twenty to sixty years in Japan, as some of them have done, that after living there all those years they or their children born in Japan would be now more loyal to Japan than to Canada or Britain? Of course they would not. Then why assert, as some do, that the Japanese are any different in this regard than our own or other races would be? I am not finding any fault with them in this regard. I am merely reciting what is, after all, only a natural human characteristic and which would seem to be part of the make-up of man and woman in almost every race.

Another fact which should be mentioned here is, why have so many of the Canadian-born Japanese gone back to Japan to complete or carry out their military training in that country? Contrary to what one would imagine or expect from Canadian-born children of certain foreign races in this country, and which is not generally known, many of our so-called new Canadians born in this country are more intensely nationalistic for their parents' homeland than are the parents themselves, and this applies to many of the university class of Japanese born and educated in British Columbia. Do not forget that almost all of them are registered in Japan even though born in Canada and that Japan looks upon them as still being her nationals.

The trouble to my mind with many people—and this includes many round Ottawa—is that they refuse to face the facts on this oriental question. Personally I see no great hope of a permanent solution for the Japanese question in British Columbia other than by way of repatriation.

Perhaps the question would not be so great and might partly be solved were the Japanese spread out over the entire nine provinces. But as the policy seems to have been for the Japanese to congregate almost entirely in one province, the problem in that province becomes a very great and perplexing one. I would, however, treat all Japanese in this country fairly and without hatred. Remember, when we speak of repatriation we should think in terms of the future, looking towards the solution of a better and more united Canada. It is worth noting here that Russia, that country from which much can be learned to-day, took action immediately Germany attacked her and removed some 387,000 persons of German descent whose forbears had lived in Russia as far back as 1817. Russia believed, "once a German always a German," and removed every last one of them, lock, stock and barrel, to Siberia.

With regard to the Japanese situation, if wise steps are not taken now to deal with the problem, looking towards a satisfactory solution, the problem will be an ever-recurring and contentious one, and it is my plea now to the government that it should be dealt with in the light of British Columbia's experience rather than, as in the past, from an entirely Ottawa and far-away point of view.

There is one other matter which I should like to mention at this time before closing, and that is the question of defences on the Pacific coast, which was discussed by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) the other day. Let me say at once to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) that it is not my intention to raise this question in any carping way or from any alarmist point of view. I do, however, warn the minister as earnestly as I can that the people on the Pacific coast are greatly perturbed with respect to Pacific coast defences. Who would have thought three months ago that the Japanese would be in control of the Hawaiian islands and in control of possessions in the south Pacific now menacing Australia itself, some 3,500 miles distant from Japan? If Singapore falls—and who can say with any certainty that it will not?—where, I ask, will Japan strike next? For in that event it will then control almost the entire Pacific.

Since the war started, so many optimistic reports have been made by high military men

and authorities, which later events showed were certainly not justified, that people to-day can hardly be blamed for being rather sceptical. We are aware that certain defences are being constructed on the Pacific coast, but our people out there are wondering whether most of these principal defences have not been for protection against attack from sea, similar to those of Singapore, rather than against attacks from the air. It is all very well for our fears to be pooh-poohed or laughed at by the higher command here.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend must not say that. There is no suggestion of pooh-poohing or laughing at anyone's fears.

Mr. REID: I am glad to hear that, but the reports that reached us in British Columbia before I came here led me to make that statement.

Mr. RALSTON: I assure my hon. friend it is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. REID: The majority of people in British Columbia believe that an attack, when and if it does come, will be chiefly from the air; hence the reason for the haste on the Pacific coast in perfecting blackout regulations and air raid precautions. Here let me commend the splendid voluntary efforts of great numbers of our citizens who are giving of their time so willingly and who belong to the various air raid precaution organizations. Necessary, however, as these precautions are, still they are not actually a protection from an attack by air. Especially does this apply to towns or cities situated on the seacoast or located close to rivers. As evidence of this, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to remember that the bombers attacking German cities now fly at heights of 25,000 to 30,000 feet, so high, in fact, that no object below is visible from that height, and also the fact that smudge or smoke fires are now used in England to black-out rivers such as the Thames.

In case someone accuses me of mentioning military matters openly in the house, let me tell them that in so far as coast defences and military operations on the Pacific coast are concerned, these are and have been known to the Japanese in British Columbia right along. Although we from British Columbia have complained, ever since 1939 when war first started, against the promiscuous taking of photographs of military defences and other important sites by Japanese and others, no attention was paid to our protests. Make no mistake about it, Japan has all these photographs now, and has also complete information of Pacific coast waters, bays and harbours, it being well known that the Japanese had up-to-date charts, the data for which were obtained during fishing operations.

Last year I protested against allowing five Japanese families to live inside one of our military compounds and defence areas, and the only answer I got was, that all these were loyal citizens. Well, Mr. Speaker, they could not all have been loyal citizens, for the day Canada declared war on Japan the Royal Canadian Mounted Police deemed it advisable to pick up some of them and intern them as enemy aliens. Nothing, however, has been done as far as I know about the others who are still living there, and whose residences are but a few feet away from the very defence guns we are depending upon for protection at the mouth of the Fraser river.

To my mind the high military command here at Ottawa are responsible for allowing conditions such as I have mentioned to prevail, and which are inexcusable. No other country in the world would pussyfoot around in these matters or act quite as foolish. Do those in high military command here really understand the Japanese situation on the Pacific, or have they any idea at all of the workings of the oriental mind, which is as different as night from day when compared with that of the occidental? Is the hon. Minister of National Defence, or are members of his staff aware, or do they just laugh at those of us from British Columbia who are earnestly and sincerely endeavouring to warn them about Japan and the Japanese people?

It is my opinion that Japan's real object is that of world domination. Japan, whilst helping Germany, is playing her own game in this war—and make no mistake about it—and this idea of world domination is no new sudden desire on the part of the Japanese. Plans for this ambitious scheme were formulated in Japan many long years ago, and her policy throughout these years has been with that definite purpose in mind. It is part of Japanese philosophy to believe in her own destiny of world domination, and might I point out in this regard that Japanese immigration to British Columbia and all other Pacific coast territories has all been a part of that plan looking toward Japanese world supremacy. The Japanese government assisted her nationals to settle on the Pacific coast of north America, and according to Japan's own records, between fifty and sixty million yen were received by her each year as payments from Japanese nationals who had been assisted in becoming established in other lands bordering the Pacific, which lands included British Columbia.

Mr. RALSTON: In what respect did I understand my hon. friend to say the Minister of National Defence or the army officers treated the Japanese situation lightly? Was it anything that had to do with military matters, or is he speaking about Japanese nationals?

Mr. REID: I gave it as my view and the view of others that the Japanese should have been removed from military defences.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is speaking about Japanese nationals in Canada; I thought he was speaking about the preparation of defences against attack. My hon. friend knows what he speaks of is a civil matter.

Mr. REID: It is all very well to say that, but surely the Department of National Defence is in command of defences there and surely they should request the removal of Japanese from such defence areas.

Mr. RALSTON: If my hon. friend will look at the defence of Canada regulations, he will see that there is a line of demarcation. I do not appreciate being made the subject of attack in connection with the internal situation in relation to the Japanese.

Mr. REID: Well, I must accept the minister's statement, but I tell him it is high time that some of these regulations were changed.

Mr. RALSTON: I can say to my hon. friend that the Department of National Defence has gone a very long way in making a protective area just because of representations made. My hon. friend ought really to deal with the department that has the matter in hand. The Department of National Defence deals with the matter of attack from the enemy.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Will the minister allow a question? When I was in British Columbia I saw something of this, and I think I had occasion to call attention on one occasion to a group of these suspected persons near a fortified position. Were they allowed to remain in defence areas?

Mr. RALSTON: I do not know what my hon. friend is referring to. I am talking about a protected area under the defence of Canada regulations, which have been recently amended. There has been a great deal of loose thinking and talking about the matter of defence areas. This matter of protected areas was formerly under the Minister of Justice and was always dealt with by that department until a few days ago. I was willing to take it over, and I made an order specifying the protected area in British Columbia, although I felt it was more a matter of civil administration.

[Mr. Reid.]

Mr. REID: The minister is in the fortunate position of knowing what the protected areas in British Columbia are, whereas members of the house are not, but I notice he did not contradict the statement about those five families living close to the guns. I visited that district the day I left for Ottawa, and but for the fact that I am a member of parliament I could not have got into that area, but the Japanese and their relatives and friends could come and go inside that military compound.

Mr. RALSTON: Does my hon. friend know that that is a defence area established by the military authority?

Mr. REID: I do not know, but I know there are four guns there at the mouth of the river, and if it is not a defence area it should be.

Mr. RALSTON: Who was it kept my hon. friend out, a sentry?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: And allowed the Japanese in?

Mr. REID: Yes. Five families in all.

Mr. GREEN: Some of them are between the camp and the guns.

Mr. RALSTON: I assure my hon. friend that it was not a defence area such as set up under the defence of Canada regulations that he is talking about.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then what is it, if it is a gun area?

Mr. RALSTON: What the hon. member is talking about is in the vicinity of some guns, but is not a defined defence area.

Mr. REID: Well it should be. Coming back to the remarks I have to make regarding the war in the Pacific, it is evident now that Japan fooled the allies prior to December, 1941, in her war with China, making them believe she was not as strong as she really was. It is interesting to note that both Russia and Japan adopted a like policy in relation to their military strength and preparedness; for it is evident now that Stalin put it all over Hitler regarding the strength of Russia. Japan, using similar tactics, hid her real military strength from the rest of the world in preparation for her fight against the United States and Great Britain, both of which countries she is endeavouring with all her military might to drive out of the Pacific. My prayer is that our war cabinet and high military command will accept these statements about the Pacific situation more seriously than they seem to have done in the past, and in speaking as I have about this matter, I do so

because I feel it to be my duty, and to warn the government and the country against the possible danger which I believe exists. We on the Pacific coast would like to see in all important centres more anti-aircraft guns, searchlights and other military defence measures. The people on the Pacific coast, however, are not asking the impossible and are well aware of the enormous demands for military equipment of every kind which is urgently required to-day to meet the enemy in all the widely flung battle fronts. I urge the Minister of National Defence, for whom I have the greatest regard, that when he speaks he tell us, as frankly as the situation will allow, of the steps which have been taken for the protection of the British Columbia coast. In the light of the actual war situation as it exists to-day, we do not expect him to reveal any military information which might help the enemy or jeopardize the safety of our people, but we do ask that he take us into his confidence as far as deemed advisable, believing that a frank statement of the situation will be of inestimable help, looking towards the prevention of any possible war hysteria or panic which might arise.

I have one suggestion to make in closing. It is that the minister bring back General McNaughton from England and have him inspect the defences of both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts, and in the light of his experience advise the government in connection with the defence of Canada against possible invasion. General McNaughton has been in England now for some considerable time and not only has witnessed enemy air attacks and bombardments but is in the unique position of knowing what the actual fortifications are in Great Britain against invasion either from the sea or from the air. He is fully conversant also with modern military tactics to be employed against the enemy should invasion arise. He has first-hand experience, information and knowledge such as few of the military staff in Canada possess. General McNaughton is the most experienced man we have for advice on how modern warfare should be conducted, and apart altogether from the respect in which he is held in Great Britain, the fact that prior to the fall of Dunkirk he stood out against allowing Canadian troops to go to France because of the lack of adequate mechanical military equipment, shows the calibre of this general, who merits, I believe, the thanks of all Canadians.

It is my opinion that if something like this were done, and any recommendations made were carried out, it would not only allay to quite a considerable extent, the fears of many of our people but also have the effect of placing us in a better position to repel any possible invasion or attack from air or sea on either the Atlantic or the Pacific coasts.

In closing, may I say that like every hon. member I realize the seriousness of war conditions to-day, and so have endeavoured in my remarks to be as fair and tolerant as possible, trusting, however, that some attention will be given by the government to the suggestions made with regard to the problems I now bring to their attention.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ANTHONY HLYNKA (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, during the past two sessions of the present parliament our task has been directed toward a solution of the problems which confront us in our national life, particularly those which arise in the prosecution of the war. Considerable progress has been made in this initial period, but no effort could have been too great while the destiny of free peoples was at stake. From now on, and until a decisive victory is ultimately won, both on the battlefields and at the peace conferences, not only must we further mobilize, equip and maintain our armed forces as our chief contribution to the cause of freedom, but we must of necessity go beyond this primary requisite.

We must not only win the war, but we must also make certain that we shall win the peace. To achieve less would be to fail in the trust bestowed upon us, the sacred privilege of delivering to future generations the hard-won liberties of our forefathers. It is our duty, therefore, to study and prevent the weaknesses and recurring dangers of past adjustments—or, shall I say, the lack of proper adjustments—of world problems which gave rise to the present world conflagration. This should be one of our many immediate concerns.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members will agree with me when I say that we are faced to-day with problems of first magnitude. Many of these problems have arisen with the present conflict, but multitudes of them find root in the past. We cannot, therefore, shirk responsibility in the solution of this chaotic state of affairs. World problems are our problems; for they have either a direct or an indirect bearing upon our national life—yes, even upon our individual lives.

We must necessarily realize that it is not the war alone that we are fighting to-day; we find ourselves also in the grip of two of the greatest revolutions of all time. Nationally we are fighting a war; internally and internationally we are engaged in two prodigious revolutions—one economic, one political. We are therefore endeavouring to survive one of the most critical and dangerous of transitional periods.

Let us, then, examine the role that we Canadians are playing in this struggle, and let us envision the role that Canada is destined to play in the future.

We are now in the third year of war. To what extent have we crystallized our views on Canada's foreign policy? What plans are we prepared to advance or adopt as the basis for post-war reorganization and reconstruction of the world? How many hours have we devoted in this chamber to the discussion of this problem during the last two years? If none, why not? Can we afford to be caught unprepared in this respect? For, as we know, this war will also end sooner or later as all other wars are supposed to have ended.

Now, when we consider the position that Canada occupies among the nations of the world at this time, it does seem that we have underestimated her importance. As a matter of fact, until recently Canada's position was unique in that it was second only to that of Great Britain; indeed in many respects, even with the entry of the United States into the conflict, Canada still remains a number one ally of Great Britain. I say that with all due respect and consideration to the material aid given to Great Britain by our good neighbour directly to the south of us, and with all due respect and consideration to the entry of the Soviet Union into this conflict on our side.

To amplify my statement: Canada's strategic position makes her the logical mediator between Great Britain and the United States. Her geographical location makes her an ideal arsenal for the turning out of tools of war for the allies. She is admirably situated for the training fields of the empire forces, and especially the empire air training plan. And lastly, because of her limitless potential natural resources and her vast, rich wheat fields, she will undoubtedly be the key to post-war reconstruction of Britain. It is only fitting, therefore, that Canada's foreign policy should be commensurate with her important position.

It is gratifying indeed to find that the broad principles which are intended as the basis for post-war reorganization of the world have been enunciated. I refer, of course, to the now historic Atlantic charter, proclaimed by two of the world's men of destiny—the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Churchhill, and the President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt. I am more than pleased, Mr. Speaker, to hear reference made to the Atlantic charter in the speech from the throne.

Then again, there are the four great human freedoms proclaimed by the President of the United States—freedom of speech and expression, freedom of every person to worship God in his own way, freedom from want and freedom from fear.

These declarations deserve all the acclaim they have already received from all parts of the world, particularly for their universality and noble purpose. We, of course, welcome and accept these principles just as we had accepted the fourteen points of President Wilson after the last war. We may be proud at least of the fact that the democratic world recognizes that world stability and enduring peace can be achieved only on the basis of freedom of all peoples capable of shaping and directing their own destinies.

Further, in his address of January 6, 1941, President Roosevelt had this to say on the subject:

> No lasting peace can be bought at the expense of other peoples' freedom.

Again, in his speech delivered at the annual dinner of the White House Correspondents' Association, he said:

> Humanity will never permanently accept a system imposed by conquest and based on slavery.

To my mind, Mr. Speaker, not only are these statements true, but they are expressions of foresight and vision. We can no longer tolerate a short-sighted plan or settlement. There must be built a new world citadel of freedom and civilization. If we ever hope to have stability and enduring peace, the principles of freedom must constantly be kept in mind and incorporated into the post-war settlement. If this basis is ignored, let us then not expect a peaceful world in the immediate future; the lives spent in this and the last war will then have been given in vain.

Let us look a step further. Should not the democracies, of imperative necessity, formulate a more definite and detailed set of proposals which will give the needed promise of release to all peoples under the domination of the aggressor nations? Should not our proposals be more positive, more dynamic, so that they may add more inspiration to the explosive force of the temporarily subdued peoples? I venture to suggest that in this manner we would change the whole course of the war very much more in our favour. I make this observation because it can well be

assumed that the axis powers are bound to offer some enticing formula to subdued nations for the express purpose of giving themselves a breathing moment before they begin tightening the reins on those unfortunate countries. Germany is already trying desperately to consolidate her position in the overrun regions. She is organizing these areas into zones which are to operate in complete subordination to her, and she is totally ignoring all racial and ethnographic lines. It is a sort of forced federal union. It would mean an eventual and permanent enslavement of millions of people. It would become a new and horrible prison of nations.

In view of this increasingly dangerous threat, the allies should, therefore, take it upon themselves to become the guardians of sovereign ideals and sovereign nations. Can we not promise all of them their national sovereignty, which would be in accordance with the spirit of the Atlantic charter, and which would make a revolutionary rebellion on their part worth while? It would be an inspiration and a challenge to them. For, as we know, there is no stronger force and incentive than that manifest in the defence of personal and national existence. I cannot, therefore, emphasize too strongly the immediate need on the part of democracies to make known their foreign policy in as complete and definite form as time and conditions permit. The issues at stake are too important for us not to make use of the incentive of confidence in the future—instead of vague hopes and wishful thinking.

Allow me now to draw your attention to the three items relevant to national sovereignty as outlined in the Atlantic charter. They are points 2, 3 and 6. Here is what they say:

> Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.
>
> Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.
>
> Sixth, after the final destruction of the nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

These three points deal generally with the phase of the problem which I am discussing. They read well, but I found numerous interpretations of them. One outstanding United States publication interprets the Atlantic charter as being opposed to the setting up of any new organisms. Of course, much depends on how the word "new" is interpreted. But are we to understand that nations who were not fortunate enough to liberate themselves during the last war shall remain in bondage? More clarification of this point is definitely needed. Then, again, the charter was interpreted as favouring the federal union proposals. Personally, I fail to find in the document any trace of expression of these views. As a matter of fact I find that the charter upholds the sovereignty of all peoples in accordance with their expressed will, which is definitely contrary to ideas propounded by federal unionists.

From what I have said thus far, it is evident that this question of foreign relations policy is an extremely broad one in scope. I wish, therefore, to confine my following remarks specifically to the discussion of a Ukrainian independent state and its importance to the British commonwealth of nations.

The question may arise in the minds of some hon. members as to why should we Canadians be interested in an independent Ukrainian state in Europe. Is it because Ukrainian-Canadians constitute a large group of our citizens, and we owe them that courtesy? Is it because they are so generously enlisting in great numbers in the Canadian armed forces and are ready to give their lives for Canada? Is it because of the heroic contribution of Ukrainians on the battlefields of the Ukraine against Germany? Or, is it because it is in the very blood of the English-speaking people always to stand up for the rights of others as well as their own? Yes, but there is a much more important reason than those I have already given.

Above all, a Ukrainian independent state in eastern Europe would be important to the British commonwealth of nations and the United States as a balance of power. I venture to suggest that in the not distant future the British people and the principles for which they stand will be more closely associated with the Ukrainians than they have ever been before.

Furthermore, Ukraine is important because of the extent of its territory, the richness of its natural resources, the size of its population, and its strategic position with reference to the Black sea, the Dardanelles, Iran, Iraq, the Persian gulf and India. Professor G. W. Simpson, of Saskatchewan university, has this to say in his "Atlas of History and Geography of the Ukraine":

> Thus the Ukraine constitutes a wide assembling place which could be used either by ambitious dictators as the starting point for sweeping military conquest, or by wise statesmen as a strong wedge-like area of defence which would stabilize all these regions tributary to the Black sea.

Consequently, it is definitely contrary to the interests of Britain to permit Germany to take and hold the Ukraine and exploit its people and its resources for aggrandizement and greater power. Again, it would not be in the best interests of Britain to see any other power enslave the Ukrainian people and, with the use of their territory and natural resources, become a dominant power holding this strategic position in eastern Europe.

Finally, a division of the territory after the fashion of the division made after the last war would only complicate the problems of Europe, and the dangerous situation would remain unchanged. Hence the problem of a Ukrainian independent state in eastern Europe is of extreme importance to the British commonwealth of nations and to the stability of the world.

I have before me a handbook prepared under the authority of the historic section of the British foreign office, entitled "The Ukraine", the topic which I propose to discuss briefly. This booklet is numbered 52 of the series of such authoritative information prepared and collected for the sole purpose of having this information available for those who were to participate in the peace conferences. It may be observed from the series number that there must have been at least fifty-one others of the kind, dealing with various important problems. This booklet contains information having to do with physical geography, political history, social and political conditions, and much other useful material. One cannot help but admire the British for their thoroughness in dealing with important matters such as these; on the other hand, the total lack of similar preparation on our part in Canada stands out in striking contrast.

True, many Canadians show a keen interest in the Ukrainian problem. Many of them seek information on the subject, but it is essential that they obtain their information from authoritative and unbiased sources. All those interested in the subject must remember that there is a great deal of distorted information emanating from people who are not totally disinterested in the possession and the control of the Ukraine. This information is usually disseminated with the purpose of obliterating the authenticity of the ethnological and ethnographical existence of the Ukrainian people. For example, any aspiration manifested by Ukrainians looking to freedom and independence in their own native land is immediately given the interpretation of being instigated by an enemy of the British. This method of propaganda is by no means new, but unless one guards against such sources of information he may be hopelessly misled.

[Mr. Hlynka.]

For the benefit of those who may be interested in the subject I wish to place on record just a few authoritative sources of information: "Ukraine, an Atlas of its History and Geography," by G. W. Simpson, professor of European history, university of Saskatchewan, published in 1941; "History of the Ukraine," by D. Doroshenko, professor of Prague and Warsaw universities, which was edited by Professor Simpson, and published in 1939. The third and perhaps the most comprehensive study is "A History of Ukraine," by Michael Hrushevsky, one of the world's outstanding historians. This book was edited by O. J. Frederiksen, professor of history at Miami university, and published by Yale university press in 1941.

May I now give this house, so far as my humble ability will permit, the fundamental facts concerning Ukraine and the Ukrainian people? First let me deal with the land they inhabit and claim.

Ukraine is a vast rich territory lying in the southeastern corner of Europe on the threshold of Asia, immediately north of the Black sea. It is the second largest ethnographic territory in Europe and fourteenth largest in the world. This territory comprises 362,200 square miles.

Immediately prior to the last world war the whole Ukraine was held by Russia and Austro-Hungary.

By 1923 the Ukraine was dismembered and divided among the four neighbouring nations. The largest portion, comprising 298,610 square miles and containing 35,026,000 Ukrainians, called the Great Ukraine, was assigned to Russia, and was incorporated as one of the republics of the Soviet Union. The western Ukraine, comprising 51,042 square miles and containing 7,500,000 Ukrainians, was made a Polish "protectorate". The provinces of Bessarabia and Bukovina, comprising 6,795 square miles and containing 1,500,000 Ukrainians, was placed under Roumanian rule, while Carpatho-Ukraine, comprising 5,753 square miles and containing 600,000 Ukrainians, was assigned to Czechoslovakia.

At the moment almost the entire territory has become the battlefield of the German and the Soviet Union forces. It has been for many months and still is being torn by destructive forces of war, and the Ukrainian people are undergoing the most cruel ordeal of their history. In addition to this tragic fate that befell the Ukrainian people, the scorched earth policy of the Soviet government was mainly applied to the Ukraine. The land which is capable of providing freedom and life to its people has brought nothing but extreme tragedy, with slavery and death.

To one who has not the facts about the Ukraine it may seem confusing why so many nations are forever determined to grab a piece of this land for themselves. The answer is that it is one of the richest regions in the entire world. Ukraine is often referred to as the granary of Europe. It is more than that. Her mineral deposits are the envy of all her good neighbours. The 1932 Encyclopaedia Americana points out that in 1928-29 Ukraine supplied the Soviet Union with 80 per cent of its coal, 60 per cent of its iron, 95 per cent of its manganese, 80 per cent of its sugar, the bulk of its wheat, vast quantities of mercury, copper and gold. The striking fact is that its rightful owners share little in this wealth.

There are now in the neighbourhood of 50 million Ukrainians in the world. Numerically they are the third largest group in Europe and ninth largest in the world. They first appeared in history in the fourth century. My time will not permit me to deal with the ethnology and the general characteristics of the people at this time; suffice it to say that C. S. Coon, professor of anthropology at Harvard university, states in his book, "Races of Europe," that Ukrainians are a distinct and separate people.

Perhaps the greatest contribution made by Ukrainians to the world was that of staving off the Asiatic hordes for many centuries from invading Europe. That is what Lord Tweedsmuir meant when he said on September 21, 1936, at Fraserwood, Manitoba, "for it was your race which for centuries held the south-eastern gate of Europe against the attacks from the east."

Again, it was through Kiev, the capital of the Ukraine, that Christianity was introduced into eastern Europe in 988. Let me mention one or two other contributions in art, music, and literature. Alexander Archipenko, one of the world's foremost contemporary sculptors, now living in the United States, is a Ukrainian. The immortal Tschaikowsky, in the field of music, was of Ukrainian origin. Taras Shevchenko, the Robert Burns of the Slavic races, was a Ukrainian. These are but a few indications of Ukrainian contributions to the world.

When national states were established after the last world war it was held that the basis accepted was not some remote appeal to historic claims, but rather a clear and unmistakable determination of the people to rule themselves. With regard to the historic claims of many peoples, some, like Finland, had not known complete political independence for many centuries; some, like Esthonia, had never known political independence in the modern sense of the word.

The Ukraine, however, has had a continuous historic tradition extending back for over a thousand years, and three times, at least, this tradition incorporated itself in terms of political independence. First, there was the Kievan state, existing from the ninth to the middle of the fourteenth century; then the Cossack state, established in 1648, which lasted to the middle of the eighteenth century, and lastly, the United Ukrainian Republic of 1918-23.

At the time when Alfred the Great of England was attempting to maintain his Saxon state against the Danes, the ancestors of the Ukrainian people were establishing a large and flourishing kingdom with its centre at Kiev. This Kievan state, with its Slav-Byzantine culture, was the outstanding political state in eastern Europe. It is the fountainhead of the Ukrainian historical tradition. When it disintegrated into principalities and suffered the devastating blow of the Tartar invasion its traditions lived on in the southern principalities, particularly in the western Ukraine. Although the western Ukraine fell to Poland and the other principalities to Lithuania, which was later joined to Poland, the ancient Ukrainian laws, customs and language persisted and developed.

Again when Oliver Cromwell in England, in the seventeenth century, was striking a mighty blow for that liberty which we are to-day defending, Bohdan Khmelnitsky created on the basis of Ukrainian tradition a free and independent Cossack state. Unfortunately Khmelnitsky had not the advantage of a sea wall, which Cromwell enjoyed, and the state which he had erected was torn between Poland and the rising state of Muscovy which was then becoming the modern empire of Russia. So firmly entrenched, however, were the institutions of self-government in the Ukraine, that it was more than a hundred years after the death of Khmelnitsky, in the latter half of the eighteenth century, before the imperialist regime could root out the last remnants of these institutions of self-government.

But the love of freedom which is an undying part of the human spirit was again awakened in the nineteenth century among the Ukrainian people as well as among the Czechs, the Poles and others who had been suppressed.

Finally, in the first world war, when the Russian empire fell, then from its ruins, for the third time in the history of the Ukrainian people, there emerged a Ukrainian independent state, proclaimed on January 22, 1918. Nine months later the Austro-Hungarian empire fell, and from its remnants there was created the Western Ukrainian National Republic, proclaimed on the first day of November, 1918, ten days before the armistice. These

two Ukrainian areas were proclaimed united on January 22, 1919, forming a United Ukrainian Republic.

The Ukrainian patriots fought desperately to defend this state so that they might live as free people among other nations of the world. They lost this freedom, and one element in their misfortune was the fact that their cause was so gravely misunderstood and misrepresented. By 1923 the Ukrainians found themselves divided among four states, as I have already pointed out.

It seemed that it was the original intention of the Paris peace conference to give the Ukrainians the right of self-determination in the western Ukraine. In 1923, however, the Council of Ambassadors granted to Poland the title to this area, on the distinct understanding that she would eventually grant autonomy to this part of the Ukraine under the stipulated clauses of the Minorities treaty of 1919. Finally, in 1934, Poland formally repudiated this obligation.

The results of these minorities treaties present many interesting angles. It may be granted that it was not easy to divide the territory in question into national states, since there were many conflicting claims; but, allowing even for that, all were not treated with equal consideration. For instance, in the territorial revision after the last war some eleven states were created that were not on the map in 1914. Some of these were: Poland, with some 20 millions of people; Yugoslavia, with about 15 millions; Finland, with 3,600,000; Lithuania, with 2,500,000; Latvia, with 2,000,000, and Esthonia, with 1,100,000. I strongly uphold the granting of sovereign rights to all these nations, because I am a firm believer in the sovereign rights of all peoples in accordance with their will. It does seem inconsistent, however, that Ukrainians, with over 40 millions at that time, came out of the struggle empty-handed, in spite of the fact that they had been an historic unit in the past. Were not the Ukrainians entitled to the same privilege as others? If not, why not?

Another error in the settlement arose out of the fact that minorities created by this division constituted a dangerously high percentage. According to Mr. C. A. Macartney, a recognized authority on European affairs, in Czechoslovakia thirty-three per cent were other than Czechs or Slovaks; in Poland over twenty-five per cent were non-Polish; in Roumania over twenty-five per cent were other than Roumanians. The important question is, can we afford to ignore racial lines in the future?

[Mr. Hlynka.]

The present collapse of the state structure in Europe has again involved the Ukrainian people, along with other peoples, in utmost misery and desolatiou at the hands of the aggressor nations. The Ukrainians have again joined hands with other liberty-loving peoples in a fight for freedom. In Carpatho-Ukraine they fought against the axis partner, Hungary, in 1938. In western Ukraine and in Poland they fought against Germany in 1939, and they are now fighting against Germany with the Soviet Union forces.

Ukrainians fought for their freedom throughout their long and tragic history. They fight for it now, and they will continue to fight for it until they are free. Ukrainians believe that they are just as much entitled to their sovereign rights as any other people are; they wish to contribute their maximum share to culture and civilization of the world. This will be possible only through the restoration of their own independence. A nation can give its best only when free from bondage. These are the tenets of the Atlantic charter; these are the tenets of Christian civilization.

It may be pointed out by some that there appear to be two obstacles in the way of realization of Ukrainian sovereignty. In the first place it may be suggested that after this war there will be no sovereign states; that some sort of federal union will take their place. Personally I do not believe that the British people would favour any plan that would require the forfeiture of their sovereignty. If they did, they would not be fighting this war.

The second obstacle which may be suggested is one with reference to the Soviet Union. It may be said that, since the Soviet Union is our ally in this war, any suggestion of an independent Ukraine might endanger our relations with the Soviet Union. Let me remind hon. members that, according to press reports, the Soviet government favours the proposals embodied in the Atlantic charter. That this is so, was indicated by the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Eden, after his recent return from Moscow. In addition to that, article 17 of the Soviet Union constitution (1936) says that "Each union republic is reserved the right freely to secede from the U.S.S.R." This should be sufficient assurance that the Soviet Union would be inclined to favour a recognition of the principle of the sovereignty of nations.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to leave with the house the following suggestion. In view of the fact that all the subdued countries that had been sovereign nations prior to this war are now privileged to form their provisional governments in exile

in order that they may carry on the work in the interests of their respective peoples, and in view of the fact that Ukrainians, who form a larger group than any of these, have not now that privilege simply because they were not an independent nation immediately prior to this war, I humbly submit that steps should be taken by the allied governments to make it possible for the Ukrainians to be represented at the various conferences now being held from time to time. In Great Britain, the United States and Canada, there are in existence United Ukrainian committees, whose primary object is to assist the governments in Britain, the United States and Canada in the successful prosecution of the war. I do suggest, if I may, sir, that since all the allied nations are fighting for a common cause of freedom, that Ukrainian committees to which I have referred be also invited to delegate their representative or representatives to express the view of 50 million Ukrainian people at conferences held by the allied nations.

I believe I have sufficiently pointed out that the stability of Europe and of the world can be achieved only on the basis of universal justice. The European madhouse will remain a madhouse until Europe is reconstructed with freedom written into every word of its constitution. When that is done we may expect a lasting peace.

Mr. J. A. BRADETTE (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with my remarks I want to compliment the previous speaker, the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Hlynka) upon presenting so lucidly and forcibly one of the great problems which his people living in Europe are facing now, and which we shall have to face and try to solve after the present conflict is over.

It is with a certain amount of trepidation, realizing that all hon. members are alive to the seriousness of the situation, that I dare to speak on this occasion. I believe, however, that this is the time, in the course of the debate on the speech from the throne, as the floor of this House of Commons is the place, for a member of parliament occasionally to express his sentiments on great matters which are agitating public opinion.

I was not here when the mover (Mr. Fournier, Hull) and the seconder (Mr. Macdonald, Brantford City) spoke, but I made it a point to read their speeches, and I join with others in complimenting them sincerely upon the splendid presentation they made. I also listened attentively to the excellent address given by that true Canadian, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) last week, and I might say the same about the speeches given by the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party (Mr. Coldwell) and the leader of the Social Credit group (Mr. Blackmore).

There is one feeling that, I am sure, animates this house. We are all in agreement on the fact that a total war effort is desirable at this time and until full victory has been attained. We all want to do everything we possibly can to prosecute the war successfully. One party may think differently from another with regard to certain phases of our activities, but surely it is possible in the present serious situation, in this critical time in our Canadian history and of the world, for us all to get our hearts and minds together and bring about unity in our own ranks so that we may forge ahead successfully with our war effort.

Let me address sincere felicitations to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). In my opinion he gave a splendid, illuminating address, and I hope it will be possible for every Canadian to read, to scrutinize and carefully to analyse that speech. The Prime Minister showed what we have done in prosecuting this war. He made it known to the Canadian people, to the people of the British empire, and to all the people of the civilized world that we in Canada are willing to go further than we have gone and to make still greater efforts, and sacrifices, in time, energy and wealth in order to preserve all those things that Canadians cherish. There is one thing that surprises me—I have wondered at it ever since the war began—and that is the fact that many members of parliament find it possible to say, generally speaking, that Canadians do not realize the seriousness of the situation. Indeed, some hon. gentlemen go as far as to say that the Canadian people did not realize the situation at the time of the election in 1940. I suggest that anyone who has read at all carefully the history of the first great war, from 1914 to 1918, as well as some military works depicting not only the horrors of that war, but the horrors of the war which historians at that time foresaw would take place in the future, in other words, the war in which we are at present engaged; anyone who listened at all carefully to some of the speeches that were delivered at that time in the House of Commons by such men as General Ross, who represented Kingston, and who gave so vividly, from personal knowledge, accounts of what had taken place in the last war, and predicted what might happen in the future, does not rate the intelligence of Canadians very high if he stands up in this forum and declares that the Canadian people to-day do not realize, or did not realize, at the time of the election in 1940,

the seriousness of this war. Our people knew and know of the meaning of this horrible conflict. We all knew how serious it would be. We could not help realizing it after Germany had conquered Poland in a few weeks. We knew what was in store for all the freedom-loving democracies unless we prepared ourselves accordingly.

I protest against this attitude on the part of certain people. There is scarcely a Canadian family that has not some representative in active service on the European side, and if for no other reason that that, I am sure we are all fully conscious of the gravity of the situation and the necessity for combining all our energies so that we may make sure that we shall be absolutely victorious.

May I say a few words now about the plebiscite? I represent a riding in which there are all the nationalities known to the civilized world. Ever since the total war movement started, I have been receiving letters, in some of which I have been definitely told that unless I am absolutely for conscription I should resign. As far as I am personally concerned, let me say that on this important question I shall follow primarily the dictates of my own conscience and what I believe to be in the interests of my own country and of the British empire. I will not be led astray, or I will not be led one way or the other, by other considerations. I believe that every member of parliament must accept responsibility not only for his own political actions, but, to a large extent, for some leadership in his own constituency, and advance his ideas earnestly and sincerely.

Before coming to this session I was sincerely convinced that this government had done almost as well as it could do under the circumstances. I believed that it was fully aware of the situation, notwithstanding that in the last three or four months there has been a vicious attack from a small section of the country, of which attack of necessity parliament must be cognizant. I am absolutely in favour of holding a plebiscite at this time, and my chief reason is this. I think that when we read the history of Canada we realize that at all times we have had reason to believe implicitly in the fairmindedness, the logic and the intelligence of Canadian voters, and they always realized and accepted the fullness of their responsibilities.

Some members of the opposition this afternoon criticized severely the fact that the plebiscite would cost some money. If I mistake not, I heard almost the same sort of criticism a few months ago about national registration, and only a year ago, before the census was taken, there was a section of the press as well as of the opposition deploring the fact that the government was going to spend money on a census. Everyone now realizes that it is of national service. I do not wish to assume the role of prophet, but I suggest that when the history of this particular episode which we are now discussing comes to be written, the general feeling will be that the government acted rightly in asking the people to pronounce upon this important question.

I have not time to go over the achievements of Canada in this war. Any Canadian who wishes to get the facts can find them not only in the speech delivered by the Prime Minister at the beginning of the session, but in the press of the country. The Canadian achievement has been little short of miraculous. I am the last man to suggest that everything has been done exactly as it should have been done, or that we have done all that we could possibly have done. But we have learned a good deal from the last war; we are learning in this war too, and I have no doubt whatever that our activities will be greater as we go on.

Some of our colleagues on the other side seem to make light of the promise with regard to conscription that was given to the Canadian people in the election of 1940. In my constituency, which was typical of 244 others, conscription was not an issue, for the simple reason that I as Liberal candidate, my opponent Mr. Crumb, the Conservative, and Mr. Teeple, the Labour candidate, were all in agreement, and decidedly so, that conscription of man-power for service overseas should not be implemented in this parliament. We have to render an account of our stewardship on that question, and our position in this regard has not changed since 1940. I believe that our young men would always answer to the call of duty voluntarily wherever their services would be required.

Let me quote what was said by Doctor Manion, who became leader of the Conservative party in the last election, on the floor of the House of Commons on March 30, 1939, as reported at page 2440:

> In the last war the conscription of men to go to the front caused violent racial antagonisms, much disharmony, bitterness and misunderstanding—conditions from which as yet we have not wholly recovered; and on top of that I believe I am expressing the opinion of authorities when I say that it was of no real military value so far as the empire was concerned.

That statement was repeated on the floor of the house. Doctor Manion stated that as far

as he could ascertain, only 10,000 men at the most got into the fighting line. He went on to say:

The policy that I suggest is the one which I gave three days ago in an interview: First, that there should be no conscription of Canadians to serve outside the borders of Canada; second, that we should have full cooperation with the British empire short of the conscription of men to serve outside our borders.

Of this I never heard any contradiction from the Conservative party. That was prior to an election. Perhaps there was some personal reason for Doctor Manion making such a statement. But we had an election during 1940, and in the city of Quebec during the campaign Doctor Manion, addressing a very large meeting, faced a large banner on which was written:

I am absolutely opposed to conscription.

These are the words of Doctor Manion concerning that great issue on that occasion:

I stated on March 30, 1939, just about a year ago, in the House of Commons, that I was opposed to conscription because of its failure in the last war—

Mark you, "failure" is the word he used.

—and because it had stirred up misunderstanding and strife in our country when the duty of our public men is to hold this country together rather than to break it up. I have not waited until I came to the province of Quebec to make this statement. I made it a month ago at Brockville in the opening speech of my campaign.

When I read the report of that meeting, the newspapers were all in agreement that it was a wonderful omen of Conservative victory. He continued:

I have made it more than twenty times since then in almost every speech which I have delivered as far west as Victoria, B.C. Thus I have set forth my attitude in five provinces of Canada before coming to Quebec, and I state here again to-night that I am against conscription, and that a national government such as I propose will not put in conscription.

These are words for which hon. members have to take some responsibility. It was words of their leader that they all accepted. I am taking some responsibility myself because I stated then and I state now that I was against conscription in the election of 1940, and no matter how much white-washing you try to do, the Conservative party and other parties without exception appealed to the Canadian voters on that basis in 1940.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): The Conservatives will still be muddled.

Mr. BRADETTE: Well, I am no judge of muddling. During that campaign—and I do not say it was done purely for political purposes, but during this time of crisis we must start our discussions on an even keel—I remember that the late hon. member for Parkdale, Mr. David Spence, for whom everyone had such a high regard on account of his sincerity and integrity, when the Conservative party said they were going to burn their bridges behind them and run as a national government party, stated he was going to remain a Conservative, but they overruled him. They ran as a National Government party and were defeated.

On February 24 last in this house the then Minister of Justice, the late lamented Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, asked the sitting members of the Conservative party whether they were adherents of the National Government party, and every one of them most definitely answered "No." At the present time they have a leader in the house, and I know his modesty will not be offended when I say he is a real Canadian and a real statesman. But if Mr. Meighen is elected in York South next Monday, what kind of following will he have? Because at the present time he is running as a National Government man, something that was absolutely repulsive to the Canadian electorate in the spring of 1940, and denied by the present sitting members.

I repeat that if we go at it in the proper way we could get by the voluntary system all the young men required for service overseas. In saying that, I am thinking not only of the whole of Canada but of my own constituency as well which has responded magnificently. We may have to put more glamour into the militia; we must improve our approach; but if proper methods are used, they can get the men that are needed. We know that at present great numbers of young Canadians want to get into the Royal Canadian Air Force. If it were possible for Canada and for the United States at the present time as well as Great Britain to send 10,000 young flyers with the proper equipment to Singapore, that great outpost of civilization and of British power could be saved.

But I will go further—and I do not want to be misquoted; it seems it is always possible during a time of passion for certain newspapers to misquote everyone. During a recruiting campaign in my own constituency last fall I made it a point in speaking with the officers of that recruiting convoy to tell them that the onus and the responsibility rested primarily on their shoulders; that so far I was satisfied that the response had been not only spontaneous but unanimous and very loyal, but that the day might come when more sacrifice would have to be made and that if many did not answer the call of

national need for the defence of civilization and Christianity, then the question would be left for themselves to answer; there could be no avoiding of responsibilities.

I want to say a few words about the new leader of the Conservative party. I believe I can do no better than give the charter that has been given to him by his own party by quoting from an article in *Saturday Night* of November 22, 1941, by the well-known editor of that paper, Mr. B. K. Sandwell, who is well posted on our Canadian life and affairs. This is what he has to say about the new leadership:

> The terms of Mr. Meighen's acceptance of the Conservative leadership have revealed in a very clear light the nature of the strategy upon which the authors of the Meighen movement are relying, and which goes considerably further than was at first apparent. It is essentially a repetition of the strategy of 1917, and its design is to split off a sufficient fraction of the normal Liberal strength (first among the leaders of the party and members sitting in parliament, and then among the rank-and-file voters), partly by considerations relating to the vigour of the war effort, and partly by considerations relating to the country's railway problem, to ensure a popular vote against that party as soon as an election can be forced.

Those people who are against the plebiscite know well that their leader at the present time would be in favour of splitting this parliament to have a general election. Would they tell me that a general election would cost less than the plebiscite? I want them to be fair when they discuss such an important question, and tell the whole story.

This article continues:

> The possibility of such an achievement, negligible in times of peace, becomes considerably greater in time of war when the dependence of the party on its solid Quebec support compels it to courses which many of its English-speaking members find it difficult to tolerate.

And again, further definition of that new charter of the great Conservative party:

> One of these was the long-standing disagreement between the Liberals and Sir Clifford Sifton, which dated back to the establishment of separate schools in the newly constituted prairie provinces. But the overwhelming advantage which practically guaranteed the ability of the conscriptionists to win the election, and therefore made it easy for the dissident Liberals to come over to their camp, was the fact that they were already in control of the government and could manipulate the franchise as they wished. The War Times Election Act, of which Mr. Meighen was the author, conferred the franchise upon women relatives of members of the armed forces—

That was fine; that was the only redeeming feature of the whole thing, the only act that was not almost a criminal act.

> —withdrew it from a considerable number of naturalized aliens, and authorized the chief returning officer—

I want parliament and this country to note this; I want those who were not old enough to vote in 1917 to listen to this:

> —and authorized the chief returning officer to distribute the soldiers' vote among the constituencies at his own discretion. With these instruments at the government's disposal the result, even with a solid Quebec against it, was not in great doubt.

And they expect the Canadian people will fall for that again, as they fell for it in 1917. Once is enough. Some returned men told me personally that when they were in England they did not know their votes were going to be pooled; they did not know a reservoir was to be created, to be distributed at the whim of the chief returning officer, in any way that would suit the orders which he would receive. In my section of the country we do not want a repetition of that horrible thing, which occurred in the infamous election of 1917. During that election the fine farmers and citizens of the parishes of Moonbeam and Fauquier were entirely deprived of the right to vote. These parishes were fully nine miles apart, but had no road connection except the Canadian National right of way. The voters in Fauquier were told that they had to go to Moonbeam to vote; those in Moonbeam were told they had to go to Fauquier, and most of them spent all day walking back and forth, without being allowed to vote. In Porquis Junction there were twelve Liberal votes cast. Men wearing the uniform of the constabulary took those twelve votes and tore them up, so they were never counted. And they called that democracy. While the country was fighting to destroy the principles of autocracy, we were suffering from the worst kind of autocracy this country ever experienced; trying to destroy the principle of free, universal suffrage; and as far as I am concerned, it will never be repeated. A good friend of mine, Eddie Lapierre, was elected in my constituency—it was my constituency at that time, taking in the two Cochranes and Nipissing—by over 1,200, by his own duly qualified electors. But after votes had been taken from that reservoir of soldier votes, he found himself defeated by forty. These are things we must remember at this time. I know no Conservative sitting in this House of Commons would be a party to any such unjust, unfair practices during the present crisis; however, this is the charter, drawn up by a man who is supposed to know, and appearing in a national newspaper read in every section of this country.

I should now like to say a word about the total-war committee. I agree entirely with the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) who said this afternoon that

among the two hundred people present at that meeting were some fine gentlemen and fine ladies. But I could also tell the hon. member that many of those people went to that meeting without knowing why they had been called. In some cases—and this was told to me personally—they thought they were going to a meeting to promote the next war loan. Many of them did not even vote on the question; they remained in their seats, because they did not want to have anything to do with it. To me it smacks very much of Canada's wonder boy, who started that idiotic leadership movement which was still-born a few years ago, the young man who was going to run roughshod over every parliamentarian, making us all appear to be crooks and so on, and who eventually would become prime minister of this country. I have no fear of that last eventuality ever coming to pass.

I have tabulated each of these full-page total-war committee advertisements that I received from my constituents; and instead of these fine men and women of that committee spending large sums of money in a foolish effort to poison the minds of our electors in this province of Ontario, I think they should have found it possible to insert full-page advertisements in all the newspapers of Ontario in an endeavour to put over the new war loan, which is to be issued during the course of this month. In doing so, they would have been following some wonderful examples. For instance, I have in my hand a full-page advertisement appearing in that fine magazine *Canadian Business,* entitled "I Am Resolved." Resolved to do what?

I am resolved to be cheerful and uncomplaining at all times, sympathetic to those who work beside me, and to those in authority over me.

That is a much better principle than any enunciated by the total-war committee. Not long ago some ladies of the town of Timmins called me up and said they wanted to see me. I asked what it was about, and they said they wanted to start a total-war committee. I said, "I do not want one. I am converted to that principle and have been converted to it ever since the war started. Every citizen of this country is in favour of it." Then I added, "You must have some other work you can do, and that is helping the new war loan." Then this advertisement goes on to tell the Canadian people some other things they may do:

I am resolved to be tolerant of the shortcomings of others, realizing that to make an effort is commendable, to attempt nothing is deadly.

I am resolved gladly to do without some of those things I am accustomed to enjoy, for it is good to deny oneself—even to suffer in a noble cause.

I am resolved that if I am fitted to serve my country best in the fighting forces, I will take my place proudly beside my comrades.

I am resolved to strive with all my power, to press on in my daily task to the limit of my endurance. It may be that my modest effort will tip the scale, and set a great shout of deliverance echoing 'round the world.

In this January number appear similar advertisements sponsored by the Northern Electric Company, Limited; Canadian Industries, Limited; British American Bank Note Company, Limited; Howard Smith Paper Mills Limited; Rapid Grip and Batten, Limited, and others; and on several occasions I have also received some wonderfully elevating, loyal Canadian and British literature from The Universal Life Assurance and Annuity Company of Winnipeg. I take this opportunity of thanking these people, and many others, that slip my mind at the moment, for their constructive work. I know that at least some of them are not political supporters of the present government, but they realize the duty of the moment.

We have a fine newspaper service in my constituency. We receive the Toronto morning papers as soon as they are available in Toronto itself; we know more about Toronto than they know about our section of the country. More than that, in my constituency I have one daily paper, one bi-weekly paper, and two weekly papers. In all these newspapers these full-page advertisements by the total-war committee appeared; and all told, I received forty-three letters as a result. This was in a constituency with a population of over eighty thousand, and these letters would represent about 170 people. I acknowledged each of these letters, thanking the writer for the interest he was taking in our national affairs, in most instances making no comment. Neither did I make any comment when a mining engineer by the name of Stevenson took it upon himself to send an open telegram abusing the Prime Minister of this country. I do not intend to reply to that sort of abuse, because it is un-Canadian, it is unpatriotic. In our section of the country one man, whether he is a mucker working in the entrails of the earth, a farmer or a lumberman, is just as loyal as the next man. We know that this government is not perfect; but we also know that no matter what government is in power, we shall give it the same loyal support we gave the government of this country during the first great war.

I said the letters I received in response to these advertisments represented a total of

about 170 people. Hon. members will not be surprised, I hope, to learn that without propaganda of any sort I received communications from more than three hundred people during that period of time, telling me they were absolutely against conscription; because the only thing they could draw from that advertisement was that the answer to all our problems in connection with the war lay in manpower only. It is an important one, but there are also others. To me that is one very important subject, but there are other very important subjects as well. Canadians have cheerfully accepted many curtailments, and if they should be called upon to make further sacrifices, I know they will cheerfully do so. So far, casualties have been relatively low, but I resent the statement made both in parliament and outside parliament that in order for some to realize that we are in a war, we should have some bombing from the air. Perhaps for some people that might have a salutary effect; but no one who has seen or read or heard of what has happened in Europe, more particularly in valorous old England, is without fear in his heart and his eyes. We know what is going on. I say in the name of my own people that no matter what the government may ask of us, be it bacon rationing, sugar rationing or egg rationing, we shall be willing to cooperate.

Mr. JACKMAN: Why not?

Mr. BRADETTE: Why not? Does the hon. member put the question?

Mr. JACKMAN: The hon. member speaks of sacrifices, but those are not sacrifices.

Mr. BRADETTE: I said that we are willing to do whatever we are asked to do. I do not want to be misquoted. I do not want the spirit of misrepresentation trying to speak here to-night. I am speaking with all sincerity. I never interrupt the hon. member when he is speaking, and I think I should have the same treatment from him. Last fall I listened to a broadcast by Mr. Donald Gordon of the price-ceiling board. I do not have the pleasure of knowing that gentleman, but anyone listening to him would never doubt his sincerity. I should like to quote the last two paragraphs of the broadcast he gave when the price-ceiling policy was started. They are:

> All of these probable hardships and mistakes and difficulties I fully realize and freely admit. I wish you to realize them too, because ten days from now, on Monday the 1st of December, you are going into a battle. You, wherever you may live, old or young, rich or poor, man or woman, are a soldier in this army. . . The board of which I am chairman is only the army headquarters. You are going to be the soldiers on the firing line and you must meet and conquer doubts, fears, uncertainties, rumours, and alarms. You must keep always before you the one clear objective—prices must not rise; the price ceiling must be held; inflation must be beaten.
>
> Forget the reasons why this policy will not work. Remember only that it must work, for there is no alternative except disaster.
>
> This is your part in the war. In every home in Canada there is now a fighting part to play. I believe you can and will save yourselves and your country in this crisis. I predict that the historian of a future day will record that when this call to duty came to you, you responded, not only with your loyalty but also with intelligence, imagination, and resource.

All Canadians should do whatever they possibly can to prevent inflation. We do not want inflation similar to what we had in 1917 and which brought ruin to every section of the country. If inflation should occur, then the help we are giving so generously and cheerfully to England will be absolutely meaningless, because our Canadian money will have practically no value whatever.

I should like to mention two or three matters with reference to my own section of the country. First of all I want to say that I am an upholder of the law; I believe in the principle of British and Canadian justice that when a man commits a crime, no matter who he may be, he should be brought before the courts. There are hundreds of thousands of young Canadians in training camps all over this country. Some of those from my section of the country are in camps located over a thousand miles from their homes. These boys sometimes go out on larks and do things not absolutely according to Hoyle. I hope it will be possible to have no publicity given to these pranks. I want to be clear on this. If a criminal act is committed, such as manslaughter, highway robbery or anything of that kind, or wilful damage to property, then I want the law applied. However, many boys from the district of Cochrane are in camps at Ottawa, Camp Borden, Toronto and so on, and they sometimes get into a little trouble. The first thing we know this is spread all over the press in our section of the country. This is not the right kind of publicity to give to these boys. It is bad, not only for these young men but for their fathers and mothers living at home. They worry about this situation. Perhaps it would be possible to have these cases tried by a military court, at least they should be dealt with the same as military discipline is dealt with, and no publicity given to them.

I have one request to make. Like all members of parliament, I have always followed explicitly the lead that was given to us in the fall of 1939, that no political influence would

have any bearing upon military matters. I believe, however, it is my duty to mention some anomalies that exist. The divisional registrar for our section of the country is a Mr. R. A. Irwin, located in Toronto. I am told, and I believe that this gentleman is most competent, but the fact that he resides in Toronto makes it necessary for young men in my section of the country who want to lodge appeals to go a distance of 880 miles. These young men want to do their duty, but there are instances where it is felt that an extension of time should be given. Because of the distance they must travel, many of these men do not get the extension and through correspondence the real situation cannot be known. I maintain that our rural, mining, industrial and pioneering population should have the same right of being heard before a divisional registrar as people living in any other section of the country. Again I want to say that I have nothing against this registrar, but I believe that some injustice is being done to those living in my section of the country.

During the debate I have listened attentively to such hon. members as the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) and other hon. members who live on the Atlantic coast. I realize that all these hon. members were most sincere in what they said about the defence of the coasts of Canada. My section of the country is nationally and geographically the centre of Canada. Hudson bay and James bay cut this country almost in twain. I do not believe I am divulging any secret when I say that there are some defence works in the Bering strait. I am not going to state here what I stated a few months ago when some officers—these were not Canadian or British but allied officers—came to my section of the country and said that conditions there were not suitable for an air training school. I think that such judgments should be given by members of our own administration. Such a school should be possible in our section.

I should like to say a few words about criticism. We all maintain, and no doubt quite rightly, that criticism is absolutely necessary in a democracy under our parliamentary system. I believe it is, as long as it is constructive and not destructive. Certain sections of the press, however, seem to be deliberately trying to poison the minds of our Canadian people in connection with our war effort. They are not at all fair to our government. I should like to quote briefly what Mr. Churchill said during a discussion last July. I quote:

> I should like to give some facts and figures to show how the improved organization and the smoother running of our machines has overcome adverse currents.
>
> This is rather easy money for critics who can oil a two-day debate with disparaging charges against our war effort.
>
> Over-ardent or disaffected sections of the press can take it up and the whole give cry to a dismal cacophonous chorus of stinking fish all around the world.

Those are the things we have to fight against. I have in my hand what in my opinion is one of the most vicious, unfair and dastardly articles ever written by a newspaper. I am referring to the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of January 31, 1942. The heading of the article is, "A disgrace to parliament." This article has reference to a speech delivered by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce), and I believe he will highly resent this sort of editorial against our parliamentary system. I quote:

> Shortly after he began his address, however, Prime Minister King motioned to his leading Quebec lieutenant—

Was there ever anything so sinister? Trying to intimate that the Prime Minister motioned deliberately to his leader from the province of Quebec to do an unfair act to my hon. friend. The article continues:

> —and they showed their contempt for parliamentary procedure by walking out.

At the present moment there are only about half a dozen young men in the press gallery, but I would be the last one among the members of parliament here present to think for one moment that those who are absent are not carrying on their duties in their offices. No one will think of any other motive. It has never come to the mind of any member of parliament to doubt for one moment that the members of the press gallery, as well as the members of parliament, have duties to perform both inside and outside parliament. I continue:

> Half the Liberal members present took the cue and followed. Among those remaining the small fry—

We are thankful for that expression.

> —got so busy with conversation and heckling. . . .

I took the trouble to look up the record of the speech made by the hon. member for Parkdale, and I found that there was not one single bit of heckling from this side or any other part of the house.

There were several questions asked by the ministers, and I know the hon. member for Parkdale gladly answered them. The report in the *Globe and Mail* goes on to say:

Among those remaining the small fry got so busy with conversation and heckling that the Speaker had to call for order more than once. It is plain that what bothers these worshippers of party first is that Colonel Bruce has been so constructive in his suggestions that he has called the turn repeatedly and accurately on indifference and neglect.

We all agree with that. It goes on:

Not one of those who abused him has anything comparable to show for the time spent keeping the benches of the house warm. It would be difficult for them to indicate that they have done more than serve as rubber stamps.

The article winds up by saying:

This does not detract from the high character of the speech, a quality members of parliament must have learned to look for when the Toronto-Parkdale member gets on his feet. So they walk out lest they hear it, or heckle him in the hope he may falter. It is about as cheap a display of petty politics as could be found in the worst governed country.

If ever democracy is in danger, it is from attacks by that kind of article, the unfairness of which seeks to undermine and poison the mentality. I have been in this house for several years; I have always greatly enjoyed my associations with all the parliamentarians, and I know that I am voicing the sentiments of every member listening to me when I say that it would not occur to any of them to think a member was not true to his duty because upon some occasion he was not present in the house. A member is often called upon to leave the chamber to do something for his country or his constituency, something strictly pertaining to his own office, to attend to committee and departmental work, and that applies with all the greater force to the Prime Minister and the members of his cabinet.

I took it upon myself, following this report, to find out what had actually occurred, and the Prime Minister will forgive me for mentioning that when he left the chamber he had an interview with the Governor General, Lord Athlone. I can assure the *Globe and Mail* that there was no sinister motive in the actions of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin), a great Canadian and a fine parliamentarian. Hon. gentlemen opposite are frequently telling us to be easy on Toronto. I know a lot of Toronto people, and ninety-nine and one-half per cent of them are fine, but this kind of journalism from Toronto is a shame to that city and to the rest of Canada.

There is another matter I want to mention, but I do not want to trespass on the time of the house.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I hope the Liberals from Alberta will take a lesson from what the hon. member is saying.

Mr. BRADETTE: To sum up my conclusions, Mr. Speaker, this conflict has now been raging for nearly two years and a half. It has developed into the most gigantic war conflagration that the world has ever witnessed, and nearly all the nations are embraced in its deadly grip.

I ask myself if at the present time we are not witnessing in our national and individual lives, some signs of lassitude, jagged nerves and destructive impatience. We must absolutely shake ourselves out of those unhealthy reactions, because a lot of effort and energy wasted on biased and destructive criticism could be much better employed in helping in the accentuation of our war activities and the surmounting of the problems emanating from them.

At a critical time like this no one should question the motives and sincerity of his fellow-Canadians. Let us put, in all our actions, the best that there is in us, so that the things we cherish so much will be safeguarded.

We have differences, we shall likely always have some, and the right to express and discuss them is one of the main pillars of democracy, but surely if we realize the fullness of our duty, we shall never cultivate in our minds the destructive virus of questioning our neighbours' loyalty and profound attachment and love for Canada and the British empire.

To come victorious out of this conflict all the lovers of democracy will be required to unify their forces, and then, when the hour of victory strikes, we shall have a strong and unified nation that will be in a position to face the problems of our country and also of the post-war world.

Mr. D. KING HAZEN (St. John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much interest to the speech which has been made by the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette). He has told us that he favours the plebiscite which his government proposes to take, but he has not told us during the course of his long speech whether or not, if the plebiscite is taken and the government is relieved from the promises or pledges which it formerly made, he is in favour of national selective service. He has not told us whether or not he is in favour of the conscription of our

man-power for service overseas in support of our forces over there. If I were to ask him that question to-night he might find it a little embarrassing. Perhaps he would not care to tell us this evening whether or not he favours national compulsory selective service in this country to-day.

I have observed, Mr. Speaker, since I entered this house that it is the usual custom of members who take part in the debate on the speech from the throne to congratulate first the mover and the seconder of the address upon the excellent speeches they made.

I do not wish to appear unappreciative or impolite, but it is my intention this evening to depart from that practice and in the first place to extend my congratulations and sincere thanks to the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Gray) for the speech he made in this house last Tuesday afternoon.

Not only was that speech well constructed and well delivered, but it exhibited a courage, an intellectual honesty, a freedom from partisanship and a clearness of understanding that have not since I have been a member been equalled by any other speech to which I have listened.

No doubt that speech was not well received in all quarters, but I believe, sir, that it was acclaimed by the country, and if the hon. member for Lambton West received black looks from some he can find consolation if he needs it, although I doubt if he needs it, from part of a speech which was made on the same day in the British House of Commons by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, who said:

> I have frequently voted against governments which I have been elected to support, and looking back on it I sometimes felt very glad I did. Everyone in these rough times must do what he considers his duty.

It requires courage, Mr. Speaker, and visceral valour to place duty ahead of party but the hon. member for Lambton West has shown us that he possesses both these manly qualities.

A gentleman who once occupied a very prominent place in the press gallery of this house, not a very long time ago wrote a book in which he expressed the opinion that Canadian politicians, with few exceptions, put party politics first and other considerations nowhere. The hon. member for Lambton West has proved that he is one of the few exceptions.

I concur in almost everything he said. I wish I could have said it as well.

This plebiscite means delay; it means heartburning; it means bitterness.

It means also unjustifiable expense.

And when it is all over and the government is released from its pledge, the issue, as he says, still must be faced; and the bogy of national unity will again rear its ugly head.

In fact it has already commenced to do so.

I was particularly impressed with that portion of his speech in which he said:

> Much has been and will be said of broken pledges. . . .
>
> Does the hon. member forget that in the mother of all parliaments, Westminster, on April 27, 1939, while the nation was still at peace, and only four weeks after the then Prime Minister, Mr. Chamberlain, had renewed a pledge made by his predecessor, Mr. Baldwin, that compulsory military service would not be adopted, Mr. Chamberlain introduced a motion in these words:
>
> "This house approves the proposal of his majesty's government to introduce as soon as possible a system of compulsory military training as announced on the 26th of April."
>
> In the debate which followed the introduction of that motion, the prevailing opinion was the same as it should be here in Canada: The facts are there and we must face them as they exist to-day. Let me suggest to the Prime Minister that whatever his declaration may have been, as our first minister in this hour of peril he is bound to act in accordance with what he believes is required for the national safety. That is the supreme pledge which he made, though perhaps not in words, when he assumed the high office which he now holds. What of the solemn pledge given by President Roosevelt during his last election campaign, to the effect that the forces of the United States would not be sent overseas? Within one month of the declaration of war we find the president telling congress and the nation:
>
> "We cannot wage this war in a defensive spirit. As our power and our resources are fully mobilized, we shall carry the attack against the enemy. American land, air and sea forces will take stations in the British isles—"
>
> Has there been any outcry in the United States of America against broken pledges?

I might tell the hon. member for Lambton West that I have heard no such outcries, but I have heard in this country a great outcry against the taking of this proposed plebiscite. I have received from my own constituents a number of communications protesting against it. I do not propose to read them into the record to-night, but one of them comes from the surviving members of the 26th battalion, a New Brunswick unit that had a distinguished record in the last war. It expresses strong disapproval of the plan, and states that the expense and time taken are unjustified and the spending of money for this purpose will have a decidedly adverse affect on the forthcoming war loan. With that opinion I am in hearty accord.

When I entered this house, Mr. Speaker, for the first time, a little over two years ago now, I

ventured to express the opinion that it was no occasion for us to indulge either in platitudes or recriminations about past achievements or past failures of the government, nor was it a time for us to play party politics, but it was our duty as Canadians to unite and, in our own interests, to do everything that lay in our power to bring this war, in which we had entered as a free nation, and in which our allies had suffered great reverses, to a victorious conclusion.

As time passed, I found no reason to change that opinion. As time passed I became more firmly convinced that party politics should be set aside if we were to make an effective all-out war effort, and that this war should not be carried on under any form of party government, but that it should be carried on under some form of union government which would have the support of all the parties in this house and would be free from petty partisan criticism, which has an adverse effect on our war effort.

As time passed, Mr. Speaker, the German army overran Denmark, Holland, Belgium and France. The British army, after sustaining heavy casualties, was forced to leave Dunkirk without arms or equipment. Italy declared war. France collapsed. The battle of the Atlantic was joined. Japan became a member of the axis. Italy invaded and Germany conquered heroic Greece. The allies were forced to withdraw from Crete. Germany, Italy and Roumania declared war on Russia.

This is a very brief outline of the cavalcade of events which had presented themselves to members of this house before parliament reassembled in November last. It was not a reassuring picture. The situation that we faced as one of a group of nations fighting for our existence and the freedom of mankind afforded no ground for placid satisfaction. The situation demanded strong and courageous leadership. It demanded united action if an all-out effective effort was to be made.

On Wednesday, the fifth day of November last, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) made a report to this house on the work of his department. He had recently returned from England and had not had time to prepare a written address, but he made an excellent statement, and it was apparent to those who listened to him that he was a serious and determined man—two qualities which a minister of national defence should possess in war time. He told us—and to me this was the most important part of his address—that in the previous four months 37,000 men had been required for our army overseas and only 24,000 had been obtained. This meant that there was a shortage of about thirty-five per cent in the numbers required to support our army overseas, and that at a time when there were no battle casualties.

Since then—if I may divert for a moment—our army has suffered heavy casualties at Hong Kong. But the courageous battle put up there by the Royal Rifles and the Winnipeg Grenadier Guards will rank, I believe, with the heroic defence made by the Rifle Brigade at Calais prior to the evacuation of Dunkirk. It was not a defeat, but it was a contribution to ultimate victory. The government was asked to send that force overseas on the 19th day of September last. It decided to do so ten days later, and I want here to-night to congratulate the Minister of National Defence and the government on the fact that they so promptly sent that force overseas when asked to do so by the army command.

A special committee of this house is to be set up at the request of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) to inquire into the reasons why untrained men were sent with that force, why those battalions lacked universal carriers, why their mechanical equipment, which means so much in this war, did not reach them in time. This should be done without delay, and if the committee find that there was negligence, complacency, military inefficiency, or lack of proper organization, appropriate action should be taken. But, sir, plans seldom work out perfectly in war time, and the work of this committee can in no way detract from the fact that the government sent that force when it was asked to do so; nor can it becloud the glory of these brave men who unflinchingly went forth and courageously did their duty. The people of this country and the members of this parliament must be firmly resolved that the sacrifice which those men made was not made in vain, and that we shall go on at all costs and all sacrifice until the evil thing which they fought against is destroyed. We cannot let our army that is overseas down. We must keep faith with those who die on foreign fields.

But to return to the report made by the Minister of National Defence on November 5 last; it was apparent from his report that the voluntary system of enlistment for overseas had fallen down, that it was not furnishing the men required. It was apparent that the situation should be reviewed and that a new policy should be adopted if we were to play our part as a nation of free men and women, if we were to hold our heads high in the world and meet total war with a total effort.

I realize that a new policy could not be brought about without courageous leadership, for it meant the breaking down of some

political friendships and some old political ties. It meant also that certain old political ideas would have to be abandoned.

While we sat here in November I lived in the hope that something would be done. I hoped that the majority of the members of parliament, irrespective of party and of politics, could get together, forget party prejudices, and solve the problem of man-power for our army overseas.

Whatever hopes I had were dashed to the ground on the afternoon of November 12 when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), late in the afternoon, came into the house—there were not many present at the time—and said that the people had decided against conscription at the last election and that, so far as he was concerned, without any consultation with the people on the subject, he did not intend to take the responsibility of supporting any policy of conscription for service overseas.

That statement put an end to any hopes I had that action would be taken when action was needed.

I felt after that statement that I, as a Canadian, could no longer walk with pride among the nations of the world who were fighting for the freedom of mankind.

On my way home after the house adjourned on November 14, I had two experiences that did not raise my spirits. I met in Montreal an officer from the city in which I live, who was stationed at camp Petawawa. He told me that a short time previously a call had come to that camp for a draft of men for overseas service. The officer commanding the camp had about 600 men paraded. He told them of the order; he explained to them the situation; he asked for volunteers, and just nine men volunteered—nine of those men who were in uniform.

The same day in Montreal I met a young man, a connection of mine by marriage. His father was an Englishman, and his mother an American. When war broke out he was sixteen, living in England, and he came with his mother and sister to New York. When he was eighteen he came to Canada to enlist. He was turned down by the air force, enlisted in the army, was stationed at a camp near Montreal, and he expected to go overseas soon. He told me that soon after he arrived at that camp a draft for overseas had marched off. Eighty men had been called for to compose that draft, but eighty men did not leave that camp. If I remember his figures correctly—I did not write them down, but I think I have them approximately—that draft consisted of two English-speaking Canadians, twenty French-speaking Canadians, and thirty Americans. He told me the hut he was in held sixty-four men, and thirty of them were Americans.

Those Americans had joined the Canadian army when their own country was not at war, with the intention of going overseas to take part in the battle of freedom.

What could they have thought of those Canadians in uniform who held back after Canada had declared war and was fighting for her very existence?

And what would they have thought of those Canadian students in Montreal, who the other night, at Premier Godbout's meeting, opposed compulsory selective service, and kept crying, "Canada, Canada only"?

There has been something very wrong in this country in the last twenty or twenty-five years. There has been lack of leadership of the right kind. There has been lack of clear thinking. There has been too much appeasement. There has been too much of the north American complex in some quarters.

But this is no time to rehash these matters. As I have said, I do not think we should indulge in recriminations about the past. I will put on the record no quotations from public men which are better left unsaid at the present time. This is a time when it is our duty to get on with the war and make an all-out war effort.

We adjourned here, as I said, on November 14 last. We reassembled on January 21, not very long ago. But modern war moves fast, and during that period while we were at home Japan treacherously attacked the United States and seriously damaged its navy; Germany and Italy declared war on the United States. Japan invaded Malay, attacked the Philippines, sank two of our capital ships, invaded Borneo, captured Penang, Wake island, Hong Kong, the Celebes, Tarakan, invaded Burma, the Bismarck archipelago and other islands and threatened Australia. The war in the east was going badly, and it is still going badly.

When we came back here we were told in the speech from the throne that this was the time of greatest crisis in the world's history. We were told also that unless the enemy were defeated, the free people of the world, one after the other, would be reduced to a state of bondage.

I find no fault with those statements; I agree with them.

But what did the government propose doing in view of the situation?

It proposed to take a plebiscite! It proposed to ask the people of this country, after a certain amount of time has passed, a question to this effect:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

Does the Prime Minister of this country take that course because of a pledge he has given? Does he take it because he has to be scrupulously consistent in all things? It has been pointed out during this debate that English and American statesmen did not let consistency stop them from taking immediate action when the safety of the state was in danger. I would suggest to the Prime Minister that he ponder the words of one of America's greatest teachers and writers; it was Ralph Waldo Emerson who said that a foolish consistency was the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen, philosophers and divines. And I might say that I once read somewhere that the only completely consistent people are the dead.

The Prime Minister in the statement he made on November 12 last said:

I do not intend to take the responsibility—

There have been other occasions in the past in which he got out of taking responsibility by referring his difficulties to a royal commission or a judicial tribunal. He cannot do that on this occasion, so he proposes to take a plebiscite. I protest against it. I consider it unwise; I consider it dangerous.

I appeal to hon. members, irrespective of party, and particularly to those who served in the last war, and who are willing to serve again, to the members who are in uniform, to the men who have sons overseas and relatives overseas; to the men who want to make an all-out war effort. I appeal to them and ask them if there is no way that we can go to the Prime Minister and ask him to abandon this plebiscite that he proposes taking.

There are a number of reasons why this idea of a plebiscite should be abandoned. The most important one I think is that if it proceeds we run a very grave danger. That danger is this, that it is quite possible it will seriously injure the object that all of us, or almost all of us, have in mind and want to achieve; that is to have Canada make an all-out effective war effort, and support our army overseas. That danger should be avoided. The government should take a firm grip of the situation, tell the people what they have to do and then see that they do it. All that loyal Canadians are asking for in this crisis is leadership.

[Mr. Hazen.]

Mr. L. A. MUTCH (Winnipeg South): As a member from the city of Winnipeg I think it both natural and appropriate that my first words in this chamber during this session should be a tribute to those fellow townsmen of mine who fought the Canadian fight in the city of Hong Kong. I wish publicly to pay my respects to them and to offer my sympathy to those who wait with anxious hearts to know the fate of those whom we sent there.

I should like to say to the Associate Minister of National Defence (Mr. Power) that I believe anybody in Canada faced with the decision that he had to make would have agreed to send two battalions to Hong Kong and I am quite sure that that decision was a matter of complete agreement on the part of the government and would have been completely agreed to by any hon. member.

While I am on the subject of those men in Hong Kong, I should like to say further that I think it is contemptible that the agony of heart and mind which the loved ones of those men who went to Hong Kong are suffering should have been aggravated to help in a by-election, by what I consider unwarranted assumptions about the inefficiency of at least one of those battalions. However, the matter is being investigated, or will be, and I hope that when the investigation comes, it will not be trial by newspaper as has been the situation in some instances in Canadian political history. I hope that if anyone was culpable in the preparation for sending those men to that far-off battle field, the culpability will be made apparent and suitable punishment meted out, not in a spirit of revenge, but in order that that type of thing, if it happened, shall not happen again to the thousands who will follow them to the battlefields of this war.

I wanted to begin that way rather than in the conventional way of addressing congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, because naturally that expedition and the fate of those men are uppermost in my mind. But I should like to say to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply that I have at least paid them the, for me, unusual compliment of having read their speeches, as I was not in the chamber to hear them.

It is, however, not of the glory of the dead, or of the accomplishments of the living that I wish to speak for a few minutes to-night, but rather of the Canadian soldiers, and not so much of what we can rightly expect from them, but of what they in my opinion have a right to expect from us. I have a special contempt for the cheap, shoddy device of the demagogue, the type of parish-pump politics

by means of which any man in parliament, or in a newspaper, or anywhere else attempts to further his own ambitions or those of his party, or to give expression to his own malice, in the name of service men.

I have some recollections of the last war. As a youngster of nineteen or twenty I remember those all too infrequent occasions when we got hold of newspapers from Canada and read some of the profound remarks of the barber-shop strategists; I remember something of what we thought and felt. I am sorry to say that not only in some newspapers, but also in places where they should know better, we still encounter some of that same kind of platitudinous tripe. I think I speak for all the nearly a quarter of a million, perhaps more—we do not give figures—of Canadian-born soldiers who are on active service in this war when I say they share the feeling of distaste which I experience when I consider the antics of certain people in Canada who I think are best described as "Little Canadians." I refer to those belittlers of Canada and Canada's contribution to the war effort. People of this kind thrived and multiplied during the dirt and despair of the depression; and with the outbreak of war they multiplied again. They see only the efforts of someone far away and turn a jaundiced eye, if they look at all, toward the miracles of accomplishment that have taken place in their own country.

I am not one of those who think we need fear to boast a little about what we as Canadians have accomplished. If I have any fear at all, it is only that some of us, looking at those accomplishments, may fall into the equally dangerous and perhaps more natural folly of being too easily satisfied. Neither am I one of those who think the government did it all, even though I would include in that the whole House of Commons. I realize, as I think it is realized by every thinking person in Canada and everyone outside Canada who knows of our effort, that what has been done could not have been accomplished without a high degree of cooperation between the ordinary man and woman on the street and the government. It would have been simply impossible; and when we brag a little, as I think we might, we should remember that. It is the work of all Canadians. And if, instead of making a cult of criticism, we would look about us once in a while and see how we can help our general effort, then magnificent as it has been, that effort might be made much greater yet.

If I might make a personal reference, Mr. Speaker, I have worn his majesty's uniform for nearly five years. I do not profess to be a soldier. I do not know that my personal loyalty has been attacked, nor would I stoop to defend it if it were. What I have to say is of my own determination, the result of my own experience and thought. I begin by saying that in my considered opinion most of the organized—and I ask the house to note that word "organized"—effort for the adoption of the slogan "selective service" is pure humbug. I do not question the sincerity of thousands of persons who have been caught by the unanswerable reasonableness of that slogan. To them it has become a sort of magic formula, and many of them have the thought that without that formula being brought into operation, Canada cannot measure up to that other slogan. "an all-out effort."

I do not pay very much attention to the clamour of some public men, or to the propaganda of a subsidized press. I am of opinion that much of the effort behind this slogan of selective service is either an insincere political effort or a sort of half-hearted sabotage, not of Canada's war effort but of those who are attempting to administer that war effort in these trying times. The promoters of the current political ramp—because we are all well aware that this is just what is in the process of organization to-day—are all much too well informed to believe that this catch-phrase can accomplish those things which are promised for it. They know as well as any member of this house knows, and better than most, that a big army policy for Canada, for instance, is pure lunacy; but they make an emotional appeal in order to cloak their real motive, which is to tear down a government which believes, and practises the belief, that a generation which makes war should pay for it.

There are thousands of men in this country who fought during some part of the last war and who came home to help pay for it. They have made a magnificent contribution in helping pay for it. Perhaps at times they have been a bit cynical about it, but during troublesome times in every part of the country they have been a sort of safe and sane centre, a hard core of realism and reality. They have paid generously and generally willingly, but many of them have also determined that as far as is humanly possible they will go along with the policies of the present administration to the end that the legacy of debt and depression may be at least less than it was after the last war.

Then in times like these we hear a great deal about equality of sacrifice. I do not propose to say a great deal about that, but once or twice before in this house I have made the remark that the expression has no reality.

War is not cricket or baseball; it is not a sporting event, or anything of that kind. War is the brutal business of destruction on the one hand and self-preservation on the other. The only possible sort of equality of sacrifice in a situation like this is when every man and woman in the country is voluntarily giving everything he or she has to give. And because that definition does not admit of realization is no reason why we as Canadians should not strive toward that goal. There is no reason why in our individual and governmental enterprise we should not do what we can to level the burden. War is not a question of taking what one can get with the least possible sacrifice. It is a question of taking what one needs wherever he can get it, and not paying for it unless he has to. That is the spirit of it; that is the ruthless basis of war. It is extermination or survival; and if that was perhaps only figuratively true in other wars, most of us should be convinced by now that it is literally true in this one.

I said that this ideal was perhaps not capable of realization, because the rich young man of biblical times who turned sadly away, has too many descendants in this modern, imperfect world. The poorest and most unhappy of his descendants are not blessed with worldly goods, as he was, but are poor. But, though poor in worldly goods, unfortunately their greatest poverty is of the spirit; and any conception of an all-out sacrifice, about which we talk so glibly and of which the editorial writers and even some of our newsmen speak with such facility, is simply meaningless, because we have not reached the point where mankind is equal to it. If we are realists, selective service boils down to conscription for overseas service. I know that many earnest, well-meaning people will disagree with that statement. They will argue that selective service means taking the right man and putting him in the right place, eliminating all square pegs in round holes. We may not have another five or seven years of war to accomplish that, and in the meantime the war is catching up with us.

I should like to make one or two personal statements with respect to the policies enunciated in the speech from the throne and the methods undertaken by the government to carry them out. First I want to say that as a member of this house, as a soldier with some experience in the last war, as one who was born in this country of purely British descent, I am perhaps one of the most reluctant conscriptionists. Further, should I be convinced, or when I am convinced—I admit freely that I foresee the probability, or at least the possibility of that time coming—I would take the last son from the last widow in Canada and send him away if I were convinced that, by doing that, Canada would be making her greatest contribution to the winning of this war.

I do not believe that there are many people in this country who disagree with what I have just announced should be done in that circumstance. There is an honest difference of opinion as to the desirability of conscription now. I am prepared to give to those who believe that there is an all-out urgency for conscription for overseas service now—that is what I am talking about—the right to their opinion, but at the moment I stand unconvinced. If we were all agreed that we did not need conscription now, it might happen that within forty-eight hours we would be shown that we were wrong. If we have learned nothing else as a result of the progress of this war, we should have learned that there is no finality of decision with respect to how we should proceed. Only amateur historians or those who have been called barber shop tacticians have the effrontery to assume any finality for their plans in a conflict which is world-wide and ever shifting.

I should like to say to the members of the cabinet here to-night that the government should give us an inventory and a plan of our man-power, and it should be given to us now. It must be elastic, but it could be given within reasonable limits. They must know our resources, and it is only when we know what our potential objectives are with respect to production, that we can measure the success or the failure of the methods which we are presently employing. As far as I am concerned, my only assets are a good name and the respect of my fellow men. In my election of 1940, either through what I said myself or what was said on my behalf, I believe that conscription was not a factor.

If I agreed, which I do not, that to-morrow, or within a matter of days or hours or short weeks, conscription was essential and that had been the decision of the government, speaking for myself my conscience would be perfectly clear in supporting the government in that decision. But, because my leader elects to trust those who have trusted him so often, I shall not help to throw him to the political jackals, if you like, who thirst for his political blood. I think I speak fairly when I say that my constituents would favour conscription to win the war, and I believe I am correct when I say that many of them favour it now.

Speaking in this place to which they have sent me, I have this to say to them: Make

your support of the plebiscite overwhelming. In the hour when my judgment and conscience says that we must change any policy so far as I am concerned no sense of loyalty to person or party will deter me from what I conceive to be my duty. I say to them that such a majority as I have requested from them, and from all Canadians, will clear the way for any eventuality.

Because war is a function of government it does not necessarily follow that members of parliament are military strategists. One of the first and most important things which we who attempt to give some guidance to the new recruit coming into our army have to do is to teach him to think as a soldier. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the difference in thinking between the man who is a good citizen as a civilian and the man who is a good soldier is as wide as the poles. The measure of our success and of the usefulness of the recruit who comes into the service is very often the measure of the degree to which we succeed in teaching him to think as a soldier. I think some of us have forgotten that there is a difference between the thinking which goes with military effectiveness, with campaign effectiveness and that which goes with civilian effectiveness.

Some of these military strategists have spoken to us of sending a division to Australia. I should like to address a few questions to those who hold that view. Have they ever determined how many ships it would take to transport one division of men and their equipment, to say nothing of how long that tonnage would be tied up in transit? I should like to ask them, where are the ships to take them, and where are the ships to convoy them? Then I would ask them: Have you discovered for yourselves where the equipment is? Then I think we might add one more question: Who has asked for the men?

Remember France, Greece, Crete, Libya, Hong Kong and now Singapore. I think in each and every case the reverses which our forces have suffered have been due not so much to lack of man-power as to lack of an aeroplane roof over their heads and lack of communications. I wonder how long Australia would be worried about a Japanese invasion by sea if she had at her disposal a really adequate air force. I wonder how many strait of Macassar battles the Japanese invading forces could stand up to if that was their daily dish. I wonder what Australian cities would be bombed, even from aircraft carriers of the Japanese fleet, if Australia had the formidable air support which she will need, and which, please God, she will have before this battle is over. I wonder when people with the best intentions in the world will stop expecting the miracle of David and Goliath to be reenacted on every fresh front. I wonder when we are going to stop asking our brave and courageous soldiers to step into the breach with only their courage and rifles and small automatic arms and stem the mechanized might of our enemies who have a preponderance of attacking air force.

I doubt the wisdom of any considerable expansion in the Canadian overseas army. In this war of wide sweeps and deep objectives, with failures of communication and mechanical failures and casualties, such as we have seen in Hong Kong, one hundred per cent losses are not an impossibility. I wish I could think that they are not even a probability.

I urge that the government decide now whether our young men between the ages of nineteen and twenty-nine, which is the age when they are most valuable, shall serve Canada in the armed forces of Canada or whether they can make a greater contribution to the war effort of our allies and ourselves in the air. I do not know the answer, but if the government has not determined it, I do urge that they determine it and then let us know what their policies are. Having decided in which branch our young men shall serve, we should then determine what strength of forces we can raise and equip; and having determined that, I would expend every ounce of Canadian energy to see that those men were given the chance that brave men deserve in the way of providing them with proper equipment and adequate reinforcements so that they can meet on equal terms men, no matter whether they be lesser men than we are, who, if they are better equipped than our forces, will present difficulties which will make our losses out of all proportion to what they should be. Some day somebody in this country will have to do a little simple arithmetic. Why not now? Let us know the objective with respect to our military development and what our maximum effort can be. That can easily be determined if one takes out of this question all the sentiment and emotional drivel with which it is wrapped up, and look instead at the vital statistics. Then tell us what the answer is in terms of war effort with respect to our army, air force, and navy, and with respect to our industrial effort and the production of food. These facts are not unobtainable. Just a little simple arithmetic would give us all a better idea of where we are going than we have now. When this is determined I am prepared to support a policy which will stop at nothing to see that these men have everything that is necessary to achieve our share of victory with

honour. But I want to know where I am going. I am not willing to trust people who have no authority for their super-patriotism and super-efficiency as statisticians but their own testimony. I repeat again, we should take stock of our man-power and make that inventory public.

I should like to amplify a remark I made when interrupting the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth) the other day. I do not conceive it to lie in the mouth of any hon. member to describe as a failure a system which has already sent twice as many Canadian-born men into active service in this war, in the army, navy and air force, as we sent into the last war. I realize the difficulties in dealing with figures. I was a member of the first Canadian corps, and I will be the last one to detract one jot or tittle from its record or glory or reputation. But when I hear people comparing unfavourably Canada's contribution in this war with its contribution in the last war, I am reminded of figures which we sometimes forget, that of all those gallant gentlemen who went in the name of Canada in the last war, I believe only about 125,000 were Canadian-born. I remember my associations with the men of Scotland, England, Ireland and Wales who had come to Canada and claimed it as their home, and who made their contribution in the last war in the name of Canada, but who would have made their contribution nevertheless if Canada had inconceivably stayed out of that war. Consequently, when I realize that, and remember that the age of the Royal Canadian Air Force to-day is between nineteen and thirty-one, and the same for our reinforcements which go to the Royal Air Force, and remember, too, that during the years of their lifetime practically no immigrants have come into Canada, I realize, as the minister told us last October and November, that these men are in a peculiar sense a strictly Canadian body. When I remember the age limits in the Canadian navy, I realize that there we have a parallel situation and the same thing obtains, and in almost the same degree in the Canadian army. I have not much sympathy with those belittlers of Canada and Canada's sons who forget that in this war already we have half a million men working in war industries who were not working before, and in spite of that we have twice as many Canadian-born sons in our active service forces—and we are just getting started.

But let no one urge for any reason whatsoever, because we can take pride in what Canada has done already, that therefore we have done enough. Let no one think that any voice raised in this house would urge on the people of Canada, for the world to hear, that we have done enough. Let no one say unjustly and unfairly and in dishonour to these men who have volunteered that up to this point we have failed, because to do so would be a shameful calumny of the volunteers who have gone so gladly from this country.

Having said that, I am happy to join with the hon. member for Waterloo South in something he said in his speech the other day, and that was, if I understood him correctly, that we did not use in Canada's war effort, to anything like the full extent possible, the man-power in this country between the ages of fifty and sixty-five. We are training young men in Canada to do essential war tasks, but we have also at our disposal many men in the older age brackets with trained hands and experienced heads who are willing and anxious to serve and are only awaiting the opportunity to make a contribution to our war effort. We have sold ourselves that slogan, an unfortunate one, I think, that we are all in the front line, and the result is that we have earnest people who are carrying out their regular duties in the economic and social set-up of Canada who feel that, in so doing, they are not making any real contribution to the war effort. I think no one of us has done enough in the way of telling these people that just by carrying on their ordinary tasks they are pulling their weight and making their contribution to our war effort.

Having said that, I come to this other factor. It is my considered opinion that there is a reservoir of man-power available in this country for the replacement of people who are engaged in other occupations, a reservoir which could be made use of. I realize that those who differ with me as to the urgency of the hour will tell me that under their scheme of selective service all these things will be taken care of, but I am a little sceptical, Mr. Speaker, whether that will work as fast as they think it will or whether it will work at all, because we are not living in a country where everybody is within a few hours' train ride of every other place. We have a territory which extends for three thousand miles, and we have a diversity of occupations. Perhaps it would never be possible to make a shift in population to reach that idealistic one hundred per cent, but certainly in almost every hamlet and town, and certainly in every city, I am sure that there is a residue of unused labour which I urge the government to take into consideration if and when—and I hope it may be soon—they let us know their considered and deliberate policy of man-power for carrying on this war.

Mr. LIONEL BERTRAND (Terrebonne) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, in March, 1940, six months after the declaration of war, the Canadian nation gave the Liberal party a majority unprecedented in our political history. On that occasion the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was elected on a platform whereby Canada, engaged of its own free will in war at the side of Great Britain, was to provide a voluntary and moderate co-operation commensurate with its resources and financial capacity. This platform also contained a pledge that no union government would ever be sought by a Liberal administration and that compulsory military service would never be enacted for overseas. This programme obtained the overwhelming support of the Canadian people.

For the past two years the Prime Minister has conducted the ship of state with a mastery which does honour to his great qualities as a parliamentarian and to the confidence placed in him. Together with the late Right Hon. Mr. Lapointe, whose passing is still deeply regretted, he has worked to keep the country united and to guard against the errors and abuses of the last war. Never has the Canadian nation been more united than during the past two years. Never has there been enacted legislation better fitted to paralyze the appetites of war profiteers and to protect the lower classes of society. The system of voluntary enlistment, endorsed by the electors, has given excellent results, since 400,000 Canadians are at present ready to serve voluntarily in any theatre of war anywhere in the world. In the face of the Hitler menace which was spreading even to the new world, the Prime Minister proposed in 1940 his National Resources Mobilization Act for the defence of Canada which was accepted if not with alacrity, at least with the patriotism which every citizen owes to his country in time of peril. When this act was brought down it produced certain reactions. But the Prime Minister is able to say now with pride that he gauged the situation correctly. If this act had not been passed at that time and if measures for the defence of the country had to be placed in hand now, what a problem would we not face to-day?

The Prime Minister asked of the people of Canada for sacrifices of all kinds in contributions and in taxation; the Canadian people accepted these sacrifices with pride and patriotism. Millions of dollars have been spent in direct aid to the allies. Canada has generously exceeded the collaboration she promised. Millions of dollars have been expended to levy and equip troops for service overseas. I greatly admire those volunteers who are serving abroad and I salute those who have died, less for their own country than for the great cause of world freedom. Millions of dollars have been spent for the construction of immense munitions plants and for the organization of our own defence in every domain. The free, voluntary and moderate effort promised in 1940 has certainly broadened out, but can the government be blamed for that? I voted as a free and honest man in favour of the mobilization for the defence of my country.

In refusing to form a union cabinet, the government respected a solemn promise. It would have been a sacrilege to allow the politicians of the last war, on whose policies the people have already passed judgment, to share in the administration of the country without having received a mandate therefor. I consider that the government have accomplished a great task for the allies, a task so great that I sometimes wonder if it has not jeopardized our national defence. However, we must to-day face the fact that we shall have, from now on, to look more carefully after our own defence. Canada has a vast area to defend and has by no means a large population to do it. We shall soon enter the fourth year of war, with the spectacle of a convulsed world. Whither are we going? No one can tell. We are told in the speech from the throne that this is a time of gravest crisis. I believe that. I also believe that Canada is threatened. It is possible and even probable that our country may soon feel the horrors of war. More than ever Canada must think of the defence of her own territory, and proceed at full speed with the work in hand. I for one am not prepared to support any measure or legislation which would not have that primary object in view.

Can I, then, accept the idea of a plebiscite, as expressed in the speech from the throne, and especially the question which is to be put before the electors? In all frankness I say no. Is the question as asked a clever move on the part of the government to dodge the attacks of persistent enemies and perhaps also to silence those who, even in the government itself, oppose the 1940 programme? The question looks so much like camouflage that, in spite of the deep respect I have for my party, I cannot accept it. There is perhaps no member of this house—I do not say it boastfully—who, during the last two years, has contributed more than I to the war effort of this country. I have given my active and unqualified support to all war organizations: loans, war savings certificates, Red Cross, Canadian war services fund, salvage campaign, and so forth. I have given my full moral support to the soldiers who have been trained in my constituency, and I have frequently visited

and encouraged them. During the last year, I have given all my attention to the creation and organization of extensive shops at Sainte-Thérèse. The Allied War Supplies Corporation and Defence Industries Ltd. can vouch for the unselfish cooperation I have given them. My paper has been used in the furtherance of the common cause, and everywhere in my constituency I have never ceased to advocate cooperation with the allies and the defence of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am neither a nationalist nor a separatist. I love my province, and I am proud of it, but I consider myself above all a Canadian. I hate racial strife and prejudice, which in the past have only served to destroy the harmony necessary to the national development. That is why any movement based upon a narrow nationalism is contrary to my conception of true patriotism.

I admire Great Britain, which for the last two years has given the world a wonderful lesson of courage, steadfastness and patriotism. In her misfortune I sympathize with France, and I still admire her. I believe in her resurrection, because France, like England, can not die. That resurrection will come through the united effort of all the democracies. I do not begrudge the old world the ammunitions, the food, and the volunteers we have given it during the last two years; we have done all that because we wished to see democracy survive as the leading force in the world.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, 400,000 of our men may, through the terms of their enlistment, serve anywhere in the world. In two years only, we have spent many billions of dollars for war and our national debt is increasing at such a rate that we shall perhaps never be able to straighten it out again. What of it? I would rather see my country come out of this war impoverished but proud and free. That conscription in Canada for overseas service will change the world situation is something I do not believe. That conscription for overseas, at this critical stage of our history, can prove advantageous, I believe still less. To impose it would be a crime. The defence of the country calls for our undivided attention. Being vulnerable on every side, has not the country first claim to our solicitude? Our country needs all its man-power for national defence, at home, on the farm and in the factories. Must we have to face invasion without sufficient military strength to defend our shores and our land? What has Australia done? The world over, to every battle front, for two years now, she has sent her best soldiers; to-day, lacking sufficient man-power to meet impending danger, a stern reality to-morrow, she calls out for help. What a mistake!

Conscriptionist Conservatives, indeed, have not departed from their wonted doctrine. The members of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation are almost fully in accord with them. They will not get my vote. Nor will the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson). For this is 1917 all over again. For with these Conservatives, ten times more conservative than the ordinary Conservative, we find ourselves, just like in 1917, before the same setting, the same programme, the same zeal, the same enthusiasm. They hold the same prejudices and the same fanaticism. Indeed, we find the same faces and the same interests. Had this party been in power, conscription for overseas service would have been on the statute books long since. What is unity to them? Why should they not approve voluntary service? Were it a good thing, still would they turn away from it and endeavour to prevent it. Nevertheless, they are aware of the opposition existing against conscription for overseas service in every section of the country.

The only objective of their whirlwind campaign is conscription and power with a return of the shameless patronage of 1917. Instead of propaganda for overseas service, instead of millions to win over public opinion, why should not Mr. Meighen, Mr. Hanson and their friends devote the same zeal, the same enthusiasm, the thousands of dollars in publicity for voluntary service, to promote it and improve its results? Their bad faith stands out too clearly to require that it should be unmasked now. Conscription? Why, it would set Canadian against Canadian in every province of this Dominion; it would at one fell blow destroy national unity forged through years of concession, effort and mutual understanding; it does not add anything to the valour of our troops, for experience teaches that ten conscripted men are not worth one voluntary soldier. I intend voting, therefore, against the sub-amendment proposed by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) and against the amendment presented by the hon. leader of the opposition, because conscription for overseas is a measure both unpatriotic and contrary in every way to Canadian security.

Nor am I in favour of the question proposed for the plebiscite. A plebiscite is indeed a democratic form of consultation and the government shows, in taking such a course, a desire to know public opinion in the land. We are invited, however, to release the government of its commitments. This I cannot do, because I am satisfied with them. I am

requested to obtain release from my own commitments; my constituents, whom I know well, are opposing this already. The government wishes to be released from its obligations. Why? Does not its term of office extend to three more years? Or should it abdicate to please certain dissident Liberals? Has it weakened under pressure from the imperialistic group from Toronto who, without mandate, wish to govern the nation? Do they wish to gain time? The government states they desire release from previous commitments in order to be free to adopt all necessary measures dictated by circumstances. I understand that it is not implied that the present administration will necessarily enact conscription if released from its commitments; however, there is always the danger and the possibility that it will be enacted.

What will be the result of the plebiscite? If the Canadian people answer "No", so much the better. If the answer should be "Yes", the imperialistic press campaign, imbued with prejudice, armed with threats and invectives, will be revived, stronger, more irreverent, more audacious than before. What then? The government, released from past commitments, may have to yield to renewed pressure both from within and without. This is giving the government a blank cheque together with the power of filling it at discretion. If this cheque were handed personally to the Prime Minister or the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin) or some other minister, I state, for the benefit of my constituents, that I would be willing to take the chance. But, who could be sure that the war will be over in two or three years? Who will promise that Mr. King will still be with us in six months? Who will give assurance that Mr. Cardin will be there? Men may disappear suddenly and this truth has been brought home to us only recently. Those men gone, could I be positive that the new incumbent, armed with the blank cheque, would not be too willing, with the consent of a parliament become amenable, or a parliament transformed and favourable to him, to use it at will? I cannot risk such a contingency. I will possibly be accused of forsaking my party. Still I should have the satisfaction, which neither fame nor honours may replace, of having been faithful to my mandate and my conscience. I am a Liberal and a Liberal I shall remain, for, in my opinion, this party stands for freedom of speech. Moreover, I am convinced that my frankness will be useful to my party. I was elected in 1940, because I was supporting a certain political platform; the sincerity of those who elected me left no room for doubt. I am not going to organize a new party, nor to join any new group whether under the name of "Canadian" or "National" party. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to support sub-amendments which, after all, would have the same effect as the main motion and are consequently useless—and above all, when they are moved by hon. members sitting on the other side of the house.

Mr. Speaker, I shall return to my constituency, but I am too well acquainted with the opinions of the voters there to ask them to release the government from its past commitments. I am already too positive that they have enough faith in Mr. King to answer the plebiscite in the affirmative and that he is the man whom they wish to see in power. However, I shall say to my constituents: "consider first your country which you are bound to defend. Remember Australia. Do not repeat the same mistake. What you must defend is your homes and your rights, every inch of Canadian soil, from Vancouver to Halifax," and they will not fail to understand. I shall say to them: while some of our sons stand guard over our country, ready to make the supreme sacrifice, our soil must produce food for our armies and those of our allies; I shall say to them that farmers and their sons must stick to their ploughs and furrows and they will understand. I shall also tell them that our factories must have men to produce the tools of victory, and everyone, man, woman, girl and boy will understand. I shall instruct the young men to rally to the defence of their country, worthy of the best we have to offer, even life itself. If you wish to try your luck, if you think that it is your duty to go over there, overseas, if you want to go into action, do not hesitate, enlist voluntarily, and they will understand. All my people of the "highlands" whose courage has been sung by Valdombre know that the defence of one's country is a sacred obligation. They will not say that their country ends with the confines of the province of Quebec, but that along with their own province they hold dear all of their country from the granite boulders of the Rocky mountains to the sod of the plains of Nova Scotia.

I shall therefore vote against the address in reply to the speech from the throne and express the wish that the country's answer to the plebiscite be "No." I hope that from this negative answer will be born the sincere desire to serve our country better. I hope that the Prime Minister will continue to stand by the platform of 1940 which, to my mind, expressed the true aspirations of the Canadian nation. Let us collaborate with the allies but with all our will keep our man-power for the noble task of defending Canada first.

On motion of Mr. Turgeon the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at 10.53 p.m.

Tuesday, February 3, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

CITY OF OTTAWA AGREEMENT

AUTHORIZATION OF PAYMENT OF $100,000 FOR THE YEAR ENDING JULY 1, 1942

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (for the Minister of Public Works) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to authorize the Minister of Public Works on behalf of His Majesty to enter into an agreement to pay to the corporation of the city of Ottawa the sum of $100,000 for the year ending July 1, 1942.

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.

Motion agreed to.

"COMMITTEE FOR TOTAL WAR"

PRESS ADVERTISEMENT—BY-ELECTION IN SOUTH YORK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, at page 211 of *Hansard*, I asked a question which was perhaps not clear enough or was not well enough understood. It was about the "Committee For Total War." My question was: Is it possible to ascertain how many of the two hundred "Tailors of Tooley Street," Toronto, who signed that proclamation are qualified voters in South York? What I should like to know from the government is how many of these peacocks have a right to vote in South York. I think it is possible to know that.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): May I say to my hon. friend that I am afraid he will have to frame his question in different words if he wishes to have an answer, but I imagine, no matter in what words his question were expressed, that it would not be possible to secure the information.

[Mr. Lionel Bertrand.]

INCOME TAX

INQUIRY AS TO WHEN 1941 FORMS WILL BE READY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Finance when the income tax forms for 1941 will be ready? Will they have to wait until the tax agreements with the provinces are signed?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): All I can do is to bring the question to the attention of my colleague the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Gibson). The matter is in his department, not in the finance department.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

INQUIRY AS TO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMME FOR THE SESSION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Prime Minister when we may expect a statement of government legislation for the session, inasmuch as there is no indication in the speech from the throne that any legislation will be brought down. I think he should tell the house as soon as possible what the legislative programme of the government is and, generally speaking, its nature and extent. I assume, of course, that there will be an appropriation bill, but what else will there be?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I shall endeavour to give my hon. friend a reply in due course.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Monday, February 2, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. J. G. TURGEON (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker, will you permit me first of all, on rising to take part in this debate, to tell you that I am particularly nervous, not only because of the strain which naturally comes from the necessity or thought of making a speech, but also because of the stress which surrounds everyone who takes part in this debate owing to the bitterness which has

been aroused, not so much in this house but in the country at large, in connection with the subject matter of any speech made to-day by an hon. member on the motion to present an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to the speech from the throne.

It is my intention to deal frankly and bluntly with some of the questions at issue and with some of the agitation which is being aroused outside of this house.

First of all, however, may I deal with a more pleasing thing. May I join with other members who have spoken by paying a tribute to the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) for the excellent addresses with which they opened this debate. I feel that they did better because of the experiences they had among the people of the British isles. It is too bad that it is not possible for every hon. member to do what these hon. members were able to do—visit Great Britain during this time of stress. I did not have the honour of hearing the mover and the seconder, but I read their speeches, and one who heard them or one who read them can tell that both hon. members spoke not only from their own points of view but also from that emotion which was aroused in them because of what they saw among the people of Great Britain. They found men and women like ourselves protecting their lives and their homes, and looking after their children—who after all are like our own children. May I leave this thought with the house and with certain sections of the people of Canada, that these hon. members found in the British isles a people who were not fighting for the spreading or for the maintenance and perpetuation of imperialism, but against the most ruthless expansion of imperialism that the world has ever seen. Neither we nor the people of the British isles are fighting for imperialism. We are defending ourselves against it. And the courage which has been shown by the people of Great Britain is precisely that quality which Doctor Johnson said was the first condition of virtue, because without it there can be no virtue. They were fighting, as some day we may have to fight, for home, for fireside, and for children.

To turn now to another matter, I have noticed lately, in spite of this demand for conscription, of which I shall speak later, that county councils and other organizations are demanding of this government that it stop taking men from agricultural communities into the armed forces of Canada. That demand has been made not only in the province of Quebec—which I mention because it is on the lips of nearly everyone outside this chamber who has taken part in the discussion of this question—but also in Ontario and other parts of English-speaking Canada. In my own riding of Cariboo there is a shortage of farm labour. Our cattle men do not know how they will make their hay next fall. Our grain growers and our farmers who are dealing with ordinary agriculture are in exactly the same position. I do not want anyone to misunderstand me. I feel that at a time such as we are now entering it is the duty of every member of parliament, not only to argue this matter and try to create public opinion, although that is a supreme task, but also to make his position clear so that the people whom we directly represent, and the people of all Canada whom also each one of us represents, shall have no doubt as to where we stand.

It is therefore my intention to state clearly at the outset, though probably I shall return to it later, that I have every intention of supporting the plebiscite proposed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). I voted, when in uniform overseas, against conscription in 1917. I had not the faintest hesitation in voting against it, not because of conscription in itself, but because of the dastardly associations which surrounded it at that time. To-day I am not unmindful of the same associations that some people are trying to weave about it, but I am quite ready to trust this government, and, naturally, particularly the Prime Minister, in dealing with the various situations as they may arise. Again without hesitation, so that everybody will know where I stand, I say it is my intention, after this plebiscite is taken and the people vote favourably upon it, as I sincerely hope they will in every province of Canada, to support every measure of compulsory service—I am not afraid of the word "conscription"—that the Prime Minister and those who are surrounding him in government may think it necessary to bring to the people of Canada.

Wendell Willkie, speaking some time ago, said that democracy rises to its greatest heights at its worst moments. I am afraid that to-day we in Canada are entering upon one of the evil moments, if not the worst moment, of democracy. We talk of leadership. I wonder if hon. members who speak of leadership every time they make a recommendation which is not accepted, realize that we are so formed that sometimes we recognize leadership only when leadership agrees with our own opinions, and that we are inclined to say there is lack of leadership when a leader goes in a direction contrary to that in which we want him to go.

I intend to say something to-day about leadership, with particular reference to leadership at the present moment, having in mind among other things, naturally, this plebiscite and the leadership that is being given us so that from time to time we may be able to continue the total war effort which we have been making without arousing too many of those basic prejudices which of themselves, when brought to the surface, interfere with our full effort—leadership at the present moment, which after all merges so fast into the future. In speaking thus, one must not forget the immediate past, in spite of the fact that it has been streaming so swiftly by us that all of it to-day is obscured and most of it forgotten.

I remember something of the fateful session of September, 1939, which authorized this government to declare war on behalf of Canada against Germany. As I remember, we met on Thursday; we started the address on Friday, and we closed the house on Saturday by adopting the address, which gave authority to the Prime Minister to advise the crown to declare war on our behalf. I ask any member of this house to-day, who was in parliament then, if he will rise in his seat now and say that if the Prime Minister had suggested conscription at that time we could have finished that debate in time for the declaration of war by Canada on Sunday. There is not a member of this house who does not know that, if we had talked of conscription then, that debate would have gone on interminably.

Speaking of leadership, I want to ask hon. members what would have been the position of Canada in the eyes of the world, if through lack of leadership the Prime Minister had permitted this country to pass that fateful week-end without the declaration of war. Talk about what is being said to-day! He would have been eternally damned, and he would have deserved it if he had allowed that to happen.

Continuing then with the question of leadership, I would ask you to let your minds go back again. There is without question one man who has captured the imagination of the world to a greater extent than any other man in history, whether in times of emergency or in times of peace. That man is Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister of Great Britain. But I ask you this. Next to the things that Winston Churchill has done for us, next to what he has done in the marvellous encouragement which he gave the people of Great Britain after Dunkirk, is there anything that was greater, as a means of helping Great Britain and ourselves in the conduct of the war, than the magnificent material help supplied to us by the people of the United States through the leadership of President Roosevelt?

I think I am safe in saying that, next to what was done by Churchill, the help that was given us by the United States has been greatest. Now, where did our own Prime Minister come in? Unfortunately, and I say this deliberately, when you listen to some people speaking, when you read some of the newspapers of the day, with reference to the question of leadership, you have to wonder, as I have often wondered, whether some of them hate Adolf Hitler most, or Mackenzie King. I say that deliberately. There are groups of men in this country who are anxious for total war against Germany; but they are anxious for total war against Germany only to the extent that it will not interfere with their total war against Mackenzie King. That is one of the truths of the situation which it is necessary for somebody to bring to public notice—and you will note, I say it is one of the truths of the situation.

I was speaking of Churchill and Roosevelt, and I spoke of the past slipping away so rapidly from us that we are inclined to forget it. To-day we talk about the Atlantic charter, which came from the conference between Churchill and Roosevelt, and we take for granted that help which went to Britain through the lease-lend agreement before the United States was actually in the war in consequence of attack from Japan. What brought about these things? To-day, I venture to say, even in the minds of many hon. members, there is only at best a dim recollection of Ogdensburg, the historic meeting between our Prime Minister and the President of the United States, which took place in August 1940. From that meeting at Ogdensburg have flowed all the things for which to-day the people of the allied nations are thanking President Roosevelt and the people of the United States; and if it had not been for the leadership of our own Canadian Prime Minister, there would have been no Ogdensburg. The lease-lend agreement would never have become an accomplished fact, the meeting between Churchill and Roosevelt would not have taken place, the Atlantic charter would still be a dream of some of us, the aid that has gone since then to Russia would not have been sent. And every part of that is attributable to the man who sits here to-day as leader of this government.

I come from the province of British Columbia, and many who sit here know that in northern Alberta, in northern British Columbia and in the Yukon, there has been constructed a series of airports designed to protect

western Canada—both British Columbia and Alberta—against attack from Japan across Alaska or the waters surrounding Alaska, and the Yukon territory. I will say more about that later. But who in this house forgets that the hon. member who then occupied the seat of the Leader of the Opposition, as soon as war was declared, rose in his place, properly so, and asked for some protection against air attack or attack in any other form across Hudson bay. You do not hear much of that to-day. Why not? We have our airports in western Canada, constructed or largely under construction, to protect us from attack from the west. The reason you do not hear much demand to-day for further protection against attack across Hudson bay is that United States troops joined in the occupation of Iceland.

Again I ask you, if the right hon. the Prime Minister of Canada had not given to the President and the people of the United States that inspiration which was the foundation of the leadership given us by that president, would there have been an occupation of Iceland by the troops of the United States? There is not a member of this house who will rise and say that he does not see a direct connection between Ogdensburg and the occupation of Iceland by United States soldiers.

There is nobody in this house or outside who will not see in the occupation of Iceland a direct connection with the winning of the battle of the Atlantic. Talk about leadership! What could have been better either for Great Britain or for Canada—and especially for us in Canada—than to save ourselves from defeat in the battle of the Atlantic? That perhaps has been the greatest thing that has yet been done since war was declared in September, 1939. And the saving of the battle of the Atlantic is traceable directly back to the meeting between the Canadian Prime Minister and the President of the United States at Ogdensburg; there is no doubt whatever about that.

I said, Mr. Speaker, I was going to support the plebiscite, and that I was prepared to accept whatever measure of compulsory service may be deemed necessary from time to time by our competent authorities, both civil and military. I spoke of our attitude towards leadership. I have made recommendations to this government which have not been carried out. But am I to rise up and say that because my recommendations were not accepted I am opposed to the government and do not believe in their leadership? What right have I to say that? Yet I have as much right—though none at all—as any other citizen of Canada or any hon. member of this house. But I should be foolish if I thought every recommendation made by me must be accepted, otherwise I would consider it lack of leadership.

On the day on which Japan made her attack in the south Pacific I telegraphed the Prime Minister of Canada as follows:

> As member of Commons House of Parliament I strongly recommend that Canadian government take all possible action against Japan through executive authority without awaiting special session of parliament. I also urge that your government take favourable action upon my previous recommendations, first that ministry for war be created and secondly that National Mobilization Act be extended to include military service in any part of western hemisphere and in Siberia and that further extensions be considered from time to time as circumstances warrant.

That recommendation has not been carried out, but I sincerely hope that in time it will be carried out. In the meantime I am accepting the leadership that says "the time has not come to accept your recommendations." I made that recommendation some considerable time before Japan entered the war; I wanted the National Resources Mobilization Act extended in that manner, first, because I thought it would be of general help, and secondly, because I could see, as every hon. member in this house could see, the coming of war with Japan.

We in British Columbia and those who come from Alberta—the people of these two provinces particularly—are in a dangerous position. I am not so much afraid of a direct attack, unless it be of a sporadic nature, against Vancouver and Esquimalt, as I am of positively planned attack across Alaska or over the Aleutian islands. If I may be permitted to bring to your attention, Sir, the geographic situation of the western coast of Canada, it will be seen that the Pacific coast does not run, as people generally in the east think it does, north and south, but northwesterly. The Yukon and Alaska are considerably west of Vancouver and Victoria, and just across the straits from Alaska are islands leading to the Asiatic mainland, Siberia and Manchukuo, and to Japan. Therefore I say it is our supreme duty to make it certain that we have every possible line of defence available for the Pacific coast.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): What about the military road?

Mr. TURGEON: I am coming to that. I have suggested—and I know this could not be carried out by us alone even if our own civil authority thought it wise—that Canada and the United States should thoroughly train and arm a large force of troops prepared to step into Siberia the moment Russia and Japan become entangled. Because I am

warning the government—I do not have to; for we are represented here by the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) who naturally has given this same warning—I am warning them again that from the moment Russia and Japan become embroiled that moment will see Japan occupying bases in Siberia and Manchukuo, which are only minutes of time, not hours, distant from Alaska—the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Black) knows that—only an hour or two from northern British Columbia, and only four or five hours at the most from Edmonton and Prince George and Vancouver. Incidentally in 1939 when Japan was making her good-will flight to the United States the plane flew around over the town of Prince George, where there is now one of these protective airports, spoke by radio to the then airport, asked for directions and came right down over Cariboo country and across the city of Vancouver and on to her destination in the United States. That was the line they followed.

Now may I say a word about criticism. I read a speech made by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) the other day. I have the quotation here but I do not need to turn it up. He criticized this government because we did not have an air force available immediately to take its stand on the Pacific ocean for the protection of British Columbia. The hon. member knows that we have not the air force ready.

Mr. GREEN: The hon. member had better read my speech again, because I did not mention that.

Mr. TURGEON: We have not got it ready because every available airman and every available aeroplane has been dispatched to Great Britain, which in the conditions that then existed was the proper thing to do. No hon. member of this house will criticize the government for having done it. I do not want the people of British Columbia to be needlessly alarmed, and I am sorry for another statement made by the hon. member for Vancouver South, for whom I have—I do not need to tell him, but I am telling the house because of him—a very high personal regard. I refer to a statement about the command on the Pacific coast. I feel certain that our military chiefs know what they are doing, and I think if any hon. member of this house is doubtful of the capacity or the efficiency of any officer commanding it is his duty first to consult the higher military authorities in order to make certain that his doubts are correct before he help create panic among people who know they may soon be attacked by public expressions of doubts about the capacity of the men in our military command.

Mr. GREEN: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. TURGEON: Certainly.

Mr. GREEN: Does he believe in a triple command on the Pacific coast such as there is at the present time?

Mr. TURGEON: What I was talking about then was not what my friend said about the triple command but what he said about the man who is actually general officer commanding in chief on the Pacific. I can mention names; I was thinking of General Alexander, as the hon. member was.

Mr. GREEN: How does the hon. member know whom I was thinking of?

Mr. TURGEON: As far as the Pacific command is concerned—

Mr. GREEN: He should be supreme commander, shouldn't he?

Mr. TURGEON: All right, but is the hon. member going to blame the military authorities in Canada if through the whole military world it is the custom that there is an army command, a naval command, and now an air force command? I am convinced that there should be a supreme commander. I have not discussed the matter with the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), but I have an idea that he will deal with this question himself. Just the same I feel positive that every possible means of coordination has been carried out, so that when the general officer commanding the Pacific command gives an order, that order will be carried out by every branch of the armed forces. If that is not so, the minister will correct me when he deals with the matter in this house.

A few moments ago someone asked me about the military aspect. Well, I have spoken of the danger of attack from the north and northwest, and of the airports that have been constructed in that part of the country. I am not a military man, but I feel that Prince Rupert should be made a joint naval base by the United States and Canada. It would be presumptuous for me to say that this must be done, but I believe it should be done. I believe that the projected road from Prince Rupert to Prince George should be built by this government immediately, without asking the provincial government to contribute one cent toward the cost. I believe that to be a military road, the cost of which should be borne by this government. I believe the airport at Prince George should be connected by road with the airport at Edmonton. Again,

speaking from a military rather than a peacetime point of view, I believe an alternative route should be constructed between Vancouver and Edmonton, taking advantage of what is called the Blue River highway; and I believe the whole line of airports north and east of the Rocky mountains should be connected by highway with Edmonton. Those are my recommendations to the government with regard to highway communication in that great northwestern area of Canada which, make no mistake about it, is apt to be attacked.

Thinking again in terms of conscription, and this plebiscite, I remember that in his very good speech a few days ago the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), speaking of Australia, at page 21 of *Hansard* for this year, used these words, with which I quite agree:

> Every able-bodied man in Australia has been called to the colours. I pray to God that it is not too late. I am afraid that it may be; for how can these men be trained in time for the defence of their shores, men who have never had previous training?

Apparently my mind likes to go back to the immediate past, for when I heard those words I remembered when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), then Minister of National War Services, returned from England, where he saw devastation in the extreme. He spoke in this house, and again on the radio, demanding that more men be trained, and suggesting that industry should be able to carry on without insisting that its employees be exempt from such training. I remembered the uproar that followed. The leader of the opposition condemned the minister for making that statement, and other hon. members did the same thing. We were told that the minister was making threats against the patriotic captains of industry; that he was going to upset the whole industrial programme; that there was no need to train more men, but that the greater need was in industry itself.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I never said anything of the sort.

Mr. TURGEON: Naturally I accept the hon. gentleman's word without question, but I should like to be quite clear. Is he saying that he offered no objection to the statement made by the then Minister of National War Services?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I criticized the statement of the Minister of National War Services, but on no occasion have I ever said that there was no necessity for trained men. I have tried to hammer that into the minds of the Canadian public and of members of this house since the day I took my seat here.

Mr. TURGEON: I had in mind particularly what appeared in the Ottawa *Journal*, but the hon. member did denounce the minister at that time. My very good friend the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) had spoken of the matter before the leader of the opposition rose. The hon. member for Parkdale, if I might quote him from memory, said he was shocked at the statement made by the minister, and later the leader of the opposition rose in his place and joined in the condemnation of the then Minister of National War Services because of the statement he had made. There is no question about that; and now I say that the very newspapers which are condemning the Prime Minister to-day are those which a short time ago said that industry should come first.

I have before me two resolutions passed by great organizations of returned soldiers. I refer to these organizations not only because they are great, not only because they both create and express public opinion, but also because throughout this time of stress, particularly during the period when we were working by means of voluntary effort, this country received its greatest support from the men who gave their services in the last war, and their dependents. It seems to be an instinct of nature that makes us love most that for which we have suffered most; perhaps that is why, since the beginning of this war, we have been given more assistance by the returned soldiers than by any other group of men or women in the country. One of the resolutions to which I referred was passed by the Canadian Legion, the other by the Army and Navy Veterans' Association in Canada. Perhaps I may be permitted to put on record first the resolution passed by the army and navy veterans, because I happen to be a member of that organization. This resolution was passed at Toronto on December 1, which, it will be noted, was before this government announced its intention to hold a plebiscite on the question of compulsory service or conscription. Here is the final paragraph of the resolution:

> Be it therefore resolved that the Army and Navy Veterans Association in Canada in dominion convention assembled places itself on record as being in favour of some form of compulsory selective service for all men between the ages of twenty-one and forty, such service to embrace not only the armed forces, but all branches of the war effort.
>
> And be it further resolved that the government of Canada, through its Prime Minister, be advised of this resolution and be requested to institute some form of compulsory selective service, or in the alternative to obtain the opinion of the people of Canada on the matter by means of a plebiscite at the earliest opportunity.

Here is the recommendation of the Canadian Legion, or that part of it which is pertinent:

> Canada should bring about the complete and scientific mobilization, organization and utilization of all our resources in such manner that our country may be geared to produce essential foods and munitions and to wage war to a maximum capacity.

I say without hesitation or doubt in my own mind that I am completely in favour of those two resolutions. I am completely in favour of them personally as a citizen of Canada. But as a member of parliament I cannot blind myself to the fact that if, as I pointed out a while ago, this government had previously indulged or were now to indulge in immediate conscription of men for overseas service, without dealing with other things, such action would retard rather than advance our war effort.

I see some of my hon. friends smiling, and I know what they are thinking about. I say with the greatest respect that naturally they are thinking, first, that I am wrong. They are thinking, as some of them have lately made themselves believe, that the taking of this plebiscite is the reason there is discord. The taking of the plebiscite is not the cause of the discord at all. The cause of the discord is the discontent, the terrible discontent, of those men who are making the agitation. I ask any hon. member if he is prepared to rise in his seat and say that a government motion to-day for conscription of men for overseas, without dealing with all the other things which are generally meant when you speak of the subject of wealth, would pass the house any quicker and with any less discussion or discord than it will take to pass the plebiscite against which they are objecting.

Every hon. member knows that a motion of that kind would smash this house. It would be discussed through amendment and subamendment for weeks and weeks, and perhaps would not pass at all. What about delay?

An hon. MEMBER: Nonsense.

Mr. TURGEON: I hear some hon. member say it is nonsense. All right, let us see whether it is all nonsense. What about delay?

Mr. MacINNIS: May I ask the hon. member a question? Does he say that this house is opposed to the conscription of wealth?

Mr. TURGEON: I said nothing of the kind. I referred to a motion to conscript men for service overseas without dealing with total conscription of wealth and other things that are associated with it. No hon. member over there will say that the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition means the total conscription of wealth.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The total mobilization of wealth.

Mr. TURGEON: I will digress and say this, that if the leader of the opposition will rise in his place and officially pledge his party to the total conscription of wealth—

Mr. STIRLING: Nobody knows what it means.

Mr. TURGEON: —the new leader who has been impressed upon them will withdraw. There is no question about that. There is no use fooling ourselves.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has spoken forty minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. TURGEON: I thank the house for the privilege. I shall not detain hon. members very long. I was going to speak of other things which in themselves are contentious, but since I have the unanimous consent of the house to continue with my closing observations I will leave all further contentious matter aside.

I was speaking about delay and discord. In connection with delay I was going to quote only one sentence from a speech made by the Right Hon. Mr. Meighen in 1925. This was the speech in which he made his famous suggestion that there should be no declaration of war without a general election. With the courtesy of the house, I should like to deal with that. He said:

> This would contribute to the unity of our country in the months to come, and would enable us best to do our duty. It would not mean delay.

That was the sentence I wanted to leave with the house in that connection.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But that was taken out of its context. It was that the country should go on and make its preparation for defence, and the government of the day would stake its whole existence on the election.

Mr. TURGEON: You are right. But, thank God, the country is going on in waging the war, and the government of the day has staked its whole existence on the waging of the war.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): On a plebiscite.

Mr. TURGEON: The Prime Minister has announced it. And the most that the plebiscite could possibly deal with is whether we are going to have conscription of everything for overseas service.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Heads I win, tails you lose—that is the plebiscite.

Mr. TURGEON: Mr. Speaker, I express my thanks to you, and through you to hon. members, for this courtesy which for the first time has been tendered to me. May I conclude with an expression of friendliness. We have been told that discord would follow from this plebiscite. Let me give hon. members a little personal experience. The other day my old friend, the former chief government whip, the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Gray) spoke, and took a course quite different from mine. If any hon. member thinks that the friendship which exists between him and me is going to be impaired because of that difference of opinion in connection with the plebiscite, then that hon. member is foolishly wrong, because it is not.

In closing I should like to leave a simple message from the grave—and I give this not only to the people of Ontario and of other English-speaking parts of Canada, but also, and particularly, to the people of Quebec who, naturally, are ill at ease because of what might be done in connection with the further prosecution of the war. I was honoured and privileged to enjoy an hour and a half with Sir Wilfrid Laurier only six weeks before he died. He spoke of his approaching death, his passing to the land beyond, and as he spoke, tears welled in his eyes. We had been referring to the conscription issue of 1917, and to the men who had left the Liberal party and joined the Union government. He said to me, "Some of my colleagues are angry with me because I did not become bitter against those who left us." He continued, "Turgeon, I can speak to you; you are younger than I. There is no greater blessing in life than that of forgiving—not that of being forgiven." With that impetuosity which goes with lack of experience and lack of knowledge of fundamentals, I blurted out, "Sir Wilfrid, that is all right; it may apply to those who left us with sincerity; but it does not apply to those who left us from ulterior motives." He said, "Turgeon, do not forget that those who left us sincerely require no forgiveness, neither from you nor from me. If you wish to taste that which I tell you is the greatest joy in life, the act of forgiving, then there is nothing left but to forgive those who left us from what you are pleased to call ulterior motives."

Mr. E. E. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, the mover and the seconder of the address have been congratulated and complimented so often that I do not believe it is necessary for me to deal with that point. Both hon. members were lawyers, and my only comment would be that they made out a very good case for a poor client.

We have just listened to an eloquent address by the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Turgeon). The hon. member always holds the attention of the house, because he speaks so fervently in that language which is not his native tongue. To-day he excelled himself in the eulogies he showered upon his leader and upon the government. In the early part of his speech he made reference to total war, and said that many of those in Canada who were so anxious to put forth a total war effort—I have no doubt he was referring more particularly to the opposition, and to the public—were more anxious for total war on Mr. King than on total war against Hitler. I resent that. It ill becomes him or any other hon. member to question the loyalty of any Canadian, particularly of any hon. member of this house. I resent what he said in that connection.

The hon. member made special reference to the part the Prime Minister is playing in the war—bringing the United States into it, so to speak. He referred to the Ogdensburg agreement and to various measures passed by the United States government. You would almost think from his remarks that the Prime Minister of Canada was directing the war effort of the United States. I am just wondering what the President of the United States thinks of the latest action of this government in asking for a plebiscite to release the Prime Minister from certain of his pledges.

The hon. member also spoke of the battle of the Atlantic, and took credit to the Canadian government, in association with the United States, because that battle was going successfully in the matter of convoys and so forth. I wonder if the hon. gentleman ever heard of the British navy.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): And the Canadian navy. Don't leave that out.

Mr. PERLEY: The hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross), true to form, is beginning his interruptions early in the game. He has not been here very often during this session, but I see he is here now, and perhaps he will be good enough to sit and listen.

The speech from the throne usually sets out the legislative programme of the government, but the speech on this occasion is remarkable in that it mentions a plebiscite which the government wishes to submit to the people in order that it may be released of certain election pledges. I shall not take time to read the reference; it has already been put on *Hansard,* but I say that this action on the part of the government is making Canada appear ridiculous not only in the sight of our own people but in the eyes of our allies.

I wish to refer briefly to the last session of parliament. It was a lengthy session and was devoted almost wholly to war measures and other government measures, and rightly so. Private members' days were taken away so that the private members had no opportunity to introduce resolutions and discussions upon them. I think at this session private members' days should be restored. There are about 230 members of the house outside of the cabinet, and if private members had the privilege of introducing resolutions and discussions, many constructive and helpful suggestions would be made to the government. I hope that that will be taken into consideration.

I am sure there is no member of this house who desires to discredit Canada's war effort. We do not belittle it. Far from it. I am prepared to say that I think Canada's war effort has been very substantial in many respects, perhaps even greater than some of us expected. We have been passing through trying times, and I am going to give the government credit for what they have done. Some, however, think that still more can be done. We boast in Canada of the morale of our people. We are going about many of our affairs as usual, and I think we should take up the challenge which the Right Hon. Winston Churchill gave from the very floor of this house when he said that the morale of the people will not produce guns and tanks and planes. It is men who are required for that, and it is men we want. We are facing a crisis which challenges us all. In due course I shall make further reference to that.

Hon. members will recall that at the time parliament was dissolved in January, 1940, after one day's sitting, the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) had a majority of over one hundred in this house, and there was no need for any election at that time. But the Prime Minister plunged us into an election; he came back with the very substantial majority which he has at the present time, and now after twenty-two months in office he brings forth this plebiscite to be submitted to the people to release him from certain pledges he claims to have given to the Canadian people in the last election campaign.

As I said, the government has a very substantial majority in this house. We all know that the war situation has become very much graver in recent months. We believe, and I think the majority of the Canadian people believe, that this is no time for a plebiscite, in view of the crisis facing Canada and the world. It would have been more courageous for the government to bring in a resolution for the complete mobilization of all our resources in finance, industry and manpower, and I venture to say that such a resolution would have the almost unanimous support of this house and of the people of this country.

I wonder what our soldiers overseas think about this plebiscite. From my own little town of Wolseley, with a population of 830, sixty-four of our boys have gone overseas, and I have an invitation card on my desk to all the boys from Wolseley overseas to get together at the Beaver Club on March 15 next. I wonder what those boys overseas will think of the action of this government in submitting a plebiscite to the people and what they would think of us if we supported the submitting of a plebiscite to release the Prime Minister of his pledges with no understanding of what he will do afterwards. Outside of the man-power available in Canada there are no forces to support our boys overseas. I think I know where they stand, and they know where I stood during the election. They know that I stood for complete mobilization of all our resources, in man-power, wealth and industry, in order to support our boys overseas no matter in which theatre of war they might be engaged. If we fail to do that, we are breaking faith with them.

I said a few moments ago that I wondered what the President of the United States thinks of this plebiscite. The President of the United States received a majority at the last election, after he had given a pledge in the election campaign that no United States troops would be sent outside of that country. But when the war with Japan came, did the President of the United States ask for a plebiscite to release him from the pledge he had given? What did Chamberlain do? What was his record following Munich? Did he think he had a birthright at stake, as our Prime Minister says he has? I think that was a childish reference. The Prime Minister said that he was being asked "to sell his birthright for a mess of their pottage", referring to the opposition to the plebiscite in the press and among the public. But Churchill and Chamberlain did not ask for a plebiscite—and there you have the difference between statesmen and a politician.

One of the reasons advanced for the plebiscite is that it will preserve unity in Canada. The position I take is this. Surely there is not an honest-to-God Canadian citizen who does not want to win this war, and if there is going to be any disunity, we had better see just where those people are. We should know about them.

It has been stated in this chamber, I think rightly, that from time to time both parties have made mistakes. We have heard much about the period of 1914-1918 and the conscription issue of 1917. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that is all under the bridge; we are dealing with the present situation. But in referring to that period mention has been made of certain charges to the effect that the government of that day was corrupt. I know that Right Hon. R. L. Borden "cleaned house" when there was corruption. I recall statements about old horses which were sold down in Nova Scotia, and so forth, but the Prime Minister of the day, as I have said, did a thorough housecleaning. I suggest that before hon. members on the government side make any more references to this subject, they start and clean house too; and if they want to know where to start, we over here can tell them of a few things.

Mr. McNIVEN: Tell us now.

Mr. PERLEY: Yes, we can do it now. I would hate to put on record some of the letters I have received and some of the things I have heard this session, even at this early stage. Something may be said about it a little later, and some of these things will come very near the bailiwick of the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. McNiven).

Mr. McNIVEN: Let us have them now.

Mr. PERLEY: The hon. member may get them before very long.

Mr. McNIVEN: Let us have them now. No veiled references.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. PERLEY: A little later we may give you some. If the hon. member will sit quiet in his seat, we shall get along all right; he will have his opportunity a little later.

Referring to the demand for release from pledges, I can recall many pledges made by the Prime Minister. I remember his speeches following the convention in Winnipeg in 1919. He stated that he was in favour of lower tariffs; he went down to the maritimes with a promise of reduced tariffs and said he intended to carry it out. Did he do so? I have in mind a speech he made in 1926 undertaking to restore responsible government in Canada. Did he carry that out? In 1936 he pledged a greater battle against the moneyed interests. Has he carried that out?

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. PERLEY: Well, I am glad the hon. member is satisfied. A great majority of the people of Canada do not think he has. Also he made a statement that he would not declare war without asking parliament. Has he carried that out? I say he has not. And now it ill behooves him to come to this house, at this critical stage in the affairs of the war, with the request for a vote to release him from a pledge. He should come out with a courageous policy and he would receive the endorsation of all members of the house. We represent the people who sent us here; we keep in touch with our constituents; we know what is in their minds, and I venture to say that a vote of this house would be as good a criterion of public opinion as any plebiscite can show.

I might commend to the Prime Minister the memorandum, referred to by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Boucher), presented by the Canadian Legion and the Navy League. I have a copy of it here. It contains some good and worthwhile suggestions. When they declare for all-out war they set out quite definitely what they mean. What they suggest is contained in the amendment to the present motion. It calls for the mobilization of all our resources of man-power, wealth and industry, for a complete war effort. I will not read the memorandum and recommendations of the Canadian Legion, but I recommend them to the notice of all hon. members; if they were followed, I do not think there would be any difficulty.

There must be some reason for the government asking this release or taking this plebiscite. Whatever the facts are, the government know them better than any of us. Why do they not give us the facts and let us discuss the matter here? The Prime Minister said in a statement that the conscription issue should be fought out on the floor of parliament. Why, then, does he not fight it out here? Every one of us is prepared to take the responsibility of doing what he considers to be his duty. I believe that if the subject were properly presented and discussed here it would be unnecessary to take any other vote.

Let me make a brief reference to the question of enlistments. If the rate of voluntary enlistments is not satisfactory we should know about it.

Mr. THORSON: May I inform the hon. member that voluntary enlistments in the armed forces have been at the rate of almost 20,000 per month during the past seven months —that is, in the army, the air force, and the navy.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What about the army?

Mr. CASSELMAN: How many were coerced in?

Mr. PERLEY: Will the minister say that the enlistments are satisfactory?

Mr. THORSON: They have been, over this period of time.

Mr. PERLEY: Satisfactory?

Mr. THORSON: Quite satisfactory.

Mr. PERLEY: Then why need the government be released from any pledge?

Mr. HOMUTH: Why a plebiscite at all?

Mr. PERLEY: I repeat, why, if everything is satisfactory, need the government be released from any pledge?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): They will decide in the light of what the future may hold.

Mr. HOMUTH: The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) said it is not satisfactory.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We were 13,000 down in a four-month period.

Mr. PERLEY: I wish to mention the voluntary enlistments in the constituency I represent. I referred briefly to the matter in my own home town. In the constituency of Qu'Appelle we have a record of which we are proud. In the matter of enlistments our constituency stands about as high as any in Canada. We have no industry other than agriculture, and I want to pay a tribute to the farmers who allowed their sons to go—young men who enlisted early in this game, before there was any thought of a plebiscite. The sons of the farmers in the Qu'Appelle riding have done nobly, and great credit is due them. But the supply of farm help is greatly depleted. There should be some selective scheme of service under which every farmer and every man in western Canada would be in a better position to carry on. Some farmers are now in a very critical position with regard to labour. What we want is equality of sacrifice. A great many of our boys are fighting for $1.30 a day, yet we know that in other parts of Canada young men are getting as high as $7 and $8 a day. There are some from our district who have gone east and got jobs at that rate of wages. Such conditions do not represent equality of service or sacrifice.

There are two fronts on which we are fighting, the economic and the military. On the economic front we have achieved much. I am ready to give credit in that respect to the government. Great quantities of munitions, materials, guns and tanks have been produced. But I am not satisfied with what has taken place with respect to agriculture. It is playing a very important part but not getting a square deal. The agriculturists of the west are as loyal as any class in the country. They have made a great contribution; they have done their part up to date, and they will continue to play their part in the winning of this war, but they want a fair and reasonable degree of consideration. Western wheat has played a very important part in maintaining the volume of Canada's exports. After the war, if it is saved, and it must be saved, agriculture will play a greater part than almost any other industry in the rehabilitation of Canada. That is one reason why we want a fair deal and equal sacrifice, so that we shall be able to carry on. We want a parity of prices with the products of other industries which the farmer has to buy in order to carry on his business. After twenty-two and a half months, I think we should have what I would term a food production board to give direction. Represented on that board should be farmers and others, who would direct in the production of different commodities.

The Prime Minister has stated, quite correctly, that the wheat surplus will prove to be a great asset in the winning of the war. While the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), may have had a policy in 1940 to reduce wheat acreage, growing less wheat in order to win the war, when he came back from Britain in 1941 his first pronouncement in Canada, and in the west particularly, was to the effect that all this wheat would be needed and that even much better prices than we were receiving then would be obtainable. Why therefore is there a change of policy now? Why not have prices on a parity with other prices in order to give the farmer a chance?

In the last two or three days we have seen in Ottawa a delegation from western Canada numbering 430 strong. They represented 185,000 signers of the petition. Why did they come to Ottawa? They represent the pool of western Canada and practically every other industry or interest in the country that depends on farming—the merchants, the boards of trade, the municipalities, from the standpoint of taxation, and so on. They are representative of various organizations, and I know that hon. members who attended the banquet given

last night in the parliamentary restaurant, and who saw that vast crowd, must have been impressed by their appearance. They are a splendid lot of men. The Prime Minister at least paid them that tribute. They came here because on former occasions when they have sent delegations—and they have done so many times—those delegations have not been properly received and have not been given the fair consideration which is due them. In order, therefore, to put their case squarely before the government and the parliament of Canada they decided to send this large delegation of 430. There is no reason why they should not come here.

Some people have been a little critical of the delegation; they have asked why they should come here and spend all that money. May I point out that taking the subscriptions at twenty-four cents each, that is not very much from each subscriber, and I think the trip was coming to these men. They will appreciate their experience here, even though I cannot say they will go home satisfied with the reception they got yesterday. The Minister of Agriculture more or less tore their brief to pieces, and possibly they will go home a little disappointed. They have not received all that they were asking for. But they were eminently fair in the brief they presented. I have it here but I will not read it. It contains a good many figures, and I am not going to quote figures to-day. I will only speak generally on this occasion, because on a future occasion I shall put the case of the western farmers fully before the house and bring forward such figures as are necessary to substantiate the arguments that I will then advance.

I cannot see why they should not get proper consideration. Their brief asks for a better price, a dollar a bushel. I do not think that is unreasonable. It asks that the 1942 crop be segregated and kept by itself on a quota basis, if you like. That is not unreasonable. It asks that the present surplus, beginning with the 1941 crop, be kept as a reserve following the conclusion of the war or when it may be needed later on—and we know it will be needed. We know what is happening in Russia, where the great wheat-growing plains are being devastated. We know what has happened to their machinery of production. Very shortly they will need this surplus wheat. I have never been concerned about a great surplus of wheat, because we have seen wheat pile up in Canada and then disappear almost over night.

I might refer to another brief presented to the government to show that western Canada is unanimous in the demand for a dollar or better for wheat. We have from the Northwest Line Elevators association a demand for $1.02 net or a parity price of $1.22. It is interesting to me to read this brief and to know that it has been presented to the government, because I can recall this organization's attitude to the farmers of western Canada, especially during the period from 1930 to 1935, when they were not very favourable to us in our effort to boost wheat prices. We did not get very much support from them. It is interesting to note now that that organization is asking for a little more than the pool, through their representation, are demanding. I was wondering if there was any significance at all in the fact that the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) has played an important part in that organization and is close to it now. I do hope the government will give consideration to at least one of these briefs and give the farmers a fair deal, a parity of prices.

In the brief presented by the pool organizations reference is made to Canada's national income and the fact that twenty per cent of the population of Canada is in the west, in the three prairie provinces, and receives only five per cent of that income. There is something wrong there, and their argument is sound. Many hon. members will forgive me if I make a personal reference to my own record, though the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross) may resent it.

When I came to this house in 1930 I was imbued with one idea—that if with my wide experience in farming and also having been in the grain business for a number of years, I could not do something to help western Canada, and the farmers of western Canada particularly, my time would be wasted. Some of my time may have been wasted, but I have a clear conscience in this, that never have I failed to take advantage of every opportunity that has offered to put up a case for the western people. I regret that on many occasions I have failed to receive the support that I had expected when I sat for three sessions as the sole representative of the Conservative party from western Canada. Hardly a Liberal supported me, though Doctor Motherwell did. He supported suggestions I brought forward, and some of them were good, if I may be allowed to say so. I am glad to say that that gentleman, with a great deal of experience in his favour, and having the welfare of Canada at heart, did see eye to eye with me. But in 1934 and 1935, when the wheat board act was being passed, I fought—I think I may use that word—to have certain clauses inserted. It

so happens that only one hon. member of this house was a member of the committee to which that bill was referred, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston). I am sure he would bear me out when I say that time after time I insisted that certain clauses be put into that bill, taking in coarse grains, providing for price-fixing by a board, and so on.

Again in 1936 hon. members know what happened when I moved certain resolutions. Again in 1938 I suggested the processing tax, suggested a long-term price of ninety cents, possibly a dollar a bushel. I was right then because it is proven now that had we had that we would have been in a much better position and it would not have cost the country as much as it has already.

I made representations from time to time for a reduction in freight rates. In 1940 I had a resolution on the order paper, a copy of which I hold in my hand, calling for at least 90-cent wheat and the processing tax. I have a resolution on the order paper now which I hope will be reached in due course, and at that time I shall give some figures to show that we should have consideration and have a parity price fixed not for one year—this fiddling with the price each year is no use, because a review of the history of the past and of the prices over a period of ten or fifteen years indicates clearly that we can have a price which is nearer parity than the present price.

The Minister of Agriculture, even in 1939, speaking in this house on May 5, on Bill No. 83, as reported at page 3647 of *Hansard*, quoted Professor Hope to prove that farmers should have an average price of 95 cents to give them a decent living. That 95 cents he agreed should be net to the farmer, which would be about $1.15 at Fort William. He has changed his mind somewhat since, but I have here a quotation showing that he agreed with Professor Hope when he said that the farmers in order to carry on and have a reasonably decent living should have 90 to 95 cents net on the farm. Conditions are worse now; there is even greater reason for it than there was then.

I have here a comparison of the cost of living on the farm and in the cities and towns, taken from the *Economic Annalist*. Taking 1913 as the base year, 147 items, products of industry that the farmer has to buy, stand now at 143. But wheat is 14 per cent less, at 50 cents, than it was that year taken as the base. To-day industry is working on cost plus; we know what happened to labour, increased wages and a cost of living bonus; but the farmers are still expected to produce at less than cost.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Is that the Searle Grain Index figure?

Mr. PERLEY: No, the *Economic Annalist* of October. The Searle Index gives the 147 items which stand at 143. I have a number of figures here which I might put on record but I will not take the time. I suggest that the government consider adding a processing tax to a fair price; that they consider saving storage that they are paying to-day that they should not be paying to the grain companies, in terminals, annexes and in box cars—that is something I protested against; the average farmer in western Canada does not realize that he is paying for storage on a certain amount of his wheat in box cars; that they save interest by rebating the storage or making it possible for the farmers to store their grain on their own farms. What better asset could a farmer have than a thousand bushels of wheat in a bin secure on his own farm, on which he could realize sooner or later? It would be a splendid thing if the money paid by the government, some $26,000,000 for storage in other places, were to go back to the farmer. It would also result in a considerable saving in interest if the grain were stored on the farms rather than go to the market where it has to be paid for with consequent interest charge.

This is a national emergency, a national crisis that we are facing. This surplus will be needed, I am not worried about that. The government is financing purchases of food for Britain—cheese, bacon, butter, eggs, and so forth. I am not criticizing that at all, but I say they should go further and finance the purchase of wheat and deliver it to Britain at a fair price. That would be a splendid thing; it could come under that splendid offer made the other day by the Prime Minister to give a billion dollars or more to Great Britain.

I am going to support the amendment. It is far-reaching; it calls for complete mobilization of man-power, wealth, resources, industry and everything in Canada in order that we may have a complete war effort in any theatre of war. I trust, however, that the government will take into consideration the suggestions of the pool delegation. Their case was presented in a moderate way: they were fair and their representations deserve consideration. I believe the Minister of Agriculture is meeting with them now. In fact

he sent me a note just before I started to speak, saying he regretted he had to attend that meeting. Well, I regret it too, because I wish he had heard a few of the things I have had to say. However, relief assistance and marketing are two different problems and must be considered from different angles.

All we want is a long range policy which will give the farmers the security and parity of prices which will bring them into their own once again. I trust the government will be courageous. I trust that the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) will make an announcement within the next few days—it would be splendid if they could make it while the delegation is here—to assure these men before they return to the west as to what is going to happen next spring, so that they can know what is to be the policy with respect to acreage reduction and what payments they will get for the 1942 crop, and so they can go home ready to prepare for the spring work with some heart. I hope they will get favourable consideration, and I think an announcement should be made at once.

I have a resolution on the order paper that I hope will be reached in due course. I shall then be glad to present figures to show that the case presented by the pools is fair and reasonable.

Mr. P. E. WRIGHT (Melfort): I did not have the privilege of hearing the addresses of the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, but from the many compliments which I have heard from all parts of the house I realize that they made their usual able contribution to the discussions of this parliament.

It is not my intention to-day to try to deal with the many problems which are opened up by the speech from the throne, but rather to confine my remarks to one or two which I believe to be of paramount importance at this time and which should be dealt with without delay if our war effort is not to be seriously impeded.

First I should like to deal with the matter of the plebiscite, and secondly to say something concerning agricultural production in this country as related to our war effort.

With regard to the plebiscite, in many of the speeches in this house I think there has been too much emotion and not enough appeal to reason. It seems to me that the less we raise sectional differences and strife in this country at this time, the better it is going to be for the country as a whole. I do not agree with the idea of a plebiscite. I think this parliament was elected during war time to carry on this war to a successful conclusion. In my own constituency some of my best friends came to me after the last election and said they had voted against me and for the government because they believed in a strong government that could carry on the war effort. I wonder what they are thinking to-day. I believe if the Prime Minister had come to parliament, placed all the facts before it and asked to be released from the commitments which were made by hon. members on all sides with regard to conscription, this parliament would have given him that release and accepted the responsibility.

After all, when we were sent here to Ottawa we assumed certain responsibilities, and I think we should be prepared to carry them out. I believe the ordinary man on the street to-day is saying, "What are those fellows doing down there? Why don't they get on with the job? That is what we sent them there to do." I believe the sooner we do that the better it will be for Canada. I freely admit that this would have been a serious responsibility to assume, but I think most of us would have been prepared to go back to our constituents and defend our action. That procedure could have been carried through very quickly and with a minimum of expense. Various estimates have been made as to what this plebiscite may cost. In my view the greatest expense will be the time and labour that will be involved. It is not the money itself but the effort, the wasted energy, which might be employed to better advantage at this time.

I should like to deal with the three suggestions before the house at the moment. The government say, "We have already mobilized wealth and industry in this country. We have conscripted men for home service, and now we are asking you to release us from our promise not to conscript men for overseas service." I have no patience with those who go round the country belittling our war effort. Let no one be mistaken; we in Canada have made and are making a very valuable contribution to the carrying on of this war. The statement made in this house by the Prime Minister proves that. But I do not think any hon. member can state honestly that we have made our maximum effort, that we have used every dollar, every man and every woman to the greatest possible extent. Only when we have done that can we say that we have a total war effort. The government have conscripted men for home service, but as yet they have not conscripted wealth or industry; they have merely organized them. It is true that we

have high taxation, but as yet that taxation is far from being confiscatory. I believe we should measure our taxation in this way: that we should take in taxes in this country all income which enables any person to employ, either directly or indirectly, the services of any man or woman to do for him something which he is physically able to do for himself. When that point is reached I think we will find a great reservoir of labour and money made available in this country.

Let us look at the distribution of the last war loan, as set forth by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). The total number of subscriptions was 968,259, and the amount subscribed $836,820,250. Subscriptions of $50 and $100 numbered 661,282, or 68·3 per cent of the total number of subscriptions. The amount subscribed in this way was $45,302,650, or 5·4 per cent of the total. Subscriptions of from $50 to $500 numbered 861,046, or 88·9 per cent of the total number. The amount subscribed in this way was $115,300,950, or 13·7 per cent of the total amount. In other words 68·3 per cent of the subscribers invested only 5·4 per cent of the total amount, while 88·9 per cent bought only 13·7 per cent of the total loan. In other words 11·1 per cent of the subscribers took 86·3 per cent of the total loan. This shows those who were able to subscribe to that war loan.

I wonder what the men serving in our army, navy and air force are going to say when they return to Canada and find this situation. Are they going to be satisfied, when the war is over, to find that a small percentage of the people of this country will be able to sit back, clip coupons, and through those coupons, demand the services of the men who fought to make those coupons worth the paper on which they were written?

Mr. McNEVIN: If the hon. member would permit an interruption, I believe there is one point which should not be overlooked. Included in that smaller percentage of subscribers were several large insurance companies which invested the funds of a very large number of people.

Mr. WRIGHT: I quite agree, but even taking that into consideration I believe I am more than fair in saying that less than thirty per cent of those subscribing took more than seventy per cent of the last war loan.

I believe the sooner we in this house take a more realistic view of what is happening in Canada to-day, the less trouble we are likely to have in the post-war period. Only when we have conscription of accumulated wealth and industry, as well as of man-power, shall we have a total war effort. Let us take two men who started out thirty years ago. The one man raised a family; the other did not. To-day we say to the man who has three sons, under our selective service system—and I believe in selective service—that his boys must serve where they can make their greatest contribution. To one we say, "You must serve in the army;" to another we say, "You must serve in the air force," and we allow the third to remain at home. What do we say to the man who did not raise a family and who, perhaps partly because of that fact and partly through fortuitous circumstances, was able to accumulate a certain amount of this world's goods? Do we say to him that he must give his money to the government? No; we institute expensive war loan drives and advertising campaigns to coax it out of him. This is entirely unnecessary. We should conscript wealth as well as the young men of the country. If we have compulsory service, it is necessary that we have compulsory interest-free loans, levied according to ability to subscribe.

Let us now consider the amendment moved by the Conservative opposition. It reads, in part:

> This house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers have not seen fit to recommend to parliament without delay additional measures designed to
>
> (a) completely mobilize the wealth and material resources and, on a selective basis, the full man and woman power of the nation, to the end that the nation may wage total war in any theatre of war;
>
> (b) supply the imperative needs of agriculture, industry, and the fighting forces of the nation; and
>
> (c) prepare for the post-war period.

This sounds very good. I could support that amendment myself if I were sure just what is meant. The hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) stated the other day that the substance of the amendment and that of the amendment to the amendment moved by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation were practically the same. I am afraid he was not using his usual keen sense of perception, otherwise he would not have made that statement.

To begin with, to mobilize means to organize. To conscript means to control and to operate. There is a vast difference between organizing an industry to produce as efficiently as possible, but for a profit, and controlling and operating that industry to produce as efficiently as possible, without profit, and for the state. That is the difference between the amendment moved by the Conservative party and the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. The hon. member for Lake Centre said the only difference was in the

method. As I said before, I do not agree with the method being used in connection with the plebiscite. I believe the question being asked is not a fair one. We believe that along with that question there should be another one, as outlined in our amendment.

First let us consider the mobilization of wealth and industry. The government states that it has already done that, and I have not heard one of the leaders of the Conservative party state publicly that he would go farther in that respect. In fact I have seen reports of speeches by Right Hon. Mr. Meighen in which he has stated that we have gone too far. The present leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) has stated in the house that he believes the excess profits tax is as high as it should be at the present time. He objected to many aspects of the succession duties tax. Yet they do not believe that we have gone far enough in the mobilization or, should I say, regimentation of labour, and the conscription of man-power. With regard to the second and third proposals may I say that I am in entire agreement.

Let us now consider the amendment to the amendment moved by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. It states:

> This house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers have used the sweeping powers conferred by the National Resources Mobilization Act mainly for the conscription of men for home defence, and in the opinion of this house no total effort adequate to meet the present needs of the war, domestic problems and the preparation for post-war conditions is possible without total mobilization of wealth, industry and finance, as well as human resources.
>
> Therefore this house respectfully requests that the forthcoming plebiscite should seek the support of the people of Canada for the complete and effective conscription of war industries, accumulated wealth and financial institutions, at the same time and on the same basis of sacrifice as the suggested extension of the conscription of man-power.

There is no pussyfooting about that. We say, in effect, that we are realists. This is a total war, and the way to meet total war is by total effort. Let us put everything we have into the conflict—every dollar, every factory, every resource, every man and every woman, on an equal footing, at the same time and on the same basis of sacrifice, without hesitation and without quibbling. And when the war is over and victory won, let us start on an equal footing to build a better Canada, a better and saner world to live in. That is what the people of Canada want, and that is what the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation stands for.

We do not believe that when this war is over any individual or group of individuals, through holding accumulations of war bonds, or by owning the factories and natural resources of this country, should be able to say to the people of Canada, "You must work for us. We own the tools with which you must work, the materials you must use. We control the tokens you must use to provide yourselves with the necessities of life. You must pay tribute to us."

For a short time I should like to deal with the matter of agriculture. Speaking in this debate the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is reported to have said this, at page 34 of *Hansard:*

> A vital aspect of Canada's war effort is our contribution to the food supply of Great Britain. This contribution has grown steadily in importance. Britain cannot feed herself, and her own great and growing armed forces. Still less can she feed the ever-increasing numbers of men we are sending from Canada to add to her armed strength. In the present war, unlike the last, her sources of food on the continent of Europe have all been closed off by enemy occupation. Canada is the nearest source of food left open. Without our food the people of Britain might starve. Without our food the Canadian army in Britain would be a handicap instead of a help. In a literal sense the very lives of the British people and our own armed forces overseas depend upon the exertions of Canadian farmers and fishermen. In prosecuting the war, theirs is no secondary role. As time goes on, the demands upon Canada for supplies of food for the allied forces and, later, for the peoples of the now subjugated countries are certain to increase.

I would call particular attention to these last two sentences:

> I have mentioned food production separately because I doubt whether the country is fully aware of the vital importance of food regarded as a munition of war. Otherwise, it might well have been included as a phase of the productive aspect of our total effort.

Whose responsibility is it that it has not been included as a phase of the productive aspect of our total war effort? Whose responsibility is it that Canada is not aware of the vital importance of food, regarded as a munition of war? We have in the government a Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) who is in charge of publicity. If the country is not aware of the importance of food in our total war effort, then it is the responsibility of the government to make it aware of that fact. Knowing all the facts, why is it that the government has not made the production of food a phase of our total war effort?

Every hon. member who has been in Great Britain has stated that Great Britain needs all the concentrated foodstuffs we can produce. Nevertheless for the last two years the government has continued to treat agriculture as an industry of secondary importance. It has by economic pressure deprived agricul-

ture of its labour, and has increased the cost of the tools it must use to produce. We have not reached the maximum of our possible production in Canada, but I believe we have reached the limit of our present possible production, unless we are to supply either more labour or better tools with which the farmers may produce.

We have been asked for more dairy products. The only way in which we can have more dairy products is to pay a price for them which will enable the farmers to compete in the market for the available labour, and also to provide the necessary labour-saving devices. When the government wants more munitions, more guns, more aeroplanes, more tanks or more clothing, it assists the manufacturers to re-tool their plants and to produce those commodities as effectively and economically as possible. All agriculture asks is similar treatment.

During the past war there was a demand for wheat. Large areas in western Canada which never should have been broken up were put under cultivation. Farmers under the stimulus of increased prices bought equipment and assumed obligations which they could never fulfil. What guarantee has the farmer to-day that if he equips himself to produce dairy products, hogs and other requirements, he will not again be left holding the bag?

Industry has stated in no uncertain terms: If you want more plant or equipment than we can use in peace time, then the government must build it and we will operate it for you. This government and the British government have accordingly erected some 600 million dollars' worth of such plants. How much assistance has been given the farmer to construct new plant or equipment to produce food? How much assistance is to be given him this year to see that he is able to procure labour-saving machinery to replace the men going into the army and into industry? These are some of the questions the government must answer if they are to get greater production.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) is asking the western farmer to grow more coarse grains. I will tell him how he can get more coarse grains sown. Just guarantee to the farmer that he will receive the full cost of production, including depreciation, replacement and a fair return on capital investment. At the present time there is a maximum price on coarse grains but no minimum. Every farmer knows from sad experience over the past twenty-five years that if he grows a bumper crop of coarse grains this year and the speculative market is left open, the price will go below the cost of production. What incentive, is there, then, to increase production?

If the government want greater production of coarse grains, all they have to do is to close the Winnipeg grain exchange, announce that the present maximum price will also be the minimum price and that the premium on malting barley will be increased to ten cents a bushel. If they do that, they will get greater production.

Last fall there was a demand for malting barley in the United States, and considerable quantities were being shipped. Then this government stopped the export, and immediately the price in this country dropped. The government stated that we needed for feeding purposes all the coarse grains we had in Canada. Anyone knows that wheat can be substituted for barley for feeding purposes, and we have plenty of wheat. The breweries are using large quantities of barley. They cannot substitute wheat. Did they bring pressure to bear on the government to stop the export so that they could get cheaper barley? If there is a real shortage of barley for feeding purposes, would it not be better to use it to produce bacon for Britain rather than beer for ourselves? The speculative market, whatever may have been said in favour of it in peace time—and I do not think there was anything to be said in favour of it then—certainly in war time serves no good purpose. It only confuses and discourages the producer. We are told that the law of supply and demand controls our prices, but anyone who has followed prices in this country of agricultural products in particular knows quite well that that is not the situation. Let me give you an instance.

In July of last summer a neighbour of mine shipped two animals, a two-year-old heifer and a herd sire, to the Winnipeg market. For the heifer he received $8.25 per hundred pounds, and for the sire $6.50 per hundred. Six weeks later, another neighbour made a similar shipment. He received $8.20 per hundred pounds for the herd sire and $6.50 per hundred for the heifer. I am sure that the people of Canada had not changed their eating habits during that short interval. The government to-day are the largest purchasers of a number of products, and the only basis there could be for assuming that the demand had changed would be that the government needed more boloney to feed to the Canadian people through its propaganda department. How is the producer to know what are the requirements, with the market jumping in this manner?

We have had in Ottawa this week a large delegation from Saskatchewan to present to

the government what the farmers believe to be the just demands of western agriculture. Their demands have received the approval of the organized farmers in both Manitoba and Alberta and have been approved by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. They have also received the support of the towns and cities of the west. The requests of the farmers are moderate—the minimum, in their opinion, on which western agriculture can continue to produce. If the Prime Minister's statement, that food is needed and will be needed in increasing quantities, is correct, then I believe this government should see to it that necessary action is taken to give effect to their requests. I consider that there is something seriously wrong with our democracy when any section of this country finds it necessary to send such a delegation to Ottawa. Either we who represent them have failed to place their case fairly before the government, or the government, knowing the case, have refused to pay any heed to it. Surely the government knew of these conditions.

The Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture both represent Saskatchewan constituencies. Last summer I attended in the Prime Minister's constituency a public meeting called for the purpose of protesting against the present price of wheat. The largest theatre in the city of Prince Albert could not hold the crowd, and hundreds stood on the street listening to the loud-speakers. The chairman of the board of trade, the mayor of the city, along with the reeves of the municipalities, stood on the platform and openly supported the demands which the present delegation are bringing to Ottawa. The farmers of Saskatchewan do not want to be paid treaty money; they want a price for their products that is equal to the cost of production. They would like to see the present Prairie Farm Assistance Act so amended that it will become a comprehensive crop insurance plan. After our experiences over the past twelve years in Saskatchewan, we realize that crop insurance must be a part of any plan for the rehabilitation of western Canada.

Three things I believe are essential if we are to get increased production: (1) a parity price; (2) the labour situation must be rectified, and (3) provision must be made for supplying up-to-date machinery and repairs at reasonable cost. If these things are done, I am sure that we can materially increase our present production of needed food.

First, as to the parity price, I would ask the Minister of Agriculture what formula was used in determining maximum prices for agricultural products. We know, according to the bureau of statistics, that over thirty-three per cent of the population of Canada were engaged in agriculture in 1939 and that they received only eleven per cent of the national income that year. We also know that since the war our national income has probably doubled, but agricultural income has not kept pace with this advance. Using as a base 100 in 1926, we find that grain products to-day stand at 57·9. Animal and dairy products have reached an approximate parity. There is certainly no equality in such a situation.

This government, instead of developing a balanced, equitable programme for agriculture during the war, has simply drifted along trying to deal with each separate situation as it arose. We have an agriculture committee of this house. The first time it was called together during the life of this parliament was when it was invited to the banquet of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture last Thursday. We enjoyed the banquet. We heard there a speech from Mr. Evans, chairman of the AAA farm programme in the United States, who outlined the comprehensive programme which they have adopted. They have been developing it for the last eight years. When war was declared last December, it found agriculture in the United States prepared to take its place in the war economy and do its full share on an equal basis with labour and industry. Agriculture in Canada asks similar treatment.

I would advise every hon. member who is interested in agriculture to-day to make a study of what they are doing in the United States. I am sure there are points in their programme which can be copied in Canada to our advantage. Their price is based on an equality with wages of labour and retail prices. In the United States to-day they have a guaranteed price of $1.17 a bushel for wheat, while they are able to buy their implements and tools of production at from fifteen to twenty-five per cent less than we can in Canada. They have an ever-normal granary programme whereby thirty per cent of the normal crop of non-perishable foods is kept in reserve. They have a land conservation programme and a comprehensive crop insurance plan.

Second, with regard to the labour situation in Canada, if we are to increase the present production of the foods we need for Great Britain, some form of selective service draft will have to be introduced immediately. I believe that we have drawn from the farms of Canada all the men that we can by our present methods without seriously affecting production. If it is essential that more be called, then we must make provision to replace them by other labour.

Now, just a word with regard to agricultural implements. Their price has for years been out of line with the price of agricultural products. The government have known this. It is ancient history. They appointed a commission, spent thousands of dollars, ascertained all the facts, and then took no action. I am not going to enter into a discussion of this matter this afternoon. I should like to point out a greater danger at this time. Last year it was becoming increasingly difficult for the farmers to get repairs for farm machinery. Unless the government see to it that companies make proper provision for this, I am afraid many of them may concentrate on the more lucrative production of war materials. Now is the time to take steps to prevent this. If we wait until the situation becomes acute next fall, it will be too late. I would ask the government to make the necessary investigations at once and to see that this situation does not develop.

I know the farmers of Canada; I have farmed in both eastern and western Canada. They are willing and anxious to do their share. They ask for no special privileges. They demand equality. Given that, they are prepared to make all the sacrifices which may be necessary to secure victory.

Mr. G. T. FULFORD (Leeds): Like so many hon. members who have preceded me, I wish to take this opportunity of complimenting the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. It is indeed fortunate that the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) are men of superior intelligence and modesty, otherwise I fear that enlarged heads might require new hats, at a time when we are asked to limit our purchases as much as possible.

It is my desire to-day to plead with this house for tolerance and a better understanding in this great dominion of ours. Often, however, in attempting to be tolerant, one becomes impatient of those who are intolerant. This I shall attempt to the utmost of my ability to avoid.

We must all strive to understand that each section of Canada has its own particular problems. We have one of the longest and, thank God, the most friendly boundaries of any nation in the world. But the very fact that we have such a long boundary, stretching well over three thousand miles from the Atlantic to the Pacific, means that we have more than ordinary problems to face. In the maritimes they have difficulties which are peculiar to those three provinces. Quebec has its own difficulties. Ontario has questions which are of vital importance to that province.

We know that the three prairie provinces find themselves in a dilemma to-day chiefly as a result of world conditions affecting wheat. We know also that British Columbia is facing great difficulties. It is therefore, during time of war, more important than ever that we try to understand each other, that we bury our differences, that we comprehend Canada not in a narrow sectional way but as a nation as a whole. In that way we can overcome once and for all, for the duration of the war and, I hope, for all time, sectionalism and distrust.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has consecrated his life to the task of unifying the dominion, and up to the immediate present no other man has succeeded to the same extent that he has. When he assumed office in 1921 Canada was disunited and resentful, but through his indefatigable perseverance a degree of unity was approached such as this country had never known. Some weeks ago I was telephoned by a member of the committee of two hundred which was meeting in Toronto at the time with the alleged object of advancing Canada's war effort. I was asked if I favoured the policies advocated by this committee. I said in reply that if what they were after was national selective service with complete mobilization of all our man-power and resources, I was heartily behind them, but that if it was only conscription of men for overseas service, I was diametrically opposed to that. Unfortunately, as time goes on, the only issue which appears to be advanced is that of conscription for overseas service. It is being used as a smoke-screen to hide all other Canadian achievements and problems.

Some had high hopes that with the second coming of George McCullagh and his two hundred prophets a great deal might come out of Canada. I said "some", not all of us, because all too many of us remember his leaderless—I beg pardon, Mr. Speaker—his Leadership league and how it evaporated into the mists.

More recently another voice a few blocks away from the office of the *Globe and Mail* has been heard not only across Ontario but throughout the length and breadth of Canada. I refer to the premier of Ontario, who has on several previous occasions tried to split the Liberal party, but who to-day is trying new and far more sinister tactics and, with his uncalled for, unjustifiable and contemptible remarks, is in danger of splitting Canada. Well do I remember when he referred to Ontario as the milch cow for the rest of Canada. I wonder how the other eight provinces felt about that. As a citizen of Ontario I did not feel happy about the remark. I remember sitting in this house when he

scuttled the dominion-provincial conference on the Sirois report, a little over a year ago. Whether one believed in the recommendations of that report or not is beside the question; the fact remains that these delegates were asked to stay when the report was thrown out and discuss any problems of vital importance concerning each province in the dominion in relation to the dominion as a whole, and this same man who sets himself up on a pedestal in Ontario would have nothing to do with it. Instead of listening to reason and trying to contribute something to the conference, he caught the first train back to Toronto in a huff.

To-day we see him in Welland, and I shall quote a few remarks of his as published in the Ottawa *Citizen* of this morning, Tuesday, February 3, 1942. I quote:

> The premier criticized the federal government for what he said was a "policy of appeasement in every critical issue before and since the war began", termed the calling of the plebiscite a "criminal act" of reneging on the government's commitments and declared "this government at Ottawa has been a sham government."

Compare that with the remarks made by the Right Hon. Winston Churchill, probably one of the most outstanding men of to-day, leader of the British empire, when he said in this very house on December 30 last:

> The contribution of Canada to the imperial war effort in troops, in ships, in aircraft, in food and in finance, has been magnificent.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): He was talking about the people of Canada, not the government.

Mr. FULFORD: But the government are regulating the affairs of the people.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The people are supplying the money and brains.

Mr. FULFORD: The people would not have had an opportunity to make this contribution had it not been for the policies of the government. Whose opinion are the people generally of Canada to take, that of a little man in Toronto who desires more power than his mental capacity is equal to, or the opinion of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Hon. Winston Churchill?

I wish to quote some more remarks of the premier of Ontario.

> The calling of the plebiscite, Mr. Hepburn said, was the "crowning instance" of the federal government's appeasement policy. . . . Mr. King had attempted to appease the west as well, Mr. Hepburn said. "To appease the west we speculated in wheat and the wheat board announced the other day that we had lost nearly $80,000,000 on our speculations. Then we bonused the west to grow wheat and after that we bonused the west not to grow wheat."

Does that sound like a man who is trying in this time of crisis to unify the country—pitting one section against the other. Further:

> "The trouble is that we've been loaded down with a policy of appeasement", the premier declared.

He referred also to appeasing the province of Quebec—another jab at another province. I do not believe that even Mr. Hepburn's most intimate friends and associates are in sympathy with the stand he is taking to-day. He has let his party down; but worse, far worse, he has let his province and his country down.

At the beginning of my remarks I pleaded for tolerance, but there is one thing that no tolerant person can overlook or forgive, namely, betrayal and treachery; and that is what we see in the premier of Ontario to-day. To those sitting opposite, I should like to offer a word of advice regarding this political chameleon. At present he professes to back the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen; but let me read what he had to say at the nomination meeting at a by-election in the provincial riding of Hastings East, in the village of Madoc, on Thursday, December 2, 1936. I have no doubt the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe) and the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. White) will remember that day. I remember it because, when Mr. Hepburn rose to speak, bedlam was let loose. I have never heard so many people shouting so loud in so many different veins, some boos and some cheers, but always to a general confusion such as one seldom sees anywhere. Allow me to read what Mr. Hepburn thought of Mr. Meighen on that day. This is reported by the Canadian Press and comes from the files of the Montreal *Gazette*. It is dated Madoc, December 2:

> Premier Hepburn, speaking here to-day in a joint debate with Conservative leader Rowe, reiterated Liberal charges made in the 1934 Ontario general election about Senator Arthur Meighen dealing in Ontario Power Service Corporation bonds while a member of the hydro commission.
>
> "Meighen had $300,000 of these bonds" said the premier. "He violated his oath of office. He bought $90,000 more."
>
> The reference to Mr. Meighen was made in the course of a criticism of administration of Colonel George Drew, former Ontario Securities' Commissioner.

I want hon. members to get this tie-up:

> "During Drew's administration of his office there was more graft and corruption practised in Toronto than ever before," the premier said. First act of Colonel Drew's successor, he added, was to oust 91 "high pressure" stock salesmen from a Toronto hotel.
>
> Colonel Drew, Conservative campaign director, sat on the platform and heard the premier

repeat last night's challenge that he get any responsible mining men to endorse the Drew administration of the commissioner's office.

"I telephoned Mr. McCrea (Charles McCrea, former Ontario mines minister) to-day and he declined to comment," the premier said. "His very silence is its own condemnation of Drew."

Mr. Hepburn charged $12,000,000 had been taken from the Ontario investing public because Colonel Drew failed to act on information placed before him in connection with investment trusts with which Mr. Meighen allegedly was associated.

"Western shareholders asked Ontario to investigate manipulations by the trust and made charges of fraud," Mr. Hepburn said. Attorney-General Price sent the file to Drew who was being paid $10,000 a year. He reprimanded the shareholders publicly and said the matter was not in his jurisdiction.

"After that Meighen met Price and you can't tell me Drew didn't have his ear to the keyhole. The Tories stick together in milking the public. These custodians of justice—Drew, Price and honest George Henry (former premier) got together. They said, 'What will we do for little Arthur? He's in a bad way'. And they decided to buy Ontario Power Service bonds. Meighen was on the hydro commission and the commission took over at $18,000,000 bonds which had a market value of $6,000,000.

"Meighen had $300,000 of these bonds. He violated his oath of office. He bought $90,000 more. He was reprimanded by Mr. Henry who himself was a participant in the worst swindle ever put over on the people of Ontario."

I understand that Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, Premier Hepburn and Colonel Drew are all to be on the same platform to-morrow night. Strange bed-fellows!

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): You used to sleep with them, didn't you?

Mr. FULFORD: Yes, and I have regretted it ever since. I notice, as reported in the Ottawa *Citizen* to-day, Mr. Hepburn said he had hung his head in shame when the announcement of the plebiscite was made. I hang my head in shame when I think that I was the chairman of the meeting that chose Mitchell F. Hepburn to lead the Liberal party in Ontario. I further hang my head in shame to think that I was a member in the Ontario legislature for three years and four months suffering the indignities imposed upon the private members of that body by the dictator of Ontario. I believe that the people of not only Ontario, but of all Canada, of the other eight provinces that he has insulted time and time again, will realize, once and for all, the calibre of man that he really is, and stop listening to his silly palaver.

The remarks of Mr. Hepburn regarding our Prime Minister are beneath contempt and an insult to the intelligence of the electorate of Canada. The Prime Minister has been spoken of as a coward. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that no man is a coward who can withstand the tirades and insults emanating from certain sources in Toronto. He has conscientiously and courageously withstood those taunts from that section, taunts that are unwarranted, unnecessary and unbelievable. When the voice of the people is heard through the plebiscite, those hysterical screams and screeches will be drowned for now and for all time.

No one in this house, or, for that matter, in Canada, can help being thrilled when he reads of Australia and the deeds of her soldiers, sailors and Royal Australian Air Force, many of the latter of whom were trained in Canada under the empire training plan. History will acclaim for all time the bravery of Australian soldiers in Libya, Greece, Crete, and, more recently, Singapore. The defiance by Australian sailors of the enemy throughout the seven seas, and the exploits of her airmen over Germany and the conquered nations of Europe, over Libya, Singapore and the Dutch East Indies, and over the Japanese and British mandated islands in the south Pacific have covered them with glory.

The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe has referred to the plebiscite as being un-British. But Australia had two referenda in the last war. I shall quote from Chambers' Encyclopedia the definitions of "plebiscite", "initiative" and "referendum":

> A plebiscite is often used in Britain for an attempt to secure an expression of opinion on some special point of local interest by all the inhabitants of a district.
>
> An initiative and referendum—the political institutions under which the people of a nation may initiate measures to be enacted by their own votes into laws.

The fundamental difference between the two is that a plebiscite allows a government to change acts or laws, whereas a referendum requires that the laws be changed; but in principle they are very similar and in no sense can either be termed "un-British".

In this war Australia has no conscription for overseas service. South Africa has no conscription; India has no conscription, and the people of northern Ireland are just talking about it now. Is it not an insult to our sister dominions and other parts of the empire for us in this country to condemn the government of Canada for not introducing it here when it is not introduced generally elsewhere within the empire? Let us remember that every time a thrust is given this government, there is also given a thrust against the government of south Africa, northern Ireland, India and Australia.

Now that Australia's position is desperate, she is mobilizing her man-power up to the age of sixty for home defence.

I should like to suggest that even before the plebiscite, Canada begin total mobilization of man-power and resources. I know that this is under consideration, and I have no doubt that before many months have passed, it will be brought before the public in concrete form. We have heard from several hon. members from British Columbia of the danger in which the west coast finds itself, and we know that German submarines are operating off the Atlantic seaboard. I believe that before the coming of summer even greater dangers will assail us from the powers of evil. We must be prepared for any emergency. We must even accelerate our industrial and agricultural production. But, above all, we must be ready to meet, to the extent of our capacity, any and all demands made on us by the empire and the United Nations.

The outposts of the United States have been struck; Singapore and our sister dominions of New Zealand and Australia are in grave peril, and our own seacoast may be and can be invaded. We must, therefore, be ready to strike and strike hard. But this we cannot do unless Canada is united as never before. Let us, therefore, back this plebiscite to the limit of our ability—and I appeal to all parties in this respect—to assure the Prime Minister and the government that the voters of our dominion are fully conscious of the gravity of the situation. The Prime Minister, his ministers and supporters, must be released from a pledge made before the subjagation of Europe by Germany, before the entry of Italy into the war, and before that most treacherous of all attacks made by Japan in this most gigantic and horrible of all wars.

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to congratulate the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Fulford). He made a wonderful speech; in fact I think he must have been taking lessons from the Prime Minister, because his speech was 99 per cent politics.

No matter where we go to-day all we hear is the plebiscite. We hear it on the streets, on trains, and everywhere else. I have been speaking to men in the navy, the air force, and the army, and that is all they are talking about. Many questions are being asked: Is the Prime Minister in earnest about this plebiscite? What will be done if the answer is yes; and what will be done if the answer is no? Will he go through with it, or will he just get the machinery for a plebiscite in shape and then, at the last moment, spring a general election? If he does that, the people of Canada will not only rebel; they will be very much disappointed in the Prime Minister and the government. They want to know the reason for the delayed action. Why does the Prime Minister continue to play politics? Does he know something he is not telling the people? Will the plebiscite create unity or lunacy? That was asked me by a soldier. The other day I was speaking to a lady who has three sons in England. She said she did not think the mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, wives and sweethearts of the men in the armed forces would appreciate the fact that here in Canada we shall be marking crosses on plebiscite ballots while crosses are being raised over the graves of those brave men who are fighting for us.

Instead of taking a plebiscite, I wonder whether it would not contribute more to the unity of Canada, about which we hear so much, if the government raised the pay of the armed forces to a level equal or nearly equal to that of the men and women in our munitions plants. If that were done, I believe, after talking to a number of men working in those plants and also talking to soldiers, that there would be absolutely no need to talk about conscription because all the men needed could be got without it. They would sign up to fight in Canada or anywhere in the world they might be needed. At the present time they get $1.30 a day, with $20 a month deducted for their wives or mothers. Then, if a man from my city, for instance, wants to go home on twenty-four hour leave, it costs him $5.50 to go from Ottawa to Peterborough. The other night I picked up two air force boys at Port Hope. They had paid $5.50 for a ticket from Ottawa, and there they were left stranded, thirty miles from Peterborough. The rate seems to be the same whether they go to Port Hope or Peterborough, and there they were left with thirty miles to walk. One of these air force boys said that if the government paid the soldiers more money, eventually the government would get it all back again. The soldiers spend their money on train fare, for one thing, and the government owns the railway. Every time they buy anything the government gets part of the money in taxes, and those taxes are pyramided, what with the corporation tax, the excess profits tax, the sales tax and everything else. Certainly that money would come back to the government not once but perhaps twice over. The munitions worker gets a bonus, but the pay of the soldier has not been raised. The men and girls in the munitions factories believe they are getting something extra by way of the bonus, but in reality their purchasing power is not increased at all.

I have a little verse, written by a member of this house, dealing with the plebiscite. It reads:

> Oh, Mr. Churchill, don't you fear,
> Canada is voting again this year.
> Voting for to fight the foe?
> Oh, no, Mr. Churchill; just to spend
> the dough.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland): From what kindergarten did you get that?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The one down in Northumberland.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland): Well, you have been around there enough to learn something.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): That is perfectly true; I have been around Northumberland a great deal lately, and I hope to be there again soon.

One person suggested to me that if the plebiscite is to be taken, it should be held on April 1, because anyone voting on the plebiscite, whether they vote yes or no, would be fooled, because the answer they would never know. It has been said that, relatively speaking, the civil service is growing faster than the army. Most of those in the civil service have been given bonuses, but that is not the case with the soldiers.

I have been speaking of the soldier and his pay, but now I should like to mention the dependents of those in the armed forces. They should get a bonus also.

Mr. MARTIN: Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Thank you for agreeing; I know many hon. members will agree with that. The government has allowed the dependents of those holding the rank of warrant officer and under to obtain extra allowances if they have three or four children; the dependents of a soldier holding the rank of lieutenant or higher do not get it. That is right, perhaps, because the officers are receiving higher pay. One hon. gentleman says what they get is scandalous, but the soldiers get a scandalously lot less. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the dependents of our soldiers should receive this bonus. I believe the increase in soldiers' pay would take care of any shortage in men. The men already in the armed forces would know that we have not forgotten them, and the men who are enlisting would know that they had been treated fairly. I hope the government will increase the pay, and also forget about this plebiscite.

I believe we should have complete mobilization of all our natural resources, both material and man-power. When I refer to material resources I have in mind what is commonly known as the conscription of wealth. But by that I do not mean that the farmer should have his farm or his cattle taken away from him. I do not mean that the workers should have their homes taken away from them. Some farmers have homes, but they are mortgaged to the hilt. As I have said before in the house, the farmer is the forgotten man. I do not mean that the worker who has saved a few dollars should have those few dollars taken from him, as some hon. members to my left seem to think. He should be allowed to keep what he has.

When I refer to conscription of wealth I mean just that. We should use absolutely everything necessary to the winning of the war. If you and I have to do without an extra shirt, then we should do without it.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That would be a small thing.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I know that because of heavy taxation many hon. members have had to plan their lives much differently from last year, and if this year's budget is anything like what I expect, every hon. member will have to cut down to an even greater extent.

An hon. member to my left said to-day that any one who is employing a person for work he could do himself should fire that person. I would understand from that observation the hon. member meant that domestic help should be discharged. I believe that is practically what was said to my left this afternoon, and that is the meaning the people throughout the country will take. His statement meant that domestic help should go. I do not believe in that principle.

Mr. GILLIS: The hon. member who is reputed to have made that statement is not at the moment in his place, but if the hon. member who is now addressing the house will read *Hansard* to-morrow, he will find that his interpretation of the statement made by the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) is not correct.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. GILLIS: The statement Wright made—and I was listening to him—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Just a moment; I am making the speech.

Mr. GILLIS: The hon. member's statement is incorrect, and should be corrected. The hon. member for Melfort said that anyone who has some one working for him should let

that person go, and do the work himself. The hon. member should stick to that statement, it seems to me. That is what was said.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I am not going to have any hon. member contradict me on that, while I am talking.

Mr. HANSELL: Read the statement.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): As soon as I get *Hansard*. I wish to say here and now that Canada has done wonderfully well in the production of munitions and supply.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): All right, all right. Men for the armed forces? —they have got them in the navy and in the air force. I will acknowledge that, and I give due credit to the ministers of those departments. But at the same time those same ministers should allow criticism in the house. If they do not want criticism we should be permitted to have a secret session before which they could give us the facts, instead of keeping members of parliament in the dark.

One hon. member from British Columbia said yesterday that he was not allowed to go where Japanese were allowed to go. That is not fair, and hon. members have not been treated fairly by the government. Hon. members on the government side have not been treated fairly, either.

An hon. MEMBER: We are not complaining.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I know; hon. members on the government side are afraid to say anything. They have a taskmaster who makes them behave and toe the mark, every time. The hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) had some views which he expressed—and then he made a speech at the opening of the session when he expressed views which were just the opposite. "Toe the mark"—I have not the words, and I do not think old Dan Webster ever had the words to express that sort of thing. I am not even going to try to.

Hon. members should not resent criticism, and the House of Commons is where it should be made. In the British house Winston Churchill said that he did not want to listen to any mealy-mouthed persons. I do not think we should have mealy-mouthed people in this chamber, either. We should have facts before us all the time. Politics got France into a jam. Yes, it even got Norway into a jam, and it will get Canada into the soup if we don't watch out.

An hon. MEMBER: We are in it.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): One hon. member says we are in it now. That soup is boiling: watch out.

Resolutions have been passed across the country with respect to the plebiscite. I have one before me, addressed to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) from the county council of Peterborough. It reads as follows:

The following is a copy of the resolution passed by the council of the county of Peterborough, November session, 1941, which I have been instructed to forward to you:

"Whereas Canadian agriculture is an essential war industry charged with the vastly increased responsibility of producing food for the people of Great Britain.

And whereas munitions industries have been attracting farm help to the cities, depleting the man-power of agriculture to the extent that many farms are now lying idle, causing a steady reduction in farm products.

And whereas the government of Canada assumes for the agricultural industry greater contracts for the supply of foodstuffs to Great Britain, a duty which farmers wish to fulfil to the utmost extent of their ability, but which they know cannot be accomplished under the present loss of farm help for military service and city employment.

Therefore be it resolved that this council petition the federal government to give immediate consideration to this agricultural problem, especially in stopping at once the drafting of necessary farm help for military service; that we favour the mobilization of man-power, so that the greatest use may be made of available labour; that foodstuffs be placed on a higher price in order that agriculture be placed on an equality with industry; and that agriculture be represented on any boards set up to deal with the matter of obtaining men for active service."

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

HONG KONG

REPORTED STATEMENT OF REVEREND B. C. ECKERT WITH RESPECT TO CASUALTIES

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the house, if I may have its unanimous consent, I should like to make a statement with regard to an item which appeared in a Toronto morning newspaper this morning respecting the report of an address made by

Reverend B. C. Eckert, of London, at Welland. It has to do with casualties at Hong Kong, and I feel that it makes a rather serious charge. But what I am more concerned with is that I am afraid it will have the effect of seriously adding to the distress of those who are waiting for news from Hong Kong. I should like to make a statement with regard to it.

I have noted the statements said to have been made by the Reverend B. C. Eckert, as published in a report in a Toronto paper this morning. The report reads as follows:

> The initial address was made by Reverend B. C. Eckert of London, who charged the King government with deliberately withholding the Hong Kong casualty lists until after the February 9 by-elections.
>
> Ottawa knows them, and more are buried in the blood-stained soil of Hong Kong than are in Japanese prison camps.

The statement made by this reverend gentleman at Welland, to the effect that information regarding casualty lists was being deliberately withheld until after the February 9 by-election, is absolutely false.

I can state that no casualty lists have been received respecting the Canadian expeditionary force at Hong Kong except those which have already been published by the press.

Regarding the statement which directly implies that the number of dead exceeds the number of prisoners of war, the government has no information which would afford foundation for any such statement In view of the distress which this statement will cause, I have thought it advisable to give the house the following circumstances: We pressed the embassy at Chungking for information regarding Canadian troops from the reporter, MacDougall, who was reported to have escaped, and received a reply that casualties were difficult to estimate, particularly due to the fact that communications had ceased with the Royal Rifles, and the message then said:

> Guess but only guess one-third of fighting strength killed, wounded or taken prisoners during fighting, remainder presumably taken prisoners on capitulation.

I consulted with the Associate Minister of National Defence (Mr. Power) who, as the house knows, is personally and very intimately interested in this Hong Kong expedition, and we considered that what was emphasized as being a pure guess was not the sort of speculation which ought to be given to the public, at least without further efforts to get something reasonably definite and reliable.

Since then we have been straining every nerve to get further information, and what we finally got yesterday was another message which had been sent to the War Office. It stated:

> Casualties whole British force Hong Kong "very rough guess 4,000 killed and wounded."

I may say that we estimate that the whole British force would number nearly 12,000. You will note that this message was even less informative to us than the previous one since it made no reference to Canadians, and it was also emphasized as a very rough guess.

I again consulted with the Associate Minister of National Defence, and we decided that no good purpose could be served in making public such unsatisfactory and inconclusive reports. Neither of these statements gave any particulars whatever; there would be neither definiteness nor reliability in the statements; they would give no genuine information to Canadians and might needlessly increase the distress and anxiety which is now being endured.

Even in view of the statement by the reverend gentleman, I have hesitated to give these uninformative and possibly misleading reports. However, his statement means in effect that more than half the force were killed. What basis he has for this I cannot imagine. We have nothing whatever to indicate any such situation. The guesses to which I have referred certainly do not.

But after consultation with my colleague we have decided that a statement of this kind made by a clergyman would, if left unanswered, only add to the terrific burden which the friends of those who were in the Hong Kong expedition are now bearing, and that is why I am now giving the house the substance of the indefinite messages, guesses though they are.

Actually, I am afraid we have erred too much in the direction of giving information without confirmation. As a result of this, in one deplorable case a cable which appeared to show an officer as killed proved, on our receiving further word, to give good ground for belief that this conclusion was incorrect.

I deplore deeply the occasion which has made it seem advisable to give the wholly incomplete and unverified surmises contained in these messages. Only a desire to counteract as far as possible the additional distress which will have been caused by the statement made by the reverend gentleman would have led me and my colleague to change the considered view which we arrived at that we were not justified in publishing these guesses without verification and where they might only increase needlessly the anxiety which we all share.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to thank the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) for his frank statement with respect to Hong Kong. I think it will clear up a lot of misunderstanding.

When the house rose at six o'clock I had just finished reading a letter from the county council of Peterborough in which mention was made of the mobilization of man-power. There should certainly be a check-up of our man-power throughout the whole country to ascertain just who are doing their bit, and who are not doing their bit but want to do it. Some of these latter have applied for work at a good many plants but have been turned down on the ground that they are not young enough. They are as old as I am, perhaps a little older, fifty years of age and older. These men want to help, and women of that age also want to help, but they are turned down because they are too old. Something should be done to put these people in places where they can help.

Places should also be found for men who have been thrown out of work because the jobs which they have held for years are now no more—automobile salesmen, for instance, tire salesmen and salesmen in other lines which have been absolutely cut out. They should be placed in positions. They should not have to go hunting for them. The government should find places for them in industrial plants or elsewhere. There should be a thorough organization of all our man-power and woman-power in Canada so that each can be put in his or her proper place.

Last Sunday a man came to see me. He usually employs fifteen people, but at the present time he has only five employees, including his wife, daughter and thirteen-year-old son, who help him run his business. He is carrying on and will carry on. He has one son in the air force and another likely to join. There are many of these people who are willing to carry on, and there are some who could have had good jobs but find them taken by people who are not naturalized. Quite a number of people in Canada who are not naturalized hold well-paid jobs. Mobilize man-power for the munition plants and for the farms and pay a decent wage to the soldier, and we shall have not only an army, but the supplies to keep that army going.

I noticed in the paper the other day that the dairy farmers in Ontario are organizing. The cheese producers have already organized; we have an Ontario federation of agriculture; and I sincerely hope that before long there will come into existence a real farm organization from one end of Canada to the other, taking in all lines of agricultural products. Let dairymen, cheese producers, hog and cattle raisers and farmers unite in one big union, as the factory workers have done, and so get their rights. One farmer said to me, "The trouble with the farmer is that he does not stay mad long enough to make the politicians think. All he gets are promises." Agriculture at the present time all over Canada needs a new set-up, with a new scale of prices. There should be a new wage scale for labour on farms, because the farmer does not work just eight hours a day; his day begins at five or earlier and ends when he is through, which is generally not before eight or nine o'clock at night, while his returns are much smaller than those of the man in the factory.

Personally I believe that this plebiscite is the government's baby. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) should know if we need conscription. He should know if we do not need conscription. If we need it, why the plebiscite; and if we don't need it, why the plebiscite? The "baby", or the decision, is the government's. Does the Prime Minister know just how to look after this baby?

Mr. HOMUTH: How could he? He is a bachelor.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): If he is a bachelor, why should he ask the public to play nursemaid to this baby? During the last few weeks I have received hundreds of letters with reference to the plebiscite. Only three were not opposed to it, and each of the writers said, "Why talk against having a plebiscite, because the government will have it no matter if fifty, sixty or a hundred voices are raised against it in the house; they will do as they dashed well please."

An hon. MEMBER: Why not?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Why not! You have 180-odd members—

Mr. HOMUTH: Mostly odd.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Speak for yourself.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): They can put through anything they want. Why not do it by one more order in council?

Because I believe it would require a good tabulating machine to calculate how many orders in council the government have put through, and I doubt whether there is any minister who could tell you what is in half of them.

I should like to read the following extract from one letter I received:

> Yesterday I overheard an elderly widowed lady, who has a son overseas, discussing the plebiscite, and she wept bitterly because of the unequal sacrifice she is enduring under the present situation and the needless delay in obtaining needed reserves of man-power.
>
> The views expressed here are not only my own but are held by the majority in my circle of friends and acquaintances, who represent both major political parties. You have my support in opposing the taking of this plebiscite.

The writer is a well known business man in the city of Peterborough.

Many hon. members have mentioned during this debate the cost of taking this plebiscite, but it did not really come home to me until last Saturday, when a schoolteacher in my riding asked me these questions. First of all, she said, "How can I ask the children of my class to buy war savings certificates? They have been buying them every week since the campaign started; and now the government is to spend some millions on a plebiscite. How many bombers could be built with the money which this plebiscite is going to cost? How many tanks would this money buy? How many armoured units would this money equip? How many guns for the Pacific coast would it provide? How far towards building the Pacific coast highway would it go?" She asked also, "How many candy bars will the children have to do without in order to pay for this plebiscite? What extra taxes will the already tax-burdened people of Canada have to shoulder in order to provide for it? And how are the children of Canada going to feel about this?" I say, how are we all going to feel about it?

I have seen in the different military camps young ladies in uniform, and I am pleased that the government has at last recognized women in the service. It has taken them a long while to wake up, and I hope they will remain alive to the importance of this branch of service, because the women can help. One suggestion I have to make concerns munitions factories. I believe that in each of these factories there should be a woman in charge of interviewing the women applicants and checking on them. I believe that this would lead not only to an increase in the number of applicants but would attract some whom one would never get otherwise. There is a reason for this, which I cannot explain in the house, though I should be glad to do so to the Minister of Labour at some time. There is a definite need of having women in the factories to interview women applicants.

The other day the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) spoke about the proposed highway from the United States border to Alaska. I am glad he did, because I mentioned it some time ago in the house. It is a subject which interests me, partly because I have travelled on south American, central American and all United States of America coast highways, and I have studied the project as far as it affects the other end of the highway. The hon. member for Macleod is anxious, of course, that the highway shall pass through Edmonton. Personally I should like to see it go through Peterborough, but I know that is out of the question.

Mr. ROWE: Not very much out of the way!

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Well, it is a long way out of the way. For military purposes, which is a main object of the road, you should have a highway which, though not too far from the coast, will be far enough to prevent its being wrecked by gun-fire; which can be a feeder for the different airports, and which can be used by the United States government as well as by the government of Canada. I mention this road because at the present time the government has available labour to build it. I refer to the Japanese in British Columbia. They can do the work. We do not want one Japanese in Ontario for the logging camps or for anything else, because if they got in here, they would find that Ontario is such a beautiful country they would want to stay here. The hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) told us that he has seventy-five per cent of them in his riding—

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: No, I didn't.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): —and I do not think he wants them any longer. Nor do we in Ontario want them. They should be put to work and kept under the eye of the police. They could do the rock-cutting and other digging on that roadway. At the present time the government, I know, cannot secure machinery to build a road. The road machinery is all engaged in the building of airports in Canada and the United States, and I do not believe there is any machinery available at the present time. I say we do not want the Japanese in Ontario. One reason is that we already have enough people coming into the province from outside and taking jobs without having any more.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): They would not stay in Ontario anyway.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Well, it is the most beautiful province of Canada, and we do not want them. The Japs should be taken from the Pacific coast at once. I know that an order in council has been passed for the purpose, but I do not know whether it has been acted upon. The other day I asked a question with regard to radio transmitting sets, cameras and firearms. I wanted to know whether they had been taken away from the Japs. I doubt whether even to-day this has been done. I know that the day I mentioned it, Thursday, January 29, it had not. I wonder what would happen to us if we were in Japan. Would we be allowed cameras, transmitting sets and radios? We would be lucky if we had a coat to cover us and enough food to eat.

A military road built at the present time would be of service not only to-day but after the war. Its construction would help to take care of soldiers returning from the war, because there would be work for them. A road built now would be a purely military road, with no fancy trimmings, and it would eventually become one of the tourist highways of the world. It would draw tourists not only from the United States, but from central and south America as well, and if hon. members have studied the road maps of those countries, they will know what is being done there. There is only one spot, in Ecuador, and another in the Panama section, that are really stickers. In the Panama section there is a stretch of 300 miles not built yet, and only one white man has ever made the continuous trip through it; but it can and will be straddled. That road would open up all the natural resources of the country.

The other day I asked the hon. member for Yorkton (Mr. Castleden) whether he could name one man who had reaped a fortune out of this war, and he said, "any coupon-clipper who to-day reaps profits out of this war." The hon. gentleman sitting directly in front of him then said, "saboteur".

I do not think that any man or woman clipping dominion government war bonds is a saboteur. Many of these bonds are bought by widows and soldiers' wives.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Yes; they are bought by widows and soldiers' wives.

An hon. MEMBER: How many?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Many.

An hon. MEMBER: How many?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Ask the government how many. They are bought by widows and soldiers' wives.

An hon. MEMBER: There are eleven of them.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Eleven what?

An hon. MEMBER: Eleven widows.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): These widows should be praised for buying war bonds and certificates instead of being ridiculed by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party, and I say that because some of these women helped their husbands to save when they were alive, amassing what to them seems a fortune, perhaps $1,000—and all they get from clipping coupons is $30. Yet they are called saboteurs because they clip coupons worth $30; whereas hon. members to my left get that much in a day and a half in government indemnities, as members sitting in the house, though the other day for an hour and a half there was not one Cooperative Commonwealth Federation member in the house. These people will wonder why the government has asked them to buy war bonds and certificates when a member of this house says they are saboteurs.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must point out to hon. members that the hon. member who has the floor may not be interrupted without his consent.

Mr. HOMUTH: We don't mind it.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): These people will wonder what's what; but knowing that it comes from the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, as an hon. member in front of me suggests, we pay no attention to it, and I hope the widows and orphans will not. The party to my left pretend to stand up for the man who is down and out. Do they? I do not think there is a man in this house who knows more about the working people, the men who are down and out, than I do—and many others are in the same boat. They go among these people in their ridings and try to help, and they do not relish such criticism from any hon. member.

In closing, I sincerely hope that the government will forget the plebiscite and get down to business and constructive work. In fact I would say, have a secret session so that we can all get together.

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): It seems to be customary in this house for a member who rises to speak to compliment first of all the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, and then for those on the opposing side to break his nose or black his eyes or to do something of that kind. I am not going to do that to-night. I reserve the right to break noses if necessary, but I am not extending compliments in that direction. I should like, however, to compliment the hon. member behind me, the member for Vegreville (Mr. Hlynka). I am not competent to pass judgment on the subject matter of the address he gave, but his presentation was excellent. As regards the people on whose behalf he spoke, I have only the highest commendation to offer, having lived among them and worked with them since coming to this country a number of years ago. I found them to be hard workers, people who have been doing their share to build up the country, and who have been playing their part in the effort to defeat the enemy overseas.

Let me now refer to the old age pensioners. We have heard a good deal in the past in this house and on the street, and we have read in the press, about the condition of our old age pensioners. The question was dealt with by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) on November 14 last. After giving a number of reasons why the government could not do anything for these people, either by way of a bonus or by an increase in their monthly pensions, he went on to say, as reported at page 4429 of *Hansard* of that date:

> Indeed the government is prepared to consider going further than this. It believes that, for the reasons already outlined, it would be impossible to justify an increase in the maximum rate of pension payable if the whole cost were to be assumed by the dominion, and that such cases as appear to present immediate difficulties can be met by the provinces on the basis of established individual need. If, nevertheless, all, or substantially all the provinces should make representations to the dominion government in favour of some increase in the maximum amount of pension payable, the additional cost to be shared between the dominion and the provinces on the same basis as the present cost, I can assure the committee that the government will be prepared to give consideration to such representations.

I do not think it would be very hard for any of us, if we were inclined that way, to find reasons why old age pensioners should be given a cost of living bonus, or a permanent increase in the rate of pension. This legislation I believe went into effect away back in 1927. At that time the cost of living index stood at about 120; to-day it is close to 116; and the minister gives this as one reason why they are not entitled to a cost of living bonus. I would point out that in arriving at the cost of living index, quite a large number of items are taken into consideration, whereas in the old age pensioners' buying of supplies a very limited number are involved, and we find that the price of those goods which are purchased by old age pensioners has increased much more than the average

Then, again, I would say to the minister that if he wants to find excuses for giving something to the old age pensioners, he might look over the living allowance paid to some of our dollar-a-year men. That runs anywhere from $10 to $15 or, in some instances, more a day. Then, again, we find that others who are on very large salaries get up to $35 a day living allowance. That has happened in the past. Surely something along that line, although not that much, could be done for the old age pensioners. Some of our judges who give service for a certain number of years and are pensioned off get pensions ranging from $5,000 to $15,000 a year. This means that they have a pension of from $13.70 up to as high as $27.40 a day, and we were told not very long ago that this cannot be reduced. Perhaps that is because we have so many lawyers in parliament.

There is another group of pensioners, I would call them, not very far from here; I do not know what their qualifications are for their positions, but they are on the pension list. It is not called an old age pension or relief list, but they get a pension of almost $11 a day for life as well as other things that cost the country quite a lot of money. Perhaps the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) could take some of these matters into consideration when again dealing with the question of cost of living bonus or increased pensions for old age pensioners.

I consider that this government and governments that have been in office in past years are responsible for the condition of many old age pensioners to-day, because these governments have passed and supported legislation which permitted exploiters in Canada to take advantage of and legally rob these people who to-day find themselves in need of old age pensions. Therefore I am of opinion it is now the duty of the government to take care of them in at least a reasonable manner.

In connection with that part of his statement in which the minister said that if all or a substantial number of the provinces want to do something about it, the government will give it consideration, I believe a start along this line has already been made by Alberta

and British Columbia; and I hope the other provinces will see that a start is made in the very near future and that this government will give it the consideration to which it is entitled.

We go on to another group of Canadians who, I believe, are also entitled to a cost of living bonus. I refer to our teachers all across the dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We have been told in the past that teachers are working for very low salaries, and that condition still exists to-day. I do not know whether hon. members all realize that we are entrusting the training and education of our children to these teachers for the greater part of the day during at least five days a week. We expect the teacher to live and dress respectably and when setting their rate of salary, seldom think of the many other duties for which the teacher is made responsible. In order to bring them up to the same level as some of our industrialists and civil servants who to-day are receiving a cost of living bonus—about which I am not complaining—I think we should at least extend the same privilege to the teacher.

The provincial governments are having quite a hard time at present to pay the cost of education, so I suggest that the dominion make a grant to each province in order that they can pay a cost of living bonus to the teachers. The teacher's position to-day, I believe hon. members will realize, is not any better than that of a great number of civil servants, and not as good as that of many common labourers in industry at the present time.

There is another group that I might mention. There are many people employed in the smaller stores. In the larger establishments I understand the help receive a cost of living bonus, but in the smaller stores, where only a few are employed, the cost of living bonus is not paid, or at least it is not compulsory. But if we look around we find that employees of all stores buy on practically the same market, so that if those employed by the large firms are entitled to the bonus, why not those in the smaller stores?

Then there is another group that I believe is also entitled to a cost of living bonus. This group comprises about one-third of the population of Canada. I refer now to the farmers. I am wondering whether some people believe that the farmers are entitled to a cost of living bonus. I remember when I came here first in 1936, we were told by someone who perhaps knew better, that the majority of farmers went to California or some other better climate in the winter, that each family had two or three cars, and a number of other such silly statements.

An hon. MEMBER: He must have been a Liberal.

Mr. FAIR: The gentleman to whom I have reference did not sit very far from here at that time. He is not in the house now, and I hope he is happier than many of us here to-day are. Taking farmers and their families as a whole, I think the delegation that came here from Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba is a very fair sample of the average farmer of the west—and, I believe, the east as well. I think you will not find any of them lying around the streets drunk. I have not seen any. You do not find them wearing expensive clothes or doing anything that a respectable citizen of Canada should not do. Many compliments have been paid as to the calibre of these farmers and their wives. I believe they are entitled to great consideration at this time.

In the cities and towns we find that the man usually makes the living, while his wife looks after the home. That is so on some farms, but in many instances we find that the wife and children must get out and work so that the family may eat, pay their taxes and retain their home. Many of those farm homes are not as good as they should be; that is true in a large percentage of the cases. Some people on farms seem satisfied to do with less, and they are expected to do with less than people in the towns and cities. Why this should be so, I cannot understand, because, after all, farming is the basic industry of this country, and if you took away our farming, you would take away the lifeblood of the whole country.

Dealing with the question of wheat, we find that away back in 1935 the initial payment was 87½ cents a bushel, basis No. 1 northern at Fort William, with participation certificates. That figure remained unchanged in 1936, with the restriction that the farmers could not use the wheat board unless the price of wheat fell below 90 cents a bushel. The same condition existed in 1937. In 1938, however, for some reason or another, the price was reduced to 80 cents a bushel. Perhaps the farmers were getting a little too prosperous; perhaps they were painting their homes, or something. Whatever the reason, the initial payment was reduced to 80 cents. In 1939 the first legislation brought in cut down the price to 60 cents a bushel; but after a great deal of controversy, with many speeches made in this house, over the radio and at meetings throughout the country, that was increased to 70 cents a bushel. At the same time there was introduced in this house the Prairie Farm Assistance Act, which provided for a bonus if the crop was less than twelve bushels to the acre and the year was declared by the government to be an

emergency year. That policy was continued in 1940, but that year we had the additional payment of storage on wheat kept on the farm. In 1941 the same situation continued, except that the storage applied only to that undelivered portion of the quota which was held on the farm. In that year we also had regulations brought down under which farmers were encouraged to cut down their wheat acreage, and those doing so were given a bonus called the wheat acreage reduction bonus. I am not going into that to-night, but only a couple of months ago another bonus was announced. People call it by different names; I call it a general relief bonus, and I believe it was paid because the government felt so guilty. They must have felt guilty for a number of years past, but this year, because farm income was so low, they gave another general relief bonus to all farmers, grain growers, stock raisers or anything else.

This, it seems to me, is an open, frank admission by the government that their agricultural policy is not one on which Canada can live. I do not know of any body that should realize the plight of agriculture better than the government, and now they come along with another little hand-out to keep us dragging on a little longer. I would point out, however, that the latest bonus of 75 cents an acre, even with the other two bonuses to which I have referred, will not solve our wheat problem. There are two distinct problems. In the first place, the man who has no crop at all will not benefit in any way from a higher price for wheat. He will benefit through the payment of bonuses, provided they are high enough, but they are not high enough at the present time. On the other hand, a man who has a crop averaging more than twelve bushels to the acre does not benefit by any system of bonuses that may be put into effect. Therefore, to satisfy the man who has an average crop of twelve bushels or better, a higher price for wheat must be put into effect.

During past years several delegations have come to Ottawa trying to get something of benefit to the farming industry. It is realized by everyone in Canada that agricultural conditions are not satisfactory, and this applies to eastern as well as western Canada. I am not speaking of the west alone, as in the past some of us have been accused of doing. I believe the eastern farmers understand that their plight has been realized by the government also, since the government has agreed to pay the freight on feed grain coming from Fort William or points further west. So eastern farmers also are on the relief list. Let them not forget that; let them not think we in the west are the only recipients of aid. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture and the wheat pools have come to Ottawa on various occasions, and each time I believe they were told that their demands were reasonable and would be given consideration by the government. But that consideration does not put any money into the pocket of the farmer. It does not pay his taxes; it does not buy shoes for the baby, or bread for the family. We must have a little more than consideration. During the time the government has been giving our problems consideration, our debts have been piling up, and no attempt has been made by the government to cut down interest rates on the money we owe in bank loans, mortgages and so forth.

We find also that the cost of machinery has continued to go up. This government held an investigation into that matter; the government of Saskatchewan also looked into it. On one occasion threats were made by the Minister of Agriculture, on behalf of the government, that if the machine companies did not bring down their prices, the government would take drastic action. The response of the machine companies was: one increase during the investigation, another immediately after it, and a number of others since that time, of which I have not kept track. Therefore the government does not mind at all if the farmers' costs go up.

Again, in some provinces, and particularly the province from which I come, attempts were made to ease the burdens of the farmers. But as soon as legislation was put on the statute books for this purpose, it was either done away with by the governor in council or referred to the courts, and there destroyed. If we look back to 1937 we remember that the President of the United States had to take certain action in connection with the supreme court of that country. He could not get his legislation into operation, and had to take action to make way for progressive legislation. I am not sure whether it may not be necessary to resort to action of that kind in this country in the near future.

Looking back over a period of sixty-four or sixty-five years, we find that the average price of wheat at Fort William was $1.17 a bushel, basis No. 1 northern. In the United States I understand the farmers at present are being paid $1.17. That is what they are guaranteed. We are guaranteed 70 cents. The Minister of Agriculture told us that the farmers could not expect to get rich during the first two years of this war. Now we are getting into the third year, and some of us think it is about time we started at least to make our expenses. During the third year

of the first great war the average price of wheat was $2.06 a bushel, basis No. 1 northern at Fort William. As I have said, to-day we are guaranteed 70 cents, or approximately one-third the average price during the third year of the last war. We find that at that time, in the third year of the first great war, we could buy a binder for $167. To-day the same binder costs $347, or more than twice as much as it cost back in 1916. I believe this illustration will serve to show that the farmer has been caught both going and coming.

Conditions are not improving; they are gradually growing worse. At the present time there is a delegation in Ottawa seeking parity prices for agriculture, as well as other things. We wonder why we are not getting treatment similar to that received by other people in Canada. I believe most hon. members will recall that back in 1939 a limit of 5 per cent was placed on profits to be derived from government contracts. Because that was not sufficient for the industrialists, we find an order in council passed in the third week in August of 1939 which destroyed that legislation. To-day labour enjoys the same level of wages as obtained between 1926 and 1929. It has also an additional cost of living bonus. I am not objecting to that. In my opinion the workers are entitled to good pay. They work hard, and I do not object to the pay they receive. But I certainly must object when we as farmers are placed in a position where we have to produce at about half the cost of production. If industry is entitled to a removal of profit restrictions, if labour is entitled to the same wage level as existed between 1926 and 1929, with a cost of living bonus added, then I suggest that surely the farmer is entitled to the same level of prices as existed at that time.

The high price for wheat, basis No. 1 northern, Fort William between 1926 and 1929 was $1.61 a bushel. The average price in that same period was $1.35. Yet, although we have been told on different occasions that we are seeking equality of sacrifice in Canada, we are receiving a guaranteed price of only 70 cents a bushel. We find that in 1937-38 the average price for the year was $1.31⅝ a bushel. Perhaps we would not mind so much if those low prices were necessary. But, looking over some of the literature I have, I am led to the conclusion that it is not necessary. I find this at page 14 of a booklet issued by the Searle Grain company:

> It is interesting to note that one of the most eminent world authorities on the international wheat situation, Mr. Broomhall of London, said in an editorial in the *Corn Trade News* of August 27 as follows:
>
> "Farmers in producing countries would have legitimate cause for complaint if, in creating reserve supplies the price level were allowed to suffer by an artificial disparity between supply and demand."
>
> With Mr. Broomhall's conclusion we most heartily concur, for we all know that the disparity which exists to-day between supply and demand has not been brought about by the free and open market, but is entirely the result of highly artificial conditions.

Again I ask: Why does the government allow that condition to exist? Again, by way of comparison: in 1928 the farmers of Canada received for their wheat crop $441,000,000; and in 1941, even with the addition of the wheat acreage reduction bonus, the prairie farm assistance bonus and the general relief bonus, we receive approximately $150,000,000

The delegation in Ottawa at the present time advocating, as I said before, a higher initial payment for wheat, and other matters along that line, are supported by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the western wheat pools and several other organizations. We find also that the northwest line elevtors' association has sent to the government, on at least two different occasions, briefs advocating an initial price or payment of $1.22½ a bushel basis No. 1 northern, Fort William, and the Searle Grain company advocates $1.20 a bushel.

Some people wonder whether we are entitled to that. I believe we are. As is known, at the present time the government is giving orders for the manufacture of certain war materials, and so forth. The people of Canada will have to pay for those things. They will have to pay the profits to industry, and the high wages now enjoyed by labour. We as farmers either directly or indirectly will pay a large percentage of those costs.

We find that on February 19, 1941, by order in council the government made an agreement with the grain companies whereby their handling and storage charges were guaranteed until the end of July, 1943. Was any such policy laid down or guaranteed to the farmers of Canada? No. In this connection I would add that this was asked for by the grain trade, but was not asked for by the wheat pools of western Canada. The pools were asked to come in on this, but refused to have anything to do with it. To-day the Saskatchewan pool is responsible for a large delegation which, I believe, the government should be ashamed to allow to come here to make its demands known, or try to do something about it.

We are producing food. I do not think there is any need for anybody to complain that that food will not be needed. Prime

Minister Churchill has been quoted in the house on different occasions, and I intend to quote him again. On August 20, 1940, Mr. Winston Churchill said:

> We shall do our best to encourage the building up of reserves of food all over the world so that there will always be held before the eyes of the people of Europe, including the Germans, the certainty that the shattering of nazi power would bring to them all immediate food, freedom and peace.

And the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) on October 18, 1941, said: "Wheat held in reserve constitutes an invaluable war asset." The farmers of Canada are willing to produce. They complain at home, through their members and now by delegation. But we have not found them going on a sit-down strike. They continue to produce, anyway, and they are doing everything possible in the war, even to the extent of sending their last son over there to fight. I know that is true in dozens of instances. Why are we treated in this way? I believe that since the delegation came to Ottawa, it has been successful in meeting the government. I hold in my hand a clipping in point. It appeared in yesterday's Ottawa *Journal,* and states, in part:

> "Renewed, helpful and I believe fruitful consideration" will be given the representations of prairie wheat farmers, Prime Minister Mackenzie King to-day promised four hundred farmer-delegates who came to Ottawa. . . .

And so on. Let us hope that this consideration will be far more fruitful than some of the other things the Prime Minister has attempted in earlier days. We hope that will happen. Then, later in the article:

> Finance Minister Ilsley—he was one of those who heard the farmers' submissions—had to meet financial requirements and consider petitions like that of the wheat growers, with relation to the broad financial needs of a dominion at war, Mr. King added.
>
> The Prime Minister, speaking in confidential manner to the men of the west, said the government had not given any closer attention to any question than agriculture. He felt that Canadian farmers would agree no branch of agriculture had experienced more difficulty than the wheat-growing branch represented by Saskatchewan.

We are to get fruitful consideration.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): We hope the tree bears fruit.

Mr. FAIR: Yes, and that the fruit does not disappear before it reaches the farmer. Both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) agreed that the requests were fair—

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): And reasonable.

[Mr. Fair.]

Mr. FAIR: —and reasonable. It is up to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) to find the money. During the past two and a half years the Minister of Finance has been finding a lot of money, much of which has gone for purposes of destruction. We are also told that we shall be called on for far greater sums. If the Minister of Finance can find money to pay cost-plus to industry and to pay wages, through industry, to labour, he should also make it his business to pay at least the cost of production plus a small profit to the farmers. If the minister has not learned enough about money to know how to do that, I would suggest that we forgo the services of our member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) for a little while so that he may advise the minister how and where he can get this money. The minister, no doubt, has a fountain pen, and he will find out that it will work just as well for the Bank of Canada, to create credit, as it does for the chartered banks.

In the *Western Producer* of January 29, 1942, there are one or two items in a letter in the open forum, which I should like to read. Here is the first one:

> About 1912 the Grain Growers' Association sent a delegation of 400 men to Ottawa to lay our demands before the government of that day. After we had dropped all our bombs, Wilfrid Laurier only talked to them for three minutes and in other words told them to go home and the government would run its own business. In 1920 our demand for a wheat board became so urgent that we built a new political party known as Progressives. Every candidate was pledged to support a wheat board policy when he took his seat in the house at Ottawa. We swept this province (Saskatchewan) clean save for one Liberal (Mr. Motherwell). During the last week of the campaign he figured his seat was slipping so the paper with the people's viewpoint, the *Leader Post,* came out with a front page advertisement: Vote for Motherwell and return of the wheat board. When he got to Ottawa Mackenzie King made him minister of agriculture and he proved to be an enemy to a wheat board. The Progressive party landed in Ottawa after the 1921 election with 64 members, mostly all from the west.
>
> The Liberal high command had seen this storm brewing in the west, so Tom Crerar was sent out in the guise of a believer in this new movement. He led his army right into the battlefield at Ottawa and then deserted us. In the terms of to-day he would be known as a fifth columnist and was just twenty years ahead of King Leopold of Belgium, who also turned his army over to the enemy.

I believe there is one way in which the farmers can get something better than they are getting at the present time. They have been promised consideration for a number of years, but their plight is becoming worse the farther we go along. My suggestion to the

farmers is to organize. During the last election some were quite satisfied to vote for 70-cent wheat, but to-day the farmers of the west are coming here with a petition in the one hand and a hat in the other pleading: "Won't you give us something better?" As soon as they send true representatives here, they will probably get some place. We are not satisfied to-day with 70 cents a bushel for wheat, either on the farm or at Fort William. For some years past the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston) has had a resolution on the order paper asking for 95 cents a bushel, basis one northern, at the local elevator, and he has now a resolution on the order paper reading as follows:

Whereas the prices of farm machinery, all costs of living and farm wages have increased due to the war:

Therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of this house parliament should immediately take such steps as are necessary to ensure the farmers of Canada a fixed price of not less than one dollar ($1) per bushel for number 1 northern wheat at their local elevator for a farmer's delivery quota, as defined by the Canadian Wheat Board.

And to take care of the man who does not have a crop, I have the following resolution on the order paper:

That in the opinion of this house the government should introduce such amendments to the Prairie Farm Assistance Act that it will become a sound crop insurance scheme.

In conclusion, might I suggest that the first duty of any government is to look after the welfare and happiness of its people? In this I believe this government has failed miserably. Since this government came into office in 1935, there have been great numbers of men and women who could not get work, and there are still thousands to-day who cannot get a job. The farmers have been allowed to work, but we cannot get the cost of production. So what is the use of working, some people say. The government has failed to prevent production costs from going up. In view of the fact that farmers directly or indirectly pay most of our Canadian taxes, I think something should be done on their behalf, and done right away.

I believe the government should also take better care of the soldiers of the last war and their dependents, as well as the soldiers of this war and their dependents. I believe a completely new deal should be given the soldiers of the last war who are still labouring under the policies of the Soldier Settlement Board. I shall deal with this later.

There are several other matters I should like to mention, but I have not the time to-night. I would, however, ask that the organized farmers' representatives be given a place on all boards having to do with farmers' problems, and when I say "organized farmers", I do not mean that any political party friend, whether or not he is a success on his own, should be given a place on these boards.

Parity prices for wheat and all other farm products should be guaranteed, and there should be an amendment to the Prairie Farm Assistance Act to provide a sound crop insurance scheme, which is badly needed. In addition, I believe that the Winnipeg grain exchange should be closed because it is a gambling den that has no place in Canada to-day.

All these things and more can be done by making proper use of our financial system, whereby credit and currency will be issued in terms of public need, as advocated by the Prime Minister prior to the 1935 election when he said:

A national central bank is necessary in order that currency and credit may be made available in terms of public need to meet the domestic and industrial requirements of the Canadian people.

If ever that time has arrived, it is now. The farmers of Canada are not asking for charity and do not want it. All we want is treatment equal to that given to other Canadians, and we must be granted that treatment. We cannot have Canadian unity, so often pleaded for by the Prime Minister and others in this house, as long as one section of the population feasts while another goes hungry. Hitler of Germany must be licked at all costs. But we have Hitlers in Canada who must also be licked if the Canadian people are to enjoy to the fullest the liberties to which we are entitled and the abundance at our disposal.

Mr. G. A. McLEAN (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, the debate on the motion before the house has now continued for about eight days. But, as I am sure hon. members will agree that nobody has shown less inclination than I have to prolong debate or to indulge in tiresome and vain repetition, I am impelled on this occasion to crave your indulgence, sir, and that of the house while I try to give expression to a few thoughts.

The first words I would utter would be words of tribute to our fellow citizens who at our call and on our behalf have undertaken the heavy, heavy task of combat—the men of the army, the navy, the merchant marine, the air force, and the women of the nursing services. This is not the place, I know, where hon. members are wont to give expression to their deepest feelings, and I am not going to indulge in heroics, but I do think it is due to these valiant men and women that from our place

as members of the parliament of their country we tell them, not once, or twice, that we remember them; that we recognize that the task laid on them is different, very different in kind from that of all others. I believe that the words which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) used in this house on May 20, 1940, could well be repeated time and again. He said, as reported at page 49 of *Hansard* of that year:

> Everything that we can do, every help that we can give, every contribution that we can make, every comfort, great or small, that we must surrender is as a grain of sand compared with the treasure which they offer on the altar of humanity.

Or the words of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), spoken when he was Minister of Finance. I do not remember whether it was when he was delivering the budget speech or the speech on the war appropriation bill, but on some such occasion he gave expression to words which I have never forgotten, and which I think should be heard and remembered throughout the war by every citizen of Canada. I am not sure that I can recall the exact words, but they were to this effect, "I shall not disgrace the word 'sacrifice' by applying it to anything save the gift of life itself."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McLEAN (Simcoe East): I wish, Mr. Speaker, that it were possible for the response to those words from every corner of the house to be heard by every member of our armed forces, wherever he or she may be found. I wish it were possible that they could penetrate to those who are languishing in prison camps and in hospitals far across the sea. For those who have passed forever beyond the reach of all human expression, we can only offer tribute to their memory, and to the homes from which they have gone, sympathy, for which I shall not try to find words.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the question of the method of enlistment for service in our armed forces overseas should have become a contentious one. I believe that this question has been magnified out of all proportion to its importance. There is no use, however, in indulging in vain regrets over what we would like to have had; we must take the facts as they are. I am bound to recognize that, in the words of the speech from the throne, our war effort is being impaired by controversy raging over what has now become a contentious question. Up to date I have refrained from discussing this question either in Ottawa or in my own riding. I have felt that no good could come from my stirring up questions on which people were likely to have sharp differenees of opinion. During my election campaign I intentionally and resolutely kept it from being made an issue in my riding, largely for the sake of the character of the riding. I thought it would have been unfair, perhaps unfair to my opponent, if I had tried to make that an issue in my riding. But I must confess that, in common with nearly all members of both Liberal and Conservative parties, I am bound by the speeches which were made by the leaders of both these two parties prior to the last election. It is under these circumstances that I wish to take a few minutes to make my position clear to the members of the house and to my constituents.

I want to say a word first about the compulsory selective service in connection with civilian occupations. I am only going to touch on it, because I do not think there is very much difference of opinion, certainly on the principle. As the Prime Minister pointed out, authority for this was given by the National Resources Mobilization Act. The only question is how soon, in what manner, and to what extent that ought to be put into effect. Personally, I think that prompt action should be taken. In my section, as in many others, the farmers are having a very difficult time. I find men enlisting from some of our factories whom I think it would have been better to keep in the factories. On the other hand, I even know of toolmakers—mechanics who are perhaps scarcest of all—who during the depression went out to operate little farms and are still on those farms. As I say, I am not going to dwell on this question, but I shall await with great interest the statement which I expect we shall hear from the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) as to the plan he has in mind. I would suggest this, however, that the temporary postponement in connection with farm help is not sufficient and not satisfactory. A farmer must be able to plan his work somewhat ahead. There are some farms where population is fairly large though they are not very good farms and not producing very much. On the other hand, there are very good large farms where production is very high; the farm is well operated, but help very, very scarce. The same treatment should not be given in both those cases; and I do not think it is possible for a man in the office of the district registrar to deal with these; I think there ought to be somebody closer to the farmer, closer to the community, in a better position to judge of the circumstances surrounding each case. As I have said, however, nearly everything I have

to say on this question is merely repetition, and I do not want to weary the house by repeating what has already been said better than I can say it.

Coming to the question of compulsory service for the armed forces overseas, I always have believed and I still believe that the voluntary system is best. I have listened with great attention to the arguments of those who take a different view. I respect their opinion, and I do not for one moment question their sincerity, but, for reasons which I shall give, I still retain my preference for the voluntary system.

Having said this, however, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the preservation of our country and our empire, freedom, everything which is now in imminent peril, must be placed before any and all other considerations; and if and when, in my judgment, based on facts which become apparent to me or on information that I receive from those I consider best able to judge, whether inside or outside the cabinet, I consider the time has come when we can more effectively prosecute the war by compulsory enlistment for overseas in our combatant forces, I shall not hesitate to change my position and shall support it. Because I want to be free to take that changed position if and when circumstances warrant it, I am in favour of a plebiscite by which the people will free me and the government from the solemn pledge given under very different circumstances.

I am in favour of the voluntary system because of the effectiveness of the army itself. After all, victory is what we want—victory in a fight. All considerations of what is fair or logical must be subordinated to that—victory in a fight.

Our army must be trained, it must be well equipped, it must be given arms and munitions, and all that. But after you have trained it, supplied it with equipment, and given it proper leadership, it still has to fight; and it seems to me that in our discussion far too little consideration has been given to the fact that the men have to face the terror, the horror, the bloodshed and the violence of battle. They must face dismemberment and even death, and still go on and fight and fight and win victory. That takes something that is simply not in the coward; it takes something that is simply not in the slacker; it takes something that is simply not in the sort of man of whom I have heard some member speak, the man who says, "I am willing to go, but I am going to wait until the government tells me." It is not in the type of man or the man who hangs around for a year or more trying to get a commission or some other preferment.

I speak from experience as a private soldier in a Canadian infantry battalion, and as a platoon commander and company commander in a British regiment, commanding both volunteers and forced recruits; and I say that when a unit finds itself in a desperate position, its members do not want to feel that, scattered among them or supporting them on their flanks, are men who have had to be forced to fight. They want to feel that they are supported by men who are imbued with the same spirit as themselves, men who will come promptly, quickly and voluntarily when their country calls them.

When men tell me that because I am in favour of the voluntary system as against the compulsory I am not true, not loyal to the men who are at the front, I sometimes wonder whether these people have any conception of the sort of job we have given these men to do. We admit that as far as the air force and the navy are concerned, and especially the air force, we shall not have compulsion. Why? Well, I suppose it is because it is thought that men in the air force should be of the very highest type of valour and daring. Will any man tell me, however, that of the humblest private soldier who carries a rifle and bayonet into battle there is not going to be demanded the utmost in the way of human valour and endurance? And those qualities are required in a much higher degree in this war in which men are acting very much on their own—much more so than in the last war when to a large extent men fought in large masses.

I have heard it said by some members of the house that the voluntary system has been a failure. I do not admit it. I cannot give exact figures to date, but I believe that between 400,000 and 430,000 men have volunteered in the various armed forces for service in any part of the world. I believe that during last year somewhere between 150,000 and 180,000 men similarly volunteered. These were accepted in both cases, after those were rejected who were unfit physically or otherwise. I have not the total figures for my own riding, but I have approximate figures for my own home town, of between nine and ten thousand. In that town almost if not quite 800 men have voluntarily enlisted and been accepted for active service in the various branches of the armed forces. Of these, 200 at least are now overseas and about 200 in the air force.

But, Mr. Speaker, if enlistment has not been all that some might have expected, I do not put the blame for this on the young men of the country. I do not, I cannot, and I never will believe that our men are so lacking in

patriotism that they will not respond when their native land and the native land of their fathers is in peril, if that call is made clearly and in a proper manner to them.

A number of factors have militated against enlistment. In the first place, in some districts there was quite a long delay before the local non-permanent active militia units were mobilized. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that a different system was adopted in this war from that which was followed in the last war—and a much better one. In the last war units were mobilized without identification except for a number, and men were enlisted in them from all over the province. In this war the late Minister of National Defence, Mr. Rogers, instituted the system of retaining the identity of the non-permanent active militia units in the establishments of the active force in order to preserve the county spirit, the town spirit, the regimental spirit in the active overseas units. That was a good idea. But the necessary result was, of course, that in some districts men waited sometimes months and more than a year before their unit was mobilized. They waited with a good deal of impatience, and many men lost a good deal of the zeal and fervour with which they were imbued when the call to arms first came.

I remember very well the situation in the counties of Grey and Simcoe. The Grey-Simcoe Foresters were mobilized finally as a unit of the 4th division. These men pleaded with members to ask the Minister of National Defence that they be mobilized. They begged for months and months to have this done. The same thing happened in connection with many other units, and this was one of the factors that did have an effect on enlistment.

Another feature was the opinion, pretty commonly held before and for some time after the war, that because of a change in the nature of warfare it was very unlikely that there would be any occasion to send a large expeditionary force overseas—not as a matter of policy at all, but as a matter of war strategy, or whatever the proper military term is. There was also the idea that Canada was to be the arsenal of the empire, and that idea naturally turned men's minds to the duty they owed the country to remain in the occupations in which they found themselves, agricultural or industrial.

I have heard the suggestion that the government itself did not give that clarion call for enlistment to arms which it might have given. I am not going to enter upon any debate on that point, but I do say that the Minister of National Defence, the Prime Minister, and others, did make very strong appeals which I thought did not receive the attention and the publicity in headlines in various sections of the press which they might have been given.

Be that as it may, however, there were other voices in influential positions which did not speak in the accents that we heard in 1914. Let me give an example. The president of one of our large universities was reported, shortly after the war broke out, to have advised his students not to be in a hurry to enlist, but to finish their courses. I am not saying he was wrong, but I cannot help contrasting that with the attitude adopted by the president of the great university of Toronto in the autumn of 1914. I well recall how Sir Robert, then Doctor Falconer, called his students together in the autumn of 1914. He did not speak to them of the value to themselves or the country of their academic career or the places they were going to fill in civilian life. He put the issue clearly before them; he told them that they, of all classes, owed more to the country and to the way of life that was threatened, and he pointed out very clearly and forcefully that to them first of all the call to arms came. And how they responded! The voice was different from that of 1939. They enlisted in very large numbers. There was no waiting for commissions; there was none of that. Scores of them never came back, and of those who did very many never realized aspirations of their student days. There are hon. members of this house who were members of the classes of 1914, 1915, 1916, and I am sure there is nothing of which they are more proud than the lead given by their president in those days and the way in which those men responded to it.

Another feature is the popularity of two branches of the armed service—the navy and the air force. Someone may say that this is not an important matter, but I think it is. Men in the navy and the air force have been in action much sooner than those in the army, and naturally ardent youth is more anxious to get into the branches which are in action first. I suppose there is something more spectacular about those two branches. If all those who have been waiting to enlist in the air force and the navy should be added to those who have enlisted in the army, the figures would look very much better.

While speaking of that, I want to compliment the Minister of National Defence very highly upon what I understand is a proposal to give a dress uniform to the men of the army. I sincerely trust no single voice will be raised against that on account of the expense. The battle-dress no doubt is a

splendid dress for battle, but it must be admitted that it is not a dressy uniform; it looks rather slouchy and does not do justice to the men when they are on the streets of our towns and villages. It is not fair that when men of the air force or of the navy come home for a week-end and go out to some social function, they have smart, neat-looking uniforms of which they are proud, while the poor chap in the army has to wear this slouchy-looking battle-dress. When men come out of our factories and off the farms or out of the mines and attend some social function, they can take off their working clothes and put on a collar and tie and a neat suit; and if civilians can afford to dress up in that way, I hope there will be no voice raised against the expense of giving to these men who are going to fight our battles a dress of which they may be proud and which will encourage them to hold their heads higher when they are off duty.

There is another factor which has had a great deal of influence on recruiting. Ever since the first voice was raised in this house—on the eve of a recruiting campaign, as it was—calling for conscription; and as that voice was taken up by the press, by public speakers and, in some instances I am told, even by military officers assigned to the duty of recruiting, the chilly, deadening effect of that cry was felt on recruiting from coast to coast. It was felt in every meeting called for the purpose of organizing recruiting campaigns. I am sure every hon. member who has had anything to do with trying to assist in recruiting knows the truth of that statement.

It was my privilege some two or three months ago to attend a dinner meeting. The auspices were very favourable. We were in a comfortable room, had a splendid guest speaker; there was a large and expectant audience. The speaker had recently returned from England, and he gave one of the most magnificent addresses to which I have ever listened. He told of the valour of the people of Britain, the suffering of the men, women and children, the magnificent organization of all resources; all these things were pictured in words that held that audience thrilled. I was sitting near the back of the room looking over that audience, and among them were quite a number of men of military age who were not in uniform—business men, professional men. As that speaker told of the marvellous fight that the people of Britain were putting up for us, I fancy that some of those young men felt a little uncomfortable; I fancy they were beginning to give pretty serious consideration to where their duty lay. The speaker ended that wonderful address with a strong appeal. What was the appeal? Was it an appeal to those men to get into uniform? Not at all. He ended with a strong statement that the responsibility of deciding who should go into the army should be laid on the government of the country. I fancy those young men settled back into their comfortable chairs a little more comfortably when the responsibility was taken from their own conscience and placed on some other body.

What, in effect, are all these voices saying? To the young man to whom the call of his country, the voice of duty, is strong and insistent, the voice which he is about to obey, they are saying, "That stern voice of duty with which you have been wrestling for the last few days or weeks is not the voice to which you should listen. Wait; wait; we are going to create another voice. We are going to put a man-made law on the statute books of your country, and that is the voice to which you are to listen. Never mind about that voice which calls you, that powerful impulse in the life of every young man; never mind that; that is not the voice. Let us have another authority; wait until that man-made law is put upon the statute books of your country."

I am not sitting in judgment on any other man; I respect the opinion of every other man, and I would be the last to impute any improper motives. I know that many of my friends who want conscription are actuated, as I am, by the very highest and best patriotic motives. But I say that during the last year, in so far as the voices of which I have been speaking have had the effect I indicate, they have sinned against the spirit of a whole generation.

I recall some twenty-six years ago, Mr. Speaker, getting into conversation with an old shepherd up in the highlands of Scotland, where I had gone to spend ten days leave and to look up some relatives. During the course of our conversation the question of compulsory service came up, since that legislation had been enacted only recently. The old shepherd said to me, "As far as yon village is concerned, and all up the glen, we are not subject to the draft." I was puzzled for a moment, until I realized what I ought to have known, that in this particular region, where men had always sprung to arms at the first call, whether of king or of clan, long before compulsory service had been considered every able-bodied man had joined the colours. No wonder the blood in German veins often ran chill when they learned that across from them was the famous 51st Highland division! That is the class of man we need in our armed forces if we are to achieve victory.

As I have said, if and when I am convinced that we must have compulsory service, I will support it; but I know that in my riding, as in many ridings, there are families that will not be subject to the draft; and it is my hope that in my riding, as in many ridings throughout the country, there may be whole communities whose men already will have answered the higher call of duty, without waiting for the draft. I believe with all my heart that in peace or war the motive behind all heroic or unselfish action is not the compulsion of man-made law but the more compelling force of noble impulses, which are the natural gift of youth; and I have not lost faith, as I will never lose faith, that the young men of our country, when the call is put to them clearly and properly, will respond in sufficient numbers to fill up every establishment that may be decided upon by the Department of National Defence in order to carry on the war. I must say, however, that I do object most strenuously to making synonymous total war and compulsory training for overseas service. These are made synonymous by many public speakers and in the press. I am not in favour of compulsory service for overseas, yet I take second place to no man in my desire that Canada should prosecute the war to the very fullest extent possible.

In the short time left to me, I want to deal with a matter that is rather distasteful. I have tried to make my position clear to the house and to the people of my riding. I have not been driven to do so by the gibes or threats of any newspaper; nor have I refrained from doing so until now because of the motives which have been attributed to me, and to all other Liberal members from Ontario, by a Toronto newspaper. I heard the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) give the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe), I think it was, some good advice on one occasion. He said no one should ever get into an argument with a newspaper, who does not own one. Well, I do not own a newspaper, and I am not going to get into an argument with one. As a matter of fact, I have every reason to possess a high regard for the press. In my riding we are fortunate in having a very high-class weekly press. One weekly newspaper is edited by a life-long Conservative, a good friend of mine, who nearly always opposes me in politics, but I want to say that the news items in that newspaper are always absolutely reliable. That man would no more think of selling coloured news to his readers than an honest merchant would think of selling contaminated food to his customers; and the editorials appearing in that newspaper, though they usually disagree with the leader and members of the party to which I belong, are always fair argument.

I would that the same standard of journalism characterized some of the daily newspapers which serve our section of the country. For some time past the Toronto *Globe and Mail* has contained offensive references to Liberal members, culminating on December 12, 1941, in this article:

> There are 82 Ontario seats in the dominion House of Commons. Fifty-seven of these are occupied by Liberals. Not one of these Liberals has yet risen to lay before the house the clearly revealed opinion of his constituents on this all important question of compulsory selective service. This is a shocking state of affairs. We all know very well that Mr. King is cooking up some emasculated form of mobilization ingeniously contrived to appease, palliate and placate some without offending others. We all know that, true to his long established technique of enforcing party discipline, he is holding over the members' heads a number of unfulfilled appointments which each of his followers thinks he has a chance of filling. There are vacancies in the Senate; there is a rumoured shuffling of the cabinet, there are committees needing paid chairmen, and commissions whose members have not yet been named. The carrot is being held before the nose of the donkey as an inducement to that greedy and fatuous animal to walk soberly in the straight and narrow path of political opportunism.

I might indulge in an angry, recriminatory attack on that newspaper, but I am not going to do so. I am too much in earnest to adopt any such course; but I do say that every hon. member possessed of a spark of self respect; every hon. member who prizes the good opinion of his friends and his countrymen as to the integrity of his intentions, public as well as private; every hon. member who has a proper conception of the duty he owes to maintain the reputation as well as the character of the institution in which his people have honoured him with membership, every such member has not only the right but the duty to make an indignant protest against such an editorial. I heartily agree with the desirability of preserving political independence, and hon. members know full well that there have been ample evidences of it in this house. Members of both the Conservative and Liberal parties have repeatedly voted against their parties without being disciplined for so doing. Every hon. member knows, as our constituents may not know, that the popular characterization of a party whip is simply grotesque. I need not repeat the duties of the whip; hon. members know them. One of the duties of a party whip is to assist Mr. Speaker, after consultation with the other whips, in the orderly arrangement of debates in the house. He has minor duties

to perform, such as seating and office arrangements, and he also performs the very important duty of acting as liaison between private members and the cabinet. He keeps the cabinet informed as to the views of hon. members on various questions, something which cannot always be done between caucuses, and cannot always be done even at caucuses, when the membership is very large. I hold that the popular characterization of a party whip is simply grotesque, and it is unfortunate that once in a while even hon. members in the house, quite innocently I think, will slip into the jargon of the street and talk about the crack of the party whip, thus giving force to the opinion popularly held.

One word more about party independence. Political independence is an important, a precious thing. But let me say to people outside the house, and to the newspaper in question, something which hon. members know quite well, that political independence, like all precious coins, has its counterfeit. Sometimes it is difficult for the public to distinguish between the genuine and the fake. There are times when it takes a good deal more courage on the part of a member to vote for his party than to rise in his place and vote against it. Every hon. member knows that.

There may be, and there are times when the position of a party is sound and wise; but considerations of passing popular public opinion, considerations of the safety of a member in his own riding at the next election, and consideration of the desirability of laudation of headlines in the newspapers—all these things make it a great deal easier, and indeed offer quite a temptation to vote against one's party. There you have the false, the fraud; there you have the counterfeit.

And, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the metaphorical donkey and carrot, let me point out that there is more than one kind of carrot which is supposed to make the teeth of the donkey water. I am not so sure that the editor of the paper in question, or the news editor or the gentleman who arranges the headlines, has not a few carrots stuck away in his pocket which he thinks are very, very sweet to the palate of certain politicians. He does not just hold them before the nose of the animal; he feeds them to him. And he does not feed them in half-pint measures, either; he feeds them in bushel basketfuls. In fact, I think sometimes he feeds them in such large doses that the effect must be somewhat nauseating to the creature to whom it is fed.

My time is almost up, but before resuming my seat I should like to refer to one other editorial in this paper. I shall not take time to read it all; the general public has read the editorial to which the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette) referred last night. Speaking about the speech of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) in the house, the editorial states:

> And he was rewarded for his effort by some of the most disgraceful evidence of petty political spleen that the house has ever witnessed. After such an episode it is hard to have much respect for parliament.

Lest I might seem to be prejudiced, I should like to say that I have the very highest regard; indeed I have reason to have the very highest regard for the hon. member for Parkdale. I want to pay this tribute to him. I was a little annoyed when, in his first speech he suggested a change in leadership; but I have not formed my opinion of him because of the speeches he has made in the house. I have formed my opinion from the work he did in a committee on which I served. I know the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) and the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Macmillan), who was chairman of the committee, will agree with me when I say that although the committee was one in connection with the activities of which this member might have been expected to have had a great deal to say, the attitude of the hon. member for Parkdale was most modest and helpful. No member on the committee did more to assist in having its work carried on successfully and free from party bias than did the hon. member for Parkdale. That is my opinion of the hon. member who made the speech to which reference is made in the newspaper editorial. I pay him that tribute, because I do not want anyone to think that when I take objection to the editorial, I have any feeling against him.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland): Why did you not keep him on that committee?

Mr. McLEAN (Simcoe East): He is still on the committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The committee is dead.

Mr. HOMUTH: The government ought to be.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Oh, no.

Mr. McLEAN (Simcoe East): The man who wrote this editorial knew perfectly well that the actions of the Prime Minister and other Liberal members in the house did not constitute an insult to parliament. I was not in the house when that speech was delivered—and no one has a higher regard than I have for the hon. member. As a matter of fact, very

often when he is about to deliver a speech, in order that I may hear him better I go to the other side of the chamber and stand behind the curtains, so that I may be in front of him when he is speaking.

Since the last election in my constituency there have been practically no Liberals or Conservatives, as such. The people there work together. They do Red Cross work, act on committees for the sale of bonds and war savings certificates, and on committees for recruiting—Liberals and Conservatives together. None work harder on those committees than some who at election times oppose me. I would hang my head in abject shame if I were to go back to that riding knowing that the people believed that the conduct of this house and the motives actuating the members were such as depicted in the *Globe and Mail* of Toronto.

We may be a mediocre lot. God help us, I know we are. When I am no longer a candidate for my constituency I hope the Liberal party in that constituency will be able to persuade the very best, most honest, capable and respected Liberal in the riding to accept the nomination. At the next election I hope the Conservative party will be able to choose as our opponent the most capable, honest and upright among their group in the constituency of Simcoe East. I should like that no matter who is elected, the people in that constituency will have confidence that they are well represented in the House of Commons. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be able to persuade such men to run for office; they will not do it, if they believe that the conduct of the House of Commons and the motives which actuate members are such as have been depicted week after week, week after week by the *Globe and Mail*. No, you will not be able to get such men to enter politics.

I endeavour not to be angry, but I do plead with that paper: Write as strong editorials as you like, either in favour of or against any policy; condemn the action of any man you think is wrong; but, in the name of democracy, which has been falling in country after country, country after country, and which is falling into disregard even in our own country, do not continue to aid and abet those who hold democracy in contempt and who unintentionally, if not intentionally, are doing their utmost to banish democracy from our country.

I should like in closing to quote one paragraph written by a man whom I am proud to call a fellow townsman. I refer to Doctor Stephen Leacock, late of McGill university who, in the Canadian *Spokesman* of January, 1941, wrote an article which I commend to all hon. members. I commend it particularly to his very dear friends and admirers in my own riding which has been his home all his life, although he has journeyed down to McGill university every winter to give his students there the benefit of his wisdom. He is speaking of "The whole duty of a citizen," and says:

> With all this in mind the word at the moment is "my country right or wrong." It may be a poor maxim in peace time but in war time there's nothing like it. Turn yourself into a pig-headed patriot and support all those in authority without criticism or quibble. If our Prime Minister and cabinet are not the biggest men in Canada, I'm going to think so till the end of the war anyway. After that I can turn back into a Conservative and look for some fun again.

He ends up with these words:

> There it stands. To submit and to obey: To pay gladly: To applaud the brave: To honour the fallen, to aid and comfort those bereft. In that lies a united nation. You and I can at least be a humble part of it.

Mr. A. R. ADAMSON (York West): Mr. Speaker, I should like first to congratulate the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. McLean) who has just taken his seat. I am not sure, but I believe it was his maiden speech in this house; and while I disagreed with almost every part of it, I should like to congratulate him on the excellence of his presentation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make myself clear. I oppose this plebiscite with every power at my command. Bad as is government by order in council; bad as is government by a vast majority; bad as is a government by statements to the press and over the radio, nothing can compare in infamy with the dodging of responsibility by the method of the plebiscite. After hearing and reading the impassioned speeches of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) against Prussianism and dictatorships, it is indeed a revelation to find that same Prime Minister going to the dictators for his inspiration, because, while the plebiscite is not and never has been a recognized institution in the realm of democracy and parliamentary government, it has been a most effective weapon wielded upon frequent occasions by the dictators in the past ten years, and an instrument which usually the dictators have been able to use to their own advantage. "Eine Volk, Eine Land, Eine Reich, Eine Fuehrer—Vote Ja —Heil Hitler!"—have been the methods Hitler used to settle matters in Germany.

The time has long passed when compulsory selective service for any part of the world has been of paramount necessity. This parliament should have enacted the necessary legislation after Dunkirk and the fall of France. The

need now is even more imperative than ever. It is possible that it may already be too late. I believe that the declaration of war on Germany should have been preceded by a selective service act. Had this been done, all the trouble, all the bitterness, yes and all the violence that we may yet see would have been avoided. If there is one thing the last war has taught us it is that there can be no half measures in waging war. This war has also shown us that half measures mean defeat, degradation, humiliation and the infestation of our country by the enemy. Let it not be said of us in this House of Commons that we were incapable of seeing and doing our duty.

There is at present before this house a bill advocating a distinctive national flag for Canada. If we lose this war, we shall have a new flag, but it will contain the swastika or the rising sun of Japan. If this war is won for us, and the other united nations consider that we have not done our full part, they may themselves decide on alterations in the flag of Canada, and the alteration may contain the stars and stripes or some other emblem. Let us be worthy of the flag we have before talking about getting a new one.

While considering Canadian nationalism and basking in the Statute of Westminster, it might be interesting to see what other nations think of us. We have heard much talk about Canadian-United States unity. Let us see what is happening in the United States this month, February, 1942. On February 16 a large number, several millions of men, are required to report to the United States authorities for service with the United States armed forces anywhere in the world. My United States friends tell me that there are over 400,000 Canadians registered in the United States, and they estimate that over 100,000 more have failed for various reasons to register. A high percentage of Canadian citizens in the United States are single men of military age, and it has been estimated that between 30,000 and 40,000 Canadian citizens will find themselves in one or other of the vulnerable categories, and that half of them will be in category A 1. I am informed by United States friends that this means single men who would be in our medical category A, men who are not employed on work of national importance. Probably some 15,000 to 20,000 Canadians will find themselves called on February 16 to join the armed forces of the country which gives them protection, namely, the United States of America. What a fine position for a great sovereign nation like Canada to be in! We are unwilling to call up our own nationals inside Canada, but our realist neighbours the Americans have no hesitation in calling up our nationals resident in their country. In this war the United States is not a safe place to be.

The normal procedure under international law is to give allied nationals the option of serving with their own forces, if they can join up with them. However, the terms of service must be similar. The Canadian army is better paid than the United States army, and dependents' allowances and other advantages are granted in the Canadian armed forces. A number of Canadians caught in the United States draft might therefore elect to serve in the Canadian armed forces. Unless, however, we have conscription for overseas service, the terms of service in the United States army are much more onerous than in the Canadian army under the National Resources Mobilization Act. Our good friends the Americans know this and, I feel sure, will not look with favour on Canadians called for service in the United States anywhere in the world who elect to join the Canadian army for service in Canada only. As one Washington reporter put it to me, "We are not going to let your men shirk their responsibilities and return to Canada and become home defence units." He called them "campfire cuddlers." Is it a great thing to be a Canadian; or is it?

I now come to the reasons why I so strongly advocate the course I do.

The recent announcement as to the Canadian army to be formed overseas is of great interest. It, however, cannot come as much of a surprise to anyone who has given any thought to the problem, nor can it, in the light of the situation in the Pacific, be considered excessive. Indeed, in comparison with the efforts put forward by our sister dominions of Australia and New Zealand, it is very meagre.

I am pleased to see, however, that the government has followed very closely the formations I recommended in a speech made in this house on May 8 last, as reported at page 2687 of *Hansard*. I suggested, in the light of the battle of Greece, that we needed:

> . . . four infantry divisions, and with each division a complete armoured brigade and complete artillery units. Besides that, I suggest that we need two complete armoured divisions. We must be able to maintain in Canada in training complete reinforcements for these formations, assuming an annual wastage of one-third. That I submit is, in the light of recent events, the minimum commitment that we can be called upon to complete.

That was last May. I went on to discuss what this would mean in man-power, and I estimated an active army overseas of 200,000 men. Add to these the air force and the navy, 100,000, and you will have an overseas force

of approximately 300,000. With the exception that I suggested an armoured brigade with each infantry division, and the proposal now is for two armoured brigades with the infantry army corps of three infantry divisions, my proposals in May, 1941, and the government's proposal of January, 1942, are identical, the tragic difference being that the government waited nine months to give birth to its plan, a plan which must now be considered to impose but a light burden indeed on our man-power, because it will require enlistments of but between six and seven thousand a month for the army.

The present situation, which has mobilized every able-bodied man, woman and child in Australia, calls for equally drastic action from Canada. A force such as the Canadian army, small as it is in comparison with those of the other belligerents of the united powers, will call for an even greater force on the home front and in the munitions factories. It is because of the necessity of maintaining a proper balance between the fighter in the field and the fighter in the factory that I so strongly recommend compulsory selective service.

From the military angle, in the middle of October, 1941, we were unable to supply even the small number of men needed to provide first reinforcements for two battalions sent to Hong Kong without including 138 men who had not received their full advanced training.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend makes that statement, but he knows perfectly well that there were plenty of trained men in Canada for that duty. Nobody knows that better than he does.

Mr. ADAMSON: Is the minister suggesting that there were trained men available and they were not sent?

Mr. RALSTON: Certainly I am suggesting there were trained men; and my hon. friend knows it, too.

Mr. ADAMSON: Well, why were they not sent?

Mr. RALSTON: That is a matter which is to be discussed and inquired into. But my hon. friend makes the statement that there were not trained men. He knows better. An officer in his position particularly—

Mr. ADAMSON: Then why were they not sent?

Mr. RALSTON: I say that that is a matter to be inquired into. It has nothing to do with the incorrectness of the statement which my hon. friend made a moment ago.

[Mr. Adamson.]

Mr. ADAMSON: The minister said in his own speech that there were required for overseas duties these reinforcements, and that 138 were below the standard.

Mr. RALSTON: I did not say that there were not trained men in Canada, which is what my hon. friend said a moment ago. And he knows better.

Mr. ADAMSON: Well, then, there were trained men, but they were not sent.

Mr. RALSTON: Exactly. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMSON: Very well—

Mr. HANSELL: That makes it all the worse.

Mr. ADAMSON: Then I just want to say that there must have been a great shortage of men if for that small force 138 were sent who had not completed their training.

Mr. RALSTON: I say that my hon. friend knows himself that there were trained men.

Mr. ADAMSON: If they had been available they would have been sent.

Mr. RALSTON: That is matter for an investigation. I am asking my hon. friend if he does not know himself that there were 138 active trained men available in No. 2 district. I will let him say yes or no.

Mr. ADAMSON: Then they would have been sent.

Mr. RALSTON: Will my hon. friend answer that question? He does not have to if he does not want to. The important thing is that he says there were not trained men, when there were.

Mr. ADAMSON: Well, I am amazed at the minister making that statement.

On January 29, 1942, the minister stated that 10,000 had volunteered for the active army during the month of January, 500 of whom had volunteered the previous day. It is obvious that this great increase in enlistments, gratifying as it is, must seriously congest the training centres, trade schools, and other military establishments for the training of troops. Accommodation is at a premium, and the duties of military instructors will no doubt be severely taxed.

The situation, therefore, is that in October we could not raise a small number of reinforcements for two battalions without including a number of untrained men, and in January our training establishments are overcrowded because of the glut of enlistments. Surely this house must realize that to have called men up on a scientific basis, as they

were needed, would have been the most efficient way to handle the military man-power required.

In this connection, I quote the experience of the United States armed forces where General Lewis B. Hershey called on Secretary Henry L. Stimson and Secretary Frank Knox to wind up all recruiting of volunteers for the army, navy and marine corps and rely entirely on selective service. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will quote the dispatch:

"America faces the disruption and dislocation of its supply of essential man-power," General Hershey contended.

The army suspended recruiting in December but resumed subsequently after congress had lowered the limit for selective service to 20 years rather than 18 as favoured by the war department.

In his letter he said the appeal for volunteers had lured skilled men from vital production jobs.

General Hershey asserted also that recruiting services were building up a belief that volunteers would be favoured in the military service and commented "such practices are not conducive to good morals."

"An appropriate agency of government should decide where the individual could best serve his nation in total war, rather than leave the decision to the individual who is not a free agent in the matter of such choice," General Hershey contended. He proposed that the recruiting of volunteers be brought to an end gradually to avoid difficulties.

A complete parallel of the position we find ourselves in is to be found in New Zealand where in 1938 the Labour party was elected to power, one of its pledges being "no conscription." In 1940, after the fall of Dunkirk, public opinion became so alarmed that the government of our sister dominion very wisely altered its stand on this question and brought in the national service emergency regulations. These were passed on the 18th of June, 1940, and made public on the 24th of June, 1940. All voluntary enlistments ceased on the 22nd of July, 1940, except in the Royal New Zealand Navy and Royal New Zealand Air Force. The ballot system was introduced for all men between the ages of twenty-one and forty-five, and the bill enacting this measure passed the New Zealand house without a seriously dissenting voice.

As an example of what a small country, whose population is but 1,636,000, can do, I should like to quote the following figures for the record, taken from the New Zealand *War Record,* an official publication of the government printing office, Wellington, New Zealand: After two years of war, that is in December, 1941. New Zealand had 80,000 men on active service, overseas or in training, 138,000 for home defence enlisted on conditions somewhat similar to our reserve army—

Mr. RALSTON: I have been endeavouring to get the figures about New Zealand. Will the hon. member give the source of them? Are they from the New Zealand handbook?

Mr. ADAMSON: Yes. This book I have is issued by the director of publicity, Wellington, New Zealand, 1941, and as far as I can judge it is an authentic government document.

Mr. RALSTON: I am not suggesting that it is not.

Mr. ADAMSON: Ninety-five thousand enlisted in civil defence units, making a total of 313,000. Besides this, she had 33,000 applications for enlistment in the air force, of whom 13,500 are, or were at the end of two years of war, actually serving in the Royal New Zealand Air Force. Her operational and air crews overseas were 4,300, as well as 6,000 men volunteered for the navy—4,000 of whom were serving in the New Zealand navy in September as well as 1,000 more New Zealanders in the Royal Navy. To recapitulate: 80,000 active service army overseas or in training; 138,000 home defence units—reserve army; 13,500 air force; 5,000 navy. Total military personnel, 236,500 at the end of September. To this must be added 95,000 in civil defence units, bringing the total for this gallant country, whose population is but one-eighth of ours, to the magnificent figure of 331,000. This was of the date of September, 1941.

New Zealand is, however, not an industrial nation, there being but 11,000 persons engaged directly in munitions manufacture. Therefore it would be unfair to say that on the basis of comparative population Canada's contribution should be 2,650,000 men. It is just this sort of argument and petty mental arithmetic that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) uses when he takes the Canadian enlistments and multiplies by ten to show what the United States army should be compared with ours. You cannot apply the multiplication table to the raising of armies. That is not the way in which an army is raised, and it is this sort of dangerous oversimplification that causes so much ill-feeling and misunderstanding. The way to consider Canada's war effort is to see to it that every man will be called upon to do the job he is most capable of doing. Surely there is no disagreement with that statement.

The unfairness of the present system is that men now doing one job and doing it well can and do alter their calling or occupation almost at will, frequently to the great disruption of industry. I will give one example. In the manufacture of Bren guns there is a very highly technical and skilled job of straightening out

the barrel prior to its assembly. This is done by hand and by eye, the barrel receiving a series of bumps until it is perfectly true. The trueness of the barrel is judged by the eye of the operator, who observes a series of concentric rings or shadows formed in the barrel, which is highly polished. A great deal of the final accuracy of this magnificent weapon depends upon this operation.

The operators are all young men with peculiarly gifted eyesight. When they engage in this work they are trained for a period of four or five months, and they agree not to go to the movies, not to read, not to smoke, to drink very little, and to do practically no work by artificial light. I am sure the house will agree that these men are working at considerable sacrifice, no matter what they are paid, and that if they change their occupation, it is harmful to the Canadian war effort. Surely it cannot be good to have these very highly trained men who are doing this excellent work change their position and enter the armed forces unless they can be replaced. Several of these men have enlisted in the Canadian armed forces, against the wishes of their employers, their reasons being those of any red-blooded young Canadian. I suggest that to use these men in the army is not in the best interests of the country's war effort at the present time.

I come now to the present application of the National Resources Mobilization Act. My objection to the present policy of the government is that under the present regulations you have two types of soldiers. This is undignified and entirely foreign to the nature of the Canadian people, and in my opinion Canada believes that the soldier should be a soldier to go where he is sent, to do what he is told to do, to fight the enemy wherever the enemy may be found. To have an active army battalion in which there are men whose service ends with the three-mile limit is the evil outcome of the mind of a political contortionist, and I warn this government that to continue this policy may have the most serious consequences not only on the morale but on the internal discipline of the unit so affected. A regiment of volunteers which finds itself with an admixture of home defence recruits immediately thinks its fighting days are over. Morale decreases and resentment against these unfortunate young men grows rapidly.

A regiment is a sacred thing, full of long traditions of great service, full of esprit de corps; and to destroy this fighting spirit is criminal folly which must rest squarely on the shoulders of the government. To have some members of the unit proudly wearing "Canada" on their shoulders and their regimental badges, while other members do not wear these proud emblems, is a disgrace to our military history. It is not only a disgrace to our military history, but is a slap in the face to men of a previous generation whose bravery and endurance contributed so much to our safety here to-day.

The Prime Minister spoke long and loud about the need of preserving national unity. What has he been doing in the past eighteen months? In this very matter of dividing the armed forces into active and home defence bodies he has sown within Canada seeds of disunity and discord which will bedevil posterity with the fomenting of hatred long after he and the rest of the government have passed from the scene.

The great Grecian patriot Pericles, in his immortal speech, bequeathed to the world the conviction that freedom was the right only of those who had the courage to defend it. Those deserve to be free. Yet under our present system it is also given to the faint-hearted and to those who live sheltered lives; they expect the courageous to provide freedom for them.

I have a word to say on the question of a war council of the united powers. It is essential for the prosecution of this world-wide war to act in conformity and jointly with our allies. We have in Washington to-day a United Nations war council for defence on the Pacific; we have in London an imperial war cabinet. Is it for the Prime Minister to say we are not interested in joining both of these bodies? Certainly our highest possible and most accredited military and governmental representatives should be sent to these councils. Not to do so is to accept colonial status. Admittedly we have a joint defence board with the United States, but that is not enough. What goes on in the south Pacific, the fortunes of Singapore, the battle of Libya and the magnificent defence of their country by the soviets are of immediate concern to us. We must be prepared; in fact we must demand, that we be informed of what is being done, and say what we can do and what we are prepared to do about it. If war can be kept at these safe distances, we shall indeed be fortunate. But we cannot expect other nations to be interested in us should we be invaded, unless we are interested in them.

The whole tragic history of the defeat of allied arms in this war has been caused by this narrow nationalism and this inability of nations to act together as a unit. For any responsible Canadian not to jump at the chance, nay, demand that we be included in all of the councils of the United Nations is

an exhibition of that parochial spirit and an example of the petty political mind that destroyed France.

If, however, we demand this, as I believe we should, we must be prepared to do our part equally and without the slightest hesitation or reserve along with the other United Nations. The government must get out of its mind that Canada is merely contributing something towards the waging of someone else's war. This manifestation of an inferiority complex puts us in a false light. The fact that many of our allies are numerically stronger than we are does not necessarily mean that we have to accept an inferior position all along the line. We must have a say, and an important say, in how the war is to be conducted. And we must be prepared, as I have already said, to perform whatever tasks are assigned to us.

There are some who consider that Canada's war effort in this titanic struggle must be of a minor nature. I do not agree with that view. We have a country of twelve million people, a quarter of the population of Great Britain. We have a skilled manufacturing and agricultural manhood. We have natural resources in great abundance. The Prime Minister is prone to talk of Canada as a nation, but every time we are expected to behave as one we immediately revert to the status of a colony. It is essential that we take our active part in both Washington and London and that we do it without delay. But we must remove the one barrier to ourselves as a nation before we can sit in these conferences of great men, and that one barrier is the lack of an all-out war effort, which includes selective compulsory national service.

Now I come to one more question. I see by the press that there is a movement on foot to take away the wet canteens from the soldiers and to restrict the sale of beer throughout Canada. Let me warn this government that if it wants to create bad feeling and to strike a deadly blow at the morale of the Canadian army, the first and surest step to take is to restrict the privileges of the wet canteen. I will ask my friends who are so anxious to interfere with the lives of others to remember that the gallant garrison at Tobruk when they were relieved stated that one of the reasons why their morale remained so magnificently high was the fact that a wise United Kingdom government had seen to it that they had a constant supply of beer.

The discipline of Canadian troops in the city of Toronto during this war has been exemplary. To close the beer parlours or to restrict the sale of beer to his majesty's forces would shortly bring about the deplorable conditions of the prohibition era and lead to the eventual break-down of respect for law. To do this would be criminal folly.

I have just one word to say to those good people who will accuse me in making that statement. I state that I do not drink beer, nor do I smoke; I do not own any stock in any brewery; I do not know any brewer, and there are no breweries in the riding I have the honour to represent. I merely wanted to make that statement for the record, so that it may be seen that what I have said was said in the interest of the forces and not because I am interested in any other way.

There is one final point that I wish to raise about the speech from the throne, namely, that it contained no mention of Russia. To-day our soviet allies are providing the one bright spot in the picture of world-wide catastrophe. The Russians have been the first people to meet and defeat the blitzkrieg. It is to them we must look for the initial destruction of the German land forces. Their magnificent heroism has sent the brazen horde reeling in disorder from their capital. To-day the soviet power is the second or third most important in the world. Soviet Russia and Canada are near neighbours; we are both northern people living in an extreme climate; we both have a great country to develop. Yet one would think it was almost indecent to mention Russia. I suggest that we should immediately take steps to recognize the government of the Soviet Union. I am glad we had the statement concerning that of the Prime Minister yesterday. We should welcome in this country a soviet military mission, and should send one of ours to Russia. I believe we have much to teach them, and it is more than likely that they have much to teach us.

I am not afraid of the spread of communism in Canada, if we treat Russia as a full ally and welcome members of her armed forces in the same way as we do those of any of the other "united nations." I should like to see a soviet legation at Ottawa; the hammer and sickle should fly proudly at the masthead instead of being considered an emblem of somewhat questionable morality. I realize that in saying this I may be accused of being a communist or of having communist leanings. I am no communist and no socialist. Some of my friends and all my enemies consider me a reactionary Tory. But to refuse to recognize this great power is building up trouble for ourselves and is going to give great aid to subversive elements which are even now at work trying to undermine the security of the state. We are going to have to admit that the soviet philosophy exists and that it has done

great things; let us admit it openly and above the broad tables of government rather than have snivelling, subversive agents peddling anarchist literature to the adolescent minds of the students in our schools, universities and training camps We have seen what anarchy has done in other countries. It can happen here.

Listening to the desk-thumping at the close of the Prime Minister's apologia on this plebiscite question, I thought of the words of the poem, "The Fall of the City", by Archibald McLeish:

> The city of Masterless men
> Will take a Master.
> There will be shouting then.
> Blood after.

Country without leadership; government without direction; parliament without authority.

Canada without leadership.

> Shouting now.
> Blood after.

Mr. F. G. HOBLITZELL (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on a subject of vital importance. First, however, I should like to say that the views I am about to express are my own, and are the result of deep personal convictions. I am quite aware that these views are not shared by many hon. members on this side of the house, but this matter is of such grave importance that it far outweighs any party considerations. In what I am about to say I am considering first of all the interests of the whole country, certainly not those of any political party.

I believe the time is now ripe to wage total war with total war effort. Does anyone here suggest that we have total war effort? How is it possible to have total war effort without the mobilization of all our man-power, wealth and material resources, under a plan of universal compulsory selective service?

As member for the constituency of Eglinton in Toronto, I have received thousands of communications from my constituents, both Liberal and Conservative, with regard to the vital question of selective compulsory service of man-power, wealth and material resources. I greatly welcome the interest taken by my constituents, and at this time publicly thank them for communicating their views to me. I should like to say, however, that prior to receiving this widespread expression of opinion, I had already taken the opportunity of giving to the press my views as a member of parliament on this vital question. I stated then, as I do now, that I believe the only fair, honest and efficient way to wage total war is by the allocation of our man-power, wealth and material resources, that is, by introducing a measure of universal selective compulsory service.

I have not arrived at this conclusion hastily and without consideration for the views of others. On this matter, however, which concerns the life and security of every one of us, I felt the time had arrived for me to add my views to those expressed in this house and elsewhere.

I should like to say something about Canada's war effort up to the present. In many spheres it has been a most creditable and substantial contribution. When we consider the difficult task of changing a nation from a peace-time economy to an active war-time economy, I think it becomes us all to pay tribute to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the members of his government for the good work that has been done. In fact I believe it is the utmost pity that in this one most important sphere, the issue of man-power, we should allow the splendid efforts of the government to be overshadowed by the resultant depreciation in civilian morale throughout the land. I realize that this is a job beyond the strength of any one man or group of men to carry on without the cooperation and unity of all men and women in this country.

If we are to carry our full weight forward to victory, it is of the utmost necessity that the people be given inspired leadership, so that our military and material contributions will be supported by a high state of civilian morale. Nazism is a horrible disease which has been allowed to run rampant too long. It must and will be destroyed. But let us use every expediency, everything within our power and knowledge to destroy it as quickly as possible before it destroys too many of us.

I should like to state exactly what universal compulsory selective service means to me. It is the complete mobilization of man-power, wealth and material resources, as has been said so often. In the words of the Prime Minister, total war must be met with total-war effort. To that effort there are four parts which go to make up the whole. No two or three parts are of any use or can make up the whole or total effort without the fourth.

First, proper allocation of all Canadians, manhood and womanhood, and proper use of all material resources will do this.

Second, men and women who are on the farms, or have knowledge of farming must be kept on the farms. This department of a total war effort I believe to be in a critical stage right now. Farm lands must be kept up to strength, for the food question is equally and as vitally important as the other three parts which make up the whole of total effort.

Third, our industrial plants and munition factories must not lose their specially trained and skilled labour. Where women can do the work as well as men, they should be conscripted for this work, leaving thousands of men free for the armed services; and all men of the proper age, and fitted to serve in the armed forces, must be trained and equipped to serve anywhere and at any time.

Fourth, all material resources must be wisely appropriated and properly used for the functioning of our war effort.

In my opinion, the voluntary recruiting system has not been a success, particularly in connection with the army. This is not my opinion only; we have the expressed view of our own high military authorities, including Brigadier General Panet and Major-General Vanier, and of course the figures given to this house by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) at the end of the last session, which in themselves were a complete admission that the voluntary system of enlistment was not doing the job. The figures to which I refer were those which he gave the house as to the results of the campaign for 35,000 recruits, which fell short of its objective by approximately 10,000. This speaks for itself.

I despise the backdoor methods, which are a disgrace to our country, of gaining recruits for our armed forces. I wish you could tell me, Mr. Speaker, how to answer the boys who are constantly coming into my office. These are loyal, patriotic Canadian citizens, anxious to do their duty and ready to serve equality of service. Some tell me they help in or are even the sole support of their families. Even so, they are ready to enlist and do their duty; but, why should they enlist when so-and-so over there, who has no obligations, who is earning good money and enjoying all the comforts of our country, sits back and waits for good opportunities left open by our volunteer recruits? Nor do I approve the disgraceful methods used by some of our recruiting officers, which constitute a system of coercion. Many of these stalwart youths, being just underage for service, are the constant objects of ridicule, sneers and badgering by these same officers. I believe universal compulsory service would be received happily and with deep satisfaction by all the young men of our country. Equality of sacrifice and of service, which far transcends any economic policy, is the only method by which we can defend the system under which we live.

It is true that in the beginning of 1940 our Prime Minister and others gave a pledge to the people of Canada not to instigate conscription for our armed forces for other than home defence, without consulting the people. But was any government or any prophet in the world at that time able to foresee the sorry and horrible mess into which all the freedom-loving peoples of the world would be thrown by the end of 1941? As I said before, nazism is a disease, and we must keep healthy the place where it is not lest that part also be destroyed. We must go and fight it where where it is.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is my considered judgment that the majority of the people of this country desire that the Prime Minister keep the pledge which goes with his high office, that is, to take whatever measures he and his government feel are wise and necessary to protect the lives and property of the people in the light of whatever perils face the nation. I implore him not to besmirch the honour and dignity of this great dominion by substituting the uninformed opinion of the people for vigorous, courageous and honest leadership. We have seen evidence of the disunity that the proposed plebiscite is going to create among our people. I therefore plead, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Prime Minister, that it is the course of wisdom for him to arrest this ever-growing dissension of which we all have ample evidence. The simple way would be to provide legislation that will bring into force universal compulsory selective service, both for manpower and material wealth. In this way everyone, regardless of race, colour or religion, who shares the privileges of this country, will equally be called upon to share the responsibilities that go with those privileges.

On motion of Mr. Church the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Wednesday, February 4, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Tuesday, February 3, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, the war is Canada's only business at the present time; it overshadows everything else. Nothing else matters. There are a large

number of domestic problems which at other times would be very important, but in the face of war nothing else amounts to very much until the war is won.

I have read over the various addresses which have been made in this house since the beginning of the session; and it is altogether too bad for parliamentary government in Canada that the real issue, the war, which is now not far from Canada's shores, cannot be discussed without many of the personalities and some of the arguments which have been used in this particular debate.

After all is said and done, principles are bigger than individuals. Criticism is to be expected in times like these; and those who sit on this side of the house have given the government pretty good support since the war started. I believe that it is the desire of every good citizen in this country from coast to coast to cooperate with the government so long as it does its duty and tries to achieve a full war effort. But this is not the first government which has failed in time of war. The Asquith government went out of office in 1916. Why? Because it tried to conduct a war on a political basis, the way the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is trying to conduct this one—on a Liberal basis. So Mr. Asquith went out of office. The present government is carrying on in the same way. I defy anybody to successfully contradict that statement. Not one hon. member from the Toronto district who is a Conservative has been invited since the day the war started to see a thing, either in the army, the navy or the air force. The first letter of invitation we received was yesterday, from the army council, to members of parliament—who did not need any invitation to go on government property, notwithstanding all the restrictions imposed by the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe). By the way, if the Prime Minister cannot be here, I hope that his assistant, the deputy leader, will sit in his seat, because I believe that some criticism is necessary in reference to statements which have been and are being made in this chamber and outside it. I have said that the first invitation which hon. members from the Toronto district got was from the army council, to go down to some building—the Jackson building, I believe—have their photographs taken, receive some card and obtain a passport, if they wished to visit some ships of the Royal Canadian Navy and some air force establishments and various camps in the Toronto district. For myself I do not intend to accept this invitation, because I believe that the certificate of a member signed by the respected Clerk of the House of Commons to each member of the house should be sufficient for the purpose.

[Mr. Church.]

I was not able to go to the last war, but I tried to do my duty to all classes of citizens, no matter who they were; politics did not enter into it at all.

I say that this belated invitation effort is very much out of place. Criticism is a tonic which stirs governments to action. So long as it is founded on fact and is not influenced by political bias, it helps and encourages an administration and often assists it, even against some of its own friends. Of course criticism should be based on fact and be impartial, and critical comment, if it is to be valuable, must be fair. Before one makes a speech containing any criticism, he should look around him; he should try in some degree to discern the future; he should be sure of his facts, because facts are facts, and history always repeats itself.

It is true that the government is not alone responsible for earlier reductions of military estimates. It had to assume the consequences of inadequate appropriations made by itself and other administrations as well, as a result of the depression and refusal to face the facts. As I have contended frequently in this house, all parties are to blame for the present situation, for listening to the pacifists and refusing to arm before it was too late.

The opposition has a duty to perform; and I may say that in my opinion the government have not acted fairly towards us in the house in the matter of the war effort. We as Canadians and members of the British empire have no divine right to expect victory. The path is not going to be an easy one. The government seem to think there is a royal road to victory, and have neglected to prepare for this war on land and sea, and in the air. Victory can only come out of resolute leadership, total war effort, service and real sacrifice. There is no use boasting about victory and talking as if it were our right by divine law. We can gain victory only by telling the truth to the people, facing the real facts, and building up from the worst of the facts. The hour has come, the men were ready, but machinery and mechanization are not ready. We are now going to take a plebiscite, and that gives the country plain evidence of the fact that we have not yet learned any lessons either from the last war or from this one, and that we refuse to act. We are getting farther away from the main object of the time—to win the war. We have been outbuilt by the Germans and outwitted by them in diplomacy and strategy.

As a member of the House of Commons I believe in certain principles, and one of them is that we should always tell the people the truth. That is a very important thing, and I say to the Prime Minister now that the

policy he has enunciated on behalf of the government is not satisfactory. I say to him that he should not be afraid to tell the people that he has made a mistake. The Canadian people do not expect its leaders to be gods, nor do they expect hon. gentlemen opposite to fulfil their pledges. I say to the Prime Minister: "Don't go with the multitude to do wrong." Since this war started, the Senate and the House of Commons have seemed to be like the two lost tribes of the children of Israel, and the altogether forgotten agencies of any parliamentary government. The Senate has been given no new duties. One pledge which the Prime Minister made to me at the last session and the session before was that during the recess of parliament he would consider the question of what should be done to bring about closer cooperation between the two houses of parliament with a view to getting more work done by the Senate in connection with our war effort. One body says it has been here only four or five hours since last June and since the war started, has done nothing to aid the war effort. This is not its fault.

The House of Commons seems to be the forgotten agency of government. The session seems to be a sort of "on again, off again, on again." The doors are sometimes locked and the Senate goes home itself because there is no work for it to do. If there were a reallocation of duties a greater war effort would be effected. I think the less said about pledges, the better for all concerned. The Prime Minister and some hon. members seem to be very much afraid of the newspapers. They are worried by the newspapers. As I said when I first entered the house in 1921, "you can never answer a newspaper because it always has the last word."

In my opinion, the plebiscite is just a box-office appeal to the cash customers—the voters. That is all it is—a box-office appeal at a late hour. And under the plebiscite for the next four months Canada will be off the track altogether as far as its war effort is concerned.

In the speech from the throne there is nothing but a lot of evasion and platitudes and all that sort of thing. The speech has left out any mention of those things that should be done, and it has forgotten the things that should have been done long ago but have not been accomplished. The speech declares:

> The conflict can have but one of two outcomes. Either tyranny, based on terror and brutality, must be overthrown; . . .

I do not think tyranny will be overthrown by a plebiscite, by taking a vote of the people while failing to protect them. Hitler will not be bluffed by any plebiscite on our part. There was no plebiscite when he invaded Norway, Poland and Czechoslovakia. There was no chance for those people to take a plebiscite. There was no plebiscite in Holland and Belgium. With his savage, mechanized hordes he swept through those countries, and France also, with the result that the whole of Europe collapsed. He beat them to a standstill in diplomacy and strategy, because his war and foreign policies and his strategy have all been a united part of a consistent, considered system, with great preparation and foresight.

In this house for the past ten years I have championed some causes when it was neither fashionable nor popular to do so. For instance, I have always been firm in advocating the British connection, and I have argued for rearmament and cooperation with Great Britain, but this did not appeal to the house because I was one of the last left of the die-hards of British imperialism. The House of Commons and the government of the day thought it was all right to depend upon disarmament, pacifism, and they preferred to associate themselves with peace pacts, protocols, the discredited League of Nations, the Monroe doctrine, the Kellogg note, Locarno, Pan-Americanism, and things of that sort. The time that should have been spent in rearming and preparing for what we have to face now was spent in listening to peace pacts and disarmament, and to the declarations: "We have no commitments; parliament will decide." Every nation that wanted to write a note would find a willing reader in the Canadian government. From 1935 to 1940 I repeatedly urged upon the government the importance of rearmament, and of taking definite steps looking towards defence. I deprecated the habit of hon. gentlemen opposite of building castles in the air instead of facing realities. You need only look at the index of the debates in the house from 1935 to 1940 to see the position I took in that period with regard to defence and foreign affairs.

The greatest sin which Canada has committed is that of unpreparedness in the face of the greatest disaster in all history. That is the first and gravest sin of this dominion. We thought we had all eternity to prepare for war. The government of the day, I suggest, instead of hoisting its patron saint, the plebiscite, might far better put up in front of the parliament buildings a bust of Canada's patron saint. And who is Canada's patron saint? Ethelred the Unready. He should be installed as the patron saint of Canada and of this government. We have been too late in everything we have done in connection with this war, even in the present

policy of the plebiscite. I suggest also that the government might erect a statue to Harold, who left Hastings and by forced marches arrived too late to meet William the Norman.

Canada has been too late in everything since this war began. It has been the same thing in the army, the navy and the air force; and owing largely to the urging and promptings of this country before the war, Britain parted with her defences, throwing them to the four winds of heaven, and also parted with her friends. At the end of the last war she had the finest army, navy and air force the world had ever seen, but Canada was not anxious to maintain the defences of the empire. Instead, we built castles in the air, like the league, Pan-Americanism, the Monroe doctrine, and so forth.

In my opinion it is no discredit and no disparagement to some hon. gentlemen opposite who have served the country admirably in days of peace to find themselves unfitted for leadership in war, because peace and war are two entirely different conditions. The political executives in Canada have not done well since the war started, and it could not be expected that they would.

They have supported peace pacts, peace agreements, protocols and the like, and believed that these could take the place of service and sacrifice, something in the history of the world never possible. Some of our peace political executives in Canada have lacked the element of courage, decision, the first essential, and the country has not been given the vigorous leadership it needs.

Party politics should be put into cold storage, as I said before the war started, until the war is won and for one year after; for if we lose, Hitler will not only put it there but will make life not worth living for our people.

Now Hitler seeks to capture the future by the present; Canada's policy is the opposite; it seeks to capture the present by talking about what it will do later. We are all along talking of what we are going to do in 1942, 1943, 1944. I predicated in 1937, 1938, 1939 that if war came, it would take two years to train a man and two or three to get munitions. The government are making a great mistake; they are not ready and they do not intend a total war, so they have resorted to delays and vacuum and coma and fear and doubt of a useless plebiscite to kill time. As Tennyson says in the early part of his "In Memoriam":

> Our little systems have their day;
> They have their day and cease to be;
> They are but broken lights of thee,
> But thou, O Lord, art more than they.

[Mr. Church.]

I say the policy which the Prime Minister has announced is a follow-your-leader policy, "your leader is your policy," a "me-too" policy. Did you ever hear of such a policy in any country that prizes its liberty or in a free parliament?

In Ottawa and in Ontario the Conservative party went out of office on the follow-your-leader policy. Ontario will never tolerate it. I opposed the general referendum in 1924 and 1925. I said in this house—it is on five or six pages of *Hansard*—that in time of war I would never as a member of this house allow Mr. General Election to become commander in chief of the British forces; that I would never allow Mr. General Election to become admiral of the British fleet, because before Mr. General Election could open his ballot boxes the enemy might proceed up the St. Lawrence by land, sea or in the air and bomb the citadel at Quebec and bomb this very chamber in which we are meeting. That is the policy I then announced regarding the referendum and do now.

I have here many pages of *Hansard*. I had a motion on going into supply because I was very much dissatisfied with the government, and on March 21, 1939, on a motion to go into supply, I moved a want of confidence motion in the government's foreign policy and defence policy. I said that the true facts were kept from the people of Canada; that we were not given any information regarding the real picture, and I took a stand in the house on that date regarding the British empire, rearmament and this war. I quoted the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Chamberlain, where he said in the British House of Commons:

> If the people are not allowed to know the facts; if they are only allowed to know what their rulers choose them to know, then that people are in danger of being led to embark upon a course which may presently lead them to disaster.

That is found on page 2095 of *Hansard* for 1939. Again, on the opening of parliament on February 14, 1938, I had twenty-two questions on the order paper with reference to Canada's pacifist part in the war that seemed sure to be coming. My questions dealt with the Washington conference, that ill-fated conference at Washington in 1921 and 1922, which drove Japan into Germany's arms, and the mission of Lord Halifax to Hitler, the Tokyo legation, the Sino-Japanese conflict, Canada and the Nine Power conference, the Prime Minister's visit to Hitler in Berlin in 1937. The Prime Minister was not satisfied for the British government to deal with Hitler, and he went to visit Hitler himself to let him know

Canada was a nation. My question is found on page 391 of *Hansard* for February 14, 1938, and was as follows:

1. On whose invitation did the Prime Minister visit Berlin and the German government of Herr Hitler in 1937, and on what days was the visit made?

2. What were the subject matters discussed and was the government of Great Britain advised or consulted about this visit?

3. Will a summary of the matter discussed be laid on the table of the house?

4. Was the subject of establishing a Canadian embassy to Germany under discussion?

5. Did the Prime Minister of Canada make any proposals during said discussions, and if so, what were they?

6. Was the subject of the ceding of the German colonies by Great Britain discussed?

7. Were any economic or international questions in their relation to Canada discussed, and, if so, what questions?

8. What is Canada's foreign policy with respect to Germany?

9. Is such foreign policy a Canadian policy, or is it in harmony with the foreign policy of Great Britain?

The Prime Minister replied with a reply that was no reply at all.

Then there was a Nyon conference to prevent piracy on the Mediterranean and on aid to Britain in the Pacific by funds for the Singapore base. I had urged for many years in this house that for maritime freedom in the Pacific a grant should be made by Canada; also the adoption of the Jellico report and a vast empire shipbuilding policy; the training of 5,000 cadets a year; that Singapore meant more in Pacific protection to Canada than to Australia or New Zealand. And what was the policy of the government? They would not give a dollar, even on Lincoln's birthday, 1938, when the Singapore base was opened four years ago this month. The Australian and New Zealand fleets were there and the United States fleet and the British fleet. But where was Canada? Canada, which was first in the diamond jubilee procession, was the last to send a contingent to South Africa; the government of that day, 1897, said it was against the constitution and against the British North America Act. Canada refused to protect our Pacific coast lines in 1935 to 1940 as it did in 1938.

They have carried out that policy from that day to this, and what has been the result? There was an imperial conference in 1937; the question of shipping and the Pacific question were up, but Canada used the old hackneyed phrase as to the Pacific, "We have no commitments; parliament will decide." They refused to join New Zealand and Australia in an empire shipping plan or enter the shipping conference; they refused here the programme I offered of a large shipbuilding policy for the empire (1936-38), or to train some of the men who at that time were riding the rods, or a national register for national service.

Then we come to Canada's navy. On the same date, February 14, 1938, I asked, as reported at page 392 of *Hansard* of that year:

1. What does Canada's navy consist of, and where is it now located?

2. Did the Department of National Defence, on January 5 or 6, 1938, release the schedule of good-will cruises, 1938, for this fleet, in navy orders?

3. Has part of the fleet already set out to sea, and to what destination?

4. Have any of the fleet gone to Sino-Japanese waters?

5. Did part of His Majesty's Canadian navy go to sea, on January 1, on a three-months' cruise to Bermuda, St. Kitts, Barbadoes, St. Lucia and Granada on the Atlantic?

6. Who is the present admiral of the Canadian fleet, and where are his headquarters?

7. What is the total per annum cost to maintain this fleet, and how many officers and men have they?

We have it that Canada's navy then had a tonnage of only that of one large tramp steamer.

Many other questions were asked and replied to, and there were many other occasions on which I brought these matters to the attention of the house, urging naval protection for Canada and our empire.

On March 31, 1939, I talked out the bill of the present Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson), who would not even support a small increase in the military estimates and whose policy was that if war came, Canada would be neutral; and although I talked his bill out, it was applauded from a large majority of the house.

On Friday, March 17, 1939, I asked this question:

Will the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) be in a position at the first of the week to give the house any information on the foreign situation, in view of its great importance to the people of Canada?

That is found on page 1991 of *Hansard* for March 17, 1939. The Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe replied:

The government will take notice of the question of my hon. friend, and I have no doubt the Prime Minister will satisfy his legitimate curiosity.

I wish to compliment those hon. members who have asserted the rights and privileges and functions of members of parliament. Burke has stated what our rights and privileges are:

Theirs were formerly the feelings of Mr. Hampden when called upon for the payment of twenty shillings. Would twenty shillings

have ruined Mr. Hampden's fortune? No. But the payment of half twenty shillings, on the principle on which it was demanded, would have made him a slave.

Then, as to the rights and functions of members of parliament, Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Churchill have given the same opinion. Burke had this to say in his address at a time of grave danger in 1774 to his electors and to the sheriffs of Bristol which he represented in parliament:

Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion, high respect, their business, unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfactions, to theirs; and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own. But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion. . . .

You choose a member, indeed; but when you have chosen him, he is not member for Bristol, but he is a member of parliament. If the local constituent should have an interest, or should form any hasty opinion, evidently opposite to the real good of the rest of the community, the member for that place ought to be as far, as any other, from any endeavour to give it effect. . . .

We are members for a free country; and surely we all know, that the machine of a free constitution is no simple thing; but as intricate and as delicate as it is valuable.

Mr. Churchill reasserted that principle of free assembly, free debates, in the British House of Commons last week, in these words:

I don't see why this should hamper anyone. If a member has helpful criticisms to make or even severe correction to administer, that may be perfectly consistent with thinking that in respect of the administration such as it is he might go farther and fare worse.

If a member dislikes the government very much and feels that it is in the public interest that it should be broken up, he ought to have the manhood to testify to his opinion. Nobody need be mealy-mouthed in this debate.

Then Mr. Emmanuel Shinwell, labour member for Seaham, interjected:

Is it to be a free vote?

To this Mr. Churchill replied:

It is to be a free vote under all conditions which have made the conduct of parliamentary government possible. Surely the honourable gentleman is not a man to be frightened of the whip.

[Mr. Church.]

Then he went on to say:

It may seem silly to us, but in those minds abroad it is mischievous to our common interests and efforts. I am certainly not asking for any special favours in these circumstances, but I am sure the house would wish to make its position clear.

Therefore I stand by the ancient constitutional and parliamentary doctrine of free debate and faithful voting. . . .

That was his opinion. And when Mr. Churchill speaks he tells the plain truth; his speeches are his own; he does not mince his words, and the people listen to him. He reasserted the rights and privileges of the private member; and the British House of Commons supported him because he believes in free parliamentary and press criticism as part of the British democratic system. What a difference here in this house and in Canada! The first duty of yes-men in Germany is to find out what the fuehrer wants and then to make the planets dance to his desires. Yes-men are not all astrologers; it is a pity they are not, for they would be the better for it. They exist in all classes of society and in all communities, and their mark everywhere is the dread of freedom. These authoritarian governments, Germany, Italy and Japan, exist only because of yes-men and nodders. When a leader emerges he is acclaimed by them, and he drives the country to ruin to their resounding cheers. No opposition is possible in the dictator-ridden countries, it is true, but the evolution of tyranny in Germany and Italy has been possible only because of those who were ready to surrender to usurpation. Once these dictators are installed, they cannot be unseated without a general upset accompanied by force and revolution. In Canada, fortunately, we can speak our mind. There are grave dangers ahead, and reasonable criticism is necessary.

I spoke in this house on March 14, 1927, at page 1168 of *Hansard* as to the functions and duties of a private member. Those functions and duties are still more important in war time than in peace time. At that time, speaking as a private member of the house, I said, although a strong Conservative:

Unplaced, unpensioned, no man's heir or slave. I neither look for nor care for honour or the patronizing approval of any party. . . . There is only one consolation for a public man, and that is the approval of his own conscience, a sense of duty done. . . . I will not knowingly and conscientiously offend any man either by word or deed, but I will stand by the principles of public rights as I see them, which I have supported for twenty-five years in the province of Ontario. But if I am placed in the position of having to defend these principles and must speak, I will speak what I at heart believe to be the truth, moderately, kindly, temperately, but yet plainly, and will call a spade a spade. . . . But while I wear the party uniform,

I will never wear its plush. I will take my position among the rank and file, however humble it may be, but it will be as a volunteer and not as a "flunkey".

With reference to the situation at Hong Kong, the people of this country do not want any more talk. They want to know the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. The story of Hong Kong goes back twenty-one years to the ill-fated Washington conference of 1921. It starts when Britain, urged by Canada, decided that Hong Kong no longer should be a first class base but should become a second class base.

This plebiscite or referendum has all of us at sea, and it is not going to be any help in obtaining recruits. I believe the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) has worked hard; I think his heart has been in his work. I do not wish to criticize him or anybody else; but if we had had proper recruiting methods we would have had a million men under the voluntary system. We did not follow the proper method. Our young people had the right spirit; they were bent on giving service, but they were discouraged. They went to the recruiting stations; they had the real spirit of service, but they were not properly dealt with. All the respite after Munich, and even after war began, went for nothing. The patriotic fervour of our people was not properly directed. The old phrase, "Strike while the iron is hot," was forgotten; and as a result, a little later on we had the most direct methods of conscription and insult used on our young people in these thirty days' and four months' training camps. The vaulting ambition of youth was dampened; the government did not take the initiative, and as a result voluntary recruiting fell down. The navy and air force, however, have had no difficulty in securing recruits.

As I said in this house on November 7 of last year, as reported at page 4175 of *Hansard:*

In the first year of the war the mechanized hordes conquered Norway, Czechoslovakia, the low countries, Belgium, Holland and, last but not least, France. In the second year of the war they swept over Jugoslavia and Greece, and the mechanization still goes on. What is the position in Canada? We are now in the third year of the war and the government can give us no definite war programme for the next twelve months. As I said when this war began, the big question was man-power. I was told it was not, but it was food and munitions. Has there been any war in the history of mankind in which man-power has not played a major part? I say there has not; and if the government of the day had taken the right stand at the start, voluntary recruiting would not have reached the state in which it is to-day. We should have had a million men. During the first months of the war the country was willing to give the ministers time to become war-minded instead of believing in pacifism and disarmament; but two years of armed warfare should be sufficient to bring about that changed mentality. We should be taking active steps to see that in this third year of the war ours should be a total war effort from coast to coast. Now we find the government without any concerted, coordinated war planning for the coming year, to deal with the demands of the military services and the other demands in connection with production, shipbuilding, agriculture and so on. Home defence will never win any war; there is no possibility of that. We should take stock of our military position. The people want to know the facts, but they cannot get them. As I said in 1937, are we to wait until the enemy comes up the St. Lawrence by air, land and sea, and bombs the citadel and this very building? All the protection we have is provided by Great Britain, and the United States would be attacked also but for the British navy. The small nations of Europe have been enslaved by this mechanized army; they have endured the spies, the sergeant-majors, the concentration camps, the loud speaker, the tramping of feet, the gestapo, the whips, the spirit of barbarism, brutality and savagery; and but for Britain we on this continent would be compelled to suffer the same experiences. Yet we do not pay her tribute.

What are we going to do about it? Sooner or later there must be another Peninsular war on the continent, and what is Canada doing to prepare for it in man-power to aid the mother country? New Zealand and Australia were represented in Africa, Greece, Syria and other countries. Canada was not. Now we have been told by one of the ministers, within the last day or two, that no Canadian troops can be moved out of England without the authority of this government. That is just what I said in this house last June, that not a man could be sent from England without the permission of the government of this country. That is a fine state of affairs. That is not a total war effort, or coordination with Britain; that is not showing cooperation with the other parts of this empire. The time has now come when there should be a change. I think we need something more than words, something more than the essays and all that sort of thing we have been getting. The people should know the extent of our war effort and exactly what our position is.

I have been told by some of the ministers in the last few days that no Canadian troops have been moved out of England without the authority of the government. I said that last June, that no man could be sent from Great Britain without permission of the government of this country. It is a fine state of affairs when, in a total war effort there is no guarantee to Britain that there will be full cooperation of other parts of the empire. The time has now come for a change, and the people should know the facts.

I may say that we are living in a world to-day where force is the only argument. Then, how is civilization going to be preserved without an army? The Prime Minister, speaking in Quebec city a few days before the 1935 election, said that Canada is never going to be carried into another war without a

plebiscite. Yet in 1939 he carried this country into war without a plebiscite. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Cardin) said the same thing in 1935, namely, that never again would Canada send troops overseas. But Canada has sent troops overseas, and he is still a member of the government.

I have a great deal of sympathy with the people at the Pacific coast. But this plebiscite does not help them at all. This pompous measure may preserve the dignity of a few people in Ottawa, but in my opinion there is no authority for the plebiscite. It is a hollow mockery. There is no mandate for it. There is nothing in it with which to fight Hitler. It will be a plebiscite without any act, or any way to see the cause and effect of it.

The people are very much dissatisfied with the conduct of the war as it has been carried on so far. They wish to support the government, if they can. Then, with respect to a war cabinet may I point out that in my opinion, in not having a war cabinet the government has made a fatal mistake. One thing which we noticed before the outbreak of the war was the tremendous popularity of the monarchy, the decay of parliament and the decline of the House of Commons. I say there has been a decline, because our functions have been taken away from us by outside boards and bureaucrats. His Majesty the King is beloved the empire over, and we admire the courage and cheerfulness of the king and queen. We must remember that our king is the King of Canada. There should be a war cabinet, with some one beside him, as was the situation in the great war to represent Canada before him.

I believe the Prime Minister would have been well advised to have a war cabinet. That is an absolute necessity. New Zealand and Australia want a war cabinet. In the great crisis of the last war the war cabinet proved to be a great success, and I believe that Canadian sentiment is behind it. I hope it may yet develop. It created comradeship among empire troops, and that is something which should be extended. I repeat that I believe the people of Canada are behind it.

I say this because to-day London is the centre of Christendom. We have the battle of London, the battle of the Pacific and the battle of the Atlantic and I believe that such a war cabinet is necessary. I believe all such questions should be dealt with at an imperial conference. I gave reasons for this on May 7, 1941, as follows:

1. Empire shipping and trade policy.

2. Eire bases and the battle of the Atlantic, and increased protection on this ocean for Canadian trade.

[Mr. Church.]

3. The creation of a long-distance defence and foreign policy.

4. Trade, defence, migration and refugees.

5. The lease-lend bill and its application to Britain and empire policy.

6. The Pacific question; also re the leasing of bases in Newfoundland, the West Indies and Canada's foreign policy therein. She will find herself bound by it.

7. The financial adjustment of cost—

And all that kind of thing, and—

8. The giving away of parts of our empire and Atlantic ports and bases from Newfoundland to British Guiana, in exchange for 52 obsolete warships.

I believe all these questions should be dealt with at an imperial conference.

At the present time the government has violated nearly all its pledges. It violated tariff pledges for ten or fifteen years, and in addition to that it has violated many other pledges I need not mention.

There is one pledge which has to do with bureaucracies. I see the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) in his seat. He has established what is known as a transit commission, headed by a transit commissioner. What is that official going to do? I say to the minister, "Hands off Toronto's public utilities." They are operating at cost, and doing something in the war. I repeat, "Hands off those utilities." Then, he has a transit commissioner from Quebec city.

I find this article in a newspaper (Toronto Telegram, February 3rd):

> Public transportation is approaching critical conditions in every city on this continent. . . . The T.T.C. has even been asked by the federal transit controller as to whether any cars could be spared for other cities in Canada, where the situation is very bad. He has the authority to arbitrarily take them, if absolutely necessary, and some buses intended for us already have been diverted to war plants.
>
> We wish, of course, that we had been able to obtain the 60 new street cars ordered in 1940 for use this winter. The old Toronto Railway cars that are being used are not efficient or comfortable. We know it, but the authorities at Ottawa would not even consider granting permission to buy new street cars as long as any old cars could be used at all.
>
> Nobody knows what the effect of gasoline rationing on April 1, and the tire restrictions, will have on public transportation.

And so on. Those are the words of Mr. Patten, General Manager of the Toronto Transportation Commission.

All of these bureaucratic boards have been established. And so the House of Commons is only the forgotten appendage of government; there is no more security.

I have some other matters in mind, but I shall take an opportunity to refer to them later on. With particular reference to the Pacific question, however, I believe the

danger is not far from Canada. The Japanese have submarines which can cross the Pacific ocean, and I believe the day is not far distant when we may be in actual danger.

I am not opposed to the policy of building a road to Alaska. The United States should build that road, if it is to go through to Alaska. In addition to that the government should use lease-lend funds, because it is a matter of home defence. After all is said and done, there is no such thing as home defence. If the British fleet goes down, and if the Royal Air Force fails, the enemy will be on our shores very soon.

I must commend the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Hoblitzell) who is my representative in the House of Commons. I commend him particularly for his refusal to support the policy of "follow your leader," and the principle of making a member of parliament just a "me-too" for anything the government may propose.

On a later occasion I hope to have an opportunity of dealing with the Pacific question in detail, and I want to deal in further detail with all the boards which have been established under the auspices of the government.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the principle of government solidarity is fairly well understood in the country. The people generally know that when the speech from the throne states government policy, that is the policy of the whole government and has the concurrence of every member of the government. This fact, however, does not prevent questions being asked as to whether this concurrence is reluctant or formal, on the part of certain members of the government, or wholehearted and sincere. My main purpose in speaking in this debate is to make it clear beyond doubt to my friends in my own province, and members of the business community, with which the Department of Finance brings me constantly in close contact and to everyone else who is interested in the matter, that my concurrence in the plebiscite policy is based on conviction, and is given without any doubt or reservation whatsoever.

I would not take part in the debate unless I felt it to be my duty to make this fact perfectly clear. I have been surprised by the confusion of thought which exists in the country on this matter, and I have been amazed by the extent to which thought has been submerged by emotion. Even after allowance is made for the extravagance of language, which is attributable perhaps to by-elections, I can hardly believe that such words as have been used and are being used should be used about a policy which appears to me to be natural, honourable and desirable.

Words such as cowardly, dastardly, contemptible, shameful, humiliating, crowning indignity, and so forth, have been used. I must say that the members of this house have shown a sense of their responsibility in regard to the use of language far greater than that which has been exhibited outside. They know, I think, as a result of their association with their fellow members from all parts of Canada, that violent language is inappropriate to this situation. But some of the members and certain spite-infused and hate-inspired enemies of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) have simply let themselves go. They have let themselves go in a way that will make them ashamed of themselves in future months and years.

On the other hand I am convinced that however the step that this government is taking now may appear to these individuals at the moment, it will be looked back upon after a lapse of months and years as the right thing to have done and the best thing to have done in all the circumstances. At times such as these ministers and members should express themselves with simplicity and sincerity. Every syllable they utter should be the truth as they see it, nothing more and nothing less. If they do this, if they pour out their true selves, so to speak, they cannot dissociate themselves from certain fundamental factors such as their heritage and their environment.

My own background is that of the country districts of Nova Scotia. I represent people whose ancestors for the most part left the British isles centuries ago, people whose loyalty to the British empire, whose belief in the British empire and its institutions, are deep-seated, and for that matter taken for granted. They call it the British empire, not the British commonwealth of nations. They do not think too much about home defence. Through the centuries their sons have fought in distant parts of the world and they know that the defence of the British isles is their defence. The distinction between serving in Canada and serving overseas is a distinction which for them has no meaning whatever. They would consider it their duty to defend what they call the British empire, and what I call the British empire, in any part of the world in which the continued existence of the empire was in peril. Their young men are serving in great numbers, proportionately to the population, in the army, in the navy and in the air. These brave young men, the finest and best of Nova Scotians, are being killed. To-day one is missing in Libya, to-morrow another is shot down

over the North sea or in France. Casualties bring still more enlistments. The whole population is determined that the war shall be won and be won as speedily as possible. In the minds of some there may be something old-fashioned about this environment, about this attitude, but can anyone deny the inspired soundness and nobility of it?

These are the people whom I have had the honour—and I mean the honour—of representing in this house since 1926, and whose view-point, which is my own view-point, I reflect in the cabinet. I want to make this perfectly clear so that my remarks upon the plebiscite may be more thoroughly and completely understood. These people believe and I believe that this government, without too much regard for remotely distant consequences, should adopt the most efficient and effective methods now of carrying on the war. I believe that the programme which we plan should for the immediate future, the coming year, be a programme which will strain the human and material resources of this country to the limit. I have, therefore, agreed as Minister of Finance to a war programme for the coming fiscal year which in my opinion, and in the opinion of my advisers, is the extreme limit of what this country can do, having in mind its human and material resources. I am in favour of pursuing a policy which will make for the fullest possible measure of success for that programme.

One issue between the government and its more sincere opponents seems to me to be this: Will the continuation of the voluntary system for overseas service, at least for the time being—we have the compulsory system in many other lines of the war activity—make for a greater success in our programme than would its abandonment? I wish to say that neither as a member of the government nor as a member of the war committee of the cabinet, nor otherwise, have I been able to find any evidence that the abandonment of the voluntary system and the substitution of the compulsory system in respect to that part of our war effort represented by overseas army service would help at this moment in our war effort.

Surely no one can deny that the voluntary system to date has functioned magnificently. In what single respect has it fallen down? Any question as to the success of the voluntary system for overseas service is not as to its success at the moment but as to its success in the future. No one can tell what methods, what degree of compulsion may be required in the months and years to come, but this government, in my judgment, having in mind its commitments at the last election, would not be true to its trust if it allowed the situation to drift in directions not now possible to foresee without appealing now to the people, when we know that the appeal can be made without sacrifice of military advantage, to release the government from its commitments so that the government will be completely free to lead this nation wherever it is necessary for this nation to go and by whatever methods it is necessary to adopt to bring about the successful and earliest possible termination of the war.

Mr. HOMUTH: What if they do not release them?

Mr. ILSLEY: I shall come to that. The other course is to leave the commitments outstanding, and then, if the necessity for more compulsion should arise, disregard the commitments, break our promise on the plea of necessity. If we do that, imagine the situation that would result. The other day I heard one of the members—I think he made a speech in this house—a member from one of the western provinces, say that during the last election he read the pledges of the government leader at seventy-one meetings which he held in his constituency. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that these pledges were made not only by the leaders of the government but by the opposition leaders with just as much definiteness. He said truthfully that those electors, many if not most of them of central European descent or central European birth, believe now in democracy and in democratic methods, but they would never believe in democracy again, would never believe in the government again, and would never believe in any public man again if those pledges were broken.

This is the time for the government to get a release from its pledges, not to break its pledges. This all seems so elementary to me, it seems so clear to me that when I hear hysterical screams against the plebiscite in parts of the province in which I am now speaking, from some of the people of the province in which I am now speaking, I wonder whether I can believe my ears.

I should like to deal with a few of the arguments which are advanced against the plebiscite. In the first place it is said that it is a cowardly negation of responsible government. This charge is repeated loosely by many critics. But surely there is nothing in this charge. Surely the essence of responsible government involves not only a government responsible to parliament, but a parliament responsible to the people; not a government which breaks its solemn pledges to the people who elected it, but a government which, if

elected on a particular pledge, seeks the consent of the people to free it from that pledge, if changing conditions seem so to require. Surely, also, the cowardly government or parliament is one, rather, which fears to ascertain the views of the people.

Then it is said that a plebiscite involves a dangerous delay. The argument is specious but fallacious. As I have said before, there is no evidence whatever that within the next three months the voluntary system, in so far as overseas service is concerned, will not function with complete efficiency, in my opinion with more efficiency than a compulsory system in its early stages, with its endless exemptions, its tribunals, its appeals and its delays, would function.

Then it is said that a plebiscite will make Canada a laughing stock in the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia and elsewhere. Perhaps it is not necessary to say much about this argument.

As to the United States I am willing to let the New York *Times,* which is a representative and a great organ of public opinion in the United States, speak. In its editorial of January 26 it says:

> On this matter it would be impertinent for outsiders to give an opinion. But when the opponents of the plebiscite utter their fear that, unexplained, the plebiscite will throw doubt upon Canada's exertion of her full power in this war, her friends—and we are all her friends—must protest. In this very speech from the throne she plans an even wider, a total effort with her armed forces, munitions, supplies. The patriotism of Canadians has been demonstrated by their efforts in this war.

As to British opinion, I am willing to let the London *Telegraph and Morning Post* speak. What did it say? It said this:

> When the time comes for an historian's sober estimate of realities of the British empire's participation in this war, the performance of Canada will bulk large in the picture. The addition to that record announced by Mr. Mackenzie King is one of the finest things in the history of inter-imperial relationships. His government propose to make a free gift to this country of food and munitions to the value of some £225,000,000, and to place at our disposal an immense sum free of interest for the duration of the war.
>
> On any showing it is an astonishing demonstration to all the world of solidarity within the British commonwealth of nations. It is but the latest, of course, of a multitude of such proofs. Canada threw herself into the battle against the forces of evil of her own unanimous will. Her whole national economy has been transformed in arming herself to fight beside us by land, sea, and air, and in organizing from the outset her enormous additions to our own war effort. To-day some forty per cent of her national income is devoted to war purposes. Both her forces and output of her war industries have been and are being steadily expanded. Wherever we may look in appraising the value of the service done to the cause of freedom by the allied peoples, we shall find nothing more splendid than the record of Canada.

Let those who think of the effect on Australia remember that Australia did not have conscription for overseas service during the last war; that on two occasions during that war a referendum was held on this issue, and both times it failed to secure the majority vote; and that conscription for service outside the commonwealth is not in effect in Australia to this day.

I hope I shall not cause offence if before I leave this argument I take occasion to point out that the greatest source of misunderstanding in other countries in regard to Canada's war effort arises from the unrestrained criticism in certain quarters in Canada of nearly everything the government has done or is doing. Our own efforts to tell the world what Canada is doing may fall short of perfection, but to read much of the comment in the Canadian press and in this parliament would lead the uninformed to believe that Canada's war effort amounts to nothing at all. It is time that we ceased smearing Canada. Canada's war effort—and it is the country's effort, not the government's—is one of which every Canadian can be proud. That is the verdict of foreign observers who have studied what we are doing. I do not suggest for a moment that there should not be criticism, and strong criticism, of our failures and our shortcomings. Constructive criticism is indispensable. But if Canadians are helped to see in true perspective the real accomplishments of our war programme, they will have a well founded pride and an improved morale which will spur us all to yet greater efforts.

Then, to some members of the house, the objection to the plebiscite is that the plebiscite is likely to receive a majority vote and consequently the government will thereby be relieved from its pledge not to introduce conscription for overseas service, and they are so strongly opposed to conscription for overseas service that they even oppose the release of the government from its past pledges. Their position is that never, never under any condition, should the government compel Canadians to serve abroad. They do not deny that service in Canada is a fit field for compulsion. The underlying assumption seems to be that service here in Canada is more vital, more effective, more important, more necessary to the defence of Canada than service abroad. Now these hon. members are, I am convinced, mistaken. In spite of what has happened to Norway, Belgium, Holland, France, Jugoslavia, Greece and so forth, in spite of Pearl Harbour, they fail to see that in a world where international gang-

sters with enormous military striking power are running amuck, no country is safe which withdraws behind and seeks to defend itself behind its own borders. They fail to see that the war we now fight is not a war for imperialistic aggrandizement but a death struggle between two types of civilization. They fail to see that for us it is a war of survival, survival of our integrity as a state, of our free institutions, of our democratic way of life. They fail to see that Canada's destiny as a free or a slave state may be decided not on her own soil, but in far distant parts of the world, and that the magnitude of Canada's contribution to the struggle may readily tip the scales.

However mistaken their point of view may seem to us, it is one which we must recognize. It is one which is held by minority groups in several sections of this country. It is strongly held, charged with emotion. It is one which has its roots deep in the past. It is, at least in part, due to incredible blunders made by ourselves during the last war. Surely we should not repeat these blunders by attempting to ride roughshod over opinions which differ from ours, by breaking pledges, and using the powers we undoubtedly have to force a measure through this house, with no attempt first made to assure that there is for it the maximum amount of understanding, and therefore of sympathy and consent, throughout the country. Surely we should not jeopardize the gains we have made since the last war and sacrifice the substantial measure of national unity which has been achieved in this war by adopting the arbitrary, unrestrained and provocative methods which the vehement advocates of conscription now would have us use. Certainly those of us who believe in a total Canadian effort for total war should avoid such methods as they would the plague.

Then there is the attitude of another class of opponents, those represented by the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth) who interrupted me a few minutes ago, who base their objection on the fear that the plebiscite may be defeated. This is the argument of those who are all-out for conscription whatever the consequences, whether it wrecks national unity, whether it helps or hurts the war effort. This is the argument of those who do not trust the people, the argument of those who would have parliament put through conscription without consulting the people, whether the people approve or not. Their position seems to me to be wholly untenable.

Conscription is only a method. The efficiency of any method is to be measured by how it works. I am free to confess that in my opinion, if it were strongly opposed by a majority of the Canadian people, it would be a far less efficient and effective method of providing reinforcements for our troops overseas than the continuation of the voluntary method. Its adoption under such circumstances would, I believe, impede and retard the war effort, not to mention any other disastrous consequences which it would have to the fabric and unity of the state. But I for one wish to express emphatically my belief that the plebiscite will result in an overwhelming majority of the Canadian people voting to release the government from any past pledges which might now prohibit it from using its discretion to fight this war by any method that seems necessary to win it.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then what?

Mr. ILSLEY: I need not say that I personally will do my utmost to bring about that result.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then what?

Mr. ILSLEY: We shall be free to act and we will act in the best interests of the country and of the war effort.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Free to do nothing.

Mr. ILSLEY: The first outcry was that this was a plebiscite on conscription; the second outcry now is that it is not a plebiscite on conscription. There is, in my opinion, only one possible danger which need cause fear about the result, and of this I speak with some trepidation. That danger is the possibility that some of the advocates of conscription may go so far in their use of unrestrained, abusive and provocative language, may so let their emotions run away with their intelligence, as to provoke an equally violent emotional resistance on the part of those who do not now believe in or may not yet have made up their minds about selective military service.

Then it is said that the plebiscite is a costly process. Estimates running all the way from a million and a quarter to five million dollars have been made, some of them gross overestimates. This argument, Toronto *Saturday Night* said, is put forward by people who raise no objection to the continued expenditure by Canadians of vastly greater sums every week upon light entertainment, imported luxury foods, sport, travel and other non-military objectives. They translate the cost of the plebiscite into terms of the bombers and corvettes it would buy, as if the limitation of our supply of these military articles were the amount of money we can spend, whereas it is really the plant capacity and skilled labour available for their production, none of which

would be diverted by taking a plebiscite. Despite this rebuttal of the argument, I as Minister of Finance am interested in saving every dollar that can possibly be saved. If the cost of the plebiscite could be saved; if, in other words, taking the plebiscite represented wasted effort, I would be the first to want that money saved and that waste eliminated. But I cannot believe that it represents waste or needless expenditure of public funds. If so, it might be said that the prolonged debates in this parliament represent waste. That is the charge that Hitler makes, that all costly and time-consuming processes of parliamentary government represent needless waste and inefficiency—that a dictatorship is cheaper and more efficient.

I do not think I need labour this point. We who believe in democracy are willing to pay the price of democracy. We believe that the values received are worth the price we have to pay. If as a result of the plebiscite we can bring home to all our people what this war really means; if we can spread a better realization of the fact that Canada is being defended and must be defended not just on its own shores but in England, on the sands of Libya, on the Russian steppes and in the far-off islands of the south western Pacific; if we can help to dissipate any lingering remnant there may be of the doctrine of isolationism, then probably no price will be too high to pay. If we can accomplish these results, as I believe we can; if those who believe in total war and in the principles of a comprehensive selective service, seek loyally and fervently, and without ulterior motives, to achieve their aims by democratic rather than by fascist methods, then I verily believe that the result of the demonstration of a united national will be of immense value to the country's war effort, a striking contribution to the cause for which we fight.

Then there is the threat of a strike against the victory loan. It is in connection with this controversy over the alleged costliness of the plebiscite that a development has arisen which has shocked me immeasurably. I refer to the letters addressed to myself by several persons, published in certain newspapers, threatening to cancel their regular purchases of war savings certificates and to boycott the new victory loan, in order apparently to scare the government into abandoning the proposed plebiscite or to punish the government for deciding to take it. I cannot believe that the writers of these letters can have given a moment's consideration to the significance of their irresponsible action; and to the credit of the press, some newspapers which believe strongly in immediate conscription for overseas service have written editorials of protest against this type of opposition.

If the individuals concerned will stop to think, they will realize that their threatened action means nothing less than a strike against the state, a strike against our men in the armed forces, a direct sabotaging of the country's war effort. It is fascism, the attempted use of force to bring about a change in government policy. No doubt these individuals feel strongly as to the soundness of their own opinions, but unless I am greatly mistaken they would be the first to condemn a labour group which threatened to strike in a vital war industry. Their own position is even less defensible.

Surely there is no justification for fascist methods in this country. Surely we still believe in the democratic process. Let such individuals express their opinions as strongly as they will. Let them attempt to convert their fellow-citizens, their members of parliament. Let them seek by any democratic means to overturn the government if they disagree with its policies and decisions. But no Canadian should strike against the state.

No Canadian should boycott a vital part of the war effort. In our war financing activities we have received the unstinted support and cooperation of men and newspapers of all parties and all shades of opinion. I have repeatedly expressed my warm appreciation of that cooperation, and I now do so again. I am confident that however much we may disagree on methods and policies in other fields we can continue to work in complete harmony in the enormously important task of raising the vast sums of money required to pay our soldiers, sailors and airmen and their dependents and to provide them with the best equipment which we can buy or produce.

In conclusion let me appeal to all Canadians for moderation, restraint and reasonableness. In some cases I know my appeal will fall on deaf ears, for example in the case of the premier of Ontario. He would laugh at me, he would laugh at my appeal. But this is not true of most Canadians. Unity is still possible in Canada if we take ourselves in hand. The other day when the Prime Minister was speaking, appealing for unity, I understand that an hon. member interjected, "What unity?" Well, let no one scoff at unity or despair of unity. We can maintain unity by the course we are taking. But we would shatter it into a thousand bits if we followed the course advocated by any single faction of extremists in the camps—not the camp—against us. The objective of all of us is a total war effort in the interest of the earliest

possible termination of the war. Surely no one doubts that this is the objective of the government. Surely these wild men who accuse us of having some sordid motives, of thinking of our political futures, do not believe what they are saying. I have no sons, but look at almost any danger area in the world, at almost any theatre of war, and you will find there a son or sons of some minister of this government.

Well, if we have no ulterior motives, and if our opponents have none, surely there is no unscalable barrier to agreement on methods to unity and understanding.

I close with Mr. Churchill's words on unity, which he uttered in the British House of Commons last Tuesday. He said:

> We should not allow ourselves to be rattled when this or that other place has been captured, because once the ultimate power of the United States is brought into play it will move forward remorselessly, provided we fight with the greatest vigour and tenacity and provided we, above all, remain united.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): I am sure that every hon. member listened with a great deal of interest to the statement just made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). Coming from Nova Scotia also, from another section of it, and perhaps representing a totally different environment, I am going to endeavour to express my opinion on the matter now under debate.

Before I proceed to discuss the plebiscite I should like to refer briefly to a statement or statements made last evening by the hon. member for Peterborough West (Mr. Fraser). At the time he made the statements I endeavoured to correct them and was ruled out of order, and if this debate closes there will not be another opportunity of setting the record straight on that matter.

It is not my intention, and as a rule this group does not waste the time of the house in placing our political views before the house; we endeavour to stick to the issues and to be as brief and explicit as possible. However, when statements are made obviously for political effect, directed at this group, and those statements are not correct we must of necessity answer them.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): It was in answer to a political speech made by a member of that group.

Mr. GILLIS: The matter to which I wish to refer is the statement made by the hon. member as reported on page 276 of *Hansard* of February 3 when he said:

> An hon. member to my left said to-day that anyone who is employing a person for work he could do himself should fire that person.

I take it from that observation that the hon. member meant that domestic help should be discharged. He continued:

> I believe that is practically what was said to my left this afternoon, and that is the meaning the people throughout the country will take.

That is that domestic help should go. I do not believe in that principle. At the time that statement was made I endeavoured to correct it as it was not the statement made by the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. Wright) to whom the hon. member for Peterborough West was referring. What the hon. member for Melfort did say, as reported by *Hansard*, is this as reported on page 268 of yesterday's *Hansard:*

> I believe we should measure our taxation in this way: that we should take in taxes in this country all income which enables any person to employ, either directly or indirectly, the services of any man or woman to do for him something which he is physically able to do for himself.

The hon. member for Melfort was dealing directly with the question of taxation. The hon. member for Peterborough West was dealing with the dismissal of domestic help and made a very broad and sweeping statement which could very easily have been misunderstood. We realize perfectly why he was making that statement.

I should like to draw attention to another statement which is not in accordance with the facts. The hon. member for Peterborough West said, as reported on page 281, that "these widows should be praised for buying war bonds and certificates, instead of being ridiculed." He went on to talk about widows and coupon clippers. What I am concerned about is this statement:

> . . . though the other day for an hour and a half there was not one Cooperative Commonwealth Federation member in the house. These people will wonder why the government has asked them to buy war bonds and certificates when a member of this house says they are saboteurs.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The hon. member who is speaking said "saboteurs".

Mr. GILLIS: Correct. I am going to explain it. The hon. member for Yorkton made an observation with respect to coupon clippers, bond holders, those who conducted a sit-down strike to remove the five per cent limitation on profits, and so forth, and I interjected in that connection "saboteurs". I consider the people who at such a time put a gun to the head of the government when the British empire with its back to the wall was being driven towards Dunkirk, and who demanded their pound of flesh and retarded necessary

production in this country to supply Britain with the machinery necessary to defend herself, were saboteurs. I said that then and I say that now.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The hon. member said "any coupon clipper" and you said "saboteurs".

Mr. GILLIS: Exactly. As to members of this group not being in their seats for an hour and a half on a certain day, there is no foundation for that statement. The hon. member cannot name a day when at least some of the members of this group were not in the house. No party in this house attends the sessions more religiously than the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation and social credit groups. For two days this week, while the delegation from the west was in Ottawa, the five members of this group from Saskatchewan were meeting with that delegation, endeavouring to assist them in ironing out their problems. But at no time while this house has been sitting have we all been out of the chamber; at least either the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) or I were here listening and paying attention to what was going on.

Then the hon. member referred to an indemnity of $30 a day, a statement which was also misleading and which might be misunderstood.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I said $30 for a day and a half.

Mr. GILLIS: That statement might very easily be misunderstood. The hon. member may have understood what he meant, but no one else would understand it from reading *Hansard*. The indemnity may mean just that to the hon. member who made that statement, but certainly it does not mean that to the members of this group. We work for the people we represent three hundred and sixty-five days a year, and if you divide the indemnity by that figure you will see what it means to us. In addition at least fifty per cent of our indemnity goes into the work we do for our people, maintaining offices, endeavouring to assist them iron out their problems and helping them understand some of the legislation that goes through this house. And of course taxes eat into it as well.

With respect to the question before the house, almost every hon. member who has spoken, particularly from this side, has made the statement that the people are going to be badly confused, and that the taking of the plebiscite will delay the war. I guess a great many of the people engaged in the fighting would not mind if that were true, though I cannot see it in that way. I can readily understand why there should be so much confusion throughout the country. I have sat in my place listening to the speeches since the opening of this debate, and practically every hon. member who has taken part in it has added to that confusion. Each speaker has had a different conception of what the proposal means. No one seems to have any clear idea as to just on what the plebiscite is to be taken, and I am in that position myself.

So far as that goes, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the principle of consulting the people on any matter as serious as requisitioning the lives of our people. I believe the people are the most important element in any order of society, and I see governments merely as administrative bodies, carrying out the wishes of the people. So far as I am concerned, therefore, I have no quarrel with the government in the taking of this plebiscite. For the past twenty years I have attended labour conventions; and at most of these meetings the stand of organized labour has been that before Canada engaged in a war, the opinion of the people should be taken. So, in regard to the plebiscite itself, I believe it is the proper thing to do. The question, however, of just on what the plebiscite is to be taken is another matter. I have read the Prime Minister's speech; I have searched through it very carefully to see if I could get some indication of just what the people would be asked to vote upon at that time. So far as I was concerned I could not get any clear conception of just what is to be the issue. He would say something in the first paragraph; he would change it in the second; he would say almost the same thing in the third, and by the time you had gone completely through the speech you were left in doubt as to just what it all meant.

As I see it, there are three specific matters before the house. First there is the government's proposal, which is vague and uncertain and which must be clarified before this debate closes. Then there is the Conservative amendment, and finally the amendment to the amendment moved by this group.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Would not the hon. member give us his opinion on the plebiscite? Is he for it or against it?

Mr. GILLIS: I have already done that. I said I was perfectly satisfied with the principle of the plebiscite; that I believed any issue as important as requisitioning the lives of our people should be voted upon by the people who are to be dealt with in this way. I believe the principle of the plebiscite is correct.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And if the people say "no" the hon. member is quite willing to have the country overrun by Hitler?

Mr. GILLIS: May I say a little on that point as I go along? At the moment I am trying to waste no time and to deal specifically with the matter before the house. I would have no hesitation in voting for anything introduced by hon. members at that end of the chamber if I thought it was right. I believe the only failure a man has to fear in life is the failure to stand up for the things he believes are right, and as long as I am in this house that is what I shall do.

The part of the Conservative amendment to which I refer particularly reads:

(a) completely mobilize the wealth and material resources and, on a selective basis, the full man and woman power of the nation, to the end that the nation may wage total war in any theatre of war;

(b) supply the imperative needs of agriculture, industry, and the fighting forces of the nation. . . .

We all agree with the last paragraph; what I am concerned about are the words:

. . . completely mobilize the wealth and material resources and, on a selective basis, the full man and woman power of the nation. . . .

I have a great deal of respect for many of the hon. members to my right, and I have no quarrel with the leader of the opposition who sits in the house. Since coming here I have found him to be fair. He places his views before the house very capably; when necessary, he stands up and defends himself, and he is courteous to everyone to whom he speaks. He has a right to his opinions; but, in the light of the statements made by the new leader of the Conservative party, I am very much concerned as to exactly where he stands on this question of mobilizing the wealth and resources of the country. As a worker, I see the wealth and resources of this country mobilized now for certain purposes by certain people; yes, completely mobilized to be used for their own ends. So that this aspect of mobilization must be very considerably clarified, as far as I am concerned, before I would be prepared to support this amendment.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I am also concerned about men who make pledges, as to whether or not they are prepared to stand behind those pledges once they are made. The only guide we have in this connection is to make an analysis of the background, integrity and stability of the persons making these promises. The leader of the Conservative party does not now sit in the house; he is endeavouring to obtain a seat. If we accept at face value the amendment before the house from the Conservative party, then we must make an examination as to who leads that party now, and as to whether he is prepared to stand behind the mobilization of the wealth and resources of the country in order that we may prosecute the war as we think it should be prosecuted. I find that in the past with respect to questions of this kind he has been more or less of a contortionist.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Mostly more.

Mr. GILLIS: He has made statements with regard to these matters, and those statements appear in public documents and in the press. For example, the latest one came over the radio at ten o'clock this morning. It is contained in a Canadian Press dispatch of February 4, and is in these words:

Toronto, February 4. Acceptance for himself and the Conservative party of the principle of "conscription of men, if conscription of wealth and industry is imposed on an equal basis" was announced at a meeting here last night by the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, the Canadian Conservative leader, and candidate in the York South federal by-election on February 9. Mr. Meighen said:

"Mr. M. J. Coldwell, Cooperative Commonwealth Federation leader in the House of Commons has said his party will accept conscription of men if conscription of wealth and industry is imposed on an equal basis. I accept his offer. I speak for myself and the Conservative party."

Mr. NICHOLSON: Oh, oh, oh.

Mr. GILLIS: It continues:

The Conservative leader said he always had favoured the type of conscription of wealth now advocated by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation—

Mr. NICHOLON: What do you know about that!

Mr. GILLIS:

—and would accept any measure of conscription that could assist in winning the war.

"I have been quoted as saying I only favoured conscription of wealth as the last gasp," he said. ". . . I never made any such statement. What I did say was that wealth must be conscripted just as thoroughly as man-power just so long as it is necessary to win this war. I said we are taking it nearly all now but if it all goes, that is the last gasp."

Mr. BRADETTE: The road to Damascus.

Mr. GILLIS: I am not sure whether we are going to accept this latest recruit into our party, but I would say that that is not only the last gasp, but it is a death-bed repentance.

Let us see what he had to say a week ago on the same question. I am sceptical of people who can change their minds so quickly. It is

an indication that there is not any mind to change. Just a week ago, on January 30, according to the Toronto *Daily Star*—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh, well,—

Mr. GILLIS: —he stated this, on the same question:

Conscription of wealth, Mr. Meighen declared, would "shackle the enterprise and efficiency of our industry." To get the most out of men you have to give them an incentive, he argued. He called conscription of wealth "a foolish suicidal thing" until absolutely necessary to finance the war.

Mr. MacINNIS: Or win an election.

Mr. GILLIS: It continues, under the heading, "Urged in last war":

"In the last war men who are now the government in this war called on us to enact conscription of wealth. 'Why don't you conscript wealth?' they asked. Now they're in office and they haven't done so. Why? Because they realize now it wouldn't work and they are right," Mr. Meighen declared.

Just a week ago that was his opinion on the conscription of wealth. It was suicidal, he said. But a week later he is prepared to commit suicide. I said a moment ago that I am always concerned about people who change their minds so fast. It sounds to me very much like Mr. Hitler's non-aggression pacts—"Lull you to sleep until I get the appropriate opportunity to take a shot at you."

One reference, which goes away back to 1926, might be worth while mentioning at this time. This was a speech made at Quebec on December 1, 1926, and that part having to do with the subject matter now in hand was as follows:

"I declare that so long as I shall be in power in this country no troops—" Mr. Meighen halted for a moment to recall the French phrase. Then he went on— "no troops will be sent out of the country without the people being consulted." There was an outburst of applause at the words. Mr. Meighen went on, that at the outbreak of the last war, no party had been of this view. Both parties were unanimous in parliament that aid should be given without delay. But it was the opinion of the Conservative party that, in the future, the people should be consulted as well as parliament.

Now he is in opposition to the plebiscite. He says that the people should not be consulted when there is no stability, or continuity of thought. I am very sceptical.

Mr. JACKMAN: The house is on fire.

Mr. GILLIS: And these are the people who helped set it afire. In addition, there are the telegrams which were placed on record by the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), and which appear at page 179 of *Hansard*.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I suppose the hon. member knows that those things were all threshed out in parliament and denied, and the whole story fell to the ground. If the hon. member will go back and consult the parliamentary debates, he will find that there is not a tittle of proof in them. He should consult the records of parliament, in connection with the Mackenzie resolution.

Mr. GILLIS: These press dispatches certainly are not wrong. They are recent statements, and are an indication of just how much dependence can be placed upon people who change their minds so rapidly. It looks to me as if the statements were made merely for political expediency. I make reference to them at this time only because of the seriousness of the war situation. I believe the men who to-day have the responsibility of directing the Canadian people, and prosecuting the war in the light of the international situation, should not have any doubt in their own minds as to where they stand, nor should there be any doubts in the minds of the Canadian people.

Mr. JACKMAN: There should be no doubt in Mr. Meighen's mind, and never was.

Mr. GILLIS: These press dispatches show exactly where Mr. Meighen stands.

A further matter to which I wish to make reference is the amendment offered by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. I believe there is no necessity for me to read it. It is clear, concise and explicit. The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation stands now and always has stood for the all-out prosecution of the war. We realized at the outbreak of the war that in order to defeat Hitler we had to defeat the forces in this country which make Hitlers, in addition to defeating the Hitler in Europe. We are prepared to go all the way.

There is strong sentiment throughout the country to-day. I get around the four eastern provinces quite a bit, and I can say that with the exception of the Toronto area one does not hear this urge for the conscription of man-power only. The sentiment in the country to-day among the working people, the common people, who in the final analysis will do the fighting—the arm-chair generals will not fight the war—have expressed their opinion about conscription. If and when the ballot is taken, I say that the Canadian people should have the right to speak on the question of the total conscription of finance, industry, wealth and man-power, on the same basis, at the same time and with the same degree of sacrifice as man-power is asked to make.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What does the hon. member mean by the conscription of wealth?

Mr. GILLIS: Mr. Meighen agrees with it.

Mr. JACKMAN: What do you mean by it?

Mr. GILLIS: Ask Mr. Meighen. I have thought a great deal about this plebiscite and its clarification. My own opinion is that there is no intention to conscript man-power. I think it will be found before this question is settled finally that someone will pull a rabbit out of the hat. Conscription of man-power and selective service are two entirely different things, as I undertand them, and they must not be confused. You can have one without the other. Perhaps the reason the government is so evasive and mysterious about it is that they have no intention of conscripting man-power.

I agree with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) who says that there is no necessity at this time for the conscription of man-power. To conscript man-power without having the necessary equipment to fight and train with, without having all the materials necessary to put the men in the field, would be a waste of time and would bring about a continuation of what is happening now, a back-paddling on every front.

What is necessary is the mobilization of industry under proper direction. When this government is relieved of its pledge in connection with the conscription of man-power, instead of conscripting men for overseas service I believe what we will get—they are promising it, and the Conservative amendment promises it—will be selective service. That will give the government or those in authority the right to regiment further the working people of this country.

As I understand it, selective service gives the government full authority to decide where every man and every woman in this country shall work. That is proper and has considerable merit in the light of the present situation, but what we are concerned about is who is going to control it. How is it going to work? What representation will the working people of this country who are going to be mobilized and regimented have?

An hon. MEMBER: None.

Mr. GILLIS: None. We see the government's policy reflected in the setting up of war boards headed by captains of industry and the heads of our large financial organizations. There is no representative of the common people upon these boards which now control the economic resources of the country.

[Mr. Gillis.]

Mr. MacNICOL: The heads of these companies—I am one myself—have worked up from the very bottom to the top. We were all common people but through our ability we got to the top.

Mrs. CASSELMAN: What about the new Minister of Labour?

Mr. GILLIS: I am sorry the hon. member brought that up. I did not want to refer to it, but I shall. I agree with the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) that quite a number of people have climbed to the top. But they are not sitting on these war boards, nor is the hon. member for Davenport. Hitler climbed from the bottom to the top, but what has he done? It is the use of power by the individual who reaches the top that is important.

I am afraid of this growing control of the management of the country by certain groups. Take H. R. MacMillan, for example. He owns and controls practically the whole lumber industry of Canada and yet he sits on a board that sets prices for his own industry. If you follow this thing through you will find that in 99 per cent of the cases these men are simply acting as super-sales-agents for their own organizations to see how much of the money being spent on the war can be directed back to their own organizations.

I have met the people and discussed this matter with them in their unions and have tried to arrive at some understanding as to what selective service means. I believe in the first analysis that what is in the minds of those who will conduct this plebiscite is the organizing of the industry of this country on the basis of selective service. The conscription of man-power is secondary to that. Those who will make the greatest contribution should have representation upon these boards which will be set up to regiment further the working people of this country. The working people should be represented in order that their interests may be safeguarded now and in the aftermath of the war.

The hon. member for Edmonton East (Mrs. Casselman) has asked me what I think of the new Minister of Labour. I am not personally acquainted with him, but through thirty years' association with the labour movement I know of him. I know his record. What his activities will be in the house if he gets in—we are doing our best to stop him—is problematical and I cannot make any forecast. It has been heralded throughout the constituency in which he is running that he is a labour man. He represented labour in this house, but my recollection of the acting Minister of Labour—

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Not acting; he is the minister.

Mr. GILLIS: The people will have a say in that. My recollection of the record of the temporary Minister of Labour is that he was elected first on a labour ticket, but with the assistance of the Liberals. According to my information, all the time he sat in this house he was very nice to our friends across the way. I understand that the last speech he made in this house was a tirade against the people with whom he sat. He went back to his constituency of Hamilton East and ran again on the independent Labour ticket. The Liberals did not contest the election; they gave him their official endorsation, but he was defeated. The people had got wise to him. He is said to be a trade unionist, but everyone who carries a trade union card is not a trade unionist, just as everyone who preaches the gospel of the Tory party is not a Tory, as is exemplified by their leader, who is now a socialist. That is all I have to say with respect to Mitchell. He has done quite well for himself—

Mr. BRADETTE: We know what labour thinks of him.

Mr. GILLIS:—but not very much for the people who sent him to the house in the first place and gave him a start.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GILLIS: We have this kind of person in the labour movement. In the final analysis we are all human beings. I may say a little more on this question for the benefit of the hon. member for Edmonton East. I am going to say a little about the administration of the department since the new minister took it over, with relation to Kirkland Lake.

We hear a great deal about planning of industry and the necessity for such planning. It is part of the programme of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. We believe that the industries of this country should be planned and directed in order to give their maximum production. I do not believe maximum production is being achieved at this time. I do not say that because I want to belittle what is being done. We of this group have stated many times that as far as we are concerned we recognize the difficulties of transferring Canada from a peace-time nation to a war-time machine. The Canadians are not a warlike people. They love peace. That was exemplified in our complete disarmament during the years when Hitler was preparing for his onslaught. We realize the difficulties; we know that ministers who have the direction of the war effort are pretty much in our own position; they are ordinary, average people with not very much knowledge of war or the war machine, or of industry or the planning of industry or its operation; and perhaps they are doing a better job than some of us expected they would. But there are times when we are concerned about the situation.

Take the question of aircraft production. It is admitted that on every front aircraft will be the decisive factor in the war. Yet there is a shortage of planes. We have lost two of our largest battleships in the Pacific because there was not sufficient air support when those boats were out in the narrow straits. So it is rather alarming when we find right here in Ottawa the state of things set out in the Ottawa *Journal* on January 17. It reads:

> Ottawa Car and Aircraft Limited has laid off almost 500 employees in the last six weeks, and many more will be let out soon. Redmond Quain, K.C., president of the company told *The Journal* Friday night. While large numbers will be laid off, this condition must not be assumed to be permanent, he said.
>
> Reason for the suspension, Mr. Quain said, was the complete lack of aircraft orders. Drastic reductions in personnel have been made and will continue to be made because at this particular time the company has no more aircraft orders to fill. . . .
>
> He pointed out that the situation at Ottawa Car and Aircraft Limited was not an isolated case, and that there are other large aircraft factories and companies in a similar position at this time.

Surely, in view of the seriousness of the war situation and the lack of adequate aeroplane support in every area where battles are taking place, a condition of that kind should be inquired into. Why are there no orders for aeroplanes? They want them in Britain; they need them in the United States; we want them here in Canada; they are required in every section of the globe where war is being waged to-day. Yet on January 17 a responsible official connected with aircraft production in Canada makes the statement that there are no orders for aeroplanes and he is laying off men. It is something which should be inquired into and rectified.

Mr. MacNICOL: It should be censured.

Mr. GILLIS: It should be. It appeared in the Ottawa *Journal*.

These are factors which enter into the question of the conscription of man-power. If you have a job and you are comfortable, and appeals are being made over the radio and in the press for you to enlist, put on a uniform, go to Malaya or some other section, and fight, what is the effect of statements such as the one I have read? I am asked to put on a uniform and shed my blood in some foreign

country for the protection of Canada. At the same time statements are made that the machines necessary to protect me and enable me to fight that battle are not being produced in Canada, not because of lack of equipment, of factories, or of employees, but because there are no orders.

Mr. MacNICOL: There are too many factories idle.

Mr. GILLIS: Exactly. That is not an inducement to voluntary enlistment. The tendency rather is for one to stay at home where he is safe—as long as he is safe, however long that may be. There is only one way, in my opinion, to overcome this. I do not say that the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) can do it; he is only one man; I do not say that partisan politicians appointed by the government are in a position to do it, because they are partisan politicians, small-time ward-heelers, and so forth, interested in jobs. These are not the people to step up production and see that these conditions are remedied. You must get someone who is interested in the job, who has some knowledge of what is involved, and who is free from political or any other kind of pressure. I think what should be done is what Ernest Bevin, the British Minister of Labour, did when he took over his portfolio. It took him just about nine hours in conjunction with his labour advisers to lay down a set of regulations governing war production, and he appointed forty inspectors, men who were capable and competent and could be depended on.

Mr. MacNICOL: He picked practical men.

Mr. GILLIS: Yes; and he sent them into the factories to step up production.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): He is an organizer.

Mr. GILLIS: We, too, have them, but they won't let them organize.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Yes; that is the trouble.

Mr. GILLIS: Some attention should be paid to that. No factory in Canada should be closed which can produce aeroplanes. Every factory should be turning them out.

Mr. MacNICOL: They should be working twenty-four hours a day.

Mr. GILLIS: Right. And it is essential that we take care of the small details among the people themselves and demonstrate to them that, while we are fighting a war, we still realize that the common people at home are human beings.

An hon. MEMBER: And have to be looked after.

Mr. GILLIS: And have to be looked after. I do not believe that there would be any difficulty in getting men on a voluntary basis in this country if we took care of matters of this kind affecting war production and the everyday needs of the people whom we want to do the fighting. In the final analysis it is the fellow who works who is going to do the fighting. It is not the cabinet minister or the member of parliament. Nor is it the little pin-headed local politician who wants to stay at home and work his machine to death and get what he can out of the war; he should be pushed aside.

There is another matter I should like to bring to the attention of the house, because I think it is retarding enlistments. A committee on pensions sat during the last session of parliament. It was largely composed of members of the government, but two members of our group, of whom I was one, had the privilege of serving on it. A supplementary report was presented to the house, tabled, and, as I understand it, accepted, containing certain recommendations in the interests of men actually engaged in making war. Those proposals were never implemented; they were changed.

One question to which I would direct your attention is the rehabilitation of the soldier after he returns. There is nothing worse, nothing that affects a community more injuriously, than that a man who has made some contribution to the war, who has served perhaps a year, having gone over to England and been returned as physically unfit, should be found walking the streets unable to get a job. He goes to an employer and is told, "Your certificate of discharge is not worth the paper it is written on; you are physically unfit and we do not want men who are unfit." That man is a living example to the other fellow as to why he should not volunteer, and there are many such men. I have run into many of them in my section of the country.

Mr. MacNICOL: Far too many.

Mr. GILLIS: Far too many. The welfare officers working on rehabilitation do the best they can, but they do not get cooperation on that question from the employers, at any rate so far as my part of the country is concerned. We made a recommendation to the pension committee at that time, based on the regulations as they exist now in Britain. It was to the effect that a soldier returning from the war should be retained in uniform for at least six months and given some voca-

tional training and pay and allowance for himself and his dependents in the meantime, and that he should be rehabilitated and fitted for some gainful employment. That was the committee's report. Now he is put on relief. Under the new regulations he can make application to the welfare officer and be given so much a week for so many weeks or until he is employed.

Mr. MacNICOL: There should be no necessity for such relief in a country with the resources that Canada possesses.

Mr. GILLIS: That is a state of affairs that should be abolished. If we got rid of that condition there would be no necessity for conscription for overseas service. The committee made another recommendation—and these are matters that relate to the war—that the desirability should be considered of extending the provisions of orders in council P.C. 3359 and P.C. 3492 of November 10, 1939, with reference to Canadians serving on ships of other than Canadian registry operating from Canadian ports. That is a question that we considered very carefully. Wherever there is a seaport there is a good deal of trouble in this connection. This has reference to boys serving on convoy ships; and there is no branch of the service that is more essential. They are taking greater chances on old ships than they otherwise would. A lot of these old ships are held together by paint, and they leave these ports loaded with war materials. That is true; hon. members can check it up.

An hon. MEMBER: A little more than paint.

Mr. GILLIS: I have seen them in Sydney and even the paint was not holding them together. Everything that will float is put into service, and perhaps that is necessary. But these boys go on board these ships and whereas they have protection if the ship is of Canadian registry—they get the protection of the Canadian pensions regulations—there is no protection whatever for them if they are on a ship of foreign registry—and eighty per cent of the ships leaving Canadian ports are of foreign registry. If they drown, leaving families in Canada, their dependents are out of luck. As I say, there is no protection whatever for them from the Canadian government. I have received two letters since coming here, one from an old lady of eighty-seven. She brought up a boy from the age of five and he was her only means of support. He tried to enlist in the army but was rejected because he was physically unfit. As his contribution to the war effort he went on board a ship and two days later it was torpedoed and the boy was lost. There is no compensation for this old lady. Now she has to depend on charity. I have dealt with twenty-five or thirty cases in my own area, because there is a large number of boys from that end of the country going into that service. And without that service there would be no war in England or in any other part of the empire, because they are getting foodstuffs, machinery and other supplies, everything that is produced on this continent which is necessary to carry on the fight over there, by means of these ships. I submit that these boys should be protected by the Canadian government regardless of the registry of the ship.

I have a letter in which I am told that a woman whose husband was lost should look to the Norwegian government for consideration. The Norwegian government is responsible for any compensation to which she may be entitled. But that government is in exile, and that means that this man's dependents are now thrown upon charity—and we know what that is to-day. Something should be done with reference to these little matters, because whether we realize it or not, while people do not publicize these things—and they are not vocal; they have no press in which to publicize them—it is this sort of thing that is eating the core out of the war effort. There is no doubt about that. It is talked about in lodges, in local unions, in fraternal societies and in every avenue through which people congregate in communities. It is reflected in the homes. Boys who should be in uniform, and who would be in uniform perhaps, use this argument. We do not want a repetition of Hong Kong through the closing down of factories. These are problems that we shall have to take care of.

Then there is the question of war-time housing, another important matter. I have had considerable correspondence with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) and with those responsible for war-time housing. In one city I know, the city of Sydney, about a thousand men have been added to the steel plants. There is a steel plate mill opening this month which will require 600 more workers. That port is full of ships, and there are thousands of people there who were not in the place prior to the outbreak of war. The result was that when war broke out there was a shortage of housing. They require 500 additional houses. It is impossible to get rooms. The plate mill and the steel plants are essential means of producing war materials and there is resentment in that city in consequence of the overcrowding and the conditions under which people are obliged to live—fifteen persons in two and three rooms.

Prior to coming here the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis), the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) and myself, in Sydney, met the mayor and the council and emphasized the seriousness of the unsanitary conditions under which the people were obliged to live owing to overcrowding. That is something that should be looked into and remedied. It retards the war effort and builds up resentment in the minds of the people.

As I have stated on several occasions, the Department of Labour is one of the most important war departments of government. If you will look up the record of the Minister of Labour in Britain you will find that he is the biggest factor to-day over there in the prosecution of the war. The Minister of Labour must have the confidence of those for whom he legislates, and that confidence can be built up only on the basis of his activity and his approach to the people who have to turn out the machines of war.

To date, the Department of Labour has not been functioning as it should have been. I just want to refer briefly to the situation at Kirkland Lake.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to inform the hon. member that his time has expired.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. SPEAKER: With unanimous consent.

Mr. GILLIS: I will finish as quickly as I can. The Department of Labour bungled the Kirkland Lake situation very badly. The men in that section canvassed all the legal machinery laid down by the government. A government-appointed conciliation board recommended recognition of their union. They were not looking for higher wages or shorter hours or anything impossible. Such matters would have been ironed out later through their agreement; all they asked was the right to sit down round a conference table with the employers and bargain with them as to conditions under which they would work and what wages they would work for. The statement has been made by the new minister that order in council 2685 sets out the principles which the government is supposed to stand for, that labour should be a partner in industry. That is all these men ask for. After canvassing every legal avenue, the operators—they are the saboteurs I talk of—took the position that as far as they were concerned they were not recognizing the government-appointed conciliation board; they were not concerned about the loss to the country; they were a law unto themselves. I pleaded here with the government to take some action to stop what was bound to happen at Kirkland Lake, the men forced into a strike, that strike with a ballot taken previously, everything done to offset it. Nevertheless the Department of Labour—and I hold them responsible—did not take action with regard to an entire community of between 4,000 and 5,000 people who were earning wages, making a contribution to the war effort of this country, prepared to do anything they could to assist. All they asked was the right to do what the operators had done many years ago, band themselves together for the purpose of mutual understanding and in order to work out their problems on a cooperative and collective basis. That was denied them.

The new Minister of Labour took charge, and his first official act is one that is not going to stand to his credit, no matter how long he is in that department, if he is lucky enough to go there. He started to handle that question. These men had been on strike for months, living on nothing, there being sent there from other sections of the labour movement to support them money that could have been very well used somewhere else. The heads of the Canadian Congress of Labour in conference just a few days ago with the Minister of Labour thought a solution had been arrived at. The whole matter as far as the union officials and the congress officials were concerned was put up to arbitration, but immediately after coming to that understanding to which the miners of Kirkland Lake agreed, the Minister of Labour did a right-about face and added a proviso that the men must go back to work in the mines before the dispute would be arbitrated. He did that without any understanding or consultation with either the officials of the union in the Kirkland Lake area or the congress of labour who have offices right here in Ottawa. That thing is being further prolonged. I want to make this clear, that while the men have lived up to the laws of this country 100 per cent, the operators have yet to state where they stand on this question and get these men back to work. They are sabotaging that industry; they are violating the laws of this country; they are interfering with the war effort, and as far as I am concerned, if the Minister of Labour was doing his job they should be in an internment camp. That is the unfortunate part; I said, if he was doing his job. There are many men in internment camps in this country for nothing who, if released, would be willing to come out and do some useful job in connection with the prosecution of the war. These people stand out as saboteurs, interfering with the entire life of a community, building up in that section antagonisms and hate and prejudices which

will not be erased as long as that generation is living there. The men who have gone into the mines against the wishes of the majority of the men with whom they work will never be forgiven or forgotten in that section; I know, I have gone through that. It will be handed down to them and their children. Laxity on the part of the Minister of Labour and the government in not seeing that something was done there is responsible for that situation.

I am sorry to have exceeded my time. I have more to say, but I shall reserve it for some other time.

Mr. J. A. MARSHALL (Camrose): As I listened to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), my mind went back over the past ten years, when the movement with which I have the honour to be associated, the Social Credit movement, was so bitterly assailed on all sides. The minister's speech was a masterly defence of the actions of this government. I have a great deal of sympathy for the government now, for we Social Crediters too have borne the burden and heat of the day for an idea. As the Premier of Alberta has said on many occasions, "Truth and Right will prevail." Time alone will prove the wisdom or otherwise of this government's attitude. Posterity will judge.

I should like to compliment the previous speaker, the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis), on his splendid presentation.

Three questions, all of them of major importance, have been exercising the minds of the people of my constituency for a long time. The first is, old age pensions, or, Where do the old people go from here? The second is agriculture, or, Where do the farmers go from here? The third is Canada's war effort, or, Where does the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) go from here?

On the question of old age pensions I should like to make just two brief remarks. I hope that ample opportunity will be given early in this session to discuss the Old Age Pensions Act. The action of this government in placing obstacles in the way of bringing some additional measure of happiness and contentment to a section of our people is neither appreciated nor deserved. We can find money for mass produced massacre. We can find none for increasing old age pensions. We wrap our cloaks round us and hide behind the law. In Mr. Dunning's time as Finance Minister, lack of money was the excuse for holding up pensions for the blind. Because that excuse would be laughed out of court to-day, we are told that the law stands in the way. I wonder what excuse will be given next, when this one is finally overcome. I wish to tell this government that this matter of old age pensions is a really live issue. The feeling that a "New Deal" is due for old age pensioners grows and gathers strength. It cannot be lightly brushed aside. It must be faced in the very near future, and faced realistically.

The second problem, that of agriculture, is equal in importance to Canada's war effort. We have been told that we are all in the front line to-day, the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker, the business man, the professional man, and the farmer. An analysis of the economic situation will show that the farmer has appeared in the casualty list more frequently than any other member of organized society. Ninety-nine per cent of the farmers are still on that casualty list. When will this government assume its proper responsibility by taking the farmer out of the casualty column and placing him where he rightly belongs, namely, in the front line with the rest? I believe now is the time, and this is the place for all members of parliament, particularly those who hail from western Canada, to rise in their places in this house and serve notice upon this government that the wishes of more than 150,000 residents of western Canada who signed a petition, and who are backed by the prayers and good wishes of hundreds of thousands of other Canadians, shall not go unheeded. It is not enough for us as members to offer simply lip-service on behalf of these farmers. We must back up our talk with action, the only kind of action this government in general, and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) in particular, understand; that is, political pressure. A new deal for our farmers, or else! You may read into this expression what you wish. I mean just what the words are intended to convey; a political threat. We must serve notice that we mean business, serious business. We must not sit complacently in our seats; we must rouse ourselves to action. To me it would be a serious calamity were all the energy, all the labour and all the money poured out by these people to be spent in vain. Ours is a grave responsibility. It will take real courage on the part of Liberal members, particularly, to fight this battle. It must be faced. It must be fought. It must be won. Agriculture must survive.

The third question is the most important one of all. It transcends all others both in magnitude and in importance. The evacuaquestion of Canada's war effort. The evacuation of Dunkirk; the ebb and flow of the tide of battle in north Africa and Russia; the fall of Hong Kong; the appalling disaster at

Pearl Harbour, the onward rush of the Japanese hordes in the far east, have done much to awaken our people to a realization of the dangers which we are facing and which, as Mr. Churchill says, we must face in the future. Our people are stunned by the complacency, by the overconfidence, by the bungling of high military officials, by the red tape, by the departmental jealousies, by the liquor and by the languor, as one financial newspaper puts it, which have brought us time and again to the edge of the abyss. We have made many trips to the edge of that abyss; I hope we shall not fall in.

Is it not time that a thorough house-cleaning was made of those who have been directly responsible for all this bungling? On many occasions in this house we have heard it said, "Let us forget the past." Why should we? We must punish those responsible for our humiliation as an example to those who follow after them. Those in authority at Pearl Harbour were not forgiven. We have had our Hong Kong. Many brave men lost their lives there. No one, as far as I am aware, paid the penalty for the bungling methods employed. Bureaucracy rules this country, but seemingly bureaucrats are never punished. They have power, with no responsibility. We cannot afford to take chances while the enemy knocks at our gates. I am upset, just as many other hon. members are, at the incidents which have occurred in British Columbia. The dead hand of bureaucracy is seen everywhere. It is little wonder that our people are stunned by the smug complacency in high places.

On every hand people are asking for a total war effort. We, upon whom rests the responsibility of giving the people those things which they demand, must pay some heed to the people. It is not entirely the outbursts of the press that concern me, but rather the smouldering anger of the people who all these years have been kept in the dark.

What is meant by a total war effort? The Prime Minister gave us his definition. It is a thousand pities that he shuns with studied design the question of conscription or national mobilization of finance. My conception of a total war effort is one in which finance and material resources are put into the melting-pot before man-power. May I say, too, that this concept is held by a very large body of public opinion in my constituency. Had finance and material resources been conscripted in the fall of 1939, when we urged this upon the Prime Minister and his government, we would not be in the unhappy position in which we find ourselves to-day. Finance rules the war effort, ably aided and abetted by a bureaucracy which is growing stronger every day.

[Mr. Marshall.]

One of the speakers earlier in this debate, a member supporting the government, said that this war cannot be carried on without finance. Twisted and distorted thinking hinders rather than assists our war effort. Does my friend not know that, all our leading economists, including such individuals as J. Maynard Keynes, are acknowledging to-day the fact that finance must be made subservient to the wishes of the people. Let my hon. friend go out any day and wave a Canadian government bond for five thousand dollars in front of a Japanese tank, and then come back—if he ever would—and tell us which he found to be of greater importance.

Cassandra, writing in the London *Daily Mirror*, has this to say about the question of finance:

> The news that America is to spend a billion dollars, or is it ten billion?—to suppress Hitlerism is unlikely to send a chill of fear down the Fuehrer's spine.
>
> These vast financial bombshells were impressive about the year 1933, but when Hitler began to demonstrate that fighting power really depended on work, machines and raw materials, the sting began to disappear out of the wads of bank notes and share certificates that the democracies brandished so vigorously.
>
> I don't think any nation can "buy" the defeat of Hitler with its accumulated wealth. You have got to go in and fight the creature.
>
> A thousand-dollar bill may be a fearsome thing, but I'd be much more scared of a dime's worth of lead coming at me at a thousand miles an hour.

Do not let us lose sight of this simple, realistic fact. We are fighting this war with men and machines, and not with money.

Another speaker—I think he was a member of the Conservative party—remarked that instead of the Prime Minister asking the Canadian people to release him from his 1940 promises, all members of parliament should individually ask their electors to release them from promises made in 1940.

Well, I for one would not wish, nor shall I ask, to be released from any pledges I made in 1940. Early in the war, September, 1939, to be exact, we as a group foresaw that eventually we must face the question of conscription. We might have side-stepped it, but instead we took a determined stand and came forward advocating conscription in the following order: First, finance, second, material resources—these before man-power.

What was the consequence of our stand? Seven seats were lost, because we had the intestinal fortitude to proclaim what actually must be done if we are to give of our very best.

Subsequent events have proven that we were on sound ground. I wonder what the Liberal senator, who campaigned so vigorously in my constituency during the 1940 election, and who in an unguarded moment told a sympathetic band of Liberal workers in one of our leading hotels that the Camrose constituency was in the Liberal bag because the Social Credit candidate could be tied up to conscription, is thinking about now. If these few remarks meet his eye, I hope he will go back to Camrose constituency and tell the people he was just playing party politics.

This plebiscite is nothing to get excited about. We are overemphasizing its importance. The main thing is, plebiscite or no plebiscite, to get on with the war. From present indications—as witness the appointment of one Charles Bothwell, an ex-member of parliament to the position of chief electoral officer, pro tem, for this plebiscite—it is playing politics. It is a simple means of placing a little more money into circulation by adding to the purchasing power of needy Liberal camp followers. It is a pretence to draw the minds of the public away from the sterner facts of life. It is the simple plan of "spoofing the public," as the Englishman would say.

There is no question about the intention of the Prime Minister. To consult the public on some important issue is a worthwhile thing, and is to be commended. To fiddle while Canada is in flames is an entirely different matter. It seems to me it is the government's desire to draw the attention of the people away from such items as the fiasco of the last victory loan, the war savings racket, the blunders of shipping wheat and scrapiron to Japan, and the present unfortunate situation at Kirkland Lake.

For months past, with the assistance of a high-powered sales organization, we have been bearing down very heavily on those people who have scanty means and slender pocketbooks, to get them to invest part of their meagre incomes in war savings certificates and bonds. This branch of our national war effort is bogging down. The sale of these little "two plus two equals five" pieces of paper, which one may see advertised by the brewing industry of Canada on every hoarding in the land, is not going very well. It will take a great deal more persuasion, added to the high-pressure and shady tactics employed by certain types of individuals in the last war loan drive to put the next one over.

The people are becoming educated to this financial racket very quickly.

Leslie Roberts, writing in the January issue of the *Montrealer* said:

> If we are to move away from the voluntary system under which one man elects to do his bit by dying in a ditch, and the other by investing his money in war loans at a comfortable rate of interest, only one destination is open to us. That is total war.
>
> Total war means the giving of everything that we have and are, not men, materials and tools, but money, profit and all things which, when added together, comprise the Canadian state. It means the placing of every man and woman in the land on an equal economic footing for the duration of the war, the throwing of everything into the pot.
>
> That is not what the conscriptionists want. What they want is compulsory service for somebody else. Well, until such time as they are ready and willing to give this and more, apoplectic gentlemen whose hardening arteries render them unfit for battle, and ladies who inundate the letters to the Editor columns (including that great self-naturalized Canadienne, Miss Thompson) would be well advised to sing low. By all means give us total war. But let's be done with half-measures designed to restrict sacrifice to age groups.

While I do not agree entirely with Leslie Roberts in all that he has said, yet he has spoken some truths which cannot be glossed over lightly.

By all means give us total war, but do not permit it to become a racket designed to enrich the few at the expense of the many. It is not enough to ask a man to offer his life in the service of his country, only to find on his return that some financial institution has taken possession of his property, and moved his relatives out into the road allowance, as actually happened during the last war.

These financial institutions—soulless organizations—must be made to understand they are in the front line, too. They must be herded there, first, and the sooner this action is taken the sooner shall we have a total-war effort.

The voluntary system of enlistment has not been allowed to function, from the very beginning. It has been hamstrung. Our whole war effort has been marked by blundering, inefficiency, stupidity, sprinkled lavishly with political patronage of the most bare-faced character—bureaucracy on the rampage. From the very beginning recruiting for the army particularly was seriously impaired. Some moron handed the army a battle-dress which the soldiers had to wear on all occasions, especially when off duty. The air force and the navy were both given uniforms of smartness and neatness. I am not quarrelling about the battle-dress, but it was no parade uniform. Everyone knows that. Some person

is now endeavouring to remedy matters after two and one-half years of war, but the damage has been done. It is almost irreparable. It was an asinine regulation.

Stepping up the pay and allowances of all the forces has not yet been tried. We speak bitterly about the man earning from $5 to $10 a day in industry. We compare his lot with that of the soldier. We do nothing about it. Suggestions are made that the worker in industry must be brought down to the level of the man in the fighting forces; never do we suggest raising the pay of the man in the fighting forces to that of the worker in industry. This type of thinking, the destructive type, is encouraged by those who control the destinies of our nation. They do not sit in the front benches of our government either. Their desire is to keep the people in that state of penury and destitution which will render them more tractable. Increases in pay and allowances will come only when we as members of parliament forcibly demand them.

In 1938 a debate took place between Lord Snell and Mr. Amery over the British Broadcasting Corporation's network. The subject of that debate was, "Should national service be compulsory," and I should like to quote what Mr. Amery said on that occasion:

> I am sure that you will agree that nations in the long run depend quite as much upon their civic as upon their military strength, and that the development in their citizens of ever higher spiritual values, is even more necessary to their permanent welfare than are millions of conscripted men with guns and bayonets in their hands. Now those who advocate conscription appear to assume that nations live by guns alone. They wish to take a young man's body and train it for one definite and very limited purpose, while they ignore his other needs as a responsible human personality.
>
> Let me examine very briefly your statement that national defence is a common obligation. I do not deny this obligation, but there is also an obligation to the individual on the part of the state which is rarely remembered. I admit, of course, that all of us as free citizens have some obligation—physical, financial, moral—to the community which has nurtured us and whose social institutions and liberties we have inherited, and historically, of course, there are precedents for enforced military service. In the ancient Greek cities every citizen was compelled to give military service; but the Greek citizen was himself a proprietor who had a direct interest in defending the soil of his fathers, for the land did actually belong to him. The slaves were never called to arms, and no one who had nothing to defend was ever asked to share the risks and burdens of war. Rome acted in the same way. Her armies were armies of citizen proprietors. Nearer our own time, the French revolution was the first to decree a general levy on the ground that the fatherland was in danger but before doing that, the convention enfranchised the serfs and gave to all the right of property.

[Mr. Marshall.]

If the state considers that there is a responsibility due it from the individual, surely it is not too much to expect that the individual has certain rights and privileges which must be recognized by the state.

The Prime Minister should tell the country, even at this late date, that in future all the men in the fighting forces and their dependents shall be forever economically secure. A statement of this sort would be most assuring to our young men in the armed forces and, in my opinion, would stimulate recruiting to a remarkable degree. You must offer them more than a farm mortgaged to the hilt and controlled by the financiers of Toronto, or a home where the bailiff's shadow casts gloom and despondency around. It is not enough.

Parliament exists to carry out the wishes of the people. If I interpret the wishes of the people of my constituency correctly, they are for a total-war effort. Thus far these wishes have been thwarted by the bureaucrats of the East block who have given the people what they (the bureaucrats) think is good for them.

For a long time I have entertained the feeling that we must hear what our experts have to say about the whole business—McNaughton of the army, Breadner and Bishop of the air force, Nelles of the navy, and not what the bureaucrats have to say. General McNaughton is now in Canada. Let us summon him before the bar of this parliament to give us a frank statement as to Canada's preparedness and Canada's need for men. This and this alone will satisfy and perhaps allay the fears of our people.

In conclusion, let me summarize briefly. First, this plebiscite will settle nothing, not even the question of compulsory national service. Second, we are playing politics when in reality we should be fighting a war. Third, total-war effort must include conscription of finance and material resources before man-power. Fourth, the bureaucrat must give place to the expert who alone knows how wars are won and lost.

If we do not insist on a programme which will give us an all-out war effort, then the letters which we have a right to affix to our names, instead of standing for member of parliament will take on their true significance, a mess of pottage.

On motion of Mr. Fraser (Northumberland) the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, February 5, 1942

The house met at three o'clock, the Speaker in the chair.

MILITARY SERVICE

REPORT OF SPEECH OF MR. ST. LAURENT IN QUEBEC CITY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to direct a question to the Prime Minister based on the report of a speech made by the Hon. Louis St. Laurent, Minister of Justice, at Quebec city on Monday the 2nd instant, in which he is reported to have said in a radio address that "at the moment and probably for a long time to come conscription for overseas service would harm our war effort."

I now ask the Prime Minister if that statement of the Hon. Mr. St. Laurent represents the government's views, and may it be taken as a statement of government policy? Was Mr. St. Laurent speaking with the authority of the government, and does the Prime Minister support or repudiate this statement of the Minister of Justice?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I have been trying to avoid political controversy and give my thought and time to the effort of the country in the matter of the war, and I do not intend to be drawn into any controversy by the leader of the opposition.

CANADIAN ARMY

RECONSTITUTION OF ROYAL RIFLES OF CANADA—REFERENCE TO RECRUITING POSTER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Notwithstanding the profound feeling of admiration that we all have for our glorious dead, and in view of the statement made by the Prime Minister on the very first day of this session that the government would grant a committee of investigation in the matter, and in view of the fact that such committee has not yet been named, also in view of the fact that our volunteers should not be on active duty anywhere unless fully equipped and trained, may I be permitted to call the attention of the government and of the house to a poster which may be seen anywhere and which is the worst possible appeal for recruiting volunteers:

Remember Hong Kong. Royal Rifles of Canada will be reconstituted 100 per cent. Follow their glorious example. Enlist now. Apply to the nearest recruiting station in your district.

My question is this: Is it the intention of the Department of National Defence to give immediate and definite instructions that such posters shall be removed at once from anywhere and taken away from the sight of the only ones who have the right to forget—I mean our gallant soldiers, airmen and sailors. It should be for them to forget Hong Kong, although we shall remember it all our lives.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): I did not know of the poster. I do not know who designed it or put it out, but I know this, that a group of very fine patriotic citizens, not only of Quebec, but of Montreal as well, made representations to the department asking that we reconstitute this battalion, with its magnificent tradition, and we gave authority so to do; and recruiting is going on for that battalion. At the moment I do not see what my hon. friend's objection is to the poster. The insinuation that he makes, the reflection which he makes against the department, I quite understand; but that is a matter which will be investigated and inquired into in due course. As regards this poster, I presume it was got out by the local recruiting committee, whether by the district officer commanding I do not know, but I am sure with the full consent and approval of the officers of this newly reconstituted battalion, a number of whom at least have relatives and friends among those who were in the Canadian Hong Kong expedition. It seems to me that what was considered by them to be appropriate would be considered by the house and the people generally to be equally so.

Mr. POULIOT: I rise to a question of privilege. I made no insinuation whatever, and besides that, the minister is my colleague in this house; but I protest strongly when he calls me his friend.

SOVIET UNION

RECOGNITION BY CANADA—ARRANGEMENT FOR EXCHANGE OF CONSULAR SERVICES

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): A few days ago the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) asked the following question:

1. What decision has the government reached regarding the recognition of our present ally the U.S.S.R.?

2. If recognition has been decided upon, will the government exchange representatives with the Soviet Union?

I explained the reasons at the time why it was not possible to give an immediate answer to the question. I am now in a position to give the house the following information:

De facto recognition of the U.S.S.R. was accorded by the United Kingdom government following the signature of a trade agreement at London on March 16, 1921. Canada adhered to this agreement on July 3, 1922, from which date extends Canada's de facto recognition of the U.S.S.R.

On February 1, 1924, the United Kingdom government granted de jure recognition to the U.S.S.R., while formal recognition by Canada may be dated from March 24, 1924, at which time a communication from the Canadian government was forwarded to the government of the U.S.S.R., stating that Canada was prepared to recognize the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

Up to the present time, therefore, the Canadian government has maintained diplomatic and commercial relations with Russia in exactly the same way as is done with many other countries with whom direct diplomatic relations have not yet been established, that is, through the British diplomatic and consular services.

In reply to the second part of this question I would like to inform the house that an agreement was signed in London to-day at 3 p.m. London time between the government of Canada and the government of the U.S.S.R., providing for the exchange of consular representatives between the two countries. The Canadian High Commissioner in London, the Right Hon. Vincent Massey, signed on behalf of Canada, and the Russian ambassador, M. Maisky, signed on behalf of the U.S.S.R.

I may say that it is the belief of the government that the establishment of direct relations, pursuant to this agreement, will greatly facilitate the solution of common problems arising out of the war efforts of our two countries.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Wednesday, February 4, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. W. A. FRASER (Northumberland, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, I realize, on rising to offer some contribution, I hope, to this debate, that as a member of this house I am endeavouring to speak at the most serious time in the history of Canada, the empire and the future of civilization as we know it. I want it clearly understood at the outset that, supported by the stand I have taken in this house since 1936, I am absolutely and irrevocably and determinedly for an all-out war effort on the part of Canada.

Before proceeding with the observations I have to make this afternoon I should like to make reference to the speech made by my good friend the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Gray), which I considered a well-developed and well-delivered oration. But I can only say to him, as I can say to the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Hoblitzell) who spoke two days ago, that as Voltaire said:

I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.

The first thing we should do, Mr. Speaker, in considering Canada's position is to consider the position of Great Britain at the present time; to consider the position in which the people of Britain have found themselves from the beginning of this war, but particularly as developments have taken place from day to day; to consider the position of Britain to-day as compared with the position she was in during the war of 1914-18. Then there were many places to which Britain could turn for supplies; there was Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Spain, and it is not necessary for me to mention, except to ask hon. members to visualize, the supplies she drew in raw materials from the countries accessible during that conflict.

At that time also Britain had available for her war effort the raw materials and food supplies of Australia, New Zealand and the other parts of the empire.

To-day Britain's position is such that Canada is not only the most important but practically the only reservoir for the supplies she needs not only to carry on her war effort but for the very existence of her people. Situated as we are on the shortest sea lane across the western ocean, we must be ready, as we have been, not only to supply Britain with her food and raw material requirements, but to supply her to the limit of our ability with the implements and equipment so necessary to carry on this conflict. In that regard Canada, a highly industrialized country, a vast agricultural country, with over one-third of her people engaged on the land, occupies an outstanding and essential position in the matter of enabling Britain to maintain her people and to carry on this war.

It has been necessary for the government and the people of Canada, in consultation with the people and the authorities, military and civil, of Great Britain, to work out some

plan whereby Canada could extend to Britain the maximum contribution to the achievement of our common objective, that is, the defeat of our enemies, the defeat of that school of thought, the defeat of the totalitarian dictators. That is Canada's duty to-day as it has been in the months that have passed.

Anyone who has not had the opportunity to survey Canada's war industries, to go into the shipyards, the gun plants, the aeroplane plants, the plants producing parts, plants producing the things that Britain has not been able to mobilize to produce even to this day, cannot realize the tremendous effort that has been made and the great results that have accrued from Canada's industrial mobilization under the direction of the efficient and tireless and experienced Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe). If hon. members could, as I have done, spend a month going over the industrial development of Canada, taking into full consideration the time required to turn industry from peacetime production to wartime production, the time required to tool up, to produce dies, jigs, machines, to procure from the only available source the requisite precision tools to produce guns, planes, parts and equipment and munitions, they would marvel at the contribution Canada has made in that respect to the war effort of our empire and our allies.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer for a moment or two to a recent issue of the *Monetary Times*, in which appear page after page of names of those who have been brought into the service of the nation in order to mobilize Canada's industry for our war effort. I hope hon. members will not consider it out of place if I read into the record the names of these men, of all political complexions, from all walks of life but leaders of various branches of industry, who have voluntarily entered the service of the state, to give of their time and experience in the organization of Canada's war industry and the alignment of Canada's economic and financial position in this world struggle. These are the names:

Donald Gordon, chairman, wartime prices and trade board.
R. C. Berkinshaw, chairman, wartime industries control board.
Allan H. Williamson, controller of supplies.
G. R. Cottrelle, oil controller.
D. B. Carswell, director general of naval construction.
John H. Berry, motor vehicle controller.
S. W. Fairweather, director general, economics and statistics.
Colonel D. E. Dewar, director general of arsenals and small arms.
Shirley G. Dixon, K.C., artificial silk administrator.
H. G. Smith, administrator of knit goods.
Hon. J. G. Taggart, food administrator.
F. B. Walls, coordinator of textiles and clothing.
Edgar G. Burton, administrator of retail trade.
Robert F. Chisholm, administrator of wholesale trade.
D. J. O. Meyers, director of purchase branch in United States.
R. B. Whitehead, K.C., deputy administrator of retail trade.
Thomas Arnold, machine tools controller.
W. D. F. Drysdale, director general of industrial planning.

I understand this gentleman has made an unparalleled contribution to Canada's tank production.

F. M. Ross, director general, naval armaments branch.
Colonel D. Stairs, director general of defence projects.
J. P. D. Malkin, joint director general of purchasing.
Desmond A. Clarke, director general of shipbuilding.
F. H. Brown, assistant director general of munitions production.
Wilfred Gagnon, joint director general of purchasing.
J. G. Dodd, administrator of cotton.
Ralph P. Bell, director general of aircraft production.
J. D. C. Forsyth, administrator, men's and boys' furnishings.
Allan S. Nicholson, controller of timber.
E. P. Taylor, president, British supply council in North America.
D. M. Farish, director general of personnel, munitions and supply.
H. J. Symington, K.C., controller of power.
C. Blake Jackson, controller of construction.
H. M. Long, special assistant to the Minister of Finance.
Michael Morris, administrator of furs.
Harry J. Carmichael, director general of gun production.
Frederick B. Kilbourn, controller of steel.
Doctor R. J. Manion.
John A. Marsh, Hamilton.

I had the honour of sitting in this house with Mr. Marsh, who is doing one fine job of work on behalf of this dominion to-day. And then day after day we see in the daily press lists of men who have been asked or who have volunteered to give their services to the country to do necessary work in the prosecution of the biggest business in the world to-day, the business of war. These men are not chosen from any political rank or for any particular colour or stripe; they are chosen by the government, and in particular by the department under the administration of the Minister of Munitions and Supply because they are the best men in Canada to carry on that work.

I should like to refer for a moment to statements made in the British House of Commons by Mr. Churchill on January 28, only last week, in connection with Canada's financial contribution to the empire war effort.

This quotation is from the Montreal *Star* of January 28, 1942:

Mr. Churchill himself praised us when he was here, and yesterday in the British house he referred to "Canada's great and growing contribution to the common cause in men, money and materials," as part of his expression of thanks for our financial offer, which he glowingly termed an offer "unique in its scale in the whole history of the British empire."

I wish to place on record also another statement, this time from the *Globe and Mail*, made at the same time by Mr. Churchill, in these words:

We are conducting this war on the basis of full democracy, and this attempt has'nt been made before in such circumstances.

A variety of attacks are made upon the composition of the government. It is said that it is formed upon a party political basis, but so is the House of Commons. It is silly to extol the parliamentary system and in the next breath say, "Away with party; away with politics."

I have mentioned this statement because I want to make reference to it a little later.

Before proceeding further I feel that as a member representing a constituency in the province of Ontario I would not be taking full advantage of this opportunity if I did not make some reference to the "total war committee" of the city of Toronto. If I were not firmly convinced that mine was the right stand; if I were not firmly convinced that I had a duty to perform, as a humble member of this House of Commons, to express my innate convictions, I should not be speaking this afternoon; but, since I am speaking, I believe I would be unmindful of my duty if I did not make particular reference to this so-called committee. My roots are buried deep in the soil of Scotland. When the war of 1914 broke out my dear old Scotch father called his three boys into the living room and said, "The empire is at war. Choose what you are going to do, the navy or the army, but get into it." That is but an expression of the loyalty I hold not only to Canada but also to the British empire. I make reference to this incident because I take second place to no one in this chamber, or out of it, in my loyalty to my country. But I am going to maintain that loyalty without subterfuge, without fear, without appeal to emotion, prejudice or class. I am going to maintain it in fair, manly language; I am going to do my duty as I see it, regardless of party, race or creed. And I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I consider the methods used by the "total war committee" of Toronto embodied subterfuge, deception and hyprocrisy.

I want to place upon record this afternoon the original telegram—"the" original telegram —sent out by J. Y. Murdoch, Fred K. Morrow and Charles Burton, inviting two hundred people from Ontario to attend a luncheon for which they paid in the Royal York hotel in Toronto. I shall place the full wire on record.

This wire was sent to Mr. O. G. Alyea, at Trenton, Ontario. Please take particular note of the phraseology of it:

Would appreciate if you would join us at luncheon at Royal York hotel on Saturday, January 10, 12.30 p.m. to a limited number influential citizens to discuss a matter of urgent national importance which in the meantime must remain confidential. Please telegraph acceptance immediately care of Royal York hotel, Toronto.

Why did they not tell those people what they were there for? Why did they not tell them why they were invited? The great majority of those two hundred people went to the city of Toronto expecting that these outstanding men were inviting them to have luncheon in order to organize on behalf of the Dominion of Canada the new victory loan. They did not expect they were going to be placed under the obligation of accepting a luncheon at somebody else's expense. They did not expect that within the confines of formal etiquette they would be placed at a disadvantage by their hosts. They were invited there to discuss a matter which must be kept confidential. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that anything which has to do with the welfare of Canada is not confidential with me. I can say it from my place in the House of Commons or say it publicly on any platform or at any luncheon, paid for or otherwise, in the Dominion of Canada.

Now, let us analyse the records of these gentlemen. I make this analysis because I shall have something to say about it before I have finished. I make the analysis because I detest underhand methods. Last night I sent down to the parliamentary library and obtained a copy of "Who's Who", which contains the record of every industrialist and financier in Canada. Every industrialist and financier in Canada who wishes to have his picture or photograph published pays $200 to get it in. Let us read it—

An hon. MEMBER: And writes it himself.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland, Ont.): Yes, as I was going to say, writes it himself. Listen to this:

Murdock, James Y., K.C., LL.D.; President, Noranda Mines; President, Canadian Copper Refiners Limited; Waite Amulet Mines, Limited; Amulet Dufault Mines; Pamour Porcupine Mines, Limited; Hallnor Mines, Limited;—

And then there is a company the name of which is in Spanish. The list continues:

Kerr-Addison Gold Mines, Limited; Goldale Mines Limited; The Office Specialty Manufac-

turing Company, Limited; Vice-president, Aunor Gold Mines Limited; Director: The Bank of Nova Scotia; The Mutual Life Assurance Company of Canada; The British American Oil Company Limited; Hollinger Consolidated Gold Mines Limited; Canada Wire and Cable Company Limited; Wright-Hargreaves Mines, Limited; Quebec Gold Mining Corporation; Rolland Paper Company Limited and Maple Leaf Gardens; Director, Allied War Supplies Corporation.

That is the industrial position of one of the men who issued the invitations for that luncheon.

Mr. MacNICOL: A very great man.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland, Ont.): I shall deal with that later. Now I am going to read to the house what "Who's Who" has to say about Mr. Morrow. This is it:

Morrow, Frederick Keenan, Chairman, Wilsil Limited; President, Essa Securities Company Limited and Loblaw Groceterias Incorporated; Director, Bank of Toronto; Consumers Gas Company Limited; Reiss Premier Pipe Company; The Ogilvie Flour Mills Company Limited—

Yes, Ogilvie Flour Mills—

—Consolidated Bakeries of Canada Limited; Massey-Harris Company Limited; Robinson Consolidated Cone Company Limited; Federal Fire Insurance Company; Hiram Walker-Gooderham & Worts Limited; Maple Leaf Gardens Limited; Ward Baking Company and Remington Rand Limited.

An hon. MEMBER: Read Charlie Dunning now.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland, Ont.): If there is any hon. member who wishes to speak, either I will sit down or he can wait until I finish.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We are enjoying it.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland, Ont.): Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the gentlemen who make this statement.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh, don't forget Mr. Burton; let us have him, too.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland, Ont.): Well, I have not time to get into a price-control argument debate on the floor of the house.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Don't renege on him. Don't forget Mr. Burton.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, will you ask hon. gentlemen to write me? I cannot hear them.

Now, listen to what these gentlemen say:

There is only one way to meet total war,—by total effort—that is to mobilize all our man-power and material resources under a plan of universal compulsory selective service. Those who can serve best on the farms must work on the farms. Those who can serve best in the factories must work in the factories. And those best fitted to serve in the armed forces must be trained, equipped, and available for service in Canada or overseas anywhere at any time. That is the only way that our farms, our factories and our armed forces can wage total war. No half measures are consistent with national honour.

And this is what they have suggested should be told to members:

Tell him to inform parliament, and through parliament the whole of Canada, that the people of his riding advocate and will support any measures, however drastic, which will assure the last ounce of effort of which they are capable.

I might add that out of 21,000 voters in my constituency, only 62 took advantage of the opportunity of writing me in this connection.

National honour and the safety of our people demand that every man who wears the uniform of Canada be ready at all times to go overseas to hit the enemy wherever and whenever he can be reached.

Let these gentlemen, who signed the invitation under subterfuge and hypocrisy, if they want to contribute to the war effort of Canada, take advantage of the non-interest-bearing loan offered by the Dominion of Canada. Let them say to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) "We wish to have equal sacrifice. We wish to have universal compulsory service, but if you wish to take our money away from us we will give it to you, without interest." That is the suggestion I make. It is a grand suggestion, and it would be some indication that these honourable men are sincere.

Let me go further and say to them, that if I owned an empire such as "Who's Who" says they own, I would want to conscript everybody in Canada to defend it. And, Mr. Speaker, if I had their mentality not only would I wish to conscript—insist upon conscripting—every man in Canada to defend that empire, but I would go farther and spend every dollar I could to create in this country in the minds of the people a situation which would delude and deceive them into conscripting people to defend my empire.

It is not often that I agree with my hon. friends who are led by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), but standing here in my place in the House of Commons I want to say that I agree with many of the fundamentals which he has expounded in the last few weeks. I want to say to these men who advertise to the public, that their financial empire will not continue. These people not only want to conscript men to

defend their empire; they want to sit in at the peace table. They want to dominate the government and the people of Canada in order that when we win this war, which we surely will do, they can defeat the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar and myself and anyone else who is trying to make sure that they will not have that kind of empire after the war.

Let us see how far these people go. They do not just go to the extent that a business man would go; they do not just go to the extent that a true citizen of Canada would go; they do not just go to the extent that people would go who understand that to-day we, like our allies and the rest of the empire, have our backs to the wall. They do not do that; they are not satisfied with that. They are not satisfied to spend their money upon cheap paltry engraved cards; they are not satisfied to sell their country short; they are ready to do what my hon. friend the leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation detests, what is detested by the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King) and by myself; they are ready to besmirch the ballot, to take away the right of free people to stand behind a curtain and put an "X" on a ballot, the right that we won under the Magna Charta. They are not satisfied in their contracted mentalities where a common stock dividend is the most beautiful thing in the world. People with this type of mentality are ready to spend money to besmirch the ballot box and take away the rights of the common people in this democratic country. Not only do they do that; they want to attack democratic government from the pulpit. They want to go farther than that and use the loyalty of hon. members of this house, which I am ready to admit, taking advantage of their sincerity, and attempting to ridicule democratic government. I am sorry the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) is not in his place, because there is no one I would rather face than him. I should like to quote what he placed on *Hansard*, January 29, 1942, at page 131. He was quoting the words of a certain person, as follows:

> I ask you to request our Prime Minister to beg Churchill, Wavell and Prime Minister Curtin to hang on. Canada is voting in three months.

Did the hon. member for Parkdale contribute anything to Canada's war effort by placing that on *Hansard*? Did he help things by repeating that evidence of cheap prejudice and sabotage of Canada's war effort? If he were sitting in his place there are one or two more references I should like to make, but because of my respect for him I shall not use them now.

[Mr. W. A. Fraser.]

But they go further than that. According to last night's press a discredited candidate, a man who stood up on the platform in the city of Ottawa to speak in the most emphatic language against the great Conservative party and tried to advise them what to do, has something to say. He nearly sabotaged them at that time. Here is this fellow Herridge, the Honourable Mr. Herridge, stating in London, in the centre of this empire of war, that the safety of Canada depends upon the resignation of the Prime Minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland, Ont.): Before this war is over my hon. friends who say "hear, hear" will hang their heads in shame. This man was Canada's representative in Washington, and yet he makes that statement in the heart of the empire. I feel that I can say without fear of contradiction by hon. members of this house, even by hon. members who have disagreed with me, even by my many sound-thinking friends in the Tory party, that everyone will reject that kind of attitude toward Canada at this time.

I should like to make one or two other references. First, let me refer to a statement made upon a public platform, during a by-election campaign, by the premier of the province of Ontario. The premier of Ontario has been a friend of mine of long standing. Perhaps there is no one who has cooperated as much with him, who has done more to have him adopt a moderate attitude than I. Here is what he said on January 28:

> —"deliberately attempting to set the French against the British on the issue of compulsory selective service".
>
> "I charge Mr. King with deliberately trying to set the French against the British through his chief lieutenant in Quebec, Mr. Godbout," said Mr. Hepburn.

I read that simply because I intend to refer to it again in a minute or two. Let me say this to my hon. friends in this house: Make no mistake about it, there can be no equality of sacrifice in a war. Anyone who uses that phrase is not stopping to analyse its meaning. I ask my good friend, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar: would the union men of Canada leave the production lines to go on our farms? Canada is a highly unionized country; I ask him if they would permit themselves to be pushed and shoved around. Obviously the answer is no. They are doing a wonderful job. They are just like the senior civil servants in Ottawa; they are giving all they have to Canada's contribution to the war effort. There can be no equality of sacrifice during a war. It is with a knowledge of Canada's contribution to the empire war effort

that I am proud to say that 565,000 Canadian workmen are producing the implements of war for the air force, the navy and the army, not only for service overseas but in Canada. I am ready to depend upon the loyalty and the understanding of Canadian citizenship to put this job over without endeavouring to create dissension by conscripting people.

I am watching my time, Mr. Speaker. I have great respect for every member of the House of Commons, but if I did not know them all personally, if they were all strangers to me, I would still have the same respect for them because somewhere, in some part of Canada, they have offered themselves to their fellow Canadians to do the best they could for them as their representatives in this assembly of a democratic country. I have much less respect for men who pile up millions and have never offered themselves for service, men who try to browbeat and influence by prejudice and hate the good people of the Dominion of Canada. I have even less respect for those who have been rejected by the people of Canada as a whole but who insist on trying to dictate the policies of the government of Canada, and I want to spend the next three or four minutes appealing to my hon. friends opposite in this house.

This is going to be an appeal for unity, for understanding, cool heads and clear thinking, and appreciation of the facts. The first thing I want to say to my good friends in the Tory party in this house is that no one has ever suffered to a greater extent than they from the consequences of a house divided against itself. It was the Bennett-Stevens catastrophe of a few years ago that resulted in the position in which they find themselves to-day. Surely that is an example to prove that unity is necessary.

This government is running a three per cent war and a loan without interest war, not a five and a half per cent tax-free war for the plutocratic financiers of Canada under Arthur Meighen. No, this government is running a three per cent war. These are the facts, these are the realities I ask you to take into consideration.

This is a democratic assembly elected by all the people. We have in this house sixty-five members from the province of Quebec. I have not the Reverend Mr. Shields' hatred of religion and race. I have not and never could have the feeling of hate that was demonstrated by Colonel George Drew and Doctor Shields platforms in the East Hastings by-election when they said that the French-Canadians were a conquered race and must expect to be treated that way. I have not that hate and could not have that hate for my fellow Canadians. They elect their representatives to this democractic assembly; they are our fellow Canadians, and you cannot get away from that. I do not care what bitterness, what hate, what passions and emotions others may appeal to, but my appeal to-day, Mr. Speaker, not only to those to your left but to every member of this house, regardless of race or creed, and to my fellow citizens everywhere, is to trust Canadians and the government of Canada by Canadians. This is a time to trust Canadians. You can turn the dial of your radio and listen in to the United States. There you have a government, not as the hon. member for Parkdale states, but a party government, and not universal compulsory service, as the hon. member for Parkdale stated. But there you have a highly-unionized country, a country where recompense and compensation and loyalty are the incentives—not the Hitler labour camps, but unity, loyalty, compensation, understanding, education. That is the guide and slogan in the United States, where you find Mr. Willkie speaking on a platform and over the air, appealing to the people of the United States, and standing shoulder to shoulder with Mr. Roosevelt.

While my hon. friends opposite may not realize this—and I have read or listened to every speech that has been made in this debate—I want to tell them that Mr. Mackenzie King is the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada in accordance with the wishes and the voice of the people of Canada. The hon. member for Parkdale, who came into this house after the 1940 election, day after day has stated that we need a new Prime Minister, but the people of Canada with an unmistakable voice said: Mackenzie King is the safest man to conduct the affairs of this country and to conduct the war. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that he is still Prime Minister of Canada, and all the dastardly—and I say this for the record—all the dastardly attacks and all the unspeakable epithets that have been hurled against William Lyon Mackenzie King by his enemies cannot change the fact that he is Prime Minister of Canada and the leader of responsible government in Canada. We had an example in Spain of rebellion against constituted government there which cost over three million lives. We had a similar thing in France, a people divided against themselves—and not only in France but also in the low countries. It was Pearl Harbour that cemented the people of the United States. Do not let us as Canadians require a Pearl Harbour or a Dunkirk to make us united. I will join with every man in this house and with every citizen of Canada who

will take as his slogan: Don't sell Canada short, because that would be selling your own country short. You would be sabotaging your own country. When you do that, you are not damning the man who is the Prime Minister and the head of responsible government in Canada; but you are damning and sabotaging your own country.

I know that to-morrow morning my name will be on the back page of that sheet, the *Globe and Mail,* but I trust that the sincerity of my voice and of my determination will go across this country from one end to the other when I appeal to my fellow Canadians to be Canadians, just as the Americans are Americans, and to back the Prime Minister and constituted government.

My time, Mr. Speaker, is up.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland, Ont.): I have much more that I could say from the very altar of my honesty and sincerity. This government has brought in a measure as a result of the deliberations and conclusions of the cabinet. There may be features about the plebiscite that are not as we would all like, but I have studied it. I went home and for three days did nothing but turn it over in my mind, and I came to this honest conclusion. I was convinced that if ever in my life I should stand as I have stood this afternoon and appeal to my fellow Canadians to stand behind the man who for five times has been elected by the ballots of the people of Canada to lead this country, now is the time. If an offer was made to my hon. friends opposite to-day to come and join a national government under Mackenzie King they would not do it. They would want a national government of their own making, of the making of the Murdochs.

In closing, I would express my appreciation of the splendid hearing which my fellow members have given me this afternoon, and thank them for the extra time they have allowed me. Finally, I appeal to every hon. member, as I would appeal to my brother: For God's sake get behind Canada. Don't sell her short. Get behind the Prime Minister, and let us put this thing over. We will do it.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): On a point of order, I did not wish to intervene while the hon. gentleman was speaking, but the rules are there; they should not be violated without the consent of this house, and no consent was asked for. Had the hon. member asked for overtime I personally would have cheerfully granted it to him, but I do not think the rules should be used for the purpose of abusing political opponents or of putting on a burlesque in this house.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. member mentioned the fact that he was exceeding his time I looked to see if there was opposition, but as a matter of fact the expression that was given by those on the left was that he should continue, and I assumed that he had consent.

Mr. NORMAN J. M. LOCKHART (Lincoln): It is not my intention to emulate the scene that has been enacted in this house within the last forty-five or fifty minutes or perhaps an hour. Apparently the theories propounded by the previous speaker have met with general approval among the followers of the government. I have not at any time attempted to minimize the war effort of this government, but I rise in my place at this time to urge them on to greater things.

None of us question the loyalty of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Fraser), who has just spoken, and I want to assure him that there are just as many loyal subjects in Canada to-day as there were in the last war, as is shown by the fact that they have sent sons overseas.

I am not particularly interested in digging up from among the archives anything that might appear to discredit men who have, in fact, been a credit to Canadian public or civil life. Those men on whom a vicious attack was made to-day will be able, I am quite sure, when the last account is taken to measure up with anyone, whether he be Speaker in this house, member of the house, or among those recited in the great list which have given of their best.

I received no telegram; I attended no banquet; but I think it would be interesting to have a comparison made between the records of the men who were viciously attacked in the preceding address, and, perhaps, some of those who are members of this house. This is no time for us to indulge in recriminations. This is a time when every member should express to the best of his ability his point of view and the views of his constituents. A strange spectacle has been enacted in this house in the last week or two—yes, and it is being enacted in many parts of Canada to-day. The daily papers are to-day reporting incidents which I believe it would be better to have deleted from the records of the nation. Canada, the empire, Christian civilization itself is rocking on its foundations, and in my opinion the spectacle which is being enacted in this house—within the last hour—is not a credit to the parliament of Canada in this time of crisis.

I listened the other day to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Fulford) denouncing his friends. Not long ago the lion and the lamb lay down together in peace. How things have changed! Then we have another hon. gentleman, the member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck), appearing on a public platform in the city of Toronto supporting the candidate of my hon. friends to the left, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party, and the next day appearing in the constituency of Welland and urging before the electors the defeat of that same candidate. I say that strange spectacles are being enacted throughout Canada as well as in this house.

We are the elected representatives of the people of Canada, and I think that every representative has a sacred duty to perform at this time. It was hoped, at least I had hoped when I came to the house at this session, that we would be given an opportunity to accomplish something with alacrity in the interests of Canada and of the empire. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) as a private member spoke to us yesterday at length; as a minister of the crown, a member of the war cabinet, he has also expressed his views. I for one respect those views just as I expect him to respect the views of my constituents or any views I may advance.

He has approved of the expenditure of money on a plebiscite. With this I have to disagree. He has likened it to the spending of money by people on amusement. I would point out that the spending of trust money, raised by the sacrifices of the taxpayers of this country, on matters such as a plebiscite is far different from people spending the small pittance they have left after paying these taxes to get a little amusement and recreation for themselves.

The speech from the throne deals specifically with few matters but more particularly with the plebiscite suggested by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). In respect to that I had hoped we would have something definite placed before us. The leader of the group with which I have the honour to be associated pressed for that, and others have pressed for the definition of what this plebiscite would contain. The answer given by the Prime Minister is found on page 32 of *Hansard:*

> When my hon. friend goes on to ask me what I am going to do with respect to any expression of view which may be made by the people in connection with any reference which will be made to them, may I say to him that in seeking to get relief from past commitments I am not going to begin by making new and fresh commitments. In seeking freedom on the part of the ministry I am not going to start in by seeking to tie my own hands.

Later on the Prime Minister said, as reported at page 60:

> May I add that such attitude as I shall take at the time will be taken in the light of all the circumstances as I may know them as a member of the government, and of all conditions as I know them in regard to this country and, as far as I am able to know something about them, conditions in other countries as well.

This, with some more words, was the answer to a request for more explicit information and direction on this plebiscite. This evasion of responsibility is not acceptable to the voters of my constituency, and I do not believe it is acceptable to the voters of many parts of Canada. It seems to me the Prime Minister is following public opinion entirely, following and listening to see what the effect of his pronouncements may be, without giving the leadership desired in this hour of crisis. I am sure that has been made manifest in the press throughout the country.

I state here publicly that at least one thousand of my constituents have sent me individual messages of protest. Collective groups comprising 75 to 100 signatures each have also sent me communications in considerable number. I have received thirty or more resolutions from municipal councils, service clubs, church organizations and all kinds of kindred groups, which totalled up would represent at least two or three thousand names. These people have protested most definitely against the vagueness of the language used by the Prime Minister in referring to the plebiscite and what he proposes to place before the people at this time.

They urge a complete and total war effort. They urge compulsory selective service, and in no uncertain words they tell me what my duty is as a member of this parliament, sent here as their representative. I am urged to do all in my power to prevent a plebiscite being taken. The reasons given by them, in which I entirely concur, are that the saving of time and money in this hour are essential. I voice, therefore, the opinions of my electors as expressed in the messages they have sent me. And what is more, as a member of this parliament, in making these utterances I am prepared to take my full share of responsibility to see that they are carried out.

I must in fairness say that I received one message, signed by one individual only, said to be representing an executive group, but from an organization I have not heard of before, endorsing the plebiscite but definitely calling for compulsory selective service. That is the extent to which the hundreds, yes, thousands of messages that have reached me approve of this plebiscite. I am urged to do everything I can to put a stop to what they

call putting square pegs in round holes in this war effort. I am urged by returned soldier organizations to get more fully behind the thousands of lads who have gone overseas, to make definitely sure that reinforcements will be provided in the hour of need. I am quite sure that other hon. members have received similar communications from returned soldier organizations.

These organizations point out the need of trained recruits. They point out the necessity that might arise following such tragedies as Hong Kong, Dunkirk, Greece and Crete, and all these disasters that have been referred to by other speakers. Who knows, they say, when the next demand may come? We may have to go to Alaska or points close to Canada.

In this connection I think we as members of this house must have appreciated the observations made here by hon. members from British Columbia as to the critical situation there. We cannot be unmindful of the words of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) when he pointed out the position our troops would be in if overnight the treacherous Japs were to strike in the dark, perhaps on the shores of Alaska. What would be our position if we had to go to our armed forces and pick out the men who could leave Canada from those who could not go? This has been brought to our attention by messages received from returned soldiers' organizations in my city. If on the other hand Vancouver turned out to be the vulnerable point, how quickly could United States forces respond to our help? I plead with this government to see that we are placed in the same position as the armies of the United States so that we can give one hundred per cent support whether it be in our own Canada or on shores perhaps not too far distant—yes, even in the remotest parts of the world.

I was home over the week-end, Mr. Speaker, and during that time I received a great many telephone calls; in fact the wires on my telephone were almost burning up.

An hon. MEMBER: Too bad they didn't.

Mr. LOCKHART: Too bad they didn't? Perhaps the hon. member who interjected that remark had better go home himself. That is just another example of the cheap performance we hear in this house all too frequently.

I was repeatedly asked if I would define the proposed plebiscite. Among the questions I was asked was this: Is there any commitment, or what is the commitment, as to what will be done following the taking of the plebiscite? Many people told me they were sick and tired of the delay in parliament and were not even going out to vote. That is something I greatly deplore, that the electors should be placed in the position of not being sufficiently interested or informed to exercise their franchise. But the onus for that situation rests entirely upon the Prime Minister and this government.

What could I reply to that question? I could only read the Prime Minister's evasive words in response to direct inquiries. Then I was frequently asked another question, which I commend to the attention of the hon. member who interrupted me a moment ago and to other hon. members who were so vociferous in their applause following the address of the hon. member for Northumberland, Ont. (Mr. Fraser). I was asked: When this vague proposition was presented to parliament, was the press report correct in stating that about 175 supporters of the government in this chamber supported the proposal and applauded to the housetops? I had to say that the answer was yes.

I cannot pass on without making a brief reference to the courageous stand afterwards taken by a few hon. members opposite, who seemed to feel that their responsibility was not limited to applause, but who felt they should express their individual views and the views of the people whom they represent. I want to pay my tribute to those hon. members who had the courage of their convictions.

Inquiries came to me from the adjoining constituency, the county of Welland, which is so much in the limelight to-day. The late esteemed member for that constituency was elected to this house by one of the larger majorities that returned this government to power. He was very well thought of, and we regret his passing. But that majority now is split asunder. The plebiscite is the only issue in that by-election; and we have seen the nomination of an independent supporter of the Liberal party in protest against the plebiscite. The electors of Welland who were in contact with me over the week-end not only reminded me that the plebiscite had destroyed unity in that part of Canada, but they also directed my attention to other parts of this country. Only to-day I have been in receipt of three or four letters, containing clippings, referring to statements made in Quebec last Tuesday evening by one of the principal speakers campaigning in that province in the interests of the government candidate. I believe these were the words used by Mr. Taschereau, of Quebec:

> There are events happening in Australia at present which more than ever would not only justify Prime Minister King's non-enforcement of conscription for overseas service but which might even oblige him to recall troops now stationed in England.

This clipping was given me by an elector of the constituency of Welland. On the same evening the present Minister of Labour, speaking in Welland, is reported in these words:

He expressed the opinion that the vote of the Canadian people "will relieve Prime Minister King of his non-conscription pledge in the coming plebiscite." Quite plainly the collective responsibility of cabinet ministers, as well as the principle of responsible government, is being scuttled in Canada.

Such was the direction given me by the electors of Welland. The plebiscite is not only causing national disunity in that part of Canada. We recall that in connection with these by-elections there was supposed to be some mutual understanding; new blood was to be brought into this parliament, and that mutual understanding met with more or less general favour. The electors of Welland stated to me that they accepted that principle; and to hon. members of this house I want to say that members of this party more or less accepted it also. As a result no attempt was made by the Conservative party to place anyone in the field to oppose the Minister of Labour. Who is to blame for the upset that has occurred in that county? I ask this house on whose doorstep can be placed the responsibility for causing this disunity. Do not blame it on the Conservative party. Do not blame it on any members from more remote parts of Canada. The responsibility rests with the Prime Minister and his ministers for foisting on the public such a vague proposal as a plebiscite.

What may be the outcome in that by-election no one can say. It was suggested by one gentleman in that county that perhaps even yet the hon. member for Northumberland, Ontario, who is not at the moment in his seat, may have the opportunity to become Minister of Labour, as has been suggested in this house. In any event, the Prime Minister may yet have to make his selection from the membership of this house, and whom can he thank for the mess he has made? That is what I ask this house.

Then on Saturday evening I crossed into New York state, where I have many friends whom I hold in high esteem and with whom I have had many things in common over a long period of years. I looked up some of them to see what was their view of the present situation, now that a menace has sprung up in the southern Pacific. What were their views? I will try to express them. I found a changed attitude on their part. Yesterday the Minister of Finance quoted an editorial from one of the New York newspapers. Perhaps I might be permitted to quote an editorial from a newspaper published much nearer the Niagara peninsula and the constituency of Welland than the New York *Times*. The clipping was in the hands of my friends in New York state. When I asked their views, one gentleman produced the clipping which I shall read to the house. He said it expressed their views, and I believe it expresses the views of many people in the United States. This article appeared in the Buffalo *Courier-Express* in its issue of January 24, 1942. I assume I have the same privilege as was accorded the Minister of Finance; namely, that of reading at length. This is the article:

Announcement by the Earl of Athlone, governor general of Canada, of a plebiscite on raising troops by conscription means that our brothers north of the border have determined to meet squarely their toughest political problem . . . Canada is now faced with the same problem which confronted the United States only a few weeks ago. Our draft law called for the training of men for service within the United States. Pearl Harbour changed all that and congress immediately authorized the use of United States troops in any theatre of war. To-day Canada drafts men, 21 to 24, for full-time defence duties with the active army, and these men, after four months' training period, are posted for home defence duties, releasing volunteers for overseas duty.

The natural question which arises on this side of the border is that if we can do it overnight why does Canada hesitate?

Let me point out that this editorial reflects the feeling of many of my friends in the United States, and a great mass of public opinion in that country.

A full explanation of the political reasons would take this entire page and several succeeding pages, but the answer is always the same—French Canada.

That is what is being said along the border where one of the most bitter by-elections ever fought in the country is being waged. While these spectacles are being enacted, not only in the house but in different parts of Canada we, the elected representatives of our people, sit here and twiddle our thumbs for the next few weeks waiting for some vague plebiscite to decide an important issue. That is the point which strikes me most forcibly. Faced with the same dangers, faced with the same possibilities of attack, why cannot we in the parliament of Canada deal with this matter now, the same as the parliament of Great Britain and other parts of the empire and the United States have done?

Some of my people call it political expediency. Other letters I receive describe it as a political blunder. Others call it lack of leadership. Whatever those opinions are, certainly Canada is being divided over this

plebiscite, at a time when more than any other in our history national unity should be our objective.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that while we twiddle our thumbs the voice of parliament is still. We go on with this spectacle. Let me urge hon. members to frown on all this cheap political—

Mr. MacNICOL: Burlesque.

Mr. LOCKHART: Yes, burlesque, if you wish to call it that, which is so evident in the house.

We are faced with a desperate situation. Let me say a word at this point about the effect of national compulsory service on the farmers, a subject which has had some consideration in the house. Let me give a specific example which indicates the extent of the problem in my section of the country. One man came to me recently and told me that he had just returned from one of the largest food processing factories in that vicinity. The manager of the plant had asked this farmer to sign again this year the contract he had signed in past years calling for the production of certain lines of foodstuffs. The man said to me, "I visited that factory about three weeks ago, and learned that I had to buy five tons of a particular type of fertilizer, involving an investment of considerable money. When I came home my only son met me at the door and produced a notice to serve in the army." The father was in a dilemma. On the following morning he and his boy drove to Toronto to discuss the matter with the regional director. The result of their trip was nothing but evasion. They were promised a deferment.

I have no doubt other hon. members have heard similar stories. This is not a new problem, and I could give many other examples. That man urged upon me that his only son was needed at home. I told him that he might obtain a deferment, but he would have to use his own judgment. The man said to me, "The manager of the processing plant is urging me to take this contract, but I cannot sign it if my son is to be taken."

The time has come when each one of us in Canada must be told what he is to do and how he is to do it. The farmer must be told what he is to produce, and he must be given guarantee that at least an only son will be left to help carry through his obligation to produce for Great Britain and our lads overseas.

I shall not detain the house, but when hon. members discuss these matters with their constituents, and when they learn about the chaos in the present set-up, surely they should stand in their places and tell the house that we must have selective service of every man and woman in Canada. Every industry and every resource must be mobilized in the most effective way—and now. Evidence of that is apparent on every side. And so I ask: Why do we delay? Canada is one of the granaries of the world. We have become one of the chief sources of supply of foodstuffs for Great Britain. We have become one of the main sources of supply for those thousands of our boys who have gone overseas. A clear, comprehensive and constructive policy must be given to the farmers by the government, and given without delay.

I pass on. Thinking back over the references which have been made in this house I realize that there are many hon. members who are too ready to dig up dead horses. They have been ready to go back into the history of the last war and attempt to discredit the public life of men some of whom have long been dead. They bring in all kinds of inferences which have no bearing upon the crisis which now confronts us. I urge hon. members to cease this idle twaddle; let us get down to present realities and accomplish something. When the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Turgeon) was making his defence of the plebiscite he told us what he thought of compulsory service two years ago. We know how the President of the United States was swept into power; we know that a few weeks afterwards he went to congress without any plebiscite and said that he must have compulsory service in every part of the world where the enemy might be met.

Why can we not have the same thing in this country? That is what I am urging should be done. We read the newspapers, we know what is happening, we realize the possibilities in Australia and we see the reverses that our armed forces are encountering. Surely the crisis is just as great now. Why should we sit here and talk idly about technicalities or make inferences which have no bearing upon the present emergency?

The Prime Minister must give some thought to the definite demand in this country for compulsory selective service. Let us try to guide him; let us tell him the views of our own people on this matter. That is my duty this afternoon, to try to show him exactly what my own constituents are saying. We should not have any differences of opinion about this, because that is all it amounts to in connection with this plebiscite. It is just a case of one man thinking one thing, and another man thinking something else. But it

has created a lot of disunity. If the elected representatives of the people would deal with this question here in the house I believe it could be settled just as well as it will be three months, six months or a year hence. The men who are now overseas are demanding it. Surely all hon. members are receiving letters daily urging that this action be taken, demanding it. These men are wondering, if they have to go to Hong Kong or some such place, whether there will be somebody to step in should they have to make the supreme sacrifice. I say this advisedly because I am receiving scores of letters from overseas.

There is only one important step to be taken—compulsory selective service. What have we in Canada to-day? Industry has been regimented and our money has been conscripted. You may call it what you like, but the fact is that it is being taken from us. Our young men were called up for thirty days' training and they had to go. That training was found to be totally inadequate; some people made what was termed a "war shout" over the cost, and then young men were called for four months. That also proved entirely inadequate for the situation which was becoming more acute. The defence of our own shores began to loom up, and these men were then called in for the duration of the war. Call it conscription if you like, but it is compulsory selective service. They had to serve.

There is only one more step we need to take in this parliament. Instead of calling for service in Canada, we should call for service anywhere in the world. We should not be frightened about compulsory service. The only difference is as to where we have to serve. I am not afraid of its being said that I have been conscripted. I am prepared to assume whatever share of the burden I am asked to take. Those who are overseas are calling for assistance, and there is just one more step which the Prime Minister and this government have to take in order that we may have all-out compulsory selective service. Why hesitate any longer?

We are in the midst of a mad race for supremacy with a ruthless enemy. I think that must be conceded. Let us stop pussyfooting in this parliament which is supposed to be the last word in directing this country. The world is looking upon us at this time, with parliament in session, to give some kind of lead and not play for political positions, not trifle with the great questions that confront us. Never before to my knowledge has there been such a demand upon the courage of men, that they act like men. Surely we have an example in the men who have gone overseas. They stand out because of their courageous action. We, the elected representatives of this country, must have the courage of our convictions. I say again that it is a race for supremacy, the supremacy of all that is right and decent. This supremacy cannot be won if we do not strain our resources to the last ounce. Otherwise we may lose. That is the tragedy with which we are confronted. That is what may happen if we do not measure up, if we are not courageous.

I urge upon the government, I urge upon the Prime Minister as leader of the government, as leader of the war time cabinet, that these possibilities be seriously considered. I urge upon him that he come frankly before parliament and place upon every hon. member the responsibility of doing his duty. In this race he holds the starter's pistol. If he pulls the trigger, we have to go. I say to hon. members: if the Prime Minister will just pull the trigger, let every one of us go to the last ounce of our strength before it is too late.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, it is with much diffidence that I rise to take part in this debate. The issues confronting us are so many and so complex and the war itself is on such a world-wide scale that it is next to impossible for the human mind to grasp its full extent and implications. But this much I think is clear. We know much better to-day than we did two years ago, or in September, 1939, who our enemies and who our friends are. Yet as I go among the people I find that there are many things which are not clear to them, and some of these will, I believe, have to be clarified before we get a full war effort.

We are being told by the radio, the press, the churches and a hundred and one other agencies that we are fighting for freedom, for liberty and for democracy. Yet we can see every day that there is a never-ceasing struggle, and sometimes I think a losing struggle, carried on in our midst during this time of war. Instead of class conflict becoming less as we prepare to meet increasing difficulties, it is becoming more intense and more bitter. As anti-social employers gloat over victories gained over their workers, with the assistance of a servile and anti-labour government, smouldering bitterness grows in the hearts and souls of beaten and sullen workers. These are some of the important issues in this war, and they are some of the issues that are preventing us from getting a full war effort. As I shall show before I finish, the government of to-day not only has ignored labour, but is fastening more and more tightly the shackles of big business

control on the people of this country. The speech from the throne says that this is no ordinary war but a conflict between irreconcilable forces. The government uses these words but seemingly does not understand them. Cannot the members of this government see that the very same conflict is going on in miniature in our very midst? If, however, they do see it, are they doing anything to remove the causes of that conflict in order to leave us more free to fight the common enemy?

I think, Mr. Speaker, we shall have to realize, before we fully understand the nature of this war, that it did not begin in September, 1939, and also that it is, as the speech from the throne says, more than an ordinary war; it is a world revolution. This war began in January, 1933, with the destruction of the German trade unions and socialist parties by Hitler. It was continued and has continued on a score of different fronts, and in a thousand different ways, before Poland was invaded in September, 1939. It was continued by the destruction of the Vienna socialists in 1934; it was continued in 1936 and 1937 and 1938 in Spain, as the hon. member for Northumberland, Ont., (Mr. Fraser), already pointed out this afternoon. In Spain the women and children of Madrid, Barcelona and Burgos were bombed by the war planes of Hitler and Mussolini, and we helped them destroy the loyalist government of that country. I remember speaking in this house on May 26, 1938—and what the hon. member for Northumberland, Ont., said to-day brought it to my mind—and I tried to get parliament to reverse the attitude which this government had taken in the Spanish civil war. But no one cared. I should like to read a few words of what I said on that occasion. It is important now because the democracies could just as easily have had a democratic Spain as they have a fascist Spain. I said as reported at page 3246 of *Hansard* of May 26, 1938:

> I am going to confine my remarks to one aspect of our foreign policy which seems to me to transcend all other aspects, even at this time when we are beset on all sides with questions of very great import. I refer to our policy with regard to Spain. To me our policy in connection with the Spanish situation has been and is devoid of every semblance of equity, justice, fairness or the application of international law.

I do not wish to quote more, but that much was apparent then. I pointed out that the result of our policy would be that either fascism or communism would become dominant in Spain. I have often wondered how some of the members of the cabinet of that day could stay in the cabinet—the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), for instance, or the present Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie)—realizing as they must have done what the consequences of the policy they were endorsing would be. I may come back, if I have time, to the question of the labour policy of the government.

First, however, I want to say something with regard to the plebiscite. The announcement of the plebiscite is the most important item in the speech from the throne. For myself I am not finding fault with the principle of referring matters to the people for an expression of opinion, but in referring such matters to a popular vote there are, it seems to me, two essential requirements before an intelligent verdict can be given or expected: (1) there must be a clear-cut question which can be answered yes or no and from which predictable results will follow, having regard to the popular decision; (2) the people who are to decide must have reliable information on which to form an opinion. In the proposed plebiscite the first essential consideration is missing, and, so far, there is no indication that the people will get reliable information as to the need or otherwise of compulsory military service for overseas.

No member of the government, as far as I know, has yet said that compulsory military service for overseas is urgently needed or that it is not needed. I was not in the house when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) spoke on January 26, but I have read his speech with great care. It is a good speech until he begins to deal with the matter of the plebiscite. I admit that he has made a good case for a reference to the people, but he has not made a case for the kind of reference proposed—and I reiterate that my objection is not to the principle of a plebiscite even in times of national crisis. My objection is based on the fact that the question to be placed before the people, on which they will be asked to vote, is not the straight question yes or no on conscription, the only question at issue at this time. The question on which the people will be asked to vote was stated by the Prime Minister and has been read in this house a number of times. It is this:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity that that is not a proper question to put before the people of Canada at this time. There is only one matter on which the government feels its hands tied. The government, if it wants to be released, should ask for release without any beating about the bush. A vote

taken on the question proposed will in some parts of Canada be a vote on conscription; in other parts of Canada it will not be a vote on conscription. It will depend in what part of the country one happens to be. In places where sentiment is favourable to conscription, people will be told that a favourable vote will result in the government introducing a conscription bill; in parts of the country where there is opposition to conscription, the people will be told that a favourable vote will not mean conscription. The premier of Quebec, as well as other speakers in that province, has already stated that a favourable vote will not be followed by conscription.

This plebiscite, then, is neither fish, flesh nor fowl, but it is a good red herring. It is about as clever—or as clumsy, whichever term you choose to use—a piece of subterfuge as has ever been perpetrated upon a people.

During the past two months the acting leader of this group and I have crossed this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We stopped at all the larger centres of population and at some not so large. We met and spoke with thousands of people in all walks of life. I think we are both convinced that the people are more ready for conscription to-day, if it is necessary, than they were for the declaration of war in September, 1939. I say that they are more ready, but I say it with a proviso. They are ready provided it is not only conscription of flesh and blood, but also conscription of the amassed wealth, industrial capital and financial resources of the country as well. They want an all-out war effort with all the resources which the people of Canada possess.

The fathers and mothers of the youth of Canada are not prepared to sacrifice their sons to safeguard the wealth and special privileges of the Crabtrees, the MacMillan's and the McLean's, who already own too much of Canada for Canada's good. Indeed, the Canadian people are disturbed over the complete control of the economic life of the country which has been given since the war began to these exploiters by the Prime Minister and his cabinet.

The group with which I sit are, as we have already stated, in favour of a vote on the clear issue of conscription, because we believe it is the real issue confronting the people of Canada to-day. We favour a vote on two questions: (a) conscription of man-power; (b) conscription of material resources, industry and finance. If both questions were given to the people for endorsation or rejection, I feel convinced that they would approve both provided they were told it was necessary.

The Prime Minister in his speech said that there were three ways by which the government could seek release from past commitments—with respect to the methods of raising men for military service: (1) a general election; (2) a referendum on conscription; (3) a plebiscite in which the government would ask for release from past promises. Two of the means mentioned by the Prime Minister are, in my opinion, clear and definite, namely, a general election or a referendum on conscription. The third means, a plebiscite, woolled up in words, is not clear, and true to form, it is the means by which the Prime Minister asks the people to decide. He asks them to decide without furnishing them with the information necessary to an intelligent expression of opinion.

The Prime Minister rejects the idea of a general election, although he admits that conscription would be the main issue, but other issues might enter. He rejects the idea of a referendum because the vote would be a definite vote on conscription. He rejects the one because it would not be clear; he rejects the other because it would be clear. It does not seem to me to make sense. I think, really, it is juggling with an important issue, and that is not desirable at this time.

The Prime Minister knows, as every member of this house knows, that only one commitment or reservation was made with regard to military service, namely, that there would be no conscription for overseas service. That reservation, surely, was based upon conditions as they existed in Canada at the beginning of the war; but if those conditions do not apply to-day—and the Prime Minister indicated in his speech that they do not apply—it is the duty of the Prime Minister and his ministers boldly and clearly to tell the house and the people of Canada what the real situation is. There is no other way by which either members of parliament or the people of Canada can make wise decisions. Let us then be done with this humbug. Let the people of Canada decide whether they want conscription for overseas service and also whether they want effective conscription of industry, accumulated wealth and finance for an all-out war effort.

I wish to make brief reference to our situation on the Pacific coast because of recent happenings. The question has already been covered fairly well by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) and also the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank). Three main questions are disturbing the people there. The first is, Are the defences on the Pacific coast ade-

quate? I do not know; I imagine no one here knows. But I support the suggestion made by the hon. member for New Westminster the other day, that the government should ask General McNaughton, who is now in Canada, to go to the Pacific coast and make a thorough inspection of the defences there. I am sure that because of the knowledge he must have of the defences built in Great Britain, he will be able to advise the military authorities and the government here wisely.

Another question that is disturbing the minds of the people on the Pacific coast is the question of Japanese nationals and Canadian Japanese. I have made some investigations on my own behalf of what the government has done and is doing in that connection. I am satisfied that the government has the situation in hand. We must always keep in mind that most of the Japanese in British Columbia—the people of Japanese origin—are not Japanese, they are Canadians. Today we heard a plea for tolerance for another minority in Canada, a much larger minority, of course. But minorities must be treated fairly not because they are large but because they have certain rights as Canadians. In considering this question we should remember that we are Canadians and that we also are British, and in dealing with minorities we must not adopt the policies either of Japan or of Germany or of any other country that are not as good as ours. I was pleased with the very reasonable way in which the hon. member for New Westminster dealt with this question the other day, and I do not wish to say a word that would take away from the good effect of his speech. But I was rather surprised to hear him put forward as an example of what we should do with the Japanese in British Columbia the fact that the Russians moved a whole population of some 350,000 people to Siberia. Moving people to Siberia is a habit in Russia. The czars moved tens of thousands of people to Siberia, and thousands of them died there.

Mr. REID: For the protection and safeguarding of the state.

Mr. MacINNIS: It was always for the protection of the state.

An hon. MEMBER: For the protection of the czar.

Mr. MacINNIS: The czar moved them for the protection of the state, but we cannot save the state by means like that. We save the state by justice or we do not save it. As an hon. member suggests, it is not worth saving if we cannot save it in that way.

[Mr. MacInnis.]

I have as I say discussed this matter with the people in charge. After discussing it with the Royal Canadian Mounted police, I am inclined to think better of the government, because I have a feeling that a police force can never be better than the government which directs it, and I am satisfied with the attitude taken by the Royal Canadian Mounted police with regard to our Canadian Japanese.

Then there is the question of air raid precautions. I agree with what the hon. member for Vancouver South said in that regard. I believe that while to a large extent this work may be done by civilians, the government must furnish the larger direction and also the funds to provide the equipment. I do not believe that is being done at the present time. In fact I believe it is in a very bad muddle indeed.

I now wish to turn to labour matters which I referred to in my opening remarks. I have been trying, trying, trying for the past two years to get this government to take a democratic attitude towards labour. And I have failed. The situation is getting worse. I am going to try now, and I believe I can convince even hon. members opposite that the situation is getting worse. The hon. member for Edmonton East (Mrs. Casselman) asked yesterday, when the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) was speaking, if we would not consider the appointment of the new Minister of Labour as something on the credit side of the ledger as far as the government's attitude toward labour is concerned. I am going to try to give this house a picture of what about two months' administration of the Department of Labour under the new minister amounts to. I regret to have to do it, but I do it because there is no other way by which the people concerned can get access to the government of this country. They are double-crossed by the Department of Labour, and they cannot get access to the Prime Minister.

For lack of understanding of working-class needs, and for the most colossal ineptitude in dealing with labour problems, I thought the former Minister of Labour was in a class by himself; I thought he had no equal. But without being yet long enough in office to be elected to parliament, I believe the new minister has already shattered the record of my hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty) in the Department of Labour for doing the wrong thing at the wrong time.

I shall submit to this house two cases and let hon. members decide for themselves as to the fitness not only of the new Minister of

Labour to hold that office, but also as to the rightness of the policy that has been followed by this government.

First, I want to refer to the Kirkland Lake strike. It was referred to yesterday by the hon. member for Cape Breton South. In that strike the miners used every avenue provided by law and usage to get a conference with the employers, but they failed.

I have before me the report of the conciliation board which heard the dispute between the miners and their employers. This is a unanimous report, signed by the chairman, Mr. Justice C. P. McTague, Mr. F. Wilkinson, the member for the employers, and Mr. J. L. Cohen, the member for the employees. This board had experience; it had tried previous cases; and in making its report on the Kirkland Lake dispute it quoted some paragraphs from a report which was made by the same persons sitting as a board in another dispute and which appeared in the *Labour Gazette* of February, 1941, from which I shall read briefly:

> As industry has grown and developed, the right of work people to organize into collective associations or trade unions, and through such organizations to bargain collectively with their employers as to the terms and conditions of their employment, has been increasingly emphasized. It is a right asknowledged by law, by industrial practice, and by public policy. It has been verified by many important public pronouncements.

That is what the miners were asking. Then the report goes on:

> The abstract rights which it is now conceded belong to labour, can only be said to exist in a concrete sense if collective bargaining is practised and collective agreements are concluded.

Then they point out that the employers in the present dispute based their refusal to negotiate with the miners' organization on the fact that its headquarters are in the United States. On that point the board has this to say:

> It is our view that this is an erroneous and illogical approach to the matter. There is no law that we know of that prevents any group of workers from joining an international union and constituting it as bargaining agent. In fact it seems to have been recognized policy for a great number of years to encourage the activities of international unions in Canada. Otherwise it is hard to explain section 2 of the Immigration Act—

I need not give the reference.

> —in force as far back as 1921, placing accredited representatives of international unions entering Canada for the temporary exercise of their calling within the class of persons entitled to entry without restriction.

Then the board continues:

> The problem, if there is a problem, would seem not to consist in discrimination against particular international unions but rather in making sure that international unions, national unions and employers as well, conform to the laws of this country while carrying on their activities here. In this particular matter the board was denied, on account of the course followed by the mine operators, any opportunity to conciliate the differences betwen the parties at all. At a comparatively early stage in the proceedings counsel for the mine operators informed the board that his clients were unalterably opposed to recognizing the union and wished to withdraw from any further participation in the proceedings. Manifestly, the use of such technique makes completely futile the appointment of conciliation boards to deal with questions of recognition.

I have been telling the Minister of Labour and this house that the question of union recognition should not be a matter for conciliation boards. I find now that this board agrees with me. I quote:

> As a matter of fact, it is more than doubtful that the question of union recognition falls within the purview of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act at all. The employment of such a technique, together with a doubt as to jurisdiction under the act, would seem to leave the broad question of collective bargaining to be dealt with by parliament or cabinet council rather than by the old process of conciliation boards under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act.

This government never hesitates to use an order in council when it wants to do something, but it would not use an order in council to compel those employers to bargain collectively with their employees, according to the principles laid down by the government.

Now, just for a moment, I am going to show the position of the present Minister of Labour with regard to this dispute. On Friday, January 16, there was a meeting of the war labour board, and Mr. Mitchell proposed that this board act as arbitrator in the Kirkland Lake dispute. This proposal was immediately sent to the miners, and it was supposed that it was also sent to the mine operators. The miners dealt with the matter on January 18, and informed the minister that they had accepted the proposal. Nothing being heard from the employers after several days, inquiry was made as to what they intended to do. The first reply was that they had not received any proposal at all. Some time later Mr. Mitchell sent another letter to the miners outlining a proposal altogether different from the one he had submitted formerly, the one they had accepted. I should like to read to the house a few words from a letter written by Mr. Mosher, president of the Canadian Congress of Labour, with which the Kirkland Lake miners are affiliated, just to show exactly what Mr. Mosher thinks of the Minister of Labour, and I think Mr. Mosher is right:

I acknowledge receipt of a copy of your letter of January 21, to Mr. William Simpson, president of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, local No. 240, Kirkland Lake, and I should like to point out, as I did in my conversation with you yesterday, that I regard the contents of that letter as embodying a proposal which is at variance with that which you requested me to submit to the miners, and which I informed you subsequently had been accepted by them.

Then Mr. Mosher says:

It seems to me that, in the circumstances, I should have been consulted with regard to any change in the original proposal which might be contemplated by you, and that your action in submitting a new proposal direct to the miners was most objectionable from the standpoint of both courtesy and ethics.

It is important that there should be no misunderstanding on the part of the miners or the public in this connection, and I must, in fairness to myself, make the facts known to all concerned.

That is signed by Mr. A. R. Mosher under date of January 24.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I take up another case, affecting another union. The C.I.O., or the unions affiliated with it, may be just as bad as Premier Hepburn says they are; but from what has been said about Premier Hepburn in this house during the last few days by his "friends", perhaps Premier Hepburn's word is not worth much, or is worth just as much as his morals, and that is not very much. The union concerned is an American Federation of Labour affiliate. The facts, however, show the same ignoring of organized labour and the same kowtowing to employers' interests, regardless of whether the head of the Department of Labour is a lawyer, financier or an ex-trade unionist.

In the summer of 1941 the boilermakers and plumbers and steamfitters employed by Morton shipyards in Quebec made application for a board. The board sat and heard both sides in the dispute; but before it had finished its deliberations, the then Minister of Labour, who is now Secretary of State had set up a royal commission to investigate all shipbuilding industries in Ontario and Quebec. Despite the fact that a national labour supply council had been created by the government, and was supposed to be consulted in matters of this kind, the appointment of the royal commission was not referred to it. Three lawyers were appointed to act as commissioners.

Lawyers may be the best sort of people to act on commissions of this kind, but I do not see how lawyers would know so very much about shipbuilding, and the wages of shipyard workers. I do not believe they have much experience in that kind of work. The fact remains, however, that the commission was composed of lawyers.

[Mr. MacInnis.]

The Minister of Labour, Mr. Mitchell, invited Mr. W. J. Coyle representing the boilermakers, and Mr. J. W. Bruce, representing the plumbers and steamfitters working for the Morton yards to come to his office to discuss wages in the Morton shipyards. At that interview wages and bonuses were agreed upon which were acceptable to labour representatives, the Department of Labour and the Department of Munitions and Supply. That is stated in a letter forwarded to Mr. Bruce by Bryce Stewart, Deputy Minister of Labour. The letter is dated December 23, and in it Mr. Stewart suggested that the proposals were made without prejudice to any reference to the national war labour board, in the event of any dissatisfaction. They agreed to vary the findings of the arbitration board, and there was agreement to accept a lower scale—five cents an hour less than the board's award. The representatives, Mr. Bruce and Mr. Coyle, put the proposals before the employees of the Morton shipyards and induced them to accept.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired. Unless there is unanimous consent he cannot continue.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go ahead.

Mr. MacINNIS: I shall try to be as brief as possible, and I thank hon. members for permitting me to finish.

Under date of a communication dated December 29, 1941, Mr. Bruce advised the Minister of Labour that the workers concerned had accepted the proposals of the department. Then there is another telegram dated December 31 from the Minister of Labour thanking Mr. Bruce for his wire. In the meantime it appears that there had been consultation with the employers, and that the employers did not like the agreement made by the labour department. The next thing Mr. Bruce and Mr. Coyle learned about the matter was the passing of an order in council on January 26, while the house was in session, repudiating completely the agreement already agreed to by the Minister of Labour, and attaching a new scale of wages and bonuses to the order. Not only that, but the order in council placed the setting of wages in the hands of the Minister of Labour, without reserve.

Order in council P.C. 269, dated January 26, 1942, contains this paragraph:

2. The Minister of Labour is hereby authorized to adjust the basic wage rates for other classifications of employees of the aforesaid shipyards in such relationship to the basic wage rates specified for mechanics and in such amounts as in his opinion, having regard to all the circumstances, are fair and reasonable.

Mr. Bruce then replied in a telegram dated January 29, 1942. I draw the attention of hon. members to the similarity of this wire to the letter from Mr. Mosher which I placed on record. The wire is addressed to the Hon. Humphrey Mitchell, Minister of Labour at Ottawa, and is in these words:

On December 22 you requested vice-president Coyle and myself to come to Ottawa to discuss report of the board of conciliation in the Morton shipyards. After considerable discussion with Deputy Minister Stewart and director of industrial relations Crawford it was agreed, and a proposition submitted to us in writing on December 23, that was to be submitted to the men with rates of wages based on reports of the royal commission on shipyards and other provisions of the report of the board of conciliation would be accepted acting on your suggestion and as a war measure this proposition was submitted to the men with our endorsement and adopted and notification was conveyed to you by telegram from myself under date of December 29. I was considerably surprised to-day to receive word that Morton company had posted notices repudiating our agreement vice-president Coyle informs me that Deputy Minister Stewart has informed him that the department had repudiated the conditions we agreed upon. If this is so without any recognition of our rights or consultation with us is an outrageous and unwarranted violation of our agreement and a breach of faith by a department of government and will warrant the disapproval of the workers throughout the whole dominion and bring the government into disrespect for repudiating a written agreement thereby placing myself and Coyle in a very unsatisfactory position as the men accepted our endorsation in good faith. We would appreciate some explanation of the situation.

No explanation was given. Is the Prime Minister going to stand for that sort of thing in the Department of Labour? Does he agree with that kind of double-crossing by his ministers? If he does not, then he had better clean house in the Department of Labour.

As matters stand to-day, wages are regulated by order in council. The government which in 1940 put itself on record as favouring collective bargaining has virtually abolished collective bargaining. Order in council P.C. 8253 abolished the previous order in council P.C. 7440, which recognized collective bargaining. Under order in council P.C. 8253 a national war labour board was set up, with an elaborate system of regional boards. Before this system had properly begun to function, the government abolished—in this case at any rate—the manner of appeal for which they had made provision.

This is a matter that calls for the condemnation of every member of this house. Unless we are able to deal with the small matters at home, we should stop trying to bring a better world into being, because we cannot do it.

He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much.

Mr. BROOKE CLAXTON (St. Lawrence-St. George): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) absolved all lawyers from any special knowledge of labour problems, and I shall take that as my excuse for not following him in the remarks I am going to make. I should like, however, to refer to another lawyer who addressed this house yesterday, making a magnificent speech that appealed to hon. members in all parts of the house as well as to thousands and thousands of Canadians in every province of Canada. It is exceedingly difficult to follow him with any speech this afternoon. In showing his love of Canada the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) took us right back to the beginning of this debate, which was opened by two hon. members who also showed a similar love of our country.

I am glad to add my quota of congratulations to the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) upon opening this debate. They are two of the most popular and respected members of the house, and their speeches were worthy of them. One is of French descent from my own province of Quebec; the other is of Scotch descent from the province of Ontario, but they both spoke only as Canadians. In love of their country, in devotion to its service, in appreciation of its problems they are second to none in this house. They are representative of the great body of Canadians who stand between the two extremes referred to yesterday by the Minister of Finance. One extreme may be said to be represented by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce), and the other by the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe). The one appears to want conscription for overseas service no matter what it costs; the other appears to want no conscription for overseas service no matter what it costs. There is no hope for the unity or for the future or safety of Canada in either of them.

In what I have to say I hope to follow the hon. member for Hull and the hon. member for Brantford City and speak as a Canadian calling to all of Canada. I must do that because the constituency I represent is made up of people of every race and every station in life. It may be expected that the census of last year will show that Canada is less Anglo-Saxon than the United States. Every day in the week I am reminded that thirty per cent of the population are of French origin and twenty per cent are of neither French nor British origin. I am reminded that the one bond we have in common is our attachment to Canada, that we can make that

bond as strong and no stronger than we preserve our unity and show our love for our country.

This debate is taking place at the most crucial time in the history of the world and of our country. It is in the minds of everyone that we should do our utmost to see that our country puts forth its greatest effort at this time, so that in cooperation with our allies we may defeat Hitler and Japan as soon as possible and gain the opportunity to work for a better world. I would have thought that this discussion would fall under three heads, that we would have discussed what we have done, what more we can do and how best we can do it. But there has been little criticism from any opposition group as to what we have done, and there has been even less suggestion as to what we should do. The Conservative opposition in the house and the mixed opposition outside the house have concentrated their attention upon how we should do one particular thing in our war effort, namely, the method of raising men for overseas service. They say that we should have conscription now. Why now? Because, they say, voluntary recruiting has failed. Because they want conscription now, they do not want a plebiscite. I shall have something more to say about the position taken by the opposition groups, but I should like to start my contribution to this debate at the right end and refer to what we have done and what we propose to do.

What have we done? One would think that at this time there would be no need to refer to what we have done, that it would no longer be necessary to tell the Canadian people of the effort that has been put forth by our country. However, the campaign of unlimited detraction that has been carried on makes it necessary that we should go over this again and again so that there may be no misunderstanding on the part of the public about it.

Canada with a population of eleven and a half million people probably has a higher man-power overhead than any other country in the world. By man-power overhead I mean that we have proportionately more people engaged in transportation and other essential services necessary to keep the country going. With our population we have to carry on the services of a country equal in area to the United States but with only one-eleventh of its population. Despite that, to-day Canada's fighting forces total over 400,000 men who have enlisted voluntarily for service anywhere in the world. We have four divisions in England, with over 100,000 in the army alone. We are told that in equipment, training, physique and morale they will stand comparison with any other armed force in any part of the world. They stand at the place of honour in Great Britain to-day.

We are more than glad to welcome back to our shores this week their gallant commander Lieutenant-General A. G. L. McNaughton, and to congratulate him upon his recovery from an illness due entirely to overwork in our cause. In his message to the troops under his command on the second anniversary of the arrival in December, 1939, of the leading elements of the first division, General McNaughton said:

> It now is two years since leading elements of the Canadian army arrived in this country. The equipment and training of these formations was completed and since then a steadily increasing force has been held ready for any service which might be required; meanwhile other forces have been organized by Canada and dispatched to the far east and to our own western shore, now menaced by a new foe.
>
> So far it has been our principal duty to stand guard in these islands. We recognize the need for this decision for, with the enemy's hordes within a few short miles of this vital centre of civilization, the reason is evident to all.
>
> Nevertheless, through long months on watch and in repeated routine training there have been many disappointments at action deferred and great patience has been required. It has been given without complaint and I count it a privilege and a satisfaction to be able to say so and to thank all ranks for the steady purpose and acceptance of conditions which they have shown.
>
> On behalf of all our force I thank the people of Britain also for their continued hospitality and friendliness, which have done so much to ease our path.
>
> From a very small beginning the Canadian army has now grown to many tens of thousands of men and women. New units and formations and reserves have come to us as quickly as ships could be found to bring them here, and as they have arrived the organization of our military headquarters, reinforcement units, hospitals, schools, repair establishments and many other needed facilities have been pressed forward; meanwhile our engineer and signal and forestry corps have made their contribution to the life and welfare of the community.
>
> Throughout this long period of preparation which circumstances has given us, the corps, divisions, armoured formations and other field units have been completed in equipment and trained together and with squadrons of the Royal Canadian Air Force assigned to army cooperation. These tasks have been pursued with unrelaxed attention and the whole has been made ready for decisive employment when the opportunity comes to take full effect on the enemy.
>
> That the future holds great difficulties and dangers and much hardship there is no doubt, but we go forward firm in our confidence in the ultimate result—the triumph of justice and right over the dark forces of evil which oppose us.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the house should have that message, and I count it a privilege to be allowed to read it to the house and put it on *Hansard* because, when in the last war General McNaughton was placed in command of the Canadian Corps heavy artillery, I was serving in one of the batteries under his command as a non-commissioned officer. The hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Casselman), the Conservative whip, who was in the same unit with me will remember that General McNaughton was a fighting general. He was appointed a general at the age of thirty-one. He gained distinction as no other man on the western front did for work as an artillery officer. I am glad now, not only to welcome him back to Canada and to put before the house his fine message, but also to wish him and the forces he commands all possible success in whatever lies ahead.

I was speaking of our army in Britain. In addition to the men outside Canada, we have on the strength in Canada certainly over 150,000 men in the army alone, enlisted for voluntary service anywhere in the world; and including the air force and the navy we must have in Canada alone well over a quarter of a million men enlisted for service anywhere in the world. In the navy we have 28,000 sailors in 350 ships helping to keep the seas open. The air force has over 100,000 men in more than 100 establishments, producing thousands of air fighters a month to keep the planes in action in the air over the enemy. The air training plan has cost us more than the Canadian Pacific railway. It is a major factor in the war and a magnificent achievement.

Few people in this house and few people in Canada realize that in eight months we have increased our armed forces, voluntarily enlisted for service anywhere, by more than sixty-six per cent. Men have enlisted in that period for all the services at an average of 20,000 a month, and that, it may be noted, is more than the average for the whole war, so the last eight months are better than the previous period. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) announced in the house last week that January showed recruits for the army alone of 11,000 men, which I think would make January one of the very best recruiting months since the outbreak of the war.

There is no shortage of recruits for the navy. There is no shortage of recruits for the air force. Canadian boys do not lack courage, and they want action. For this and other reasons recruiting for the army did not compare as well during some months at various periods; but during the last few months, with the dastardly attack of Japan on Pearl Harbour and the possibility of action, recruiting has picked up, and I would not be surprised to learn that January will be among the best months since the outbreak of the war.

Men have been discharged at the rate of about 1,500 a month. But that wastage has been more than made up. Reinforcements have been built up in England and in Canada. The fact that we have only about 15,000 men called up for service in Canada for the duration of the war indicates that we are getting all the volunteers that we can equip and train at the present time.

I have spent a moment or two on the subject of our accomplishments with regard to the armed services. Think of what has been done in agriculture. Despite the loss of probably 150,000 farmers and farm labourers to the armed forces and to munitions work, the farmers of Canada have produced three-quarters of a billion pounds of bacon, two hundred million pounds of cheese and immense quantities of other foods for Britain. We have sent all the food that ships can be found to carry.

In thousands of factories, over six hundred thousand workers are producing planes and guns and shells and tanks, practically the whole equipment of an infantry division every six weeks. We are equipping our own forces and also equipping five times as many more.

Of course there are occasional shortages. Everybody has had the experience of going to a departmental store and finding that they are out of something. Our guns and planes and equipment are sent to the places where they will do the most good. A shortage in a training camp in Canada may be caused by equipment having been sent closer to the firing line, where it should be sent. I remember in the last war, after four months of service in Canada, we had not seen a firing weapon of any kind, and we were four months in service in England before we saw a modern gun. To-day we are sending munitions to every corner of the world.

The changed character of the war is shown most dramatically in motor vehicles. In the last war we had 153 motor vehicles for a division compared with 2,500 in this war, and those 2,500 develop a horse-power of 400,000, equivalent to that used in the city of Toronto. The difference between this war and the last is also shown by the fact that for every fighting man we need a motor vehicle and a fire-power weapon bigger than the rifle. It is a totally different war, and it is high time that all of us realized this.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CLAXTON: When the house rose at six o'clock I was speaking of our war effort and giving some figures. In addition to what I have indicated, we are shipping to Britain all the munitions and food that ships can be found to carry, and we are building the ships too. We are building this year one million tons of cargo ships, about as much as Britain will build herself. We are raising enough money in taxes to meet our own war costs, and this year we are borrowing from the Canadian people a billion and a half dollars to meet ordinary costs of government and the expense of what we are sending to Britain.

This year we are sending to Britain, without receiving payment except by way of a book entry, twice as much as we ever sold to her in any year before; and in proportion to national income or population the tax burden on the Canadian people is comparable with that in Britain to-day.

Mr. Churchill said not long ago that in the twenty-sixth month of the war Britain was employing her resources to a degree that was comparable with what she had accomplished in the forty-ninth month of the last war. In Canada, because our effort is relatively so much greater than it was in the last war, in the twenty-sixth month we are spending at a rate which is nearly ten times as great as it was in the forty-ninth month of the last war, in terms of the same money. This year we are spending on the war nearly twice as much as we spent in the entire period from 1914 to 1918, and we are getting more value for our money because the government had the foresight and courage to take steps to stop inflation and prevent profiteering by more drastic measures than had ever been taken before in any democracy.

There have been no disorders in Canada, no sabotage, no panics, no shortages, no scandals and no irretrievable mistakes. Canadian industry, Canadian labour and Canadian organizing skill have been equal to every challenge. It has been an orderly, steady march even though it has had no brass band. We have every reason to be proud of our achievement; we would have every reason to be dissatisfied if it stopped there.

So I come to the second head, namely, what it is proposed to do to-day, what policy or plan the government has laid out for the future. This was indicated in the speech from the throne and in the Prime Minister's speech. We are to have a Canadian army of two corps, one of three infantry divisions and two tank brigades, while the other corps will consist of two armoured divisions. The army will be a force of terrific hitting power.

Now, has there been any criticism of this plan in this house? Has there been any other suggestion put forward by the opposition? I have not heard any. They have said that we should have a much larger force—much bigger. How much bigger? We all know the "For God's sake do something" school of criticism, the people who say that we must do more, without saying how it is to be done or indicating what the inevitable limits of anyone's efforts are. They do not say how we can equip and train and reinforce a force in England bigger than an army and, in addition, maintain the air force with recruits at the rate of tens of thousands a year, and a navy and land forces to defend Canada, and supply munitions and food in ever-increasing quantities.

These critics do not strike a balance and say what is possible and what is not possible. They just say they want more, and more, and more. When this kind of pressure is put on, there is danger that we may be stampeded into biting off more than we can chew, stampeded into getting the war effort out of balance, so that we have an army when we have not the men to make the munitions to outfit that army.

The cry for conscription now is based on the assertion that we are not getting sufficient recruits by voluntary methods. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), in his speech, said that he was basing his plea on recruiting statistics, but if you look through his speech you do not see a single sign of anything in the way of recruiting statistics. There is not one there. If the facts and figures given us in the house by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), are true, we do not need conscription to-day because of any shortage of recruits, for the reason that we are getting them in sufficient numbers.

The leader of the opposition quoted speeches made by recruiting officers, and those speeches indicate that recruiting is going on. They do not indicate that recruiting has failed. In recruiting speeches would you expect the recruiting officers to say that they do not need men? They are asking for recruits because they need them, and recruits have been coming forward in adequate numbers. In support of his argument the leader of the opposition cited a comment which Lincoln is reported to have made—and "reported" should be put in quotation marks, because that was the language of the leader of the opposition, which will be found at page 25 of *Hansard*. I ask the leader of the opposi-

tion where that reference came from. It begins:

Voluntarism is the unprincipled dodge of cowardly politicians.

This language has been used in a number of newspapers, the first reference to it having been found in the *Canadian Airman;* and when we tried to track it down we found that the man who had written the article had lost his notes. I have in my hand a letter from the library of congress indicating that the most careful search has been made of Lincoln's speeches, correspondence and books, and there is no reference to any such statement in anything that Lincoln ever said.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That does not detract from the logic of the statement just the same.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Synthetic logic.

Mr. CLAXTON: Let me, however, quote words that Lincoln did use in 1863. He said:

It is the people who in the end must decide.

The question of how Canadians are to deal with this matter is one for Canadians; and references, whether accurate or inaccurate, to what Lincoln said or may not have said in 1863 have not much significance for us to-day. We have to tackle this question as a Canadian question, and that is the way we are doing it.

The problem of conscription has hung like a cloud over Canada for twenty-five years, and the government is making an effort to remove the shadow of that cloud from Canada, to remove the method of raising men for overseas service from the emotional entanglements in which it has become involved. To accomplish this, the government proposes to ask the people in a plebiscite one question:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

It is said and said rightly that the mandate given to the government in the election of 1940 was a mandate to carry on the war. But that mandate was subject to the limitation, to the restriction made expressly by every leader of every party, that there would be no conscription for overseas service. The object of the plebiscite is to remove the limitation and restore responsible government. If the answer to the plebiscite is "yes", the question of the best method of recruiting our soldiers for service anywhere may be placed before parliament, free from any shackles should the question arise.

It is asserted that in resorting to a plebiscite the government is denying responsible government. The government say that the place to decide the question how to raise man-power is in parliament. It is not evading responsibility, but is asking for more responsibility.

The hon. member for Vancouver East said the question should be put in the form: Are you in favour of conscription? But that would be an abnegation of responsible government. Here we are seeking to be released from the pledge; nothing more.

The most extraordinary line of argument taken by the opposition and others outside the house is that we should not have given these pledges.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLAXTON: I hear someone say "Hear, hear." I ask hon. members to go back to the outbreak of the war. We have already heard references to that and to what happened then, made by the Prime Minister and others in their speeches. I ask hon. members to go on a step to the Quebec election of October, 1939. I ask them to put themselves in the position they were in then when Mr. Duplessis called an election for the purpose of testing whether or not the province of Quebec would cooperate fully in the war; I ask them to think with what relief they heard that the late Right Hon. Mr. Lapointe, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Cardin) and the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) were going to Quebec to fight out there the issue whether or not Quebec would fully cooperate in the war. Was there a word of protest heard throughout the land when Mr. Lapointe gave pledges and repeated the pledges already given? Was any person or any newspaper heard to say that he was wrong? And that was the same Lapointe who in a speech that I heard myself at the Montreal Forum on October 21, 1939, speaking to an audience that was almost entirely French-speaking, said:

In this campaign I am defending Canada, I am defending the future of our country, I am defending the future of my children and yours.

Je cherche à défendre, à maintenir, à soutenir, l'œuvre de Cartier et de Macdonald.

And switching into English he said:

I am trying to defend, to maintain, to uphold the work of Cartier and Macdonald. We want to preserve their work. We want to make this a great nation inhabited by a united people.

The crowd rose as one man. The election was won; every man in Canada was glad. I hold in my hand clippings from newspapers from end to end of Canada; every one of them was more than relieved. The Ottawa *Journal* said:

Let us accept it as a great healing, a healing of prejudices wherever they may live.

Not a word that Lapointe was wrong. The Winnipeg *Tribune* began its editorial with "O Canada" in French and English, and it said:

> Mr. Lapointe is the man of the hour. . . . If he were to die to-morrow he would be ranked, along with Laurier, among the greatest of Canadians.

The greatest monument to his memory is the contribution he made to Canada's unity and to Canada's cause in the last two years of his life. Are we now going back on that word? Are we going back on the series of most solemn promises ever given to any electorate? Some people say we should, that our word should be broken. In another place it was said:

> Their pledge is no more important than others that have been given in the past in election time and thrown into the scrap basket immediately after.

Can we break faith? How can the electors of Canada believe anything said by these people who now urge that such a solemn pledge should be broken? They do not trust the people, and the people will not trust them.

Conscription is no ordinary question. It is difficult to explain it to English-speaking Canadians from outside Quebec. It is no ordinary question; there is no other question in Canadian life that has been anything like this in the history of Canada. And the reasons are very difficult to explain; they go back three hundred years. For three hundred years the citizens of Quebec have been isolated; they have had to fight for their survival; they have had to fight their environment, and at times the fight has been bitter, made bitter often by the people they had to fight to preserve their integrity. They are a different race. It is exceedingly difficult to explain how they feel about a question like this, particularly to a Conservative opposition that has not a single French-Canadian member in it. I could go back to 1917; I could go in detail through the terrible history of those years—

Mr. CASSELMAN: I would not suggest that.

Mr. CLAXTON: —if it were not for the fact that then I would be accused of raising passions and prejudice.

Mr. CASSELMAN: What else would you be doing?

Mr. CLAXTON: I would be disclosing what happened.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And the things you have kept alive ever since.

Mr. CLAXTON: What are they trying to do? They are trying to get us to break our pledges in the same way they broke their pledges in 1917. If the government broke its pledges now, who would believe a politician again? Who would believe a political leader again? People have faith in their leaders if their leaders keep faith with them.

Mr. MacNICOL: "Politician" is right.

Mr. CLAXTON: It looks sometimes as if Hitler and some extremists in Canada want to save us from the horrors of self-government. They talk about the delay in recruiting. Recruiting is going on; I do not believe the people know what the figures are. I have said something about that. But if there were conscription to-day, how many more men would be taken into the armed forces? The Minister of National Defence may answer that, but I would be surprised if there would be any more. They talk about the expense. We are spending three billions to defend democracy; surely it is worth spending a few cents per capita to maintain democracy, and the basis of democracy is faith in the integrity of public men.

The hon. member for Parkdale asked: "Are we going to abandon them now?" Colonel Cockeram, a former member of this house, said: "We are telling our men overseas that they need not expect reinforcements, that they are left to fight the battle alone." Where do you find that? How can you possibly read that from the fact that we are holding a plebiscite? Those statements condemn themselves. The strain, this emotional tension that has been built up in Canada, has not been created by Hitler or by any crisis of the war; it has been created in Canada by Canadians, and it has been created for the purpose of upsetting public confidence in this government.

We are going to have this plebiscite, and the question is what we are going to do about it. If we want to get on with the war, then I suggest that we should vote "yes". I am very glad indeed to see that the vice-president of the Canadian Legion in Montreal, Colonel Nicholson, a friend of mine, in a speech yesterday urged that everyone should vote "yes".

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Did he approve of the plebiscite?

Mr. CLAXTON: He said nothing about that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): He has already said he does not approve of it.

Mr. CLAXTON: He said to vote "yes"; he is not reported yesterday as saying anything about the plebiscite itself. I will ask my

electors, and I urge the people of Quebec to vote "yes". They have reason to know, from what I said in this house last year, that I am sympathetic to them and that I am trying to understand and to explain them to our fellow Canadians in other parts. I do so for reasons I set forth in a letter to *Le Devoir,* part of which I should like to read:

> We are in this war, not as a satellite, but as a principal. We are fighting this war not because some other country is in danger but because Canada is in danger and because the welfare of Canada is bound up with the defeat of Hitler. Wherever there is a front against Hitler or Japan, there we are defending Canada, as surely as we would be on the ramparts at Quebec.
>
> This is why Canadians of all races and creeds and ages want Canada to do her utmost in the war for Canada and for humanity. Differences of language, differences of background and outlook, make it difficult for all Canadians to feel alike and to act as one. But to-day we are all challenged. Everything Canada has stood for through three centuries is at the hazard.
>
> If there ever was an occasion when all Canadians can have the same feeling and act together it is in our desire to defeat nazism. We may differ on the means. There can be no room for uncertainty that we are united as to the end.
>
> Quebec is a vital part of Canada. Quebec's history and distinctive character make what it says and does in the war of supreme interest to the world. For three hundred years people who speak the French tongue have kept their integrity in a fight against their environment. At times the fight has been bitter. The lingering recollection of that bitterness must not be allowed to blind any Canadian as to where their interest is to-day. It is of vital importance to all of us that there should be no misunderstanding anywhere in our fundamental attitude in the array of civilized feeling against Hitler.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If I may ask the hon. member a question, has *Le Devoir* replied to that letter?

Mr. CLAXTON: As far as I am aware, the only comment by *Le Devoir* was made in a footnote to the letter, which I should be glad to show my hon. friend.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I suppose the hon. gentleman knows that *Le Devoir* says, "No; never."

Mr. CLAXTON: It was because I knew their attitude that I wrote what I did.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my time has gone.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has the hon. member unanimous consent to continue?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carry on.

Mr. CLAXTON: If I had not devoted so much time to this question, perhaps I might have dealt more usefully with some other aspects of the war. I should like to have said something about man-power and the means of organizing it; about the difficulties yet the necessity for making the utmost use of our resources, and of ways in which we might do that. If I had time, I should like to have said something about the better mobilization of parliament itself, following along the line of the suggestions made by the hon. member for Saskatoon City (Mr. Bence) and the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker). I think there is a good deal in their suggestion that we can do far more useful work if we get down to business in committee, and that we do creative work in committees of parliament. I should like also to have suggested that we might do something more in connection with the organization of debate. The Minister of Finance will remember the debate last year on the war appropriation bill, on which we spent twenty-eight days. During that time there were usually nine or ten cabinet ministers present, among them always the Minister of Finance. I think something more should be done in the way of organizing debates in order to prevent a recurrence of the free-for-all which took place on that occasion. It may interest hon. members to know that in the course of those twenty-eight days the leader of the opposition had no less than 954 separate innings.

I should like to remind the house to-day, Mr. Speaker, that this year is the seventy-fifth anniversary of confederation. Seventy-five years ago to-day the delegation representing the two provinces of Canada and the two colonies were in London working out the draft of the bill which was to be presented in the House of Lords on February 12, 1867. This year we celebrate the seventy-fifth anniversary of confederation. It is a challenge to us, a challenge to meet the emergencies, the urgencies of this terrible time with the same courage, the same foresight that the fathers of confederation displayed back in those early days.

Ours is a great country. Good people came before us, all from across the seas. They discovered, cleared and settled the land, harnessed nature, brought the colonies together, built railways and industries. Nothing stumped them; but before this war we were not responding so well to Canada's challenge. We were putting our problems on the shelf. Now and then we took them down, dusted them off before a royal commission, and put them back on the shelf again. We were zealous in finding reasons why things should not be done. Every time we failed to deal with a problem we lost faith in ourselves. Some of us became frightened of freedom and disliked new ideas because they were new. We need now a new birth of the democratic faith; belief in the people; belief in each other; faith in our own ability to hoist ourselves by our own

boot-straps, if we have to do it. "A vital democracy is a community of people working out its own salvation." We must change frustration into creative, buoyant enthusiasm, and give Canadians everywhere the joy of achievement again.

Concluding a speech made in the debates in the first session of the first parliament in Canada, in 1867, the Hon. D'Arcy McGee made certain remarks which I am now pleased to repeat because the constituency he then represented, namely that of Montreal West, was the seat which is now divided between the hon. member for St. Antoine-Westmount (Mr. Abbott) and myself. His words on that occasion might be applied to-day to that class of people described by the Minister of Finance as "smearing Canada". These were his words:

> The policy of self-abasement I cannot see in the light of policy at all. I trust this first parliament of the dominion will stamp its reprobation upon every mention of such a policy, and that while avoiding all bravado on the one hand, as unbecoming men in our position, we will in this place endeavour to elevate, and not to depress, the public spirit of the country. Mr. Howe said the other night he would not take back anything he had said as to the extent of these provinces. He leaves us, unabridged, our square miles, and I trust also that he will leave us unshaken, what is more essential the faith of our people in their own future, the faith of every man, of every Canadian in Canada, and of every province in its sister province. This faith wrongs no one, burthens no one, menaces no one, dishonours no one. As it was said of old, faith moves mountains, so I venture reverently to express my own belief that the pure, patriotic faith of a united people will be all-sufficient to overcome and triumph over all difficulties that lie ahead.

The fathers of confederation left us a legacy of courage. They moved the frontiers back. The only new frontier now is what lies ahead. We are fighting for the chance to make the future not Hitler's, but our own. We are united with our allies in our determination to save humanity and set it on the forward march again.

Mr. H. R. JACKMAN (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, speaking in support of the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), which states that this house regrets that his excellency's advisers "have sought to evade their responsibilities by holding a plebiscite, which, in the view of this house, is the negation of responsible government," I wish first to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address, my very good friends the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald). They, like myself, had an unrivalled opportunity last November to see Great Britain at war. They have seen the peril which that nation is facing, and they have seen the sacrifices which every British man, woman and child is called upon to make. They have come to a visual realization that the defence of Canada lies on the coast of Dover. While I might not agree with the action which they would immediately take to face the common danger of nazi domination, nevertheless I compliment them upon the able manner in which they expressed their point of view.

The main aspects of the unshackling measure, called a plebiscite, mentioned in the speech from the throne, are, as I see them, two in number. First, will conscription for military service overseas become necessary and, second, how is it best brought about? As to the latter aspect, I can only say at this time that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) had, under constitutional practice, no right to bind the hands of parliament. What, under section 106 of the elections act, he could not do in writing, he has attempted to do orally. It is a breach of the spirit of the act, if not the letter. Under the greatly changed circumstances admitted by all, he is not even morally bound by any alleged pledge. On the other hand he is morally bound to provide leadership and security to the state.

I believe it is the duty of every representative to speak for his constituency. Lord Asquith said that a referendum would impair, if it did not destroy, the sense of parliamentary responsibility. To quote from him, he said:

> It would really destroy the law of government by representation.

The armed services are only one form of contribution. As to the industrial side of our war effort, time will only allow me to say here that I believe in the mobilization of industry and resources, which is referred to by some as conscription of wealth, to the utmost extent necessary to the winning of the war. I believe our industrial effort is notable, but it is impossible that we should have increased civilian consumption as measured by retail sales 20 per cent in 1941 over 1940, and claim that we are having a full-out industrial war effort.

This government has not seen fit to put in the address anything in black and white which would suggest conscription for military service overseas. Even the microscope used by the Prime Minister when reading the Conservative amendment fails to disclose it. But since conscription for overseas is the only limitation placed on our war effort by a so-called party pledge, and the Liberal government wishes to be relieved of that pledge,

the purpose of that release must be in order that compulsory military service for overseas will be contemplated, should the need arise.

This government desires to be released from any obligations arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service. Their request is for a blank cheque, when in the opinion of many, none is needed. Nevertheless I am alarmed by the preamble to the speech from the throne, which states:

> My advisers believe that the magnitude and balanced nature of Canada's war effort is being obscured and impaired by controversy concerning commitments with respect to the methods of raising men for military service which were made prior to the spread of the war to all parts of the world.

Surely the Prime Minister is not asking to be relieved of the so-called pledge in order only to remove the cause of controversy. If the government would place on the statute books a measure for compulsory service wherever it believes the defence of Canada lies, it would do much to remove the feeling of national dishonour. Examination of the requirements of total war might then be made, if it has not already been made, to determine where our man-power can most effectively be used.

What are the present military proposals of this government? According to the administration's figures there are now more than 260,000 men enlisted in the army for overseas service anywhere. Of these, 120,000 are already defending Canada outside Canada. The Prime Minister has laid down the programme for the army overseas, for the year ending March 31, 1943, which will require the services of 200,000 men. This figure includes reserves and reinforcements. If there are any casualties, the figures may have to be increased. But is this programme a really full-out contribution by Canada even allowing for the greatly increased contribution through our navy and air force, now amounting together to more than 130,000 men? March 31, 1943, will have seen us in this war for a period of three and one half years. In the last great war, what was the contribution of Canada in man-power after three and one half years? By the end of 1917 Canada had serving overseas 258,893 men, and the Royal Air Force was noted for the numbers and quality of its Canadian pilots. In addition, casualties who did not see service again, probably amounted to another 100,000 men. These comparative figures would of themselves be startling enough; but when one recalls that the population of Canada has grown in the interval between the two wars by no less than 43·6 per cent, or from 7,879,000 to 11,315,000, it looks as though the scales were out of balance. The size of this proposed army overseas requires a most careful examination by a committee of the house aided by military experts.

What answer is there to the contention that the Prime Minister is playing politics, which he dignifies by the terms "national unity" and "not getting on with the war." Has he evaded the issue by wasting a month's time in debating whether we are to have a plebiscite, with another three or four months to find out the results. He has thrown the total-war supporters a sop, and now they need only trust in him to do the right thing. Other parts of the country are free to expect him to follow the opposite course. He has done something; he has held a plebiscite; surely that will keep them quiet for a few months longer while he thinks up other dodges to placate the people, while the nazi-Japanese hordes draw ever nearer to our Canadian shores. Is it to be the policy of the government to keep down our military contribution overseas so that the need for conscription will not become clamant, because if the need for reinforcements becomes urgent and is unsatisfied, as in the last war, there can be only one answer? The Prime Minister knows it, as does the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar), the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power), as well as every member of this house.

The Prime Minister has made some caustic and uncalled for remarks about the committee for total war, which committee has its headquarters in Toronto, a city truly great in spirit and in stature. Two incidents with respect to opinions held about this total-war movement have been highly amusing. A group of my fellow Conservative members, seeing a preponderance of Liberal names on the committee, felt that the movement was a sly and cunning Liberal trick to embarrass the Conservative party or to help the Liberal party in some way or another. Then to hear from the lips of the Prime Minister that it is a political move against his government is to reel with laughter between the pillar of suspicion and the post of cynicism. The truth is that there never was a committee more non-political, there never was a committee more Canadian, there never was a committee better apprised of Canada's danger, Canada's need and Canada's duty. The Prime Minister, in setting an example for the members of the house, referred with innuendo to the fact that the

movement was highly financed. In looking over the names of those who instituted the movement, I find that most of the highly financial ones are personal friends of the Prime Minister.

I was amazed this afternoon to hear the hon. member for Northumberland, Ont. (Mr. Fraser), saying things about the various members who signed that petition. I recall that one very good Liberal friend of mine from Toronto who signed the petition has no less than four sons serving in the forces, and yet men of that character have to be subjected to such things in this house.

In order that they might realize the true nature of Canada's peril and the fact that England, ten hours flying time away, is Canada's outer rampart, I wish every hon. member of this house could visit the beleaguered isle of Great Britain. Only to refresh our memories may I point out that in area Great Britain is no greater than a narrow strip of land running from Windsor to Montreal and contains 46,000,000 people. In this overcrowded little island country which is the workshop for those from whom she imports raw materials and foodstuffs, the members of the empire parliamentary association delegation, drawn from all parties in this house, as well as the Prime Minister, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), and others who have recently visited that country, saw for themselves, in the brief time at their disposal, something of what a country once totally unprepared can do to meet total war.

Here may I pay a tribute to the United Kingdom branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association for having the foresight to give to the representatives of our various parties an opportunity of seeing how our only line of defence was being maintained. My special thanks are due to the secretariat of the association, Sir Howard d'Egville, Sir Drummond Shiels, Mr. Spencer-Hess, to Doctor Beauchesne, and to our Prime Minister for wishing us godspeed.

Only viewing the situation with our own eyes could make us realize how near the forces of freedom came to defeat at the hands of Germany when France fell and the evacuation of Dunkirk by a miracle saved the lives of 300,000 British soldiers, including Canadians; with what intrepid bravery and valour the battle of Britain was won when the pilots of the Royal Air Force, single-handed, attacked whole enemy squadrons and beat them off; and how Britain must remain guarded by a great army, with our own Canadian troops holding one of the most important positions facing the enemy. One realized as never before that if England fell, nothing, not a thing, stood between the shores of Canada and slaughter and worse by the nazis.

There on the coast of Dover we saw the enemy in occupied France, only twenty-four miles away, with his guns pointed on that city, and we saw where his shells had killed many of its defenceless citizens. Twenty-four miles is but a step in an age of modern transportation, and one wondered where and when on that coastline the enemy might land in the darkness of the night, or in the thickness of a fog. One trembled not alone for England, but for Canada; and when one saw the steel work defences in the sands with the barbed wire entanglements behind that, and the cement blocks staggered to prevent the landing of tanks, one said: Is this all that stands between Canada and the hun?

In Great Britain all hearts and all hands are directed against the nazi invader. Food, clothing and shelter are limited to the minimum human requirements, thus releasing all possible man-power. In agriculture, farmers cannot sow their lands to crops which are unsuitable, and labourers cannot leave the farms for the factory, if their services are required for food production. There the state has called upon every man and woman to serve wherever he or she is best fitted. Is Canada willing to do less in a common struggle?

On June 18, 1917, as reported on page 2392 of *Hansard*, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, discussing the principle that the state has the right to call upon the service of every citizen in its own defence, and the particular application of that principle to the laws of Canada said:

> That is the way I understand the existing law. And in this the law of this land is not singular, for such has been the law of civilized nations everywhere. It was the law of France when Canada was in possession of France; it was the law of England when Canada came into possession of England. In France that law remained unaltered until 1798 when compulsion was introduced for the first time; it remained the law of England until last year. If ever there was a principle which was embedded in the very soil of Britain, it was that the king could demand no service of his people except for the protection of their land and the repelling of invasion. It is well known that the King of England could not for any other purpose claim the service of any of his subjects. The English people were always afraid of permanent armies; the English people again and again have fought against their kings, to vindicate the principle that large permanent armies be not established in Great Britain.

Further on, at page 2393, Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

> I say that he could not under the act as it is, send anybody across the ocean to serve in the war. He said the other day, and he has

just repeated it, that the first line of our defence to-day is in Flanders and France. I claim against him that there never was any danger of invasion of Canada on the part of Germany. If I have taken the position I have hitherto taken it is not because I feared an invasion of Canada by Germany. Nobody could say consistently that at this time, or at any time within the three years of the war, Canada was for one instant in danger of invasion. If I have taken the position I have taken, if I have been, as I was and as I am, in favour of our participation in the war, it was not because I feared invasion but because I believed that the victory of Germany would mean for Canada, as for the rest of the world, envelopment in the black shroud of German hegemony with its insolence, cruelties, and barbarities.

Surely in essence Sir Wilfrid Laurier said that he was in favour of Canada's participation in the great war because of the disastrous effect a German victory would have on Canada, but he limited our participation overseas to the voluntary system, and in support of that position he said:

> I claim against him that there never was any danger of invasion of Canada on the part of Germany. If I have taken the position I have hitherto taken, it is not because I feared an invasion of Canada by Germany. Nobody could say consistently that at this time, or at any time within the three years of the war, Canada was for one instant in danger of invasion.

Would Sir Wilfrid Laurier or any thinking man or woman to-day say that Canada is not in fear of invasion, not only by Germany but by Japan? Those who were privileged to hear the great speech of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) know how imminent is that danger on the Pacific coast. I have endeavoured to show how imminent is that danger to our maritime provinces and to Quebec unless we help to hold the Japanese and the Germans at bay. It would be futile to wait until the enemy is on the shores of Canada if we can stop him across the Atlantic or across the Pacific. We must be realistic and destroy the enemy abroad before he destroys us. Canada is fortunate because our allies have fought and held the enemy on their own home lands, fortunate that the forces of righteousness have been saved from defeat by the forces of evil. The road ahead is long and hard. We are far from victory unless all the allied nations wage total war. We must not minimize our potentialities. Great Britain, with 46,000,000 people, has held the fort against Germany's 85,000,000, Italy's 45,000,000, together with the industrial production of France's 40,000,000 and Poland's 37,000,000, to say nothing of the industrial production of Czechoslovakia, Belgium and Holland.

How can we expect our friends to answer our cries for help if we refuse to put ourselves in a position to go to their help when needed? Should the enemy attack us on Canadian soil, let us entitle ourselves to call on our friends, both in America and abroad, by first fighting the common enemy on their homelands. He who does not put out his neighbour's fire, his own house shall be consumed.

Are we still going to follow the policy of "divide and be conquered"? Belgium, Holland and Norway are all examples of countries that refused to throw in their lot with France and Great Britain until it was too late. At the very moment that Norway was being overrun by the nazis, the Norwegian foreign secretary was drafting a note of protest to Great Britain over some alleged technical violation of her neutrality.

May I appeal to my French-Canadian compatriots to realize that this is Canada's war as well as Britain's. I could not help being startled when my friend the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) stated, in describing his visit to Great Britain, that he came back with some impressions, the strongest of which was the love of king, flag and country shown by those people. Then he said: "They do not speak about aggression." It seemed incredible that anyone should have thought that this was a war of aggression on the part of Britain. I do not suggest that my hon. friend ever entertained such an idea, but it does give one a conception of the background held by some of our French-Canadian compatriots. There was an age, but certainly not in this century, when new lands of the world were subject to exploration and conquest, but that age has long since passed, and force as an instrument of national policy gave way to disarmament programmes until Germany made it otherwise.

One is always learning something new in parliament, and I was struck when the hon. member for Hull said in relation to the plebiscite:

> I am supporting the policy of the government. I will say to the people of my province: "If you want national unity now, make this sacrifice." I do not know whether those who have spoken against the French-speaking people in Canada would make the same sacrifice.

I am sensitive to his feeling, but not to his logic. Possibly we fail to understand each other's backgrounds, but may I assure him that the people of British origin in this country have no desire but to live in peace and harmony and cooperation with their fellow French-Canadians, and have nothing but the sincerest wishes for their welfare.

We fail to understand why the element of sacrifice in conscription is peculiar to them. We would never ask them to do anything, to assume any obligation or perform any duty which we would not first exact of ourselves. We believe we are fighting in a common

cause and that just as the enjoyment of Canada is as much their right as it is ours, so is the protection of Canada as much their duty as it is ours. Rightly they will say that such a principle goes without saying, and it does. Whatever difference of opinion there may be between us arises because of different conceptions of wherein lies the defence of Canada.

There is a feeling on the part of some French-Canadians that those of British origin still have close associations with friends and relatives in Great Britain. To some extent that is true, but it can be greatly overestimated. I confess that when the Prime Minister was in England and was given a banquet at the Mansion House and he said that Canada would never have entered the war for the sake of Britain alone, a shiver of shame ran down my spine. It was not something to boast of at a public dinner.

French Canada has not the affinity of racial ties that those of British origin have, but it has the same strong attachment to British institutions, which are to everyone of us the surest guarantee of liberty and freedom.

June 18, 1940, was a very revealing day in this house. I am wondering what the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) would report as the present opinion "of the entire rural population where there exists a strong sentiment in favour of annexation to the United States, or at least of a formal alliance with our powerful neighbours." Are his constituents who were willing to join the United States willing to be led by their laws now just as are the million or more French-Canadians in the New England states? What is the opinion of the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix) who stated:

> Why not continue with our voluntary participation and wait at least until the United states enact conscription of men?

He was then taking shelter under the Monroe doctrine. Is he now willing to fight for it? National unity is a phrase which has arisen in the province of Quebec to describe an attitude, the attitude of one player in a game who says, "If I cannot make the rules I won't play." We have had war forced upon us, whether we like it or not. We cannot make the rules; we must conquer or be conquered.

One great reason for the difference of opinion which still seems to obtain between Quebec and the rest of Canada on the question of conscription lies not so much in what should be done under a given set of circumstances as in the appraisal of what the present circumstances of the war are. Undoubtedly because of historical background, suspicion, prejudice and failure to understand the issues at stake, there are many in the province of Quebec who believe the present war to be an imperialistic war and that the vital interests of Canada are not at stake. Does the loss of lives, including those of their fellow-French-Canadians at Hong Kong, stimulate them to a feeling of revenge upon the Japanese? They look upon Hong Kong as a British colony in which Canada should have no interest. They look upon the magnificent contribution which Australia has made to the Libyan campaign as a colossal mistake, particularly now that Australia is herself in fear of imminent invasion. Do the people of Quebec not realize that if northern Africa and the Suez canal were to fall to the axis powers, a short way would be open for the German hordes to invade the island continent of Australia?

We have lived together, we of British and French origin, in happy harmony for generations and centuries. We are struggling against a common foe who would change the lives and institutions of everyone of us. I cannot help but recall a story which I read when I was struggling with the French language to pass my examinations. It was called *La Dernière Classe,* by Alphonse Daudet, a great French author. In it were described the feelings of the old schoolmaster and the little French children at school in Alsace after the Franco-German war of 1871 when, on the following day, all the lessons had to be taught in the German language. Those hon. members who have read the *Black Record* by Sir Ralph Vansittart well know that the brutal German methods of 1871 are the same to-day, only worse.

Hitler's promises to Vichy are as all the false promises he made to all the other countries; the supremacy of the German herrenvolk is the supreme objective, and, in his view, the end justifies the means, however base, however cruel.

Is Canada going to subscribe to the theory of all those peace-loving and neutral nations of Europe who succumbed to the siren song of Hitler, allowing themselves to be divided and conquered? Only by meeting force with greater force can the enemy be overcome. What possible hope have we in Canada of successfully meeting an invasion? Consider the extent of our coastline. Consider the smallness of our population. Consider the extent of the enemy's forces. Should they once break through the island fortress of Britain or be able to maintain their command of the Pacific ocean, we are lost although hundreds of thousands of us may die in the losing.

Let me say to my French-Canadian compatriots, that no Canadian, no Britisher wants war. Nobody wants to sacrifice his material possessions. Nobody wants to have to fight; nobody wants to have conscription; nobody wants to lose his life. But these things are forced upon us. They are not of our making, but we are prepared to die rather than to become a slave race. Only a quisling could prefer otherwise.

To no one is his own way of life dearer, more precious, more sacred than to my fellow Canadians in the province of Quebec, and no one is more willing to fight and to lay down his life for what he considers vital. During the special war session of 1939 the Prime Minister said, as reported at page 22 of *Hansard:*

> My hon. friend gave his impression of the prize the Germans would seek in the event of victory. He said the prize would be Canada.

Then later on:

> There is no portion of the globe which any nation would be likely to covet more than this Dominion of Canada. There is no other portion of the earth's surface that contains such wealth as lies buried here. Nowhere are there such stretches of territory capable of feeding for generations to come not hundreds of thousands but millions of people.

Even more forcible is the view expressed by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin) on June 18, 1940, as reported at page 895:

> The people of my province possessed enough vision, enough intelligence to realize that by restricting their participation to the defence of the Canadian soil only, their participation should prove of no avail, that it would prove fruitless whenever Britain and France were crushed. At such a time rhetorical high-sounding speeches and empty words concerning the defence of Canada shall partake only of the theatrical and shall be devoid of any quality of true patriotism to be found among men whose main preoccupation is to forestall possible threatening dangers and to prepare, as intelligent men, for the defence of the country.

If our fellow Canadians in Quebec put anything like the same interpretation upon world events as does the rest of Canada, then there would be little difficulty about obtaining harmony and unity of policy. I believe that the Prime Minister and the members of his cabinet put the same interpretation on world events as I do, namely, that Canada's vital interests are in imminent danger and that if they cannot be protected overseas, they cannot be saved on Canadian soil. Why is it not the first duty, then, of the Prime Minister and his cabinet, giving reasons for their conclusions as to why Canada's vital interests are at stake, to instruct the people of Quebec, as to why Canada's best and surest defence lies in defeating the enemy where the war is now being waged. Surely leadership of that kind, since it is required, is the first and most compelling duty of any prime minister and his cabinet. What has been the effect of Hong Kong? The Prime Minister would probably say his first duty is to keep Canada united. Why, then, is he not in Quebec telling the people something of the nature of this war, something of the issues at stake, something of the imminent danger this country is facing and something as to the best means of meeting that danger, something of the fallacy of falling into Hitler's trap and being divided and conquered rather than resisting and destroying the enemy by a great united effort? If our sister commonwealth of Australia was not being subjected to attack, it might indeed be ourselves. This war is everyone's war everywhere. Can we with honour ask the United States to protect us, as we surely must, if we are not prepared to levy every available man to fight for her protection? Can we face the powers that are fighting with us and refuse to ask our nationals to fight anywhere along with their nationals? Is Canada a country without honour?

The unfairness of the present method of recruiting, even if results were adequate, is manifest for reasons which have already been advanced in this debate. As the great United States nation has decreed, universal compulsory military service is the only fair and democratic method. Why should only the best of our young men go, those with spirit, those with courage, those who in future years would be the leaders of a greater Canada? Why enlist when no reinforcements are promised, when some slacker will take one's job?

The invidious differences between different parts of the country make for inequality and injustice. Legitimate differences of opinion as to medical fitness make the number of recruits accepted in one centre vary greatly from the number accepted in another centre, because the general war disposition of the people in the respective centres differs. Injustice destroys national unity.

Conscription is inevitable if our armed forces are to destroy the enemy and reserves and reinforcements are not forthcoming. Is there anything in the present record of recruiting for the active army which holds the slightest promise that we can maintain an adequate fighting forces overseas? Even if the rate of enlistment was continuously satisfactory, the method itself is unfair. Great Britain has had its Dunkirk; the United States has had its Pearl Harbour, and Canada has had its Hong Kong. Must we have our Halifax, our Quebec, our Victoria and Vancouver before

Canada is geared to total effort? If our soldiers get into action on a full scale, then I believe that, dislike it as we may, we shall have conscription. We are being geared to 1943 when we may be lost in 1942.

I have set my course only with the gravest consideration and with heart-burnings that all my fellow-Canadians do not at this moment think alike on the issue of conscription. I know it is unpopular in some quarters; but I believe it is necessary, that honour demands it, and that the people of Canada, if they once realized the necessity, would be prepared to make any sacrifice to achieve victory.

Mr. J. G. ROSS (Moose Jaw): For a number of days now, and probably for many more to come, we have heard and shall hear over and over again arguments for and against the plebiscite and other aspects of government policy. For the Conservative opposition the plebiscite seems to be the only topic which can be discussed. Why? For the sole reason that they think they have an issue to confuse and confound, to disturb and distress. Whether it does the same thing to the war effort is not as important to them as party strategy. Why party strategy? Well, there is a by-election to win; a gathering hope of national government, and the smacking of lips as the office-hungry Tories dream of a return to power; by the front door if they can, by the back door if they must. Even a hand-out through the pantry window would be appreciated.

We hear a lot about leadership, about courageous action. In fact the demand for "courageous action" seems to have been adopted as the party slogan by the Tories; Tories in name, Tories in nature, including the new mascot for the party, Mitch Hepburn. Speaking of Mitch, the mascot, here is what he has to say about the plebiscite:

Special to the *Gazette*.

St. Thomas, January 22.—"I was astounded by the announcement from Ottawa to-day in the speech from the throne that a plebiscite of the Canadian people is to be taken on the conscription issue. I think this is one of the most dastardly, contemptible and cowardly things ever perpetrated on a respected and dignified people by any government.

"I appeal to Grits and Tories of Canada alike to show their indignation quickly and forcibly against this cowardly suggestion from Ottawa to-day, which will make Canada and Canadians the laughing-stock of the allied nations fighting our battles for freedom."

There is a ringing declaration for you! Mitch the man of courage who is reported in this week's press as saying that he is "dropping the idea of lowering the school age to aid the war effort"—Why? Because there was too much opposition to it. Another courageous and ringing declaration!

[Mr. Jackman.]

Incidentally this is the same courageous leader, the only man in public life in Canada to-day whose courage is such that he employs, presumably at government expense, a personal bodyguard. Perhaps he is trying to emulate the late Huey Long of Baton Rouge further in his political life, or perhaps he got the idea from some of his stiletto-handling friends.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Maybe he is afraid some of his friends will stab him in the back.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Yes, he stabs many in the back. He is trying to stab your party in the back right now.

But we are used to Mitch's ringing declarations, to his high patriotism, to the subordination of his personal interests and those of his friends to the cause of country. I shall not take time to go over Mr. Hepburn's war record; it is pretty well known in this country. Put briefly, he talks big and acts small. While scuttling the Sirois conference he did his utmost to prevent the all-out use of Canada's financial resources in our war. Why? The reason is plain. He wanted to keep the money flowing into the treasury of Ontario, which he controlled. We all remember the speech he made last September in New York, when he dragged the name of Canada in the mud, to the delight of the isolationists of the United States. By that speech he not only hurt Canada, he injured the whole allied cause. Let me quote what was said about that performance by a leading isolationist newspaper, the Boston *Daily Record*, on September 30, 1941:

A great many correspondents ask: what will happen to us in case Germany wins the European conflict? That is a natural and legitimate inquiry. It seems at the moment to be within the possibilities that the Germans might defeat the Russians and completely occupy Russia, including the Ukraine. And since the rest of Europe is already in the hands of the axis powers, there is point to the query.

What would that complete control of Europe mean to Europe, to us, and the world? Mitchell F. Hepburn, the distinguished Premier of Ontario, Canada, is not dismayed by the prospect. He predicts a triumph of Germany over Russia, but sees as a result closer relations and collaboration between the United States and Canada until "ultimately there will be no boundary line between us, because of the need and necessity of national defence." . . . "Germany is going to overrun Russia," says Premier Hepburn, according to the dispatches, "and will have all Europe in a state of subjection." . . . "Germany will have at her command industrial resources, the mineral reserves, and the oil and the loot of a nation populated by almost two hundred million people. But," continued the premier, "we will win the war with our resources." . . . "We have resources—man-power, brain-power and money." . . . "Great Britain is the outpost of America,"

and "I speak on behalf of Winston Churchill, the great Prime Minister of Britain, who has asked us to supply him with the tools in order that he can carry on the war for us."

There is a good deal of sound sense in what the noted premier of Ontario says. We can give Britain the tools with which to fight. But there is not much sense in giving Russia the tools with which to surrender.

And further:

Why not save something to defend our own democracy if, as Premier Hepburn says, "Germany is going to overrun Russia" and "will have all Europe in a state of subjection"? To be sure, Canada and the United States and all the Americas "have resources", as the premier states, if we husband them . . . Finally, as the premier says, "we have man-power." . . . Yet we do not want to fertilize foreign battlefields with the blood and bones of our fine young Americans.

That is the comment which was prompted by a speech delivered by Mitchell Hepburn in New York, while this war was in progress. Does anyone think that helped the allied cause?

There is an old saying, that you may know a man by his friends. Here are a few of Mitch's boon companions: "Sell-'em" Ben Smith, Wall street promoter, arch-isolationist and appeaser, whose trail from Vichy to Wall street to Bay street to St. Thomas, Ontario, is well known to Mitch; Franceschini, ex-internee, reported to be the angel of Mitch's tour to Australia; and, as the latest bed-fellows, George Drew and Arthur Meighen, concerning whom Mitch has often held forth in his usual vigorous style. I need not repeat what is already on the records of this house on this subject, but I might add a bit by giving you George Drew: colonel, military expert extraordinary, world traveller, author, man about town, and what have you. There is little time to deal with "Gorgeous George" except as a military expert, and in that capacity chief adviser by remote control to the opposition. Let us listen to George, the expert, the man who wanted to close up the Bren gun factory as his contribution to the war effort. We all remember George of "the broken-down boiler factory, run by a friend of the minister." That "broken-down boiler factory" has turned out to be one of the greatest assets of Canada and the empire in this war. The excellent guns made in that factory are blazing at the enemy to-night on every front from Singapore to Libya. But even "Gorgeous George" should be allowed one mistake. He still claims to be an expert. Let us hear him in that capacity on Russia, as reported in the Toronto *Telegram* of January 21, 1939. Speaking at Sault Ste. Marie, "Gorgeous George" is reported to have said: "Russia would not be a vital factor in any war." He had seen the Russian troops when he visited that country, and in his opinion the Russian army was a "broken reed." Even after war broke out "Gorgeous George" was still an expert on Russia. At a meeting of the Toronto branch of the Queen's Alumnae on November 17, George said:

Russia's troops are disorganized, sloppy. The guns and tanks you see pictured in great display in Moscow's Red Square are mostly of German construction. Russian soldiers have no ammunition, except for the purpose of their own execution squads. The propaganda of Russia's might is merely amusing.

I have not time even to go over "Gorgeous George's" amazing record as an expert. But with such an adviser, it is little wonder that the opposition do so much muddling meddling in military matters.

An hon. MEMBER: You are an expert!

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): And now, spotlight, camera, action!—little Arthur himself the new leader, the white hope of the party! Oh, I am not going to be unfair to the right hon. gentleman. I shall not go back to 1914 and give R.B.'s reference to him—that is, R. B. Bennett—as the gramophone of the Mackenzie and Mann interests. I shall not bring up the speech—the "Ready, aye, ready" speech of 1922, or the semi-ready speech of Hamilton, in 1925. I shall not embarrass the opposition by reading the bitter denunciation of Meighen by the Hon. G. Howard Ferguson, the former Conservative Premier of Ontario at the Winnipeg convention in 1927 when, for the only time in history, the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen stood before a great convention of Conservatives of Canada, and they discarded him as a leader—and those same Conservatives have never asked him to come back.

Even less will I go over the sordid tale of the Ontario power service corporation bonds, so ably set out by Mitchell Hepburn in 1934 and 1936, and referred to in this house the other day by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Fulford). No; I will be kind to Mr. Meighen, and refer only to his record within the past few days, when he was reported on January 27 as having said, "If we have to conscript wealth to win the war, we will. But people of common sense do not advocate that until the last gasp."

An hon. MEMBER: Was it a Liberal who said that?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Arthur Meighen. There is a real leader for you! How the embattled barons of Bay street must have rejoiced as this knight in shining armour tilted his lance against the approach of total

war toward their castles, and their money bags. The last man, certainly; the last dollar, never—until the last gasp.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Quote his last night's speech along with that.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Don't worry, I will finish with that. The bell-wether of Bay street! Well, they ought to know something about wethers up there. They have fleeced more people in Canada than any other outfit. I see that after ten days, as my hon. friend remarks, the effect of this statement has been borne in on the right hon. gentleman, and he has given a belated denial, terming it inconsistent with his by-election campaign. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps I have known the gentleman in politics as long as most people in this house. It may be inconsistent with his election campaign, but it certainly is consistent with the record of the man during his whole political career.

I for one believe the statement was made. In any event, the issue still stands. Let us see how our hon. friends opposite stand on the same issue—our friends opposite, who want courage, who want leadership, who demand clear-cut pronouncements of government policy and attitude! Where do they stand? It is a poor rule that does not work both ways. I ask them now: Do they endorse the "last gasp" speech of January 27; or do they slip out from under, on the inconsistent speech of February 3? Do they in their zeal for total war, and in what they claim to be the intent of their amendment, repudiate the amazing policy of conscription of wealth only as the last gasp? The people of Canada want something more than the denial of Arthur Meighen in a by-election campaign. They have a right to know whether the members of the Conservative party in this house are ready to conscript men, but consider the dollar sacred. Does their amendment clearly and unmistakably mean that they are prepared to urge, in fact demand, that the full conscription of wealth must come if and when we conscript men for overseas service; or do they favour total conscription of men's lives and voluntary methods of raising money? Let me have an answer from them. Do they join their leader in Toronto?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Which night?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Yes, which night—January 27 or February 3? What has the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Perley) to say about it?

Mr. PERLEY: Read our amendent.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): He cannot read yet.

Mr ROSS (Moose Jaw): Do you agree with your leader in Toronto, or do you not? Silence!

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Give him the same answer as the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) gave this afternoon.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): Will any member of the Conservative party answer?

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): The same answer the Prime Minister gave this afternoon.

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): No, they dare not answer. Yet these are the men who are pounding day after day at the government, and asking them to take a stand on matters.

Mr. PERLEY: Where do you stand?

Mr. ROSS (Moose Jaw): You sit; you say nothing; you do not dare take a stand. And if you did, from the speeches I have heard you make in this house—and others—in the last few days, could we consider that a pledge before the people of Canada, when you make it in the house? We cannot consider it when you make it in the country. These Tory leaders—first of all Arthur Meighen, who has again been given the leadership of the Conservative party, by a clique, not by Conservatives in Canada in convention assembled, with delegates from the people, and then these men who have been voicing views in this chamber—are not portraying the thoughts in the minds of Conservatives of the Dominion of Canada. There are many thousands of Conservatives in this country who are to-day taking their part in this war alongside Liberals and others. They are not endeavouring to cause turmoil and strife in the country at this time. They are serving on committees, working hard to raise money to buy bonds from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) to carry on the war. They are in the was savings certificates drives, and they are in the Department of Munitions and Supply, as the hon. member for Northumberland, Ont. (Mr. Fraser) said this afternoon. They are in the foreign exchange control board, in the war-time prices and trade board and everywhere else where they can aid in this effort. They have forgotten politics; they are not playing politics now, and all glory and power to them for that.

Then there are those who think they portray Conservative opinion in this country. They come to this house, and we see what happened the other day. We had just opened the sitting when an hon. gentleman rose in his place and suggested a parliamentary inquiry into the Hong Kong affair. Everyone knows there would not have been a Hong Kong if

there had not been a Pearl Harbour. Everyone knows they are not playing politics to-day in the United States. Pearl Harbour was investigated by a judicial committee, and those who were found to be negligent are to be punished. That is what should be done with regard to all these matters. Hong Kong should be investigated, not by a parliamentary committee where political capital could be made out of everything, but by a judicial board. If any negligence or any guilt is found, then those who are responsible should be properly punished.

We are getting sick and tired of hearing gentlemen on platforms throughout the country and in this house running down Canada's army. Canada has a good army, one of the best. The men who are running it can be depended upon; they are as good as any other men running any other army anywhere. We are proud of that army. They are doing a first-class job, and we should give them every credit, not try to make out that we have not a large enough army or a good enough army or that it is deficient in either men or brains.

For some time I have heard talk of a total-war effort. A total-war effort for this country should be the effort that this country can make of every kind, the effort which will go farthest to aid in winning this war regardless of what direction it may take. Some people think we should have a blueprint of exactly what is to be done in the way of defence for the next six months. If we had had one, it would have all gone to pieces two months ago because this war is changing every week. Some men still say that there must be plenty of munitions and supplies now. In proportion, there are not as many munitions and supply as there were. The battle fronts of this war have opened up faster than the factories of the allies can keep up with providing munitions and supplies.

Since December 7, when Pearl Harbour was struck—this is not a secret because Winston Churchill has said it in the open—we lost command of the Pacific. Since we have lost command of the Pacific, it is quite likely that our sister dominions, Australia and New Zealand, will be unable to supply Great Britain with many of the things with which they have been supplying her up to the last two months. What does that mean? It means that the only countries which can supply Great Britain are Canada and the United States.

There is a bigger job to-day for the Canadian agriculturist than has ever before faced him in his history. All kinds of foodstuffs must be produced in greater abundance than they have been produced in the past to help to carry on and feed Great Britain during this war. The Canadian farmer will have to get up a little earlier in the morning and go to bed a little later at night, although at the present and in the past he has done better at this than any other citizen of the dominion.

The Canadian farmer should be given fair treatment. A few days ago we had a large delegation here from western Canada making a most reasonable request of the government. They asked for a fair price for their wheat. Surely the Canadian people should be able to give it, not for all that they can grow but for what can be sold. If you go into the facts and figures with regard to this matter, you will find that wheat is the only thing that the people of Canada are asking the farmers of Canada to give to the government in the war effort for which a reasonable and fair price is not being paid. I think grave consideration by the government, by this house and by the people of Canada should be given to this question.

I hope that this drive for political purposes will stop, that these people will realize finally that no matter how much they drive the Prime Minister, the more often he has gone to an election, the bigger the majority he has received from the people of Canada. I have every confidence in the Prime Minister as the leader of this country at this time. I have every confidence in the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) and in the army officers under him. I have every confidence in the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services (Mr. Macdonald), and in the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power). I know that we could not get a better man as Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) than we have. Where could you pick up a man in whom the people have more confidence than they have in the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley)? Where could you get a man who has done more and will do more for the farmers of this country than the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner)? Yet these people have been saying day after day, "Throw the government out, get new leaders." They have asked the Prime Minister to bring men into the government from the outside. He has done that, and two of them are now fighting for all they are worth in by-elections. Why? Because the very people who asked him to bring them in from the outside are now trying to defeat them.

With regard to the plebiscite, I want to say that I gave my pledge in the last election, and as yet I have not broken the pledge to the people of this country, and do not intend

to. I ask the people of my constituency and in other parts of Canada to vote "yes" on this plebiscite and relieve the government and hon. members of their pledges. I ask my people to do that in order that I may follow the Prime Minister and the ministers I have mentioned, all of whom have full knowledge and are in complete cooperation with the allied commands and will do what is right to win this war for Canada and the Canadian people.

Mr. MAXIME RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne, explained and completed by the speech of the Prime Minister, defines the government's war programme for the present session.

The programme comprises a non-interest-bearing loan of $700,000,000 to England; an outright gift of $1,000,000,000 to England for war purposes; a war budget of $3,000,000,000 to be raised by taxation and loans; a national war effort extended to the country's utmost capacity, and, finally, a request to the people, by means of a plebiscite, to release the government from any previous commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service—in other words, a request for freedom to enact conscription for military service overseas if it sees fit.

This simple outline gives an idea of the extent of the war effort contemplated for a small nation of 11½ million still in the development stage.

If the two opposition leaders, the one who sits in this house and the other who is waiting at the door, have been able to call the $1,300,000,000 appropriation requested last year for certain war expenditures a "crushing burden, staggering in its proportion", what words will they find this year for the appropriations required by the programme I have just outlined? The least that can be expected of them is that they cease making unfavourable comparisons between our war effort and that of other allied countries, notably Australia —Australia which does not even pay the expenses of its own troops outside its territory, while we not only meet the expenses of our troops abroad, but contribute to the equipping and feeding of the troops of other allied countries. It is high time to start keeping criticism within the bounds of common sense.

Leaving all further comment on this subject for a later occasion, I shall deal at once with the question of the plebiscite on conscription, which is the most important question of all, because of the immediate consequences it will inevitably produce in the country.

The mover of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) has pointed out that the plebiscite represented "a reversal of policy" on the part of the government, and he added: "The three and a half million French-Canadians of my province are being asked to accept one of the greatest sacrifices that the country has ever requested of them."

It would be impossible to describe the present situation more tragically.

What are the facts?

A group of citizens calling themselves the committee of 200, gathered in Toronto, have decided to impose their will on the Canadian people. With little regard for the country's future, they have organized at great expense a campaign of propaganda and intimidation with a view to forcing the government to enact conscription for overseas service, in defiance of the plighted word and of the will of the people expressed on the 26th of March, 1940. And strange to say, while advocating the adoption of coercitive measures for the sending of men overseas in order to defend democracy and punish the violators of treaties, these people ask the government to violate the pact entered into on the 9th of September, 1939, at the time of the declaration of war, and to disregard the mandate received from the people on the 26th of March, 1940, not to impose conscription for overseas service.

I wish to recall briefly the circumstances and conditions under which participation in this war was decided and to draw the conclusions that necessarily follow therefrom as regards the plebiscite and the question of conscription.

On the 9th of September, 1939, Right Hon. Mr. Lapointe expressed in the following terms the conditions under which "a most important section of the country, comprising the province of Quebec", would agree to Canada's participation:

> But, sir, I believe that at this time there are two extreme sides of opinion which we should avoid and which would make for the disunity of Canada at a time when we need the very opposite. First, there are those who . . . say that Canada can and should remain neutral. . . .
>
> The other school consist of those who . . . are promoting courses which would disunite Canada—because such measures will never be accepted or enforced by and in a most important section of the country. The whole province of Quebec—and I speak with all the responsibility and the solemnity I can give to my words—will never agree to accept compulsory service or conscription outside Canada. I will go farther than that: When I say the whole province of Quebec I mean that I personally agree with them. I am authorized by my colleagues in the cabinet from the province of Quebec . . . to say that we will never agree to conscription

and will never be members or supporters of a government that will try to enforce it. Is that clear enough?

Then he added:

Provided these points are understood, we are willing to offer our services without limitation and to devote our best efforts for the success of the cause we all have at heart. And those in Quebec who say that we will have conscription in spite of what some of us are saying, are doing the work of disunity, the work of the foe, the work of the enemy. (House of Commons Debates, second session 1939, page 68.)

Could anything be clearer? Participation without conscription.

Such is the compromise proposed by Mr. Lapointe and accepted without reserve by all the conscriptionists, including the whole imperialist and conscriptionist newspapers of the country, on the 9th of September, 1939.

This compromise was ratified by the people of all Canada on the 26th of March, 1940, at a general election. It therefore constitutes a pact, which cannot be set aside without the express and explicit consent of all the parties to the contract. And this pact was concluded not for a month, not for a year, not for two years, not even for the duration of a parliament, but for the entire duration of the war. For this "most important section of the country, comprising the whole province of Quebec", which Mr. Lapointe referred to, entered into the conflict for the duration of the war and would never have agreed to participation therein without the express condition which is: No conscription for overseas service at any time throughout the whole duration of the war.

It is therefore a compromise for the duration of the war, and it cannot be set aside until the war is over.

What is being sought is not the complete setting aside of the pact of September, 1939, ratified by the people in March, 1940—this being impossible, since one of the parties thereto has already fulfilled its obligation and the parties can no longer be replaced in their previous state—but the setting aside of the obligation of one of the parties, the sole condition which the abstentionists set to their participation, namely, that there should be no conscription for service overseas.

Now that one party to the contract, the abstentionist group, has unstintingly fulfilled and even gone beyond their pledge to participate in the war—for our participation which was to be moderate and commensurate with our means has become unlimited, and we know that Mr. Lapointe, as he had promised on September 9, 1939, "devoted to it his best efforts"—now, as I say, that one party has fulfilled its pledge, the other party to the contract, the conscriptionist group, would like to repudiate their sole obligation, which was to abstain from demanding conscription for overseas service.

To all the sincere advocates of conscription in this house I say:

On September 9, 1939, a compromise was made whereby you agreed not to demand conscription for overseas service, provided those who opposed participation in the war, especially in the province of Quebec, consented to participate in that war. On the strength of that agreement, the important part of our population which opposes war has consented to participate in it. Were you sincere at that time? I dare not question your sincerity. Did you wish to obtain that consent through false representations? I dare not believe it. Now that those who opposed war have liberally and generously fulfilled their pledge—and God knows how much fervour and devotion Mr. Lapointe brought into the fulfilment of his pledge—will you refuse to fulfil yours?

If I may ask you, would you consider that it would be fair and honourable?

You would conscript men for fighting overseas those who do not honour their pledge, while breaking yourselves the contract you made with an important part of the population, and you would claim to advocate national unity. No, no, that is not possible.

But the plebiscite implies something more unusual. Not only will the party towards which the pledge was made be asked to relieve the other party from its obligation, but those who favour conscription will be asked to relieve themselves from their obligation, for, mind you, the question bears on a single point: "discarding the pledge whereby conscription was not to be enforced". Since when is a debtor left free to decide himself whether he will pay his debt or not? A creditor may be requested to waive his claim, but a debtor is never asked to decide himself whether he must pay his debt or not. And in justice only those who oppose conscription and towards whom the pledge was made, should have the right to relieve the advocates of compulsory service, or the government, from the pledge whereby they agreed not to enforce conscription.

Apart from the fact that such a request would constitute a breach of contract, and the violation of a pledge, I can see no justification whatever for it.

In the first place, the reasons for which that pact or compromise was made still exist to-day to a degree even greater than in 1939.

The leaders of the two great political parties have many times stated those reasons: The necessity of preserving national unity, and inefficiency or failure of conscription.

In a speech broadcast on March 4, 1940, during the election campaign, the Hon. Mr. Manion, then leader of the Conservative party said:

In my opinion, conscription was a failure in the last war for it only added 10,000 men to our army of over half a million and it stirred up misunderstanding in this country. For the reason I have just stated; because conscription is not necessary in this war and because a public man is in duty bound to maintain national unity, as I have said on other occasions, I am absolutely opposed to conscription. I have made that quite clear a year ago, on March 30 in the House of Commons.

What he said on March 30, 1939, is reported as follows in *Hansard*, Vol. III, page 2440:

Remembering the strong views held by both extreme sides, I see a very grave danger to the dominion unless some fair compromise policy is adopted. It seems to me that persistence in either of these extreme views, to the ignoring of the very large group who have the other extreme view, means the disruption of Canada, possibly civil war in case there was an international war in which Britain was engaged, perhaps the ultimate break-up of the British empire. In the last war the conscription of men to go to the front caused violent racial antagonisms, much disharmony, bitterness and misunderstanding—conditions from which as yet we have not wholly recovered; and on top of that I believe I am expressing the opinion of authorities when I say that it was of no real military value in so far as the empire was concerned. Not long ago, I made it my business to ask an outstanding military authority how many men got into the line from Canada through conscription. He said that there were no absolutely authentic or indisputable figures, but he estimated the number at the outside as 10,000.

The recruitment of 10,000 men out of the half million Canadians who went overseas shows that, with all the ill effects conscription had in our country, it exercised but a small effect upon the war.

On the other hand, neutrality, or independence or even failure to co-operate with Great Britain, is as repugnant to a large section of Canadians as is conscription to another large section. It seems to me, therefore, that we must adopt a sane middle course in order to preserve a united Canada and, indeed, to maintain this empire.

He added:

There should be no conscription of Canadians to serve outside the borders of Canada.

The Prime Minister spoke along the same lines on different occasions, in this house and outside, especially during the 1940 election campaign, and solemn pledges against conscription were therefore taken by the two leaders. The same two reasons against conscription still exist to-day.

[Mr. Raymond.]

Opposition to conscription is to-day as great as it was in 1939 and 1940; it is even greater since Australia, after having withdrawn troops from her borders, has found herself unable to defend her own territory.

Here is what Mr. Lapointe said on June 18, 1940, as reported at page 877 of *Hansard*, during the debate on the Mobilization Act, after the invasion of Holland and Norway and the defeat of France:

I invite all my friends to read the observations I made in this house when war was declared. . . . I then said to my fellow-countrymen that the province, one of whose representatives I have the honour to be, was opposed to compulsory military service overseas, and that we would fight it . . . that I would fight it; that if it were proposed by my government I would resign from that government. That is what I said and that is what I repeat to-day.

National unity is as necessary to-day as it was in 1939 and 1940 and it is perhaps even more necessary.

It has not been proved that conscription will be more efficient to-day than in 1917, during the last war, when it gave such disastrous results.

Those are the very reasons that prevented in 1917 and that are to-day still preventing Australia, South Africa and Northern Ireland from enforcing conscription. The Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Curtin, again made that statement less than two months ago. Then why should Canada have conscription?

Is it desired to divide this country forever? The leader of the opposition acknowledged in Toronto on October 29 last, that public opinion was not prepared to accept it and he was not referring to the province of Quebec. After all, is not the Canadian war effort outstanding? The Hon. Malcolm MacDonald, British high commissioner in Canada, said a few days ago, on January 26, that our war effort was extraordinary.

The outline of our war effort which the Prime Minister gave in his speech, on January 26 last, should convince the most obdurate that conscription could not make it any greater. It compares favourably with the effort of any allied country. What is needed is more food, clothing, airplanes, weapons, and munitions of every description. At Dunkirk, in Greece, in the island of Crete and in the Pacific, allied reverses were attributable to lack of war equipment. Proportionately speaking, no other country has supplied more material than Canada. Our land is both the granary and the arsenal of Great Britain; ours is the task of supplying still more for all theatres of war. Let us not forget, as General Ludendorff, former chief of

the German general staff, stated in his book entitled "Total War", that the supply of foodstuffs for the army and civil populations is of paramount importance; that Germany was not vanquished on the battlefield, but through starvation.

It is not when we are requested to increase our agricultural production in spite of a labour shortage already noticeable; it is not when we are asked to step up our industrial production which requires more workers to supply weapons and equipment for our soldiers; it is not when the defence of our shores demands more soldiers that we should contemplate increasing the number of recruits for overseas service by the adoption of conscription in a country whose population is less than 1 per cent of the 1,200 million inhabitants of the allied countries—Russia having 180 million; Great Britain, 46 million; the United States, 130 million; China, nearly 500 million; India, about 400 million and the other countries many more millions.

The leader of the opposition would like Canada to police the world. No sooner does he learn that the fight has started somewhere, than he wants to know whether our soldiers are in the thick of it. He forgets that there are only 11½ million Canadians.

I fail to see any reason to justify the present campaign in favour of conscription. Its adoption would accomplish nothing useful; on the contrary, it would be calamitous.

As for the plebiscite, this measure can be interpreted in one way only. The government wish to be released from the promise they gave during the 1940 election campaign that they would respect one of the conditions of the agreement of September, 1939. They ask for complete liberty to impose conscription at whatever time and in whatever manner they might think best.

Besides arguments already advanced against the proposed plebiscite, I may add that, being personally opposed to conscription and, further, having promised to fight it, I cannot blindly approve a policy leading to it, especially when the leader of to-morrow might be some unknown man. Men are mortal and the end of the war is not in sight. It is all very well to put faith in the promises of a man, but it becomes somewhat disquieting when he requests to be released from past commitments.

In the present circumstances, although I prefer the present Prime Minister to any other known contender to his position as leader of the administration, I want him as he appeared before the Canadian people in March, 1940, bound by his promise not to adopt conscription, rather than possessed of a blank cheque, of the power to impose conscription if, in his judgment, he believes it to be the proper step. Therefore I cannot support his request, nor the address in reply to the speech from the throne, nor the amendment and subamendment as they all imply the principle of conscription of man-power for overseas service.

An agreement has been concluded between two parties, between supporters of two different schools of thought, abstentionists and conscriptionists.

This agreement, valid for the duration of the war, approves participation short of conscription for overseas service. The abstentionists have discharged their obligation resulting from the pact to the last iota and they have even gone further. (One minister has fallen on the way.) We simply demand that the other party to the agreement discharge its obligation. Is this out of reason?

More than national unity in a time of war is at stake. For us, it is a matter of knowing whether commitments mean anything, whether we may rely on the fulfilment of contracts.

We are not advocating separatism, but we should not be driven to it. We are willing to live in the same house as long as it is comfortable for all. We are advocates of national unity on certain fair terms and once our conditions, laid down in advance, are accepted, we demand that they be adhered to.

I greatly fear that the Toronto committee of 200 who are leading the struggle in favour of conscription for overseas service, in direct violation of the agreement of September, 1939, are forging the weapons that will slay national unity and possibly confederation as well.

PRIVILEGE—MR. THORSON

STATEMENT BY MR. PAUL BOUCHARD

Hon. J. T. THORSON (Minister of National War Services) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. The newspaper *La Presse* of this date contains the following item:

> At St. François d'Assise, where he spoke last night in the crowded parish hall, Mr. Paul Bouchard, one of the candidates in Quebec East, read an extract from a letter written by Mr. Liguori Lacombe, member for Laval-Two Mountains, stating that Hon. Messrs. St. Laurent, Thorson and McGibbon—

He probably means Mr. Gibson.

> —are members of a subcommittee of the war cabinet which is at present studying the problem of conscription for overseas service.

I deny this statement. A subcommittee of the cabinet is at present studying the question of man-power.

Hon. J. E. MICHAUD (Minister of Fisheries) (Translation): And it is not a subcommittee of the war cabinet.

Mr. THORSON (Translation): There is no subcommittee studying the problem of conscription for overseas service. No one is studying the question, neither Mr. St. Laurent, nor Mr. Gibson nor myself. If such a statement is contained in the letter from the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe), it is entirely false.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

Mr. L. P. LIZOTTE (Kamouraska) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wish to add my congratulations to those already tendered to the mover of the address, the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the seconder, the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) on the high standard of their speeches.

More particularly do I congratulate the hon. member for Hull, who is a native of Kamouraska county, on the form of his speech, without insisting on the substance thereof. Every time I meet him and see once again his calm, smiling and restful countenance—typical of familiar faces at home—I indulge in the illusion that he still is an elector of the fine county of Kamouraska which I have the honour to represent. Because of the warm feeling I have for him I regret all the more not being able to share all the views he has expressed in his speech.

I am fully aware, Mr. Speaker, that we are going through one of the most momentous periods which our generation has known. The problems facing the members of this house are difficult, embarrassing and fatally dangerous for the internal peace of the country and for the national unity which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has so far been able to maintain at the cost of the most praiseworthy efforts.

Whatever action is taken by hon. members will have a profound effect on the present and future life of the nation.

We therefore realize at this time the gap left in our ranks by the death of Ernest Lapointe and the extent of the loss which the Canadian nation has sustained. In times of stress we of the province of Quebec used to turn to this great Canadian who is no longer here to strengthen our confidence and point out to us the road to follow.

Some days ago I heard the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) correct the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) by stating that Ernest Lapointe was born not in the county of Kamouraska but in that of Témiscouata. He was right. But it must be admitted that it is the electors of Kamouraska who were intelligent enough to adopt him as their own and give him to the country.

As the representative of the county which gave this great servant to the nation, may I pause for a moment in sorrow and in respect for his memory.

We now have to look to the Prime Minister, his companion in the battles of old, who, knowing through Lapointe the mentality of Quebec, has so far always been a friend to our province. I am confident that he will receive good advice from the present representative of French-Canadians in his cabinet, the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin) and in the near future from the hon. the Minister of Justice. May Providence grant to the hon. the Minister of Public Works the health needed for carrying on his work.

Whether they come from Quebec or from other provinces, all the members of this house harbour the same feeling of loyalty towards their country, notwithstanding the fact that some may look to Canada and others to England. Our views may differ on the means to be taken, but all of us here agree that the victory of our arms must be ensured, and that whatever sacrifices are necessary must be borne with fortitude, so that good may triumph over evil, and democratic freedom may prevail over totalitarian slavery. But while fighting for democracy we should cause no one to lose confidence in it, and the people, who are the fountainhead of all authority, should not lose confidence in the pledged word of their leaders, to whom they have entrusted their most cherished interests.

The problem which this house faces today must be dealt with in the light of these facts.

The question with which I intend to deal as briefly as possible in the course of my remarks may be put as follows: is it advisable, at this time, that the government should consult the people in order to know whether they are willing to release the government from their past commitments with regard to conscription for overseas service, and authorize them to adopt whatever recruiting policy they may deem necessary?

It must first be clearly stated that in principle the government in power may, without any other formality than the concurrence of parliament, enforce at any time compulsory military service for overseas. That is what would have happened, many months ago, if the Conservatives had unfortunately been

returned to power in 1940. The speeches of their leaders have made us aware—for those people seem to have lost all sense of decency —that in spite of the oath they have taken before the electorate in March 1940, we would have had conscription in May of the same year.

If the Liberals were to act to-day in such an arbitrary and high-handed manner, after the promises they have made, I would say that their party is no longer worthy of its great name and that my leaders deserve to be ranked among those undesirable people who are called "Tories".

Fortunately that is not the stand that was taken by our leaders. The policy adopted by the government is unquestionably a wholly democratic measure, since its object is to consult again the people, from whom all authority and power is derived in this country.

But is that measure necessary? Is it not obviously fraught with danger? Those are points on which I am not in agreement with the government. In my humble opinion, the government should continue to direct their policies in accordance with the mandate they hold. I believe that I can remain associated with my party, which is the party of free speech and free opinions while respectfully submitting that such a measure is neither necessary nor timely, that it is fraught with serious danger, and this for reasons different from those advanced by the opposition.

As far as I am concerned, I was satisfied in 1940 and I still am today with the opinion that was clearly and freely expressed by the electorate less than two years ago.

The Prime Minister himself had stated, on the floor of this house, in November 1941, that he was satisfied with the verdict rendered by the Canadian people at the last election.

In my estimation, it is not necessary to go back to the polls every season. On the other hand, do the people wish to be consulted? I have never heard anything to that effect.

When the elections of March 1940 took place, this terrible war was already in progress and the electors then gave the government direct authority to wage war, on condition, however, that, as long as they remained in power, compulsory service for overseas would not be resorted to.

Neither the shrieks of a few Toronto newspaper editors, royally paid to criticize through Mr. Meighen and his gang, neither the threats of a handful of financial barons, boosting Mr. Meighen's candidature in an attempt to realize scandalous war profits, as they did in 1917, will convince me that our people, courageously doing their share, silently accepting all sacrifices, voluntarily offering their sons to their country, request that they be consulted anew.

Would then that the government, fearlessly carrying on with the authority granted them, continue, as heretofore, to follow the lead given by our population.

I stated that, in my opinion, the plebiscite announced by the government is not necessary. I shall go further and say that it is ill-timed. Mr. Speaker, you may be sure that this expression of public opinion will create all the excitement of a general election, which the government is desirous of avoiding so as to concentrate on the war effort. I fear that this popular vote may, on account of the various and contradictory opinions expressed in different provinces, revive racial and religious controversies which we had been fortunate enough to quench. The next six months will show whether I am right or wrong.

I claim further that this plebiscite is dangerous. Anyone may foresee that, in the event the government is released from its past commitments—which personally I hope it will not—it then would be forced to adopt this useless compulsory method, in order to silence the criticisms, to block the intrigues and stop the blackmailing of the Tories. If the Canadian people do release the government from past commitments, this verdict will be interpreted as a request by the public for the immediate adoption of conscription for overseas service irrespective of its reactions on the effort made to protect our own shores; then you will witness all the astuteness of the Tories in exerting pressure on the present administration.

In certain financial quarters, if it be found necessary, subscriptions to the victory loan will be refused, in order to blackmail the the government: threats to that effect have already been made. Unfortunately, in this country, there are people who would risk even defeat at the hands of the enemy, to hoist themselves into power and slake their thirst for vengeance against our present leader and his friends. They camouflage under the cry for conscription their hunger for power and vengeance.

Personally, since the last war, and consequently for the past 25 years, I have been opposed to any form of compulsory service for overseas. This way of thinking has been inculcated in me by the leaders of my party, who have persuaded me that Canada should be my first and foremost consideration. Laurier, King and Lapointe have always refused to entertain the idea of conscription for over-

seas service. As the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Raymond) said a few minutes ago, there was a compromise on that subject between the different racial groups which make up the Liberal party. That compromise was the foundation of national unity. Is the destruction of that solid basis of internal peace now desired?

In 1940, along with the majority of the members of this house, I spoke against conscription for overseas service. I am still the same man and I hold the same view in 1942. I was, I still am and I shall remain opposed to conscription for overseas service.

With the prime minister of the province of Quebec, the hon. Adélard Godbout, whose courage is to be admired, I declare that our first loyalty must be to our country, Canada, the defence of which must be provided for right here. Now is the time to barricade ourselves within our coasts, just as England has barricaded herself in her island. Let us continue the building of airplanes and ships for the protection of our coasts, but let us also keep here the defenders of the country. I do not want to be pessimistic, but I fear that before very long we shall need here all our resources, all our munitions and all our brave soldiers. The countries we have equipped and armed, to whom we make contributions without regard to our means, may be slow in answering our desperate S.O.S. calls. Let us prepare for the worst, hoping that God will protect us.

The sentiments which I express with all the calmness and moderation at my command are shared by the vast majority of the electors in my constituency and I shall never have the audacity to ask them to modify their views when I have not yet altered mine.

Mr. POULIOT: Hear, hear.

Mr. LIZOTTE: If they are called upon to vote on a plebiscite I know their answer will be "no". However, I intend leaving them perfectly free to express their views according to their conscience and I will ask them to avoid any useless agitation.

A Quebec newspaper, *L'Action Catholique*, in an editorial dated January 30, 1942, recommends calmness and peacefulness. I quote:

> There is, therefore—without the least thought of partisanship—nothing to gain by involving and jeopardizing King's position in the country, in parliament and in the allied councils. There is no need for agitation in Quebec province to fan public sentiment against conscription. In agitation lies the road to conscription.

Such reasoning, Mr. Speaker, is common sense itself, in my humble opinion.

Let us remain calm, but let us be fearless however, in a clear expression of our views.

In conclusion, I would remind the house, as a citizen from the province of Quebec, that there is one thing not to be overlooked in the heat of discussion. And that is that Mr. King is our only safeguard, that in no one else can we rest our hope, and that the greatest calamity that could befall the Canadian people and particularly the province of Quebec in this tragic hour, would be that power be taken from Mr. King to be handed over to our worst enemies, Messrs. Meighen and company.

Mr. J. W. McGIBBON (Argenteuil): Mr. Speaker, like practically all those who have taken part in this debate before me, I feel my first words must be those of congratulation to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I thought both the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) did exceptionally well, and I feel it is freely admitted in the lobbies that these were the best speeches of this kind for a long time.

I wish also to congratulate the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) upon his fine effort. There was a sense of restraint and moderation running through his discourse which I thought sounded just the right note for a leader of the opposition in war time. I wonder whether the man who so earnestly seeks his position would not have done a whole lot of harm to our war effort, had he been in his position.

As one who has not been active in the debates of the last two sessions, it occurs to me that many hon. members, and especially the newer ones, would not know anything about the historic old riding of Argenteuil which I have the honour to represent. Argenteuil is a happy combination of English and French-speaking Canadians, all working together, all working harmoniously. I think we set a model for many other electoral districts in Canada to follow. But no one can think of the constituency I have the honour to represent without thinking of one of my famous predecessors, the late Sir George Perley. Sir George represented Argenteuil for many years, and his sound judgment, sagacity and ability to deal with things directly, and, above all, the fine representation he gave to our constituency in parliament year after year, constituted an outstanding contribution to this parliament. I am personally as proud as a Liberal to pay tribute to the late Sir George Perley as any member of this house. When

the people of our riding sent Sir George to Ottawa, they did not do so because he was eternally speaking, but rather because he was not. Sir George saw no need to be eternally speaking; he felt that there were many times when thinking rather than talking made a sounder contribution to the situation. Therefore I would hope in some respects to follow in his footsteps.

First of all, we do not believe in recriminations. It seems to me that there has been far too much talk of how Quebec feels about Toronto, and how Toronto feels about Quebec. In Argenteuil riding, where French-speaking and English-speaking people live in amity and spend their lives working with and cooperating with each other, all this controversy seems so needless, so useless. I am sure the people of Toronto want to win this war just as earnestly, just as sincerely, as we do. I am sure the province of Quebec and Toronto have the same aim in mind—the destruction of Hitler. I think no man can guarantee that we in this country could stand independently against the enemy, but on the other hand, we all agree that with united effort of this country along with that of our formidable allies we shall be successful. We all wish to travel to the same goal, but are arguing over the different routes.

It seems, too, that this debate has narrowed itself down to partisan limits. I do not think the war can be fought in that way. Nor do I believe that what we say will in itself settle the war. I think we are looking at too small a corner of the picture. This war has got beyond the narrowing frames into which some of the debaters would like to confine it.

In reviewing the war, I am bound to notice a few milestones. The first one I would mention is the Ogdensburg pact. Here surely was a strong contribution to our defence, and to our ultimate safety. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), because of his long and valued friendship with President Roosevelt, was able to arrange a mutual defence programme of immense value. Out of that came the joint defence board of Canada and the United States. Thanks to the efforts of this board, in cooperation with the two governments, we have made some notable achievements, not only in defence but as a means of offence also. But our government did not let it rest at that. The Ogdensburg pact was followed by the Hyde Park agreement, and the defence of the continent was further strengthened. I have no doubt, however, that the conversations of President Roosevelt and the Prime Minister ranged far beyond that, and I have no doubt, in view of what has happened since, that considerable thought was given to a war of offence as well as a war of defence.

Another milestone, perhaps the most important of all, was the visit of Mr. Churchill to this continent, during which visit at almost the same time that he described ourselves as the lynch-pin between Britain and United States came that outstanding document which was evidently in part the result of the labours of our Prime Minister and one which I regret to say has been little emphasized in this house. I refer to the Washington pact, of which Canada was a signatory power. This is a new magna charta of freedom, agreed to by twenty-six free nations of the earth.

The reason why I mention the Washington pact is this: out of that document has sprung a supreme war council in Washington. This council is planning the destruction of the axis, not on any small scale but with a panoramic perspective that takes in the whole world. If I may then jump from this broad conception of the war to our own House of Commons, does it not seem absurd that we should be trying to settle allied war strategy right here? Yet that is what some people are trying to do. I myself feel that it is no longer entirely up to us what we are going to do, it is up to this war council. With our relatively small number of soldiers, even by extending our present legislation far beyond its present limits, we may not have nearly enough soldiers to turn the scale. Mark you, I have not the information to argue this point at all, one way or another.

But I ask the house this: how do we know that it is troops the supreme powers want from Canada? Might it not be food, or munitions? Might it not be ships? Are our airmen a paramount consideration? Could it be that our contribution in tanks, guns, merchant ships, corvettes, or something else vital to the war is needed from Canada more than anything else? Again I say, I do not know, and I doubt if some of those who have debated so vehemently know either. I am told it would not be the first time that members of this house were not certain of what they are talking about. But there must be a few people who know better than others. In the light of the general success of our war effort so far, I consider that my chief, the Prime Minister, knows. He has been Prime Minister of this country for a long time. He has been Prime Minister of Canada for the past seven years. During that time, as a result of his position and his personal friendships with people in high places, he has gained an insight into the situation that ordinary members of parliament cannot possibly hope to have. He has been through many important historical moments, and these experiences have all been valuable to him and to the country. Then, too, from day to day, the Prime Minister is

receiving the very latest reports on the situation all over the world, as it has developed up to the present. Surely no one has clearer vision and is better versed in the war situation than he.

In the light of all this background, having regard to the long experience the head of the government has had, remembering the personal contacts this administration has had with the great nations and great personalities of this war, it seems to me that the present government is in a better position to know what is best for Canada. Under those circumstances, and hoping to be able to face any future emergency, the government now asks to be relieved of its commitments of the 1940 election period, and I personally believe the government should be relieved of them. To ask the people, to whom the promises were made to relieve this government of those promises is the democratic way. To do it any other way is to emulate the dictators, whom to-day we are fighting with all we have, to destroy.

I have personally sufficient faith in the government to believe that if it wants to be relieved of its commitments, then that is the best thing for Canada. I have sufficient faith in them, too, to know that when the time comes to choose any new or different course, that, too, will be the right course. Again I have sufficient faith in the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to feel that he is the man to guide us through to victory. Talk of supplanting him with somebody else is idle and foolish. The farmers of our constituency have been taught from infancy the danger, yes, the folly, of changing horses in midstream. That applies in Ottawa just as much as it does back in Argenteuil and the rural constituencies.

Let us approach this question, then, without political bias. Here is a man who has been elected with an overwhelming mandate from the people, and elected not in the unthinking days of peace but when the war had been in progress for more than half a year. The Prime Minister asked at that time for a mandate to carry on the war, and the people of Canada gave him that mandate; indeed, it was the greatest mandate ever given to any prime minister in this country. This is not the time for petty politics. I think we should be put in a position to give our best, realizing our duty as a united nation in the allied cause to defeat the common enemy.

On motion of Mr. Bertrand (Prescott) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre) the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

[Mr. McGibbon.]

Friday, February 6, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

CENSORSHIP

PRESS REPORT OF SPEECH OF CANDIDATE IN QUEBEC EAST BY-ELECTION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): My attention has been called to a press report of a statement by Mr. Bouchard, who is a candidate in the by-election in the constituency of Quebec East, in a speech prepared for delivery in that city a few days ago, in which he gave utterance to sentiments which were suppressed by the censor on the ground that they were a violation of the defence of Canada regulations. I have not seen the speech, but no doubt officials of the government and members of the government themselves have seen it. I ask the government if investigation has been made with respect to the contents of this speech. If it was in violation of the defence of Canada regulations it was properly suppressed by order of the censor, and if it was in violation of such regulations, what action does the government propose to take in the premises, having regard to what it did in the case of the mayor of Montreal?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): May I say to my hon. friend that I have no knowledge of what has been said or censored, but I shall look into the matter. I might say further to my hon. friend and to the house that it is a pretty difficult matter to decide what is the wisest course to take with respect to censoring political speeches. Men can be made martyrs of if their words are suppressed; on the other hand they are apt to convey an entirely false impression to others than themselves with respect to the significance of their words if they are allowed to speak freely. In these matters I think at this time we shall have to trust largely to the common sense of the people.

YUKON AIRPORTS

QUESTION AS TO DEFENCE MEASURES IN STRATEGIC AREAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): I wish to ask the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) whether any steps have been taken for the defence of the airports at White Horse, Dawson, Mayo and Watson Lake in the Yukon. The government have recently spent a good deal of public money on some of those airports, and they are worth taking

care of. The airport at White Horse is in a particularly strategic position for the service of northern Canada and the territory of Alaska. I should like to know whether anything is being done towards the defence of these airports.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): I will consult with my colleague the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) and give my hon. friend an answer later.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Thursday, February 5, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): On Thursday, January 22, Mr. Speaker, you informed this house of the speech of His Excellency the Governor General. On Friday, January 23, the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier), seconded by the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald), moved that we "beg leave to offer our humble thanks to your excellency for the gracious speech which your excellency has addressed to both houses of parliament."

On that occasion both the mover and the seconder observed the finest traditions of our parliamentary institutions, and to the tributes that have been paid to them from all parts of this house I should like, in a spirit of deepest sincerity, to add my own.

Then, sir, on January 26, those who were privileged to be here had the pleasure of hearing two very able addresses, one from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), which, although I did not have the pleasure of hearing it, on account of being engaged on important duties elsewhere, I read most carefully. And I am left amazed as to why the Conservative party in this country found it necessary to supplant him in the leadership of his party at this time. There was also that magnificent and comprehensive address of my right hon. leader (Mr. Mackenzie King), probably one of the finest in his distinguished public career, which is going to continue for many years in the history of our dominion.

My hon. friend the leader of the opposition outlined seven essential points in our war effort. May I say to him immediately that I agree with him in regard to every one of those seven points. The only question is as to priorities.

With one of his remarks I take leave partly to disagree. I quote him, as reported at page 21 of *Hansard:*

> The defence of the nation lies in Britain, in the English channel, in the North sea, in Russia, in the Near East, in the Far East; wherever the enemy may be found. There, overseas, lies Canada's defence her first line of defence. I think we are all agreed on that principle; at least I hope we are.

Well, sir, while that was definitely true some three months ago, I hold that it is not unqualifiedly true in Canada at the present time. I say that to-day the defence of Canada lies not only on those far frontiers, but also along the indented inlets of British Columbia, along our exposed Atlantic coast, along all the shores of the Dominion of Canada.

The other evening we had a speech by my good friend the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), pointing out the potential dangers to our Pacific shores. In parts—and I say this kindly—that speech may have been ill-considered and unguarded; yet in its essential thesis, which I took to be a waking up of Canada to the necessity of taking the utmost possible measures for the defence of the Pacific coast, I find myself in substantial agreement with it. As a matter of fact, quite unintentionally and without his being aware of it, the hon. member's address was a condemnation of most of the speeches we have heard from his colleagues of the Conservative party during the course of this debate. They have insisted, practically to the exclusion of everything else, on raising one issue and one alone in this house at this time; that is, compulsory selective service for the army overseas. As the Prime Minister very carefully and prudently stated in his address there is no real difference except on this point between the policies of the major parties in this house.

As reported at page 32 of *Hansard* the Prime Minister said:

> Freed from the emotions and passions aroused by the storm of controversy, it will be seen that the only difference that does exist is a difference with respect to the application of compulsion in raising men for military service overseas.

And again:

> The issue, therefore, between the government and its opponents narrows down solely to the question of the application of compulsion in raising men for the army. . . . It should be added that the issue thus narrowed to conscription for overseas service in the army

relates only to a possible future contingency, since up to the present the active army has secured the necessary recruits on a voluntary basis.

The last quotation is from page 33 of *Hansard*. The new policy of the government was announced by the Prime Minister in what I have previously termed that magnificent and comprehensive address. I quote his words, as reported, at page 39 of *Hansard:*

During 1942, that is this year, up to March 31 next, it is proposed to create overseas a Canadian army of two army corps. . . . In addition, all necessary ancillary units to serve these two corps will be provided.

This involves changing the fourth division to an armoured division and raising another tank brigade, together with the necessary ancillary troops and headquarters staff organizations.

Then, sir, an amendment was moved by the leader of the opposition—an indictment containing four counts against this administration. If the house supports any one of these counts, it votes non-confidence in this government. The first count in the indictment is that the government—

. . . have sought to evade their responsibility by holding a plebiscite, which, in the view of this house, is the negation of responsible government.

The second count regrets that the government has not introduced additional measures designed to—

. . . mobilize the wealth and material resources and, on a selective basis, the full man and woman power of the nation, to the end that the nation may wage total war in any theatre of war.

It is in the last few words that the only real difference which divides us is given expression. In the third count my hon. friend regrets that the government has not introduced additional measures designed to—

. . . supply the imperative needs of agriculture, industry, and the fighting forces of the nation.

The fourth count is an expression of regret that the government has not introduced additional measures designed to—

prepare for the post-war period.

I have yet to hear any hon. member on the other side suggest what the sponsors of the amendment had in mind with regard to the last two counts of their indictment.

I should now like to deal briefly with the amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell), who is not in his seat at the moment. It is expressed also by way of a vote of non-confidence in this administration, and regrets that the government—

. . . have used the sweeping powers conferred by the National Resources Mobilization Act mainly for the conscription of men for home defence, and in the opinion of this house no total effort adequate to meet the present needs of the war, domestic problems and the preparation for post-war conditions is possible without total mobilization of wealth, industry and finance, as well as human resources.

Therefore this house respectfully requests that the forthcoming plebiscite should seek the support of the people of Canada for the complete and effective conscription of war industries, accumulated wealth and financial institutions, at the same time and on the same basis of sacrifice as the suggested extension of the conscription of man-power.

In regard to the various arguments introduced by my hon. friend under these headings, I regret that I cannot support them. In his address, however, he made one important statement to which I would give my complete support. It appears at page 56 of *Hansard:*

If we are to have this all-out war effort, it must be on the basis of national unity. Every discussion of these matters in this house and in the country ought to be undertaken with due regard to the unity of our people of all races, creeds and tongues. Had the nature and objective of our war effort been clearly placed before the people, our unity would not be endangered. This house has failed to realize that the greatest danger to our unity in war is exactly the same danger we face in peace, the danger from inequality of sacrifice and opportunity.

Let us now, Mr. Speaker, look back to other days; perhaps from the experience of the past we may learn some lessons for the present and the future. In 1917, when the great Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Hugh Guthrie, Fred Pardee and others in that memorable debate upon the referendum urged the conscription of wealth in Canada, they advocated measures which are in full operation in Canada at the present time. To-day we have no tax-free bonds in which the wealthy man can secure his riches under the guise of patriotism. At the time of which I speak there was not even a federal income tax, which only came, in its somewhat restricted form, largely as a result of the arguments advanced during the session of 1917 in favour of the conscription of wealth, by those great Liberal leaders, although they were severed in regard to that particular issue. In this war I submit that we have gone a great deal farther than anything dreamed of in those days by the most ardent supporters of the conscription of wealth.

The hon. member who moved the amendment to the amendment—and I am not holding this against him—is a socialist, and is completely within his rights in advocating socialism for Canada. But he has been doing so for many years, and the electors of Canada have not yet approved of his policy. When he calls for the conscription of industry, accumulated wealth and financial institutions, this might mean one of two things. If it

means the conscription of large incomes, the prevention of profiteering, the utilization of our material resources, no matter to whom they belong, for the prosecution of the war, then I say that this government not only has been given the power to do these things but has done them, and is accelerating the application of its power at a rate that has amazed the entire world.

What is it that we have done? We have limited the profits of industry. We have taxed away a substantial portion of what is left under that limitation. We have done away with profits altogether in a tremendous proportion of our war industries, by setting up state-owned factories. We have taxed the personal incomes of the wealthy almost if not quite to the point of confiscation. We have told the people who have supplies of steel, copper, lumber, and a thousand and one commodities, that not the owners thereof but the Dominion of Canada shall decide what they shall do with their property, to whom they shall supply it and at what price. We have gone into industrial plants and told the proprietors what they are to make and at what price they are to sell it.

We have in control of our financial institutions a national bank which, with its many controls, is compelling the use of our national finances for the benefit of the nation. We have taken over private property, without compunction, when needed for national purposes. We have restricted and curtailed luxury spending so that private moneys shall be at the disposal of the state. We have told the grocers and the butchers that they shall not let scarcity be an excuse for increasing the price of the people's food. We took far-reaching measures for national security, such as the Unemployment Insurance Act and the post-discharge reestablishment plan.

These things we have done and are continuing to do with ever-increasing scope and severity. We have gone farther than any other country whose economy is based upon free enterprise. The marvel is that we have been able to go so far and so fast as we have, without impairing our national efficiency. These things which I have described are the conscription of wealth—conscription to an extent unprecedented in any state whose economy is based upon a system of free enterprise.

But, Mr. Speaker, if the amendment of my hon. friend goes farther than the limitations which I have described, then it asks this house to declare for the abolition of free enterprise and for the substitution of state socialism, a measure which would involve revolution in our whole economic system in Canada. In peace time I would indeed be prepared to debate that issue with the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar on its merits, and perhaps I might go very far along that road with him. I would disagree with him upon the main issues, and the public would then have an opportunity at recurring elections of deciding the merits and the demerits of the issues at stake. But I submit in the strongest possible way that such a debate in war time is a dissipation of energy. We must in this crisis use the organization which we have attained, use it to the best advantage, and with all the improvements we can make to it, in carrying out the purpose—which, after all, is the purpose of us all—of winning this war for Canada, for the empire, for democracy and for freedom itself.

I have heard arguments from time to time in this house about loss of time while we seek to ascertain the will of the people. But the loss of time and efficiency which would be involved in changing Canada from a system of free enterprise to one of socialism is such as to make any such proposal in war time, to my mind, grotesque and absurd. This amendment, therefore, is not a proposal to use socialism for the more effective prosecution of the war; it is an attempt to use the war as a justification for a socialist revolution. I humbly submit to my fellow Canadians in the house, to hon. members, that there has been too much of that sort of thing in Canada. Every party or clique with a hobby has been using the war as an argument to justify its particular theory.

I would, sir, with great respect suggest that it would be more in our national interest to throw our favourite political theories to one side and concentrate our energies for the time being on using our equipment—our present economic system—for the prosecution of this great and terrible war. Even if one were convinced that a socialist state would be better equipped to prosecute a successful war, a proposition to which the majority of members in the house and the people of Canada would not subscribe, this is no time to divert our energies from defeating the enemy to the confusing and colossal task of uprooting the whole system of private enterprise.

But, sir, on the broad principle of equality of sacrifice, in so far as we are able to adopt it, the present government has made greater strides in the past two or three years than we have ever known before in the records of our Canadian history. The government's programme is based upon the curtailment of luxuries and economic waste to the greatest possible extent. New measures in this direction are being introduced as rapidly as we can organize the procedure for administration. Greatly, therefore, as one sympathizes with

the spirit which prompted the amendment to the amendment, one is forced to ask at this time that it be defeated in the house, because, in the first place, it expresses a want of confidence in the government; because, in the second place, the machinery for its accomplishment is already on the statute books of this country, and because, in the third place, underlying it is the demand for a socialist revolution in Canada, in the midst of a war.

I now come back again to the main amendment moved by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. In language which is far from being definite or specific, it refers to the question of compulsory selective service for overseas in the army. Before I discuss that issue, as I mean to do later on, fairly, freely and frankly, may I say a word about the last paragraph of the amendment. That paragraph refers to measures designed to meet post-war problems. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what exactly was in the minds of hon. members opposite when they drafted this particular amendment. I do say, however, that the government has submitted to this house a series of far-reaching measures dealing with post-war problems, and I am glad to be able to say that at least two further important measures will be submitted at the present session.

The Unemployment Insurance Act of 1940 was primarily a post-war measure. The post-discharge plan, which was passed by order in council, but tabled in the house immediately after it was passed, giving the benefit of the Unemployment Insurance Act to members of the armed forces, and providing other measures of assistance to discharged men, is a post-war measure of the highest importance.

At the last session a competent committee of members of parliament assisted in the revision and amendment of the Pension Act. At the same time that committee reviewed the work of a dozen committees of civil servants and others, covering the whole field of civil reestablishment of members of our forces. That committee submitted a report containing certain recommendations, and I should like at an appropriate time to place on record the actual action taken in regard to each of its specific recommendations.

Of the measures to be introduced at this session, one will deal with a system of land settlement which, I believe, will be found by all members of the house to be one of the most constructive and far-reaching proposals of its kind ever submitted to parliament.

In regard to the main problem of reconstruction, the government appointed a committee consisting of six of our most distinguished Canadian citizens—and I should like to place on *Hansard* at a future time, for the information of hon. members, the names of its personnel. When the opportunity presents itself, I intend to proceed with a comprehensive analysis of the work already carried out, both administratively and by research, but I submit it is not possible at the present time to introduce any further measure which could be effective. Therefore I fail to understand the exact significance of that point in the amendment moved by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

I wish now to revert to what is, after all, the main theme of this debate, and the main theme of the main and rather beclouded amendment. I must agree with my right hon. leader that it certainly is not definitely or specifically expressed. The government of this country had three alternatives before it. One was to disregard completely its solemn and sacred pledge given to the people and come out for overseas conscription, as a national policy. I ask hon. members in all corners of the house to envision what would have been the effect in the house and country. The result would be a divided and disunited nation in Canada at the present time.

The second alternative was, as a government, regardless of possible future developments and necessities, to come out against conscription. I ask hon. gentlemen to envision what would be the effect in this house or in this country—and I reply again: A divided and disunited nation. The government has, in my humble judgment, taken the only honourable course, that is, asking for relief from a pledge which was solemnly and sacredly given in the very midst of a war, and by which this government must stand until it is released therefrom by the people themselves, or until the government itself should fall.

We are not taking a referendum on the merits or demerits of conscription itself. We are asking the people to give us the authority, in case the nation's necessity demands it, to act, irrespective of previous pledges, in the best interests of this country and of the cause for which we are fighting to-day and must, I fear, fight for many years. Indeed, if we were asking for a referendum on the merits of the issue, there is nothing contrary to tradition in that. Australia took two referenda on conscription in the midst of the last war. Canada had a general election on the issue in the midst of the last war.

Let me trace history very briefly. In 1917 the issue arose in this house. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the then honoured leader of the

opposition, that magnificent leader of the province of Quebec, moved in this house for a referendum on the issue and said that as far as his influence went, he and the province which he directly represented would be bound by the result of that referendum. However, his amendment was defeated, and the country was subjected to a general election under the iniquitous War-time Elections Act, which divided Canada and has been responsible for the division of Canada from 1917 until 1942.

Mr. Speaker, there was taken on the strength of the Canadian expeditionary force in the last war a total of 619,636 men. Of these there were obtained by voluntary enlistment, 536,281 men. The number raised by the Military Service Act, after all exemptions were dealt with, was only 83,355. When the Military Service Act became law, the total voluntary recruits were approximately 435,000. After the Military Service Act became law, the number who joined was 184,000. After the passage of the military service law, we obtained by the voluntary enlistment of all classes who did not come within the confines of that act, 83,355 out of 184,000. Therefore, even during the regime of the Military Service Act, the voluntary system produced more recruits than conscription, and of Canada's army in 1914-18, five-sixths were volunteers and only one-sixth were obtained by conscription. That issue passed, but there survived the grave national disunity which has never yet been completely suppressed in our dominion.

Then we come to 1925 when the present leader of the Conservative party, who is now seeking election in a constituency in Ontario, delivered an address in Hamilton on November 16. I am going to quote only one paragraph of that address. I have the complete speech here and if any hon. member wants it in full I am ready to make it available. He said this:

> The government would have to act on its judgment, but before there was anything in the way of participation involving the dispatch of troops, the will of the people of Canada should first be obtained.
>
> I have myself not the slightest fear but that, if danger threatened Canada again, this country would respond as it responded in 1914, but I believe, in future, it will be best for all that, before a government takes a step so momentous as the dispatch of troops, the will of the people should be known.

A few days later, at Actonvale, Quebec, during the course of a by-election in Bagot county, the same distinguished gentleman spoke as follows:

> If a crisis should occur in which our country's peace would be threatened, I declare, so long as the reins of power are in my hands, I declare this country will not send a man out of Canada without the country being consulted. Neither one party or the other was of that opinion when the last war broke out. Both parties agreed that immediate action must be taken, but the decision of the Conservative party to-day is that the people, as well as parliament, must decide such action.

The phraseology of my hon. friend's amendment is that this is a negation of responsible government, but the gentleman who is to-day the leader of the Conservative party went beyond the confines of parliament. Speaking in that by-election, he said that "the people, as well as parliament, must decide such action". That is all we are asking for to-day, that the will of the people shall prevail on a lesser issue, that is, to give the government the power, if necessary, to be free to exercise its authority to send troops by compulsion to serve anywhere. What we refer to the people is much smaller in its phase than what Mr Meighen declared in 1925 should be referred to the people.

Then we come to March, 1939, just prior to the outbreak of the present war. The then leader of the Conservative party spoke on March 28 as follows:

> Because of the danger of attack upon Canada itself and because of the necessity of maintaining Canada as a united nation, I do not believe that Canadian youth should be conscripted to fight outside the borders of Canada.

And again he used these words:

> Conscription in the last war led to violent racial antagonisms and much disharmony, and was of no real military value.

The leader whom they followed gave the same pledge to the people that we gave. At the special war session, on September 8, 1939, the Prime Minister made the following statement as reported on page 36 of *Hansard:*

> The present government believe that conscription of men for overseas service will not be a necessary or an effective step. No such measure will be introduced by the present administration.

Next came the challenge from Quebec referred to by my hon. friend who spoke yesterday afternoon. The four ministers in this administration from Quebec staked their political lives upon the issue as to whether Quebec should come into a total war effort with the rest of Canada. In that campaign the Liberal forces were returned by a tremendous majority on a policy of cooperation with the rest of Canada in regard to our effort in the war. Then came something which has become rather familiar in the last few years. The government was challenged by the government of Ontario. We have at the present time another challenge from the same Mr. Hepburn, from the same government which has been somewhat disrupted this morning. The challenge came from Mr. Hepburn

and his government, a resolution made by the premier himself, supported by his companion Colonel George Drew, in the following words:

That this house has heard with interest the reports made by the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition of the result of their visit to Ottawa, to discuss war measures with the national government and this house hereby endorses the statements made by the two members in question and joins with them in regretting that the federal government at Ottawa has made so little effort to prosecute Canada's duty in the war in the vigorous manner the people of Canada desire to see.

The Prime Minister of this country immediately decided to challenge the condemnation by the government of Ontario of the policy of this administration by appealing to the people, and the Prime Minister and his supporters in this house were returned by the free will of the free people of this free dominion with the greatest majority in the whole history of our party. In that election campaign, the leader of the Conservative party used these words:

No one knows better than Mr. King my position against conscription, because he was present in the house on March 30 last when I made my position very clear.

What happened next? The present leader of the opposition—there have been so many leaders I have great difficulty in keeping track of them—was entrusted with his present responsibility, which I may say without hesitation he has filled splendidly in this house. He made a tour of the Canadian west. Speaking at Fort William at a luncheon tendered to him by members of the Lakehead Conservative clubs last summer, he indicated that he was not sure of the feeling in the west in regard to this question of conscription. He used these words, as taken from the press.

It is my considered opinion that mobilization will come, but not unless it has public support. It is the duty of the citizens of the country, if they believe in the right of the principle, to stimulate public opinion.

That was the stand of my hon. friend. If that was their duty, it is his duty and the duty of those who sit around him here to-day. But he did more than that. He spoke in Toronto, in one of the great resorts of those who are high up in the political and social register in that great city, the Albany club, to members of the Conservative party. This is the declaration of my hon. friend who is the acting leader of the opposition in this house:

I have been urged to declare for conscription of man-power. What would happen if I did? Immediately the Conservative party in parliament nailed conscription to its masthead, we would consolidate all those forces that have been opposed to us since 1917, and they would be marshalled against us.

[Mr. Ian Mackenzie.]

Conscription is bound to come to the front more and more insistently—

Then listen to this:

—but it must come from the people themselves.

Those are the words of the acting leader of the Conservative party, the leader of the Conservative party in this house, less than three months ago, when he was speaking in Toronto. He said:

. . . but it must come from the people themselves.

That is exactly the policy of this government and of all honest supporters of this government in this house to-day. He went on to say:

Some will disagree with this view. I have studied it from every angle. If it were put to a plebiscite, I don't know what would happen. I wish you could see the letters I have received —letters from mothers who say they didn't raise their boy to be a soldier.

Then he said: "Our sense of citizenship must be such that we will go out and tell the people what the situation is," but "if you make conscription a political issue, you'll retard its adoption."

Well, sir, they have certainly made it a political issue, but not for one second, I believe, at the urging of the leader of their party in this house but of that coterie outside who are the first cousins of the gold-diggers on the roof-garden. I wonder whether his own followers in this house will be satisfied to be classified, in the language of their own house leader, as amongst those who are retarding the adoption of conscription?

On November 13, 1941, the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, after a curious conclave in this capital city of Canada, and after a week's peculiar pondering, accepted the leadership of the Conservative party from which he was kicked out by Howard Ferguson and the group in Winnipeg in 1927. In accepting the leadership, after a certain amount of coercion by my hon. friends opposite, Right Hon. Arthur Meighen said:

I shall, therefore, urge with all the power I can bring to bear compulsory selective service over the whole field of war.

So that now, despite the pledges made by hon. members opposite in the election of 1940, pledges by which they are sacredly bound to-day, commitments to which they gave their solemn adherence—despite these pledges, just because the outside leader spoke as I have mentioned, conscription is now officially raised as a political issue in the Dominion of Canada.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it must be debated calmly and emphatically; but not now. It is not the issue before this house now. The issue now is to trust the people—now, as Mr.

Meighen said in Hamilton and in Bagot, and as my hon. friend opposite said to his loyal friends of the Albany club, in Toronto, on the thirty-first day of October.

Then, adding their voice to that of the new leader, there was appointed the other day at a sinister meeting on the roof-garden of an illustrious hotel in Toronto a committee of two hundred, who are opposed to the will of the people of Canada expressing itself. They are the people who are to decide on compulsory service. Are they more powerful, more influential than the mass of the voting people in this freedom-loving country? If that day ever comes in Canada, this will no longer be a free land, and it is to keep Canada a free land that our glorious troops are fighting to-day and will fight to-morrow and every day until peace comes again to us all.

William Jennings Bryan once said:

> You shall not press down upon the brow of labour this crown of thorn. You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold.

But that is what the members of that committee, inspired by the great wealthy interests of Canada, would do. They are endeavouring to get control of parliament and to dictate its policies. Under compulsion and coercion they would, for the sake of imposing their special point of view on others, crucify the unity of Canada on a cross of gold.

So, Mr. Speaker, what are the alternatives now? What are we asking for? The speech from the throne has plainly stated that what we seek from the people of Canada is a release from our pledges, and just as truly as parliament controls the government, just as truly, at least in a democracy, do the people control parliament. We are, therefore, going back to the source of our power, to the people themselves and asking them to give us this complete freedom of action to act upon these great national questions in the light of the necessities of the nation as we see them, and our rights and responsibilities as God gives us the power and the strength to see them and to assess them.

There were certain obligations mentioned by my right hon. leader and certain obligations mentioned by the leader of the opposition. To my mind it is entirely a question of priorities. This war is entirely different from the great war of twenty-five years ago. This war has changed in its aspect as far as we are concerned, very vitally indeed in the last three months. The leader of the opposition told us—and I must say he was expressing the orthodox military opinion—that the defence of Canada lay on those far-flung frontiers where the battle rages furiously to-day. I am inclined to think, and certainly if I believe the assertions of the leader of the opposition, the order of priorities has changed.

Regardless of what our requirements may be for the defence of Canada, having committed ourselves already, as we have done in the past and we are doing here to-day in the speech from the throne, to certain obligations, of sending troops overseas, I have no hesitation in asserting that the first obligation upon Canada, the first priority, is to make sure that essential reinforcements to provide against wastage by battle or other causes must be provided for those we have trained or are training to send beyond our borders to fight for our country. That, Mr. Speaker, is the least we can do. That is an obligation of honour, and when hon. gentlemen opposite accuse us of not supporting our boys overseas, I wish to tell them now that not only will this government support them by providing the best equipment in all the world but will support them with essential reinforcements wherever they may be employed or wherever they may be engaged.

If we get a mandate in the affirmative from the people of Canada to release us from our pledges, and if voluntary enlistments should not be sufficient to provide these reinforcements, then as far as I am concerned my recommendation would be to resort to all measures and means that may be necessary to see that these essential reinforcements of trained men are forthcoming, and forthcoming in time.

Then I come to the second priority. Possibly it should be the first. I am sure that there are some of my friends who would put it first, and I am not saying they are not correct. A few months ago the defence of Canada was not the vital problem it is to-day. On account, however, of the shifting fortunes of war, the defence of Canada is a very vital problem at the present moment. I must say frankly that I do believe our duty is, at the moment, to use all our resources to see that our two coastlines have all the protection that the manhood of Canada can supply and the producing industries of Canada can equip. For that purpose we have the fullest authority under the National Resources Mobilization Act, and that authority we shall use, as was announced by the Prime Minister at the opening of this debate.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in seeking this authority from this house at the moment by

way of the adoption of a resolution, and by seeking this authority from the people later on, as fast as we possibly can obtain it, if there is to be any delay in obtaining the authority, the delay will not be occasioned by us, and the responsibility for that delay shall rest elsewhere.

We are appealing, in my humble judgment, to the altitudes of truth and to the high ways of honour.

Next we come to our contribution—I can only mention it briefly as I go along—in munitions, in supplies and in food, already well described by several speakers in this debate. I believe most definitely that, for us, man-power is not the greatest problem in this world battle. If man-power alone were all, then the teeming millions of China would be decisive. I believe that our most effective contribution most certainly comes from our factories, our farms, our fisheries and our fields.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have raised the question of delay. But this argument ignores two facts. One is that the government already has complete power to draft men for service in Canada. That authority has been and is being exercised to the maximum extent to which our military advisers say they are able to accommodate, train and equip the men so drafted.

As I have just stated, the problem of cooperating with our allies overseas is not entirely one of man-power. The demand from Russia, China, and Great Britain is for equipment, and Canada has used her productive capacity to the extent of sending at least half of her production of military equipment to other countries. Canadian guns and tanks and armoured cars, Canadian equipment of many kinds, have already seen service in Russia, Libya, Malaya and China. In so far as Canada's man-power contribution is concerned, we have sent the greatest possible force that could be equipped without depriving our allies of equipment needed on the vital battle fronts.

In this argument that a plebiscite involves delay, the suggestion has been advanced that we are not in a position to send reinforcements to the men already operating overseas. I say definitely and emphatically that that is not so. It has not been considered advisable to publish full particulars about the strength of our forces; but as we examine the figures that have been published, we are able to estimate the strength of the formations overseas. We know that substantial numbers of the troops now overseas are themselves reinforcements. We know approximately the numbers of men in Canada who enlisted voluntarily for service anywhere.

[Mr. Ian Mackenzie.]

Then, with regard to the question of national unity, which some regard as of little importance in connection with this issue, some, not in this house so much as outside, in their lofty pretensions and their exuberant protestations, scoff at this question of national unity in Canada. I humbly venture to suggest to you, sir, that if there is, during the hard, anxious and difficult days ahead for all of us, one thing in Canada above all else necessary in our dominion, it is the unity of our people from shore to shore. We have had in Canada nearly two hundred years of national life on the basis of a partnership between the French and the English, and, later on, of other European races. This is one of the greatest achievements in all history in the interests of peace. Twenty-four years ago, however, through gross mismanagement in this country, the seed of suspicion and distrust between the two major races was sown. Rightly or wrongly—it does not matter much at this stage—the feeling was definitely engendered in French Canada that the other great race was putting French-Canadians in a position of inferiority. We have endeavoured in the present war in every way possible to avoid any such situation.

We have had, up to the present time, a united effort, by representatives of the two races and of others, associated in the government, associated in parliament and associated in the armed forces in a common effort to exert Canada's maximum strength in the struggle against forces of evil, forces which are hated with equal intensity by all Canadians, no matter from what race they come.

If, sir, through the heedless overexuberance of fanatical extremists on both sides, we were to divide the component parts of our population and set up conflict between them, the loss of efficiency in our national war effort would inevitably be tremendous and irretrievable.

Certain old sores continue to rankle even now in the hearts of humble people on the farms and in the villages of one of our greatest provinces. Nevertheless, to-day, the leaders of French Canada in this parliament have undertaken to go out into the counties of Quebec and appeal to their people to free the government from a pledge which was given with honesty, with sincerity, and in the best interests of the nation.

As a Scottish-Canadian, I would pay tribute to the courage and patriotism of my French-Canadian colleagues in the cabinet and in this house for the courage and devotion they have shown in their willingness to give leadership to their people in overcoming ancient grudges and old prejudices. As a Scottish-

Canadian I may be permitted, however, to appeal to my fellow Canadians to hold their hands at this critical hour and to do nothing which will militate against the success of the noble effort which French-Canadian leaders have pledged themselves to undertake at this time. Let us rather seek paths of cooperation and harmony so that together, as Canadians, we may march as one united nation together to victory!

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to a brief discussion of the plebiscite.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has exceeded his time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Proceed.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, through you may I express my profound thanks to the house for its courtesy.

The challenge has been thrown across the floor of this house, the challenge has been reechoed in the editorials of leading publications of this country, "Why a plebiscite on this issue?" Let me remind this house that Australia took twice a referendum on conscription in the midst of the last war. Let me remind the house that Canada had a general election on this issue in the midst of the last war. The present proposal, therefore, although it has nothing whatsoever to do with the merits or demerits of compulsory selective service for overseas, is no departure from well-established practice.

The leaders of the Conservative party have no valid reason for professing to be shocked at the present government adopting a proposal which, in some form, they themselves have repeatedly advocated, and which they themselves utilized. Their policy is that whatever the government does is wrong, even when it does a thing which they themselves have previously advocated.

To the question, "Why a plebiscite?" let me give an answer, not in my own language, for the moment, but in the language of an eminent Canadian who is not to-day a member of this house. He said:

> Surely it is worth while in any British country to have the people understand once for all that they are in control of the great policies of that country and that their control is real and not merely a sham.

And then again this same gentleman, a former Prime Minister of Canada, went on to say in the same context:

> Now the next objection urged is this: that the very fact of submitting such questions to the electors contemplates the idea, possibly, that the electorate might decide adversely, and then the consequences would be terrible. . . . You can trust the people in this matter as in everything else, if you give the people the truth. . . . Bring that right down in the hearts of the people and you can trust the people of this country.

Those are not my words, or the words of the Prime Minister, or the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. They are the words of Arthur Meighen uttered in Winnipeg on October 11, 1927. They are the words of the man who is to-day the leader of the Conservative party. And his followers ask us across the floor of this house, "Why a plebiscite?"—the question which was answered by Mr. Meighen in that speech at Winnipeg: "Trust the people, because the people rule."

The present campaign, which is inspired by that group on the roof-top in Toronto is not so much a war against Germany and Italy, it is a war against this cabinet and against our revered leader, the Prime Minister of Canada. If these loose-talking, gold-digging Tories believe for one second that any member of this administration is not one hundred per cent behind our leader the Prime Minister, it is the greatest mistake they ever made in their lives. Our war against Germany, Italy and Japan is a war for freedom and democracy, the establishment of decency and honour, and the observance of pledges; and every Liberal or Conservative member in this house was elected on a platform that expressly stated that conscription for overseas service would not be adopted in Canada.

I go so far as to agree that circumstances have so changed in the progress of the war that the government and parliament itself, including hon. members opposite, should ask the country to be freed from this pledge. I do not, however, see in the immediate developments at this time—but this is a purely personal opinion—any reason for increasing our overseas commitments beyond those already made and those announced in the speech from the throne. On the contrary, there are arguments such as those used by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) which, in my opinion, strongly suggest the desirability of strengthening our Canadian defences within our own domain, the Dominion of Canada.

The time has now come, and definitely come, when the government should be free, without breaking faith with the people, from whom all our authority comes, to adopt any course which will most effectively contribute to the successful outcome of the war and the effective defence of our Canadian soil.

If taking the plebiscite involved delay in some vital phase of our war effort, I could sympathize with those who argue against taking it. But since, in my judgment, it does

not and cannot involve any delay which hinders or hampers or retards our war effort, I now appeal to those who feel that the government's hands should be freed, to stop this noisy panic-mongering appeal and get out into the country and convince those who need convincing to vote affirmatively on this great plebiscite to ascertain the will of the Canadian people. In that way we have some prospect of maintaining national unity.

The method suggested by a small element, that the government should disregard its pledges, could lead to nothing but strife, dissension, antagonism and charges of betrayal. What would be the attitude of the opposition if this government, without consulting the people, had broken its solemn pledges and proceeded with measures that were definitely in defiance of those pledges? No one likes a plebiscite for its own sake, but I submit it is the only honourable way to deal with a situation which is as much the result of actions of hon. members opposite and of their leader who is not in this house, as it is of actions of this government.

I have heard during the progress of this debate questions hurled across the floor of the house: What will the government do after this vote has been taken? Well, if one were to accept the argument of the hon. member for Vancouver South about the situation existing on the Pacific coast, it would almost lead some people to the conclusion that we should not send another soldier out of the country.

Mr. GREEN: I did not say that.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I do not suggest that my hon. friend said it, but I suggest that what he said might influence some people to think no further soldiers should be sent out of Canada.

Mr. GREEN: I would say that we should do both.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I am glad my hon. friend has amended his opinion.

On the other hand, if we listened to those who advocate another point of view, we might be led into a course which might greatly imperil the defence of our own Canadian soil. The situation on the Pacific coast we all know hinges on the outcome of the present battle in the far east, and the outcome of that struggle is not yet determined.

Now a word on the question of man-power. Some figures have come to my attention, but in their application I do not attempt to speak with final authority. Figures in regard to our man-power resources are undergoing most intensive study at the present time, in order that we may have the most complete and accurate information possible. That is the sort of information that any country must have before any final decision is reached in regard to the broad placement of its man-power.

Our duty in Canada is, first, to defend our own territory to the uttermost; and second, to contribute to the striking power of the united nations in such a way as, in the end, to destroy the enemy. This involves the best possible use of our man-power.

The census reveals that Canada's population is approximately 43 per cent greater now than at the time of the last war. But a detailed analysis indicates that the increase in the number of men of military age is not nearly as great as the increase in the general population. In 1914 Canada had just had a tremendous influx of young immigrants, mostly unmarried and of military age.

In the last war, when industry utilized less than half as many people as are engaged in war production to-day, when we had no air training plan and no real problem of home defence, Canada supported in the field four army divisions, and a fifth was mobilized but had to be broken up for reinforcements. The government were advised by their military staff in pre-war years that having regard to population and the claims of other services, the number of divisions which this country could maintain in warfare was seven. We have already formed six, and we have made demands upon our man-power for other purposes not fully anticipated when those estimates were made.

Let us consider how we have utilized our resources. Financially, Canada has declared that there is no limit; that what we have capacity to do physically we can and will endeavour to finance.

Industrially, we have undertaken tasks of a kind and magnitude never attempted in Canada before. Prior to the outbreak of this war Canada had never manufactured any weapons except rifles, although the manufacture of machine guns had been begun. We had made a small beginning in the production of modern service types of aircraft, never made in Canada prior to 1937. To-day Canada is turning out tanks, heavy and light artillery guns. We have the greatest machine gun factory to-day in the whole world—and for that, with some modesty, I may perhaps claim some credit—and we are manufacturing seven different types of service aircraft.

In the last war, Canada recruited into the Canadian expeditionary force, by the voluntary system and conscription combined, 619,000 men in four and a half years of war. She utilized also 275,000 in war industry, a

total of 894,000 men. In the present war, in two and a half years we have built up the strength of our armed forces to over 400,000 men, and in addition we are utilizing in industry 625,000 persons of whom 550,000 are men.

Mr. GREEN: May I ask the minister a question? While he is giving these figures, can he tell us how many men have been discharged from the forces?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes, in round numbers about 45,000. That number is approximately correct.

Apart from agriculture, therefore, we have harnessed to the war effort over a million men; that is, in a little more than two years we have exceeded under our voluntary system the total man-power effort of four and a half years of the last war. These are only round figures; they are not by any means exhaustive. But on the studies now in progress, our man-power policy must ultimately be determined.

Now I approach my conclusion, with the indulgence of the house.

Mr. CASSELMAN: No. The hon. member has spoken over an hour now.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I approach the conclusion of this presentation by pointing out some of the possible disadvantages of introducing compulsory selective service for overseas. First, there is the risk of sacrificing that spirit of national harmony and unity which until very recently prevailed throughout our dominion. Second, there is the possibility of stirring up antagonisms as between those of different racial origin in Canada. It is only necessary to remember the situation that existed in the last war—some of us recall it now—to recognize the importance of racial accord in our dominion. We have lived together in peace and harmony in Canada for 175 years. The nearest approach to a breach was in 1917. I believe that only the calm, wise and prudent leadership of Sir Wilfrid Laurier prevented violence and bloodshed then. He confined his opposition to parliamentary and democratic methods.

I say again that before the war came, this government gave a solemn pledge that, in the event of war, service outside Canada should only be undertaken freely. When war came, this pledge was solemnly reaffirmed both by the government and by the opposition of the present day, by practically all hon. members of this parliament; not only in the general election and before the war but in the very midst of the war that policy of declaring ourselves on this very issue on which we are now seeking a plebiscite of the people was endorsed by the overwhelming majority of the free-voting people of Canada.

As to whether, at this time of all times, the spokesmen for a nation engaged in this war should disregard their solemn pledges, I cannot do better than quote the words of the Prime Minister in an address which he delivered at Vancouver on June 30 last:

> The present unhappy state of the world is, in a large part, the result of broken pledges. Bad faith, broken pledges and disregard of the popular will are the very forces against which Canada is fighting to-day.
>
> That being so, I wish the more emphatically to affirm the government's intention to keep the pledge repeatedly given to the people of Canada.

So, Mr. Speaker, I leave this issue to the house. I have endeavoured to make the situation as clear as possible. I have endeavoured to analyse the significance of the amendment to the amendment and why I cannot accept or receive it. I have endeavoured to analyse the significance of the amendment itself, and its implications in several respects. I have endeavoured to make clear to the house that both the subamendment and the main amendment are definite declarations of a lack of confidence in this administration. I must emphasize, therefore, with all the strength at my command, that any vote for the subamendment is a vote of non-confidence in this government. I must further emphasize that any vote for the main amendment is a vote of non-confidence in this government.

I believe I have fairly and honestly endeavoured to meet the arguments which have been adduced in support of their protestations. We are not seeking dictatorial powers. We are appealing to the people, who are the masters of parliament. We are appealing through parliament, who are our masters, to the people, who are the masters of us all. We are appealing to the people for a mandate, if you will, to be unrestricted and untrammelled, not impeded or retarded, in adopting such measures in connection with the provision of men for military service as in the government's best judgment are necessary for the fullest and most whole-hearted war effort by the Dominion of Canada. I would plead, if the plea would be of any avail, that to-day, if possible, we should unite our forces and remember only the dark clouds that hang over this nation, and the uncertain course of our sacred cause.

I fear, however, that we must have dissension. I trust that the conscience of every hon. lady and gentleman in this house is clear in regard to the course that he or she is pursuing. I do aver and strongly avow that in my judgment, at this stage, we should even sacrifice some of our convictions in order to get together, if possible, upon a common,

united policy for the future of Canada, which we all in this chamber endeavour to serve and for which we have a deep-seated affection.

I trust that the great majesty of the effort we have made up until now may not be marred by bickerings or dissensions or discords among ourselves. I trust that we all may be prepared, as I certainly am prepared, to sacrifice much for the sake of a common unity and a common harmony, so that we may be privileged, in this dark period of our nation's destiny, together to work out a plan for Canada in this great struggle, which shall be a plan of purpose, a plan of honour, a plan of unstinted effort and a plan, I would hope in the end, of great achievement and proud accomplishment.

Mr. W. K. ESLING (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie), who has just concluded a lengthy address, has given a complete and extended review of the shortcomings, the sins of omission and of commission, of this party. I hope he has not omitted anything. If I were able to speak with the fervour, the fluency and the high-powered eloquence of the minister, perhaps I might be able to make some impression. However, I shall endeavour to keep below the boiling point, and to confine my remarks to the speech from the throne.

This debate is on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. That speech is brief and very carefully worded. In some respects it is as clear as it is possible for words to be; in other instances it is just about as vague as expediency could demand. During the last campaign the government gave this pledge against compulsory service outside Canada; and, at this time of gravest crisis in the history of the world, it is proposed to hold a plebiscite asking the people of Canada to relieve the government of that pledge. The National Resources Mobilization Act provides for compulsory service within Canada. The speech from the throne does not tell us what is going to happen whether the plebiscite vote is yes or no, but the basis of this entire discussion is simply: shall we or shall we not have compulsory service for overseas, to reinforce and relieve those young Canadians now voluntarily serving beyond Canadian shores?

The plebiscite is vague in this respect, that if the people of Canada vote against it the situation simply remains as it is. If they vote for it the government then is given freedom to act as its judgment may dictate. Well, this is a very live question right across the dominion. Some portions of Canada are calling for conscription; other portions are very much opposed to it. In the province of Quebec we have the Minister of Justice contesting a by-election. I do not say that he says outright that there will not be conscription for overseas service, but certainly he is creating an atmosphere of assurance to the people of Quebec that there will not be such conscription; and in that respect he is supported by the premier of Quebec, who simply says, "Well, you need not fear; Mr. King will not bring in conscription. He is opposed to it." That is the situation, whether or not the government takes exception to it. Then we also have a by-election in Welland, being contested by the Minister of Labour. I can tell this house that the government candidate there, and those speaking for him, are having the greatest difficulty in selecting words which will fit their endeavour to soothe the people of that district into the belief that the government will bring in conscription. So that we have two opposite views, and we cannot blame the people of this country for being a little concerned about it.

I am very much in accord with the suggestion put forward yesterday by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lockhart) that this parliament should be permitted to decide the question. Parliament is not deciding the question whether we shall have conscription; that is not the wording of it. Parliament is deciding only whether it will relieve the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the government from its election obligations. As is stated in the speech from the throne, the government then reserves the freedom of acting as its judgment dictates. The progress of the war makes it necessary for one to change one's pledge. The Prime Minister himself has told us over and over again that the government has laid down the principle that there will be no participation by Canada in a war without presenting the matter to parliament. But we had a declaration of war against Roumania, one against Finland and one against Hungary, without the government's coming to parliament; we had a further declaration against Japan without coming to parliament, and I am sure nobody in Canada has taken exception to the government's action in those respects—not at all.

I believe the people of Canada would, without question, approve action by parliament to decide this matter, and which would relieve the Prime Minister of his obligations, thereby saving the time, money and discontent which would naturally be connected with a plebiscite, at a time when all the energy of our people should be directed to war activities, when the time of the government should be

taken up with war measures, and when every interest centres around the putting through successfully of a loan for the purpose of carrying on our part in the war.

The other day the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) stated his position with respect to public opinion and the plebiscite. He comes from Nova Scotia. In the constituency of Kootenay West we have innumerable people who in the early days came from that province. There were lawyers, doctors and farmers, and they have done well in British Columbia. They form a creditable portion of the people in my constituency. A similar cross-section of the residents of every constituency in Canada would show a similar representation from the maritime provinces. The minister acts precisely as his conscience dictates, and I believe that is just the way every hon. member acts. He reflects the views of his constituents, and if he does not do it in a way that will retain the confidence of his electors he will have a successor at the next election.

In October last the executive council of the Canadian Legion presented to the Prime Minister an appeal for the total utilization of our resources and man-power in the prosecution of the war. That appeal was endorsed by 1,470 branches of the Legion across Canada. It has been endorsed by the fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters of the members of those 1,470 branches, and those people ask that the mobilization act be amended so that compulsory service will apply beyond the shores of Canada, as well as within Canada.

That must be accepted as the general opinion of the people in my district, even if hon. members are not willing to accept it as the opinion of people in the provinces east of Ontario. The appeal by the Legion has been endorsed by industrial, mining and agricultural communities in my district; it has been endorsed by boards of trade, by municipal councils, by school boards, by ministerial associations, by service clubs, by fraternal organizations, and others. I say that as a member of the house one must reflect and act upon the views of his constituents.

The speech from the throne contains the statement that the policy of the government is one of total national effort for total war. That is one of the vague phrases in the speech. What does it mean? Nobody knows what it means, and the government will not tell us. But surely any hon. member will admit that the man on the street interprets it to mean that there will be compulsory service to relieve those who have volunteered for service overseas.

On many occasions the government has made it clear that parliament is supreme. The speech from the throne points out that at this time of greatest crisis in the world's history the administration should possess complete freedom to act, subject only to its responsibility to parliament and irrespective of previous commitments, as its judgment dictates. Without being prejudiced, one might properly construe that to mean, as political expediency dictates.

I emphasize the fact that as members directly representing the people of Canada surely we have the power in parliament to relieve the Prime Minister of his obligations. We can pass laws; we can tell the people what they shall and shall not do; we can tell them where they shall and shall not go. We can tell them what price they shall or shall not pay for an article. The people at large have given us that responsibility; surely they will acknowledge our authority to relieve the government of an obligation which was not so urgent at the time it was made.

Last Monday the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) referred to useless extravagance in recruiting. I believe the Minister of Finance could not do better than see to it that there is some curtailment in general expenditures.

One of the branches of the Legion in my district sent in a resolution protesting against the holding of a general conference in Victoria early in November. Recruiting officers and citizens received invitations to attend this conference, as did many people in West Kootenay and other parts of British Columbia. The conference was called to discuss recruiting methods, notwithstanding the fact that every minister of the crown and other people whose services they could enlist had been speaking over the radio on the same matter. Some two hundred guests attended, and they had their travelling and living expenses paid. They were given a good time.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Also a banquet.

Mr. ESLING: At the very least the cost must have been $10,000. This created so much criticism that the Rossland branch of the Canadian Legion protested against this extravagance. There is every reason why they should. The government is engaged in raising war loans, and the children and fathers and mothers of this country are being asked to purchase war savings stamps and certificates. Not a very healthy atmosphere is created when the public see such useless expenditures of money. I was interested in hearing the

Minister of Finance say that he had received letters threatening a boycott of the war loan. I hope that these threats are confined to the few letters the minister has received. There is an old saying that a member of the opposition should never send a bouquet across to a cabinet minister unless it is followed by a brick. I have no bricks. I just want to say that in my district it is considered that the energy, the aggressiveness and the sincerity of the Minister of Finance have been the dominant factors in the success of the war loans.

I should like to quote two instances of what I would term absolute negligence in connection with recruiting. I do not think we can blame young men who have good jobs for not wanting to enlist. They feel that if they do, someone else will take their jobs. Take the Doukhobors for instance. They are absolved from enlisting or from undergoing training of any kind. The government laid out a piece of work and told them that if they would not go into the training camps they would have to do some public work, such as road building. They were to receive fifty cents a day and their board, and were to work under the control of guards appointed by the provincial government. Their reply was simply that "we are not going into training camps, we are not going to do road work, we are not going to do war service; so what are you going to do about it?" The government can do nothing.

I should like to give an illustration of indifference on the part of those who should be held responsible for men who have enlisted and then been discharged because of illness. Previously I cited the case of a young man from my constituency who enlisted in the 111th battery. He went to Edmonton with the rest of his battery and was not there very long before he had to go to hospital for one month. He was discharged from the hospital and also from the army. He was given a warrant for his fare back to his home in my district, but no provision was made for berth or meals. His mother was with him and she purchased a berth for him and his meals. When the train reached Nelson, the place of embarkation, he was taken to the hospital in an ambulance and he stayed there one month. After that he made his way to his home, some fifty miles distant. He was there only ten days when they had to send for an ambulance again to take him to another hospital, where he remained for four months. He had sold a service station he was running, and because of all these bills he and his parents found themselves out of pocket to the extent of an amount in excess of $900. He made his way to the coast in search of a job, and while there he applied to the Shaughnessy hospital for treatment but was told that there was no authority to give him treatment and he did not get it. He is now walking the streets of Vancouver. I should like to ask the minister if steps will not be taken to give better attention to such matters and provide more encouragement for enlisting.

I should like to ask the government what steps are being taken for the defence of the most vulnerable point in the interior of British Columbia, the city of Trail and the adjacent territory in which power plants are located. At this point is located the largest metallurgical plant in the world. It is really a munitions plant, and what it is producing there is for the British government. The only evidence of defence there is a partial unit of the Rocky Mountain Rangers which was organized a few weeks ago, and a company of the veterans guard. There should be some protection against aircraft.

Mr. MacNICOL: Are there no anti-aircraft guns?

Mr. ESLING: No anti-aircraft guns or protection of any kind. While I am on this matter of the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company I should like to say that I think some of the remarks made by hon. members of this house about this company are most unfair. I am sure they would not be made if hon. members were more intimately acquainted with the operations of this company. I have seen it grow from a little slag pot plant to its present size. It is where it is to-day because of the work carried on by its research committee. It is able to furnish the British government to-day with lead and zinc at a price much lower than has prevailed in any average ten years in the history of Canada. This company is providing zinc for the British government at just one-eighth of what it was sold for by the United States companies during the last war. In the early days of that war there was no process available in Canada for separating the lead and zinc in the ore. Many people do not have a proper conception of the industrial relations which exist between this company and its employees. The company has provided non-contributory pensions for its employees. They provide their employees, free of charge, with a large amount of insurance, put a seventy-five dollar cheque in their pay envelope at Christmas time, and when you consider that they have loaned employees a million and a half dollars for housing purposes, and have given to employees company shares valued at one million and a half, the company is not doing so badly, and

I think there should be a greater sense of fairness than has been displayed in the disparaging remarks against it. I do not believe that the heads of industries in this dominion are all bandits and profiteers. They create industry and employment, and that is what we want. It is the only thing which can make this country prosperous.

In conclusion may I again appeal to the government to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Lincoln, and let this parliament release the government from its pledge. The Prime Minister himself has told us many times that parliament is supreme. This plebiscite does not require the government to bring in conscription. Parliament itself, as the direct representative of the people, can release the Prime Minister from his obligations, and I am sure that if this question were submitted to parliament it would release the Prime Minister, and the country at large would thoroughly approve such action.

Mr. HUGHES CLEAVER (Halton): Mr. Speaker, I have already extended my personal congratulations to the mover (Mr. Fournier), and the seconder (Mr. Macdonald), of the motion which we are now discussing, for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to the speech from the throne.

We are now well into the third year of the war. At this the opening of another session it is well that we should look back over what has happened in the past as well as study the present and plan for the future. The opening year of the war was fraught with almost overwhelming dangers. It is a fact, well known now, that if Germany had immediately followed Dunkirk with an invasion of Great Britain, all might have been lost. Even as it was, only the fortitude and bravery of the British people saved the world.

Since then Hitler's aims of world domination have become apparent to all, and now practically all of the democracies have banded together at Britain's side. To-day, while in certain countries the tide of war is still against us, we can rest assured that we are not going to lose the war. Democracies are peace-loving countries and do not lightly become engaged in warfare, but now that the decision has been made we find them all gearing up to end the war successfully and as quickly as possible.

Canada, though only a small country of eleven and one half million people, in the short space of two and one half years has made wonderful strides. Some of our people were impatient at the start and wanted us to throw everything into the struggle without any planning for the future. Some people quite sincerely thought that the war would be won or lost in a year. Your government had no such illusions and planned our war effort for a long struggle, planned our war effort so that each year it would become increasingly stronger, and in furtherance of this policy in the opening months of the war took the time and spent large sums of money to build new factories for the production of armament and equipment. They took the time and money to build and create the greatest air training establishment in the world. They enlarged shipyards and built plate mills to fabricate plates for vessels. They increased the production of steel and other necessary materials. As a result, Canada stands to-day as a living example of what foresight, courage and initiative can accomplish. We have seen our navy personnel increase from less than 2,000 all ranks to over 27,000. We have seen our air force increase from less than 5,000 to over 100,000. We have seen our army for overseas increase from 4,500 active soldiers to nearly 260,000, and we have a reserve army of over 150,000. On top of all this, hundreds of thousands of workmen are employed in war industries all over the country.

To sum it all up, the total cost of the last war to Canada, including the cost of demobilization, was just under 1,700 million dollars. We are crowding into just this one year of this war one and one half times the total cost of the last war. In the present fiscal year, ending March, 1942, we shall have spent 1,500 millions on our direct war effort, and we shall have sent to Great Britain over a thousand million dollars' worth of shells, guns, planes, motorized equipment and foodstuffs. It is truly a stupendous effort.

Now, what of the future? Our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has already advised us that the navy will be expanded in personnel as rapidly as naval ships can be built. Already we have expanded our navy from 20 ships at the outbreak of war to 350 ships. We have built in Canada over 120 corvettes and mine-sweepers. Just before the freeze-up we were receiving deliveries of these vessels at the rate of one every four days. These little ships will outride any gale on any sea. They are the answer to the submarine menace. They are just as effective against the submarine as destroyers are.

As to merchant shipping, if we are able to maintain our 1942 programme, by the end of this year we shall be turning out merchant shipping at a rate equal to that of Great Britain.

In the air our enlistments will be maintained to the capacity of our training schools, which are as yet unsurpassed by any country.

In the army thus far we are planning an additional armoured division and an additional

tank brigade. This, added to the armoured division already planned, and the three infantry divisions and the tank brigade already in Great Britain, will bring up our army to three infantry divisions, two armoured divisions and two tank brigades, as well as all necessary ancillary troops for two Canadian corps.

As a private member with only slight military service in the last war I hesitate to express any military views, but for what my opinion is worth I should like to urge that for our armed forces overseas Canada should concentrate on armoured divisions and tank brigades. We are now industrially equipped for this type of work, and when the time arrives for an invasion of the continent I believe that the air force and swift-striking mechanized troops will be of paramount importance. Canadians in the air have shown tremendous courage, self-reliance and initiative. These same qualities will be of equal value in land operations.

There are some people who believe that industrially we have about reached the peak of our national capacity. In this I do not agree. I concede at once that we have very few skilled men out of work, but this country has not as yet really got down to business. We still have many men performing services which are not essential in war time. We still have duplication of services. Many of our people are still using luxuries we can well do without.

Let me illustrate. In my home town of Burlington, with less than 4,000 people, there are seven trucks and seven truck drivers driving up and down the streets delivering milk. In the city of Hamilton there are over three hundred coal dealers serving that city. I am told on good authority that four of the larger firms could amply supply the fuel needs of that city. We have thousands of salesmen still carrying on competitive selling which is unnecessary. Take life insurance, for example. There are thousands of life insurance agents going up and down this country. I think they could be well spared for the war effort. Then, too, we have many industries still engaged in the production of non-essentials. Thousands of men could be transferred from this non-essential work and placed in war production.

In addition to all these groups I have mentioned, we have hundreds of thousands of women in this country who are willing and anxious to work for war purposes.

For all of these reasons I would urge that orders should be placed at once which would substantially increase Canada's production of war equipment. There are still many small machine shops dotted over this country which are not being fully utilized.

Some may question Canada's ability to pay for any greater war effort. I have a suggestion to make in that regard as well. If I judge aright the temper of the Canadian people, they are not only cheerfully responding to the present demands that we are making upon them, but they are positively asking that we should request greater sacrifices on their part. There is a feeling abroad that we as a people are spending too much money and using up too much valuable material on non-essentials. In my opinion we should get down to business and stop trying to "keep up with the Joneses".

During the first ten months of this fiscal year we have collected nearly $500,000,000 in income tax, compared with a total of less than $10,000,000 collected in the entire period of the last war. This is a pretty good record, but to me it is not good enough. We have not gone far enough. At a time like this, why should we leave untouched $100,000 of income in the hands of any individual in Canada? To-day a man with an income of $500,000 is left with $100,000 in the clear. Coming down to the moderate incomes, why should we leave $15,000 in the hands of any individual as income, untouched?—and that is just what we are doing in regard to a man earning an income of $30,000. Roughly speaking, on $30,000 we take half. I wish to urge in all seriousness and with all the sincerity at my command that we should take all income over and above the living exemptions. It would mean that thousands of personal servants would have to be discharged, but these would be available for war work. It would mean that everyone would have to be his own butler and his own valet. When the safety of the world is at stake, when the flower of Canada's manhood is in the front line, or on the way to it, I ask you, should anyone at home complain if cut down to the bare necessities of life?

In the financing of this war I still have another suggestion to make. We do not hesitate to make a capital levy with respect to the estate of a deceased person. This is just exactly what we do under our succession duties acts. I firmly believe that the present situation is grave enough to justify serious consideration of the subject of a capital levy for war purposes. After setting up exemptions to provide amply for family responsibilities, for illness, and for old age, in my opinion any surplus capital over and above that should be taxed for war purposes. When a young Canadian gives his life in defence of this country, that is a one hundred per cent capital levy so far as that young man is concerned. Should wealth object to a partial capital levy?

Right here I should like to make a suggestion in regard to the armed forces. Many of those who have stayed at home have earned good wages. Some have spent them; others —many—have accumulated savings. I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that a savings fund should be set up for the armed forces. I would urge that every member of our armed forces while serving in Canada, should receive an additional $1 per day, and, while in active service overseas, an additional $2 per day. These savings should not be paid now, but at the end of the war. When the boys return, some will want to complete their education. Many of them will marry. Certainly all of them will find it difficult to get back into civilian life. None of the money would have to be paid now. This would not detract from the war effort. It would be no hardship to continue war-time taxation for a few years after the war. There is another feature about this. The proposed payments would establish a tremendous reservoir of consumer demand for goods at a time when this country will badly need a consumer demand for goods to start its industries going again in peace-time operations, turning over from war-time operations.

In some communities considerable harm is being done to the war effort through the high wages being paid, especially on piece work, in war-time industry. In this regard I have a suggestion to make. I want to say at once that these young lads who are making $7, $8, $9 and some as high as $10 a day are earning their money on a competitive labour market and should have that wage. I would not do anything which would tend to cut down the production of war material. But I do not believe that in time of war any workman in Canada should receive a greater cash wage than the equivalent of what he would receive were he in the army. In the army, a single man without dependents receives the equivalent of about $17 a week, that is, $1.30 a day, his board, clothes, medical and dental services. A married man with two children receives the equivalent of $30 a week, because you must add, in excess of the amount paid to the single man, the $35 per month dependent's allowance to the wife, and $12 a month for each of the children. I do not think that, during a war such as this, any workman in Canada should receive in cash more than the equivalent of what he would receive were he in the army. Of course it must be kept in mind that in the army there are varying rates of pay; non-commissioned officers and commissioned officers receive more money. In the factories, superintendents would have to get more money. But my suggestion is that, in the main, the cash wage to the worker of Canada should be the equivalent of the cash wage he would receive if he were in the army.

I said a moment ago that I would not deny any man the wage he earns. I would pay him the balance of his wages in a non-negotiable war savings certificate, which he could not cash, pledge, nor give away until the war is over. Thereby you would be doing two things beneficial to this war effort. You would be preventing that man from calling now for consumer goods, using up materials which should go into the war effort, and you would also be building up a postponed consumer demand which will come in very handy when the war is over.

I now come to a subject which I hesitate to discuss, because I frankly admit that perhaps sometimes I myself may have transgressed. The hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth), who is now looking so seriously at me, may in a measure concur in that regard. A deliberate attempt is being made at this time to stir up political strife in Canada, to stir up sectional and racial strife, to pit French Canada against English-speaking Canada. I wish to protest against this practice with all the vehemence at my command. It is selfish, it is disloyal, it is doing a lot of harm to Canada's war effort. I suggest that I on my part should search my heart, and that every hon. member should search his at this time. I should ask myself: Am I doing anything at which my Conservative friends could take offence? Am I doing anything which will harm the morale of the Canadian people? If I am, then I am being disloyal to Canada. Before saying anything in this chamber or out of it I should ask myself the question: Will what I am about to say help, or will it actually harm, Canada's war effort? I am not suggesting that unfair attacks should not be answered; where the occasion demands plain-speaking we should speak our minds. Perhaps in the past I have on occasions been too vehement in my views, but notwithstanding all this I say to myself and to every hon. member: think of Canada's war effort before speaking.

I freely admit that I have already dictated and thrown away two speeches for this debate, and I am not satisfied with my speech to-day; it is not good enough for the times. It is a shame that in the midst of the present life-and-death struggle we should have to take time to discuss anything but the war effort. However, during the few days that this house has been in session, and throughout the country, so much has been said about the present government being a single-party government, motivated by the party spirit, that I feel I should frankly express my view.

At the outbreak of the war we had in office a government that did not have a mandate from the people to carry on a war. Everyone agreed that there must be a general election, that the Canadian people had a right to elect a government to carry on the war, and that that election should take place as soon as possible. The Canadian war effort had first to be set in motion. That was done, and as soon as possible, having regard to the exigencies of the war, a general election was called.

In that election there was only one issue, namely, Canada's war effort. Both parties were sincerely and honestly in favour of an all-out war effort. Both parties were sincere and honest in agreeing that if a maximum war effort was to be made we simply had to have a united Canada; we had to forget politics until the war was over. The Conservative party thought that the best way to take politics out of the war effort was the formation of a national government composed of leading men of both parties. This suggestion had considerable merit; it was a view honestly reached by the Conservative party, and no one has any right to question their sincerity or loyalty in arriving at that decision.

The Liberal party, though seeking the same end, took a totally different view of the problem. We thought the best way to take politics out of the war effort was to divorce the war effort from government, to let the army heads run the army, the air heads run the air force, and the navy heads run the navy. As to production of goods, we thought the best way to take politics out of Canada's war effort was to call in leading industrialists from across Canada, irrespective of political affiliations, and say to them: Look after Canada's war production.

Those two points of view, both seeking the same end, but in method as wide apart as the poles, were placed before the Canadian people. Both were eloquently argued, over the air, on the public platform and in the press. When voting day came, the Canadian people, fortunately for Canada, spoke very decisively; there was no room for doubt. The Canadian people had a right to choose the form of government they thought would be the strongest in time of war, and, rightly or wrongly, they chose a single-party government.

The promise made by the Liberal party has been fully carried out. I have yet to hear of one criticism, in this house or in the corridors, of political interference in regard to any of the armed forces. I have yet to hear one criticism on the floor of this house in regard to political interference in letting a war contract. It is a well known fact that well over three-quarters of all army, navy and air force officers are Conservatives. It is well known that a considerably higher percentage than that of the dollar-a-year men in the Department of Munitions and Supply are Conservatives, and they are doing a wonderful job. Take for example, Mr. Allan Nicholson, the timber controller. He comes from my home town of Burlington. He was urged to contest the 1940 election as Conservative candidate. He is to-day vice-president of the Conservative association in my riding. Will anybody suggest that he is a political appointee? And he has done a wonderful job for Canada in connection with its war effort. He has saved this country millions of dollars in the purchase of timber and lumber.

Every dollar's worth of goods bought for war purposes is bought on competitive tender, or, if a type where competitive tender is not possible, is purchased in a businesslike manner from the source that can best supply it. Though hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent monthly, we have yet to hear of any serious misconduct or any political favouritism.

Right here, with all these facts in mind, I implore the opposition to cease making the charge that this is a party government motivated by party feelings. The charge is not true. Hon. members who make such a charge are not being fair to themselves or to the Canadian people. It is harmful to our war effort to stir up in the public mind distrust of the war government. We have honestly tried to take politics out of the war effort. If some are still playing politics, I say to the opposition, denounce them; give us the particulars; let us smoke them out and punish them. So far as I am concerned I owe it to the Conservative party organization in my riding to say that they have fully cooperated with me in the past, and I am confident that this will continue in future as long as the war lasts.

Personally I renounced party politics the very day war was declared. Since September, 1939, I have not made one single political appointment. At the time of the national registration, after consulting with the defeated Conservative candidate I suggested for nomination the president of the Conservative association and the president of the Liberal association as the two key men in my riding to take the national registration. These men made fifty-fifty appointments in every ward in the riding; the entire work was done on a fifty-fifty cooperative basis, and not one man accepted one dollar for his work. The national registration in Halton county cost this country nothing except the cost of printing and advertising.

In this connection let me make a suggestion in regard to the plebiscite. Halton county is going to take the plebiscite vote in the same way; it will not cost this country one dollar in Halton county except for the printing and advertising.

As I have heard over the radio and read in the press the many ill-advised, unfair and bitter attacks which are now being made, I have asked myself this question: Do these men know that they are doing exactly what Hitler would want them to do? I have toyed with this idea: What would I do if I were a paid German agent, hired by Hitler to try to thwart this country's war effort?

In the first place, just as soon as a campaign was launched for voluntary enlistments, I would immediately sponsor conscription. I would tell of all the evils and weaknesses of voluntary enlistment, and I would be all out for conscription. Why? Not because I wanted men; not because I wanted to help the war effort, but because I wanted to harm the war effort and dry up voluntary enlistment.

In the second place, when a victory loan campaign was announced, I would at once charge the government with reckless and extravagant expenditures, with throwing away money in taking a plebiscite, and so on. I would charge them with anything that would undermine public confidence in the government.

In the third place there would be only one thing I could do, other than blow up a factory. I would try deliberately to undermine public confidence in the government by bringing about disunity among the people. I would charge the government with complacency. By doing this I would hope to alienate from the government all the impulsive and restless people who are never satisfied, no matter what is being done, unless they are doing it themselves.

Then I would take the other tack; I would also charge the government with being too ruthless and too energetic in the prosecution of the war. I would charge it with interfering with business; I would charge it with doing public business by order in council. I would charge it with failing to trust the people. By doing all of these things, as a paid agent of Hitler I would hope to overthrow the government and so disturb the public mind that unity would be lost.

The Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, is carrying a terrific load. The ministers of the five war departments are working to the extreme limit of their strength. Where, I ask, would you find five better men in Canada than Hon. J. L. Ralston, Hon. C. G. Power, Hon. Angus Macdonald, Hon. C. D. Howe, and Hon. J. T. Thorson? I sometimes wonder if the Canadian people realize the load these men are carrying, and the load being carried by our Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), and every other minister of the crown.

What about this complaint about lack of leadership? What man in Canada to-day other than Mackenzie King could have organized our war effort as successfully as it has been organized? What other public man in Canada to-day holds the confidence of all groups as he does? But, Mr. Speaker, the results speak far more eloquently than I can speak, so let us look at the results. What of Canada's morale? Are the Canadian people tired of this war? They are paying heavy taxes; they are making no profits; we are interfering with their private business, but notwithstanding all this what do we find? Instead of being tired of the war the Canadian people to-day are demanding a still greater war effort. If these results do not prove masterly leadership, then I do not know what leadership means.

The load being carried by the Prime Minister to-day in directing Canada's war effort is not by any means his sole task. It is fortunate for Canada, fortunate for the British commonwealth of nations and indeed for all the democracies of the world that at this time Canada should have as Prime Minister a personal friend of the President of the United States. Friend and foe alike agree that this fortunate circumstance has, during both peace and war, served as a valuable liaison between Great Britain and the United States. It is strange but true, Mr. Speaker, that no really great man is universally recognized as such during his lifetime. I believe history will record the fact that in our present war leader we have the greatest statesman Canada has yet produced. I do not for a moment expect my hon. friends of the opposition to concur in my views; but I do say, irrespective of the views they hold of the Prime Minister, that he was chosen by the people of Canada to lead our war effort. And, health permitting, he will lead Canada until victory is won.

Now just a word about conscription and the plebiscite, and I am through. We had conscription for ten months of the last war, and the total number of troops raised during that ten months' period was less than 85,000. If any hon. gentleman wishes to check that up I shall be glad to give him the reference. During the past seven months of this war we have had voluntary enlistments at the rate of nearly 20,000 a month. As long as voluntary enlistments can be maintained at this rate, conscription would do more harm than good to Canada's war effort. During this period

when conscription is unnecessary, many people are opposed to it; and I want to say that they are not all in French Canada, as some would lead us to believe.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Then why the plebiscite?

Mr. CLEAVER: If the hon. gentleman will just possess himself in patience for a moment, I am coming to that. If the time ever comes when voluntary enlistments fail to supply our needs, all Canadians, French Canadians and those of British stock, will support conscription; make no mistake about that. Forcing the issue now, before it is necessary, will do untold harm. My hon. friend shakes his head. I am just as sincere in my views as he in his.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): The Minister of Justice does not take that stand.

Mr. CLEAVER: This may be a long war. Voluntary recruiting may become inadequate. The government realizes that the time may come in the future when conscription may be necessary. At the general election of 1940 both major parties solemnly pledged themselves against conscription. Looking to needs which may arise in the future, the government is asking the people, by a plebiscite, to cancel this non-conscription pledge. This is a democratic means of seeking the cancellation of a pledge made to the electors. The pledge was given to them, and only they can release the government from it. Every loyal Canadian who wants an all-out war effort in the final analysis must support the plebiscite. The Duplessis rabble in Quebec are opposed to any war effort at all, and of course they will vote against the plebiscite; but the loyal French Canadians—and they form a large majority—will carry the plebiscite in Quebec. As to the rest of Canada, there are some disgruntled politicians who wish to embarrass this government. There are some selfish business interests who do not like to pay taxes, who yearn for the excess profits which they enjoyed during the last war. These people, in baffled rage—there is nothing else to call it—are to-day making statements of which I predict they will very soon be ashamed. The great middle class of this country will once again assert themselves, and will carry this plebiscite with a splendid majority.

The resolution I am about to read, which was passed at a caucus of Ontario Liberal members held yesterday. gives our answer to one public man in Canada to-day who thinks he is thinking but is only rearranging his grudges:

Whereas the Liberal members of the House of Commons from the province of Ontario, in caucus assembled, desire at this time to reaffirm their loyalty to and their confidence in the leadership of the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada;

And whereas the Premier of Ontario, Mitchell F. Hepburn, for some years has directed his efforts toward embarrassing and insulting the Prime Minister of Canada;

And whereas Mitchell F. Hepburn, the premier of Ontario, is now endeavouring to discredit and to undermine the present government of Canada by indiscriminate and ill-considered criticism of the measures taken for the effective prosecution of the war;

And whereas he is presently seeking to defeat a minister of the crown who would be helpful to the government and to the Canadian people at this critical time;

Now, therefore, the Liberal members of the House of Commons from the province of Ontario desire to record their loyalty to and their confidence in the Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King as Prime Minister of Canada and as leader of the Liberal party.

It is with regret that the said Liberal members of the House of Commons record their disapproval of the actions of Mitchell F. Hepburn and express the belief that he no longer represents liberalism in the province of Ontario.

Mr. MacNICOL: Was that endorsed by all the Ontario Liberal members in the House of Commons?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Take it as read.

Mr. CLEAVER: I cannot invite my hon. friend to caucus; I think he would be out of place. I cannot break the confidence of caucus, so that I shall have to leave him in suspense.

Mr. MacNICOL: The hon. member said "the" Liberal members from Ontario. Apparently he includes them all.

Mr. CLEAVER: I must assure the hon. member that I read the resolution correctly.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Curiosity killed the cat.

Mr. CLEAVER: I cannot help thinking what a wonderful thing it would be for our country's war effort if the Hepburns and the Drews of this country could have a change of heart, and would use their time in coining catch phrases to help instead of harm this country's war effort.

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, in common with a large number of members in this chamber, and a considerable number of people across Canada who are thinking these days, my greatest concern is whether or not we are giving everything that we might in an all-out war effort. These thoughts are brought most forcibly to my mind, and they crowd out all else, when I remember what Winston Churchill said not

so long ago with regard to the part that our own Canadian boys will probably play, and perhaps very shortly, in this conflict. Within a few months, when the invasion season returns, we may find our Canadians in the United Kingdom in one of the bloodiest battles the world has ever known. Surely that one expression of opinion, coming from the world's greatest statesman to-day, should do more to unite our people than some of the bickerings we hear across this floor. And when that great statesman further said that 1942 might see a clearing up of the skies, provided that we use our man-power—he said man-power first; brain-power was second —virility and valour in an all-out effort, and provided that we stay at our task, that great galaxy of English-speaking peoples would give a good account of themselves in 1942, he no doubt had good reason for making the statement.

So we have our task before us, and I implore each and all to apply themselves to the task. It was my pleasure to emphasize the same sentiment on armistice day, November 11, 1941, in this chamber. I felt a sense of frustration then, as to what we as individual members were doing. I still feel the same sense of frustration, that we are not doing enough to-day.

If the premise I lay down is sound, and if we should have this unity to accomplish the common goal, then I have no difficulty in endorsing the mild-mannered, calm statements made with respect to unity by the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier). But without taking time to compliment him upon his speech—and he understands where I stand in the matter—I say to him and to all hon. members that the deductions he drew from the arguments he set up do not in their entirety meet with my views. And when I say they do not meet with my views I am thinking of what has happened both before and since he spoke. I call as my first witness the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). While appreciating the load he is carrying and the difficulties which surround his position in these days, I suggest that he take the keynote of the speech of the hon. member for Hull, the keynote of unity, and that in all his utterances he should see to it that no word comes from his lips which would tend to set our people one against the other.

I have in mind a reference made in this chamber by the Prime Minister when he was referring to certain people from Toronto, in answer to a question by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church). The Prime Minister did not see fit to withdraw his statement that some people from Toronto take too literally what they read in the press. Not a very serious statement, no—but you know, Mr. Speaker, and I know, that when tinder is as dry as it is now, waiting to be ignited to a flame of passion among the different elements of our people, it does not take much to set it off. And it takes very much less when responsible members in this chamber are the ones to light the tinder. How much faster does it rage when the Prime Minister is the one to set the match!

A word about Toronto in a moment or two, but a word first about one of the first citizens of Toronto. For seven years the hon. member for Broadview was first magistrate of that city. During those most trying years he took his place as a servant of the people, giving leadership in respect to matters of profound magnitude during the last war. What train came back with invalids from the last war, what train came back with returned soldiers, whether it arrived at two o'clock in the morning or two o'clock in the afternoon, did not find the hon. member for Broadview, Toronto's first magistrate, in company with his city clerk, Mr. James Somers, O.B.E., waiting to meet it? The city authorities were always given instructions to see that these men, their wives and families, were cared for. That service was given unremittingly for twenty-four hours of the day.

Since that time, what hon. member will gainsay the fact that on every occasion on which the question of empire connection of the great Anglo-Saxon race in Great Britain and throughout the empire has been discussed, the hon. member for Broadview has risen in his place and given voice to the maintenance of that connection which we all hold so dear.

Every time the opportunity presented itself he offered his empire views, which were largely the views of a great number of hon. members in this chamber as well as of the people of the city of Toronto. I say to these hon. members, and in a moment I shall recite whence they come, that they should remember that they are speaking of a great city. Toronto is no mean city. It is a city of industry, a city of intelligence and a city of integrity. This great city with its fine educational institutions, this great city with its extensive public ownership system, is always ready to rise up on every occasion of emergency to help out in war loans or anything else. The young men of that city are ready also to undertake the supreme job of work, that of seeing that the ranks of our different divisions are filled with men ready

to serve the empire during this difficult time. I do not say that Toronto is in the premier position in this regard, but her record will compare most favourably with that of any other city.

So I say as kindly and as sincerely as I can that it ill behooves the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Turner) to rise in his place and say what he did. He comes from Manitoba, a province that we love as we love all Canadian provinces. I do not think he should drag in the name of Toronto for his own political purposes. It would have been far better for my hon. friend, before discussing the question he had in his mind at that time, to go into a caucus of the Manitoba provincial members and obtain their views as to what he should enunciate on the floor of this Canadian House of Commons on behalf of Manitoba.

The hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) does not consider that any speech he makes is complete unless he is able to slam somebody or something. Because of his sense of humour, we try to forgive him his shortcomings. His depositing of the Japs in Ontario, however, is something with which I shall deal when the proper time comes. I would say to the hon. member for Fraser Valley that it does not help things in Canada to-day to single out one part of the country and say something about it which is absolutely unnecessary.

The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Lacroix) is a business man of some standing and a French-Canadian colleague for whom I have admiration as I have for all French-Canadian members. Their forbears came to this country in 1666; I would be proud if mine could date back that far. They are real Canadians, but I do not think they should drag in the name of the city of Toronto in order to support their contentions. I have been twenty years in this house, and I ask you to search the records to find one word that ever came from my lips which was in any way derogatory to those who were Canadians long before we were. The reverse is true.

I pause for a moment to make reference to the late Minister of Justice. I regret his passing. He was a great personal friend, and I should like to interject my tribute at this time. As my time is short I am sure you will understand why I do not enlarge upon it at the moment. In my younger days in 1922 I advocated the development of the Quebec harbour.

Moose Jaw cannot be very proud to-day of its representative because of what he read into the record. Mark you, I am not saying anything to the newer members of this house about reading things into the record, but when one of the older members reads into the record an essay of the kind read in last night by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross), it does not make for unity in this country. We all understand that the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) must take a rise out of every question that comes along. I think he realizes that Toronto is a city of learning, and I forgive him for some of the things he said, but not all. The hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette) was fair when he said that 99½ per cent of the people of Toronto are sound and all right. I quite agree with him, as I think all hon. members do in their hearts. You all know that Toronto is a great city and that you should not stir up strife at this time. If my pleadings will have any effect upon hon. members in this chamber, the matter will be allowed to rest there.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) is coming along with a war loan. The people of Canada must subscribe to it; they must oversubscribe the loan. I hope everything possible will be done to see that it is oversubscribed. The committee for total war effort will get behind this war loan. Too much has been said about those who signed that petition. I do not know them, but they are men and women of the ilk of those who sit in front of me. That is political history, and I do not want to drag in politics. I plead with the two hundred who signed: forget about what has been said about you in this chamber and see to it that everything possible is done to make sure that this war loan goes over. I know they will do that. In fact, they have accepted the challenge already. I endorse what they say in their resolutions and advertising. I should like to say something else: they have proved themselves to be greater Canadians than they are partisans. When the war loan comes along I am sure they will be greater Canadians than they are partisans, and I am satisfied that the loan will go over.

To my mind our people to-day are not fully conscious of their total responsibilities in the struggle that faces us. We have too many carnival makers. The theatres are crowded, the hotel lobbies are filled, our transportation facilities are taxed to their limit. We are spending money, a lot of it recklessly. Something is being done to curb this spending, but I say that these same carnival makers, these convention attenders and whatnot, will see to it that the enthusiasm they have for their country will put over our war loan. I am not fearful of the result.

What makes them slow down, as well as those of us who perhaps have more responsibility, is the sort of appeasement policy which seems to envelop particularly the Prime

Minister. In history we have had the "wait and see" policy, which almost destroyed our effort in the last war. After that, we had a tendency to take too much for granted. In Washington, for example, we had the Japanese ambassador talking to a great statesman of the United States while at that very moment Pearl Harbour was being smashed. Then, before that, we had a gentleman with an umbrella. I do not say that disparagingly at all. These were great men. The "wait and see" man was a great man, so was the man with an umbrella, and so also the man who talked with the Japanese envoy while Pearl Harbour was being bombed. But the man with a dog—the dog is now dead—should take lessons from what happened on these other occasions and discontinue his appeasement policy. He should step into the breach and lay the whip on our backs, give us more work to do, expect more from us and get more from the Canadian people. I am satisfied that in such a policy he would be endorsed by the Canadian people.

The hon. member who seconded the address was Macdonald by name but not in stature. He read most of what he had to say, and the thought ran through my mind, as it did as I listened to previous observations, that it would have been far better if he had thrown his notes to one side and let his heart and mind co-ordinate so that he could give voice to what was in his very soul, instead of reading an essay, as is done by so many other members, Mr. Speaker, in violation of the rules of the house. It would have been far better if the hon. gentleman had let his heart and mind speak, instead of simply letting his mind read something which kills the soul and leaves it dead. This has happened on many occasions, and it must have happened to my hon. friend when he shifted his position on the question of the plebiscite. Surely after he had been overseas and seen what he saw there—some of us have not been so fortunate but we will get there yet—he must have realized that the position he took in this debate did not live up to the traditions of the British or his own record. I am sure the gallant gentleman must have had heart-burnings when his own Local Council of Women sent him a resolution denouncing the plebiscite, and when his own branch of the Trades and Labour Congress sent him a resolution in similar terms.

My hon. friend the member for Cariboo (Mr. Turgeon), who gave us such an eloquent address the other day, called in the Army and Navy Veterans, of which he was a member and quoted something they had said prior to the assembling of this house. Why did he not quote the resolution he had received from that body on that day, dated February 2, and tell us that the Army and Navy Veterans, and not only that body but thirty-two other veteran organizations and kindred bodies in solemn convention assembled, had passed unanimously and sent to the hon. Prime Minister a demand for conscription at once, and no plebiscite at all. It is so easy to pick out here and there something which suits your purpose. We all know the Legion. They are men of experience, honourable and gallant men, and there are some of them in the cabinet. There they sat on the treasury benches, sphinx-like for quite a while, but gradually one by one they have risen from their seats to give voice to the feelings within them, and little by little they are getting a little closer to the precipice, as I think some call it, with regard to compulsory overseas service which they want to get over. We had an example to-day in the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie). His address brought him a little closer to the brink of the precipice. Why not take the whole jump? But the Prime Minister says no. After that most eloquent address had been given by my leader in this chamber, in which he covered the ground so thoroughly, point by point, in the fashion of a learned gentleman in building up our case, the Prime Minister followed him to tear it down, and then after delivering his speech he caucused his members, and then caucused them again. The fuehrer had spoken, and the members of the cabinet sat dormant and silent. They seemed to be anaesthetized; they could not give voice to what was in their heart and mind. It was the war loan campaign which provided an excuse for the first minister to rise in his place and express his views, and to-day we have had another minister, the Minister of Pensions and National Health, as the second example. I began to think for a while that there was no war on except the war between the different elements within the Liberal party, but one by one the ministers are breaking away from the position they took in the earlier days of the session. But they are not yet giving full expression to what they really think about the plebiscite. That is verboten. The fuehrer has spoken to them, and the result is that we are not getting a free expression of opinion from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we in this party shall vote for the plebiscite if it is forced upon us. We will vote "Ja" in the same

manner as the Czechoslovakians and the Sudetens voted "Ja", but not for the same reason. They were afraid to vote against their plebiscite. We are voting for the plebiscite because we have been put in a position where a coin is flipped in such a way that heads you win and tails I lose. I do not say that disparagingly, but that is exactly how it stands. You know, Mr. Speaker, where we stand in this chamber. We would not let Canada down by voting no, and the present administration knows that. But had we no plebiscite at all, the Prime Minister and my hon. leader (Mr. Hanson) would have been in a much stronger position to vote on a resolution presented to this chamber on the question, and I am sure that it would have received almost the unanimous vote of this house.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the sound people of Canada have provided us with this edifice in which to enunciate for them their views. Their views of two years ago have no bearing on the views of the Canadian people to-day. I took a note while my hon. friend the minister of pensions was speaking with regard to marshalling public opinion. To-day we find marshalled against us a common enemy possessed of a strength and force that we never even dreamed of in 1940 when the last election took place. Not only that: the common enemy is right at our gates. It is no time to stop and take a plebiscite.

Let me recite some of the other reasons, as briefly and hurriedly as I can.

I have been through six elections. Two hundred and fifty thousand people had the opportunity of voting in the different constituencies which I have had the honour to represent. The money spent by parties, by newspapers, by private individuals and by the candidates themselves, amounted to well over a dollar for each vote which was cast in those elections. Yet, with all the energy, the enthusiasm and the interest aroused over the many issues which have arisen during the last twenty years to excite our people and bring them to the polls; with the assistance of the clergy, of the schools, and all other agencies, the proportion of voters to those entitled to vote amounted to not more than 52·1 per cent—we will call it 53 per cent for easy figuring. The Stevens candidate got 1·4 per cent, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation candidate polled 1·6 per cent—he came in lately; previously the Labour party candidate got 1·4 per cent—the Liberal party, 13·2 per cent; and Conservative supporters honoured me with 35·4 per cent. And this, as I have said, as a result of much energy, effort and enthusiasm and all manner of means employed to bring people to the polls: we did not get anything like a complete expression of opinion. Nor will you get much of an expression of opinion by this plebiscite, for you will be unable to get the people to the polls. Of course you will get the malcontents. But do you want them? Of course you do not. Nevertheless the plebiscite is going to be held.

Let me give the government one warning now with regard to the temper of the Canadian people on this matter. Do not have dominion ministers publicize this plebiscite on the screen. Not long ago I was humiliated, while a newsreel was being run, to hear our Prime Minister booed and hissed when his picture was on the screen. That is bad business. I was ashamed of our Canadian people when I heard it. And it did not happen in the city of Toronto.

Mr. GOLDING: Where was it?

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): That should not happen. I believe my hon. friend does not come from very far from where it occurred. It was when I was waiting for a train connection. I am not going to damn another Ontario town by mentioning the name. It could happen in Toronto. It could happen in Stratford. I think my hon. friend who recited one or two days ago correspondence and editorials which have come to his desk, might recite to this house the dayletter he received from the editor of the Stratford *Beacon-Herald*: he would know that the feeling of which I have spoken is rampant throughout his own district as well as in Toronto.

Mr. GOLDING: I did not receive any letter at all.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): I will send the hon. member a copy.

I thought the Minister of Pensions and National Health would have said more to-day about his own province. To my mind there is a situation there the seriousness of which the people of Canada do not realize. Do you suppose that if 24,000 Canadians were living in a vulnerable point in Japan they would be left there? The danger to British Columbia of leaving the Japanese in their present locations is something to which the government, after the experience of our United States friends at Pearl Harbour, should give immediate consideration. True, a number of them are Canadian nationals. True, each of those Canadian nationals was registered by the consul when he came into the country. But you cannot be sure of them all. We can be kind to them. We can treat them in the

British fashion. There are wide expanses in Canada where they can be placed, far away from the danger zone.

The Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) is not in his seat. I understand he is of Icelandic origin. Also I am given to understand that lake Winnipegosis and lake Winnipeg, in his province, contain a fine species of fish called gold-eye. These Japanese are good fishermen. I understand that the Icelandic people who fish for gold-eye could fish just as well for salmon. I would transfer those Japanese to the district of lake Winnipegosis and lake Winnipeg and put them to work and be kind to them, but I would get them out of British Columbia and replace them with Icelandic people. Some of them could be sent down to Quebec, where our friends could use them in the lumber mills and saw mills. Many of these Japanese know how to work in a saw mill. Some could be transferred to Ontario. But let us get them out of the coast province and show the rest of our Canadian people that we are prepared to do something on behalf of national security.

I was sorry to hear an hon. member refer to "gold-diggers." References of that kind are not very helpful to the Minister of Finance in his task of raising the war loan. Who are these gold-diggers? Have they hard cash? The minister knows that their assets are largely made up of bank overdrafts, employing the money of others. He knows they are respectable citizens.

Mr. MacNICOL: You have got to go to them to get money.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): When the hon. member for Northumberland, Ont. (Mr. Fraser), said so many things in such a burlesque fashion with regard to these people, I looked him over, and as he was talking about "Who's Who" I thought to myself, and who are you? He talked about—I thought he said Moloch.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mulocks!

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Then I thought it was Mulocks, and then I wasn't sure whether it could not be Mohocks, but I discovered it was Murdock, the same hon. gentlemen who by this administration was placed on the Canadian National railway board and is doing a good job on behalf of Canada. I say that, holding no brief for him and never to my knowledge having met him at any time. Nor do I know Charles Burton. I have met Mr. Morrow. He could have gone a good deal further with his "Who's Who," but what good does it do? What useful service did he give to Canada in that dia-

tribe? Was he not just asking himself and other members of his party to "Keep on whistling, boys, until this vote on the plebiscite is taken; we must keep up our courage?" Every time the Prime Minister's name was mentioned we heard loud applause from the boys who are on their way to the political graveyard, a lot of these one-trippers who have so much to say and make for so much disunity in this country. They rise in their places and simply make for more disunity.

I close with something which came to my desk the other day. I hesitate to use it, but at the same time it does enunciate some ideas that are not going to help our position at the present time:

> They have a rendezvous with death,
> On desert plain or tropic hill,
> Where lethal bullets whistle shrill,
> And hell's black legions, winging high,
> Darken the April sky.
> For they have pledged and will be true;
> They will not fail their rendezvous.
>
> But we, when April brings its rain,
> Must argue whether we will keep
> Our faith with all the brave who sleep.
> Our cross—to break or to renew
> Another's pledge; our rendezvous
> With indecision and disgrace;
> Our shrine—the shabby polling place.

An hon. MEMBER: Shabby.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): It is, I am sorry to say, and it is more so on this plebiscite.

When I read that I also read this, from the world's greatest statesman, who received a vote of confidence recently of 490 to 1. How grand and glorious it would be if at this time we could do likewise in this chamber! He said:

> I avow my confidence was never stronger than at this moment that we shall bring this conflict to an end in a manner agreeable to the interests of our country and the future of the world.

That is Mr. Churchill. I commend that sentiment and feel likewise.

I add now a statement made by another great statesman, and it applies right this minute to one and all of us:

> There are tremendous things which need to be done and done now, with vigour, thoroughness and dispatch. We need more men for the overseas forces; we need a reallocation of men who are idling or who are wasting or half-wasting their time—the farm—the fighting forces.
>
> We are two years late in organizing this nation for the stern, grim compulsions of war. Political expediency has held us in its grip. Hadn't we better prepare to strengthen those men overseas? Hadn't we better get them reinforcements?
>
> In this hour when the whole world is writhing in flames, in this hour when the guns are roaring nearer and nearer to our shores, and when the enemy tightens his grip on

civilization, we are not going to waste our time counting noses. Right now we want a sharp, swift drive for results.

That is from the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen.

Mr. GOLDING: The hon. member has intimated that I have received some letter from a Stratford paper. I want the hon. member to lay that letter on the table of this house. And I want to know what connivance is going on here.

On motion of Mr. Ross (Calgary East) the debate was adjourned.

EXCESS PROFITS TAX

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ACT

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I wish to make a brief statement. For the information of the business community I ordinarily would give it to the press, but as the house is sitting it is more appropriate that I give it here.

It is the intention of the government to introduce during the present session a minor amendment to the section of the Excess Profits Tax Act which defines the "standard period". The proposed amendment relates to new businesses which commenced operations after January 1, 1939, and will preclude them from taking the record of actual earnings in their first fiscal period as their standard profit. Such companies will have to apply to the board of referees for a determination of their standard profit.

Under the law as it now stands, taxpayers who commenced business after December 31, 1937, have the option either of taking their actual profits as their standard or of applying to the board of referees. In some cases this may give very unfair advantages to those taxpayers who commenced business after January 1, 1939. For example, if a company commenced business in the latter part of 1939, after war broke out, and, due to the war situation, made exceptionally large profits in its first fiscal period, these earnings under the present law would constitute the base from which excess profits would be measured. The proposed amendment will disallow this and make it necessary for such a company to apply to the board of referees for a determination of its standard profit.

On behalf of my colleague the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Gibson) I wish also to say that the commissioner of income tax has clarified the position of sole proprietorships and partnerships in respect of the minimum standard profit of $5,000. He will interpret the wording providing for this minimum as allowing the minimum to apply after rather than before the deduction of reasonable salary.

[Mr. J. H. Harris.]

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre) the house adjourned at 6.07 p.m.

Monday, February 9, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

SINGAPORE

INQUIRY AS TO FURTHER NEWS OF DEVELOPMENTS IN THE FAR EAST

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he is in a position or would care to give the house and the country any late information with respect to Singapore.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I have no information that I believe will add anything to what has appeared thus far in the press.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

STATEMENT AS TO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMME FOR THE SESSION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): A day or so ago my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) asked if I would give to the house a statement with respect to some of the measures that will be introduced at the present session. The legislative programme for the present session, like that of other sessions of parliament since the commencement of the war, will be confined in the main, and as largely as possible, to matters pertaining to Canada's war effort or arising immediately out of the war. As in previous sessions the most important measure will be the war appropriation bill. Legislation respecting the much discussed plebiscite will be introduced immediately upon the termination of the debate on the address. Legislation also will be introduced respecting the production and marketing of wheat; respecting land settlement for ex-service men, and related amendments to the Soldier Settlement Act; and respecting the ratification of certain trade treaties with Latin-American countries.

Among financial measures, bills will be introduced regarding new borrowing authority and the refunding of maturing issues; bills to amend the War Exchange Conservation Act, the Canadian National Railway financing and

guarantee bill; a bill to ratify an agreement between the C.N.R. and the Temiscouata railway.

There will be amendments to the Civil Service Superannuation Act, the Companies Act and the Patent Act, and possible amendments to the naval service, militia and Royal Canadian Air Force acts. It is proposed to have the question of redistribution studied by a committee of parliament. There was a committee that took up the matter a session or two ago, and it is the intention of the government to have a committee look into the matter anew this session.

I have not cited the bills that already appear on the order paper, but in addition to those it is anticipated that there may be other bills of a more or less routine character. It must be understood that circumstances at the moment unforseen may, in the course of the session, occasion the introduction of other measures. I do not wish to bind the government exclusively to any programme; there may be other bills if the necessity should arise.

REQUEST FOR OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Prime Minister if the government will give consideration to permitting the ordinary course of procedure to be followed with respect to the motions of private members. It will be recalled that in previous sessions of this parliament the government took the initiative in taking away from private members their undoubted right to discuss matters which they desire to place on the order paper. I had no great objection to that in the first session or two, but I think that right ought to be restored at the earliest possible moment, and I would ask that the government give consideration to that point of view.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The reasons which governed in this matter in the beginning, if they were valid at all at that time, seem to me to be even stronger at the present time. Those reasons, as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition will recall, were that in a war as serious as the present, the attention of parliament could not be given too exclusively to matters pertaining to the war and, what might be regarded as the other side of the same shield, that there should be as little as possible to distract or to prevent the attention of parliament being concentrated upon the war effort. If the motions of private members are to be considered it means that ministers and others must prepare themselves in regard to a number of questions that at the present time are more or less academic, and in these days the burden on the ministry is heavy enough in connection with the matters relating exclusively to the war to which it must give attention.

I do not wish to say that the government will not be prepared to consider what my hon. friend has suggested, but I am giving to him at once the view that has prevailed up to the present. I think the arguments are quite as strong to-day as they were at the time the decision of the government was taken. And if I recollect aright, the decision was taken by agreement with at least most of the members of the house.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Will what the Prime Minister has said about private members' motions apply also to private bills, public orders and divorce bills? Private members are the connecting link between the government of the day and the electorate, and when they cease to function, all parliamentary government is at an end.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What I said had reference to the procedure which we followed in previous sessions. I may say in a word that the government intends to follow a similar procedure this session unless there are very strong requests to the contrary.

JAPANESE NATIONALS

STATEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER WITH RESPECT TO GOVERNMENT POLICY

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Some days ago I promised the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) that I would make a statement to the house on the policy of the government in relation to the Japanese problem in British Columbia.

The situation created by the presence in British Columbia of a population of nearly 24,000 men, women and children of Japanese race has for a number of reasons received the closest attention of the government over the past four years. The situation increased in complexity when Japan, on September 27, 1940, associated herself with Germany and Italy in the tri-partite pact. Recognizing the more critical situation created when Japan joined the axis, the government immediately thereafter appointed, on October 1, 1940, a special committee to investigate and report upon the problem of Japanese in British Columbia from the standpoint of national security. The report and recommendations of the committee were tabled and published in

December, 1940. The most important recommendation was that there should be a re-registration of the Japanese population of British Columbia and that a small standing committee should be set up to keep the government constantly informed as to the oriental situation in that province. These recommendations were acted on at once and in determining its policy the government has had the benefit of the advice of this standing committee on which various viewpoints were represented.

In the months which followed, re-registration was carried out by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police under the supervision of the standing committee. This registration included the photographing and finger-printing of all persons of Japanese origin. The committee received the utmost cooperation from Japanese nationals as well as from Canadians of Japanese racial origin. When a state of war was proclaimed as existing between Japan and Canada, the registration was all but complete. Precautionary measures, which have proved adequate, were put into effect forthwith.

The steps taken were similar to those taken in the case of German and Italian residents of Canada. Individuals, whatever their nationality, who there was reason for believing might act in a manner prejudicial to the public safety or the safety of the state, were promptly interned. Steps were also immediately taken to immobilize for the duration of the war all fishing boats operated by men of Japanese race.

Legitimate apprehensions in British Columbia were concerned with three things: the aid which might be given to enemy submarines and enemy raiders if they should be supplied with fuel or furnished with information; the possibility of acts of sabotage; and the possibility of anti-Japanese riots in which military force might have to be used to restore order.

To determine the policy to be followed a meeting was called in Ottawa on January 8, in which the members of the standing committee participated. This meeting was under the chairmanship of the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) and at it the Hon. George Pearson represented the government of British Columbia.

The recommendations of the conference of January 8 and 9 were carefully considered by the government. On January 14 I announced the government's policy. I might summarize the policy as follows:

Persons of Japanese race, who are Canadians either by birth or by naturalization, and Japanese nationals resident in Canada will be justly treated. Their persons and property will receive the full protection of the law. No action will be taken which would give any excuse for the ill-treatment of Canadians under the control of Japan.

Nor will action be permitted which might give Japan an excuse to inflame Asiatic hostility against the white race. Canadian policies will march in step with those of Britain and the United States.

As specific measures, all persons of Japanese race will be removed from fishing boats and other vessels for the duration of the war. For the same period the sale of gasoline and explosives to persons of Japanese race will be controlled by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Japanese nationals have been forbidden to possess or use short-wave receiving sets, radio transmitters and cameras. Their present surveillance by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police—similar to that successfully exercised over German and Italian nationals —will be continued.

For Canadians of Japanese race who are anxious to serve Canada, a civilian corps is being formed to be used on projects that will contribute to the national war effort.

Enemy aliens, whether nationals of Japan or of Germany or of Italy, will be required to leave the protected area on the coast of British Columbia. Permits to remain may be granted by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. For the time being, permits will normally be granted to women and children and to men who are unfit. Those required to leave may be placed in normal employment, if it can be found for them, outside the protected area. They will, of course, be under the usual police surveillance over enemy aliens.

A commission has been set up to arrange for the sale, lease, requisition or charter of fishing vessels with a view to ensuring the sustained productivity of the fishing industry in British Columbia, and fairness to Canadians of Japanese race who own or have an interest in such vessels.

The defence area from which enemy aliens must withdraw has been defined by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) and the Minister of Justice. The placing or employment of enemy aliens is being arranged by the Department of Labour through the unemployment insurance commission. The civilian corps is also being organized by the Department of Labour. A committee of the cabinet, consisting of the Minister of Pensions and National Health, the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Agriculture, has been entrusted with a general supervision of the programme. This committee will recommend to the government from time to time such further action as may be necessary.

In all the arrangements being made in connection with the Japanese problem, special

consideration is being given to Japanese Canadians who are veterans of the last war.

The situation on the Pacific coast has now been clarified. The government's policy has been determined and is being carried out by the responsible agencies. Under the circumstances it has been decided that we need no longer place on the members of the standing committee the burden and responsibility of advising the government in regard to this problem. I have written to the members of the committee and thanked them for the assistance they have rendered during the past year.

One of the results of the existence of a state of war between Canada and Japan has been the abrogation of the immigration agreement which was concluded in 1928. Thus as a result of Japan's own action, there are no longer any agreements or understandings, express or implied, in regard to the admission of Japanese to Canada.

It will be recognized that Canadian citizens of Japanese race have been placed in a very difficult position. They are being asked to bear with patience inevitable hardships and losses. A situation of this kind can only be effectively met by an equal measure of tolerance and understanding on the part of the people of Canada generally. In the national interest it is of the utmost importance that the problem should be approached in this spirit.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): How many Japanese nationals have been interned?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot give my hon. friend the figure at the moment, but I shall get it for him.

Mr. GREEN: Has an order actually been issued to the effect that Japanese shall not be allowed to have radio receiving sets and transmitters and cameras, or is that to be done in the future?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It has been issued, I understand.

Mr. GREEN: It is in effect now?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

CANADIAN ARMY

ISSUE OF SERVICE BADGES TO MEN WHO ARE DISCHARGED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston). The press reports the distribution of badges to men who have been rejected for military service as physically unfit. May I ask the minister what has been done about badges for men who have served in the armed forces and have been discharged through disability? If badges are to be issued, does not the minister think that these discharged men should be given preference in the matter?

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): Yes. I would reply to my hon. friend that what is known as a service badge is being issued. I am very much surprised that it is not out before this. As a matter of fact both badges have been authorized for some time, and it is just a matter of getting manufacturing facilities and obtaining deliveries. Badges are being issued for service as well.

WELLAND BY-ELECTION

PRESS REPORT AS TO RADIO SPEECH OF HARRY J. CARMICHAEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe). The Toronto *Daily Star* of February 7 contains a verbatim report of a speech delivered by Harry J. Carmichael, an employee of the Department of Munitions and Supply, and the director-general of munitions production. This speech was delivered over the radio in St. Catharines, in support of the candidature of the Minister of Labour.

Was the government or the Department of Munitions and Supply or the Minister of Munitions and Supply advised by this employee of his intention to deliver such a speech?

Was permission asked for, and given?

Does the government approve of the principle of government employees making speeches during election campaigns, whether for or against the government?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Speaker, the premises on which the hon. member bases his questions are not correct. Mr. Carmichael is not an employee of the Department of Munitions and Supply. He is a private citizen who occupies a post in that department. He not only receives no remuneration, but he pays his own travelling expenses; and so far as I know he has never taken one cent from the treasury of Canada. In order to qualify himself for his present position, he resigned from one of the most important posts in Canada, relinquishing all salary and emoluments connected therewith. I know of no man in Canada who has worked harder in the war munitions programme than has Mr. Harry Carmichael. He did say to me, before he

delivered the speech, that he wished to do so. He felt that the representations he had to make to the electors of Welland were so important to his own war work that the speech was justified. He wished to know if I objected and I asked him under whose auspices he intended to speak. He said he intended to pay for his own time on the radio and was speaking to his own friends in his home district. Under the circumstances I could see no objection to his doing so. I will say, of course, that had he been on the government payroll his action would have been improper, but in the special circumstances of Mr. Carmichael's case I saw no impropriety whatever.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I have not seen the speech of Mr. Carmichael, and with respect to his position in the Canadian manufacturing world I agree with everything the minister has said. The minister seems to draw a distinction between a man in a government post who draws a salary and a man who does not draw a salary. To me that means nothing. This gentleman, and I understand he is a very high class gentleman, addressed the electors of Welland during the by-election campaign while occupying a post in the government service. I think that is open to condemnation, and the minister should not have allowed him to do it.

Mr. HOWE: Since my hon. friend has made a comment about my statement, may I make a comment about his? Will he explain the position of Mr. Alan Cockeram, who spoke in the York South election?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I understand that Mr. Alan Cockeram spoke as a private citizen with the full knowledge—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That does not faze me a bit. All these catcalls do not bother me at all; I have listened to them for twenty years. Mr. Cockeram spoke to his own people with the express permission of his commanding officer and the officers of the Department of National Defence.

Mr. HOWE: Is that not true of Mr. Carmichael?

Mr. HOMUTH: He is not an employee of the government.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Cockeram is not an employee of the government.

Mr. HOWE: No? He draws a salary.

[Mr. Howe.]

PRIVILEGE—MR. GOLDING

MILITARY SERVICE—REFERENCE IN DEBATE TO COMMUNICATION FROM STRATFORD *Beacon-Herald*

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. H. GOLDING (Huron-Perth): Mr. Speaker, rising to a question of privilege, I should like to refer to an incident which occurred in the house when the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris) was speaking on Friday afternoon. On page 394 of *Hansard*, referring to myself, he is quoted as having said:

> I think my hon. friend who recited one or two days ago correspondence and editorials which have come to his desk, might recite to this house the day letter he received from the editor of the Stratford *Beacon-Herald*: he would know that the feeling of which I have spoken is rampant throughout his own district as well as in Toronto.

When the hon. gentleman made this statement, I was positive that he used only the word "letter," and evidently the reporter was of the same opinion; for in the original copy the simple word "letter" appeared. However, a correction has been written in changing it to "day letter". One would naturally infer from the hon. gentleman's statement that I had received a personal letter from the editor of this paper pointing out to me the general feeling in our district. Believing, as I did, that my hon. friend intended to convey that impression, I made the following statement, which appears also on page 394 of *Hansard:*

> I did not receive any letter at all.

However, in reading this correction in the original copy I am sure now that my hon. friend had reference only to a telegram which I received from Mr. C. Dingman, editor of the *Beacon-Herald,* on the afternoon of January 23, and which I find was a day letter. Had the hon. gentleman mentioned a telegram there would have been no misunderstanding. However, in view of this general misunderstanding and in fairness to the editor of the *Beacon-Herald,* I should like to read to the house the wire I received and my reply. This is what I was challenged to do. The wire I received is as follows:

> Would appreciate for publication statement from you dealing with following questions: Are you in favour of submitting proposed plebiscite, or do you feel parliament ought to decide issue of extention of conscription? What attitude will you take in the house? Are you in favour of compulsory selective service without restrictions? Please wire us collect any time to-day about three hundred words hinging on these questions.

My answer to that wire was quite brief, and is as follows:

You will probably have noticed that after the caucus yesterday the Prime Minister stated that it was the most satisfactory caucus he had ever attended. I think nothing need be added to his statement to indicate where the members stand on this question.

It will be recalled that I stated my position when I spoke on this question in the house, which I considered was the proper place in which to make any statement. I should like to say that as editor of the *Beacon-Herald*, Mr. Dingman was quite within his rights in asking me where I stood on these important questions, and I might add also that my good friend Mr. Dingman, as editor of a daily paper, is entirely within his rights in approving or disapproving any stand which I may take on any public question. I hope this statement will clear up any doubt in the minds of hon. gentlemen regarding what actually happened and what sort of telegram I did receive.

Mr. CHURCH: You never can answer a newspaper; it always has the last word.

LEGATIONS

APPOINTMENT OF MINISTERS TO CANADA FROM NORWAY, POLAND AND YUGOSLAVIA

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Perhaps I might say a word with respect to legations to be opened shortly in Ottawa. I notice in the press of this morning reference to Norway opening a legation in the city. I might say that there have been requests from Norway and from Poland and Yugoslavia to have legations established in Ottawa. Requests have been received from other countries, but I mention these three in particular. Careful consideration has been given to the requests, and the government has decided to accept them. We are pleased to have in the capital of Canada diplomatic representatives of these countries which have been playing such heroic parts in the present great world struggle.

The first legation to be opened will be that of Norway. The Norwegian minister will be Mr. Daniel Steen who has been consul general of Norway in Canada for many years. The first Polish minister will be Mr. Victor Podoski, who came to this country as consul general of Poland at the outbreak of the war. Both these gentlemen, now raised to the rank of minister plenipotentiary in the service of their respective countries, are held in high regard and esteem by the Canadian government and all those who have had the pleasure of meeting them. I may add that the first minister of Yugoslavia to Canada will be Doctor Isidor Cankar, who has had a distinguished career in the diplomatic service of his country and is at present Yugoslav minister to the Argentine republic.

Perhaps I should mention also that Greece has indicated a desire to have a minister resident at Ottawa and that request is being considered at the present time. With respect to the reciprocal appointments of ministers to other countries, it is understood that the matter of reciprocation will stand over until the end of the war.

BRUCE COAL COMPANY

QUESTION AS TO INVESTIGATION BY ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, as a private Liberal member of this hon. house I desire to bring the attention of the government to the following clipping from the morning Ottawa *Citizen* of January 22, 1942, page 14:

Royal Canadian Mounted Police Investigates Local Coal Company.

Acting on a search warrant obtained last night, officers of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police criminal investigation branch to-day seized all books and files of the Bruce Coal Company, with offices in the Hardy Arcade, Sparks street, and Bayswater avenue.

A Royal Canadian Mounted Police officer informed the *Citizen* to-day that an investigation of the company has been under way for a month and it was decided to seize the company's records to-day.

The same source said the probe would continue for perhaps a week or two longer. The reason for the investigation was not disclosed.

Again, sir, as a private Liberal member of this hon. house, on account of the continuous silence of the outside leader and the inside acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) with respect to this matter, and in order to save the country the sum of $1,500 daily, may I ask the government if a thorough investigation will not be made to ascertain the truth of the widespread talk in town that even since this item appeared in the press the Bruce Coal company has been selling the same coal three times at a rate of one hundred tons daily on government contracts: (1) for the Hull internment camp; (2) for Uplands airport, and (3) for the Arnprior airport.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest from the length of my hon. friend's question and what I heard of it that it is a matter which concerns several departments, and I

would have to ask him to wait until there is an opportunity of conferring with other ministers before giving him an answer.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Friday, February 6, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. GEORGE H. ROSS (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker, many very interesting arguments have been advanced in this debate. One of the most strongly pressed and in my opinion one of the most futile is the charge that it would be humiliating to take a plebiscite at this time. The speech from the throne was no sooner delivered than one of the newspapers came out with the statement that a plebiscite would be most humiliating. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) took up the cry in this house. It has also been raised with frenzied vigor by a number of speakers in this house and outside, and by a section of the press.

Why would it be humiliating to consult the people at this time? None of the speakers has told us. The press has not told us. I have asked a number of my friends that question, and not a man can tell me any reason why it would be humiliating to consult the people. Who would feel humiliated? I have never been humiliated by being consulted. I am sure the electors of my riding will not feel humiliated by being consulted. I do not believe any good Canadian will feel humiliated by being consulted.

The leader of the opposition has frequently referred to Australia as an example that Canada might very well follow. But I would remind him that during the last great war Australia on two different occasions consulted the people on the question of conscription, apparently without being humiliated. The suggestion that intelligent people will feel humiliated by being consulted is too absurd to pursue further.

The last speaker in this debate, the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris), protested vigorously against some of the references that have been made to some of the people of Toronto. He spoke of "dry tinder" being ignited by the "flame of passion". I wish to point out to the hon. member that no one suggests that all the people of Toronto are igniting dry tinder by a flame of passion directed against the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). There are very many fine citizens in Toronto. It is only a clique of hysterical Toronto people and a section of the press that would sabotage the government in order to form a so-called national government to further the selfish interests of a few Toronto financiers. I realize that this is a serious statement to make of any group of citizens, but the ruthless emotional and false attacks being made on the Prime Minister force one to this conclusion. If they can only get rid of the Prime Minister they will have gone far in carrying out their nefarious purpose. What other reason have they for directing these vicious attacks against the Prime Minister? Surely every other member of the cabinet is equally responsible.

The speech made by the Prime Minister in this debate was clear and convincing in support of the plebiscite which is to be submitted to the people. He is probably the best informed man in Canada. He is now serving his fourth term as Prime Minister. As Secretary of State for External Affairs and as chairman of the war committee of the cabinet, he is probably better informed and knows how our war effort can best be put forward better than any other member of the cabinet. He is the man who selected and brought into his cabinet the able ministers conducting our war effort. It is under his leadership that the ministers have cooperated to put forth such a fully balanced total war effort.

Mr. Churchill, speaking in this chamber on December 30, 1941, used these words:

> Canada is a potent magnet drawing together those in the new world and in the old, whose fortunes are now united in a deadly struggle for life and honour against the common foe.

Everybody knows of the splendid work done by our Prime Minister in bringing about the extremely friendly relations that exist between the United States and Canada and between the United States and the other British nations "now united in a deadly struggle for life and honour against the common foe." The Prime Minister is the personification of Canada's magnetism that brought about these good relations.

Our war effort has been magnificent. The New York *Times* recently said of it:

> Canada's all-out war effort has been no mean accomplishment . . . the achievement has been one of the little appreciated miracles of the war.

These capable men who are making such a remarkably good job of conducting our war effort have asked for a plebiscite. I shall gladly act on their judgment and vote for the motion before the house. I hope and believe that when the vote is taken the people of

Calgary East will vote for the plebiscite, and that the people of Canada will vote for it, and thus release the government from past commitments, and give them a free hand in conducting the war.

Last Friday the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) referred to some measures that have already been taken to deal with post-war problems. I wish to take advantage of this occasion to urge upon the government to provide a greater measure of social security and social insurance as a further measure to meet post-war problems. Existing legislation in Canada and in the provinces is wholly inadequate to relieve the misfortunes that come when earnings are cut off by want of work, old age, blindness, sickness or death, and when children are left with no one to care for them. It is good public policy to aid the worker in planning a defence against these hazards. He and his family should not be allowed to become public charges. In the words of the preamble to the labour section of the Versailles treaty:

> Universal peace . . . can be established only if it is based on social justice.

Let me quote further from the preamble. What I am about to quote was true of the industrial nations of the world at the time it was written in 1919; it is in a measure true of Canada to-day. The preamble says:

> Conditions of labour exist involving such injustice, hardship and privation to large numbers of people as to produce unrest so great that the peace and harmony of the world are imperilled; and an improvement of those conditions is urgently required; as, for example, by the regulation of the hours of work, including the establishment of a maximum working day and week, the regulation of the labour supply, the prevention of unemployment, the provisions of an adequate living wage, the protection of the worker against sickness, disease and injury arising out of his employment, the protection of children, young persons and women, provision for old age and injury, protection of the interests of workers when employed in countries other than their own, recognition of the principle of freedom of association, the organization of vocational and technical education and other measures.

We should have a plan of social insurance in Canada that would afford a measure of protection not only to the worker but to his wife and dependent children as well. We have already the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1940; many of the provinces have workmen's compensation acts. But these are not enough. Under workmen's compensation acts compensation is payable for "personal injury by accident arising out of and in the course of employment." There are a great many cases of distress against which protection is not given by these acts. There should be insurance to protect the wage-earner in the case of industrial accidents to which these acts do not extend. There should be insurance to protect the worker in the case of illness and old age. There should be insurance to protect his wife and family in the case of his premature death. We should have social insurance in Canada to cover all such cases.

Many now employed are wondering what will happen after the war is over. When that time arrives and our men in the forces and in munition plants are demobilized we shall be met with a serious unemployment problem. A considered scheme of social insurance would solve a substantial portion of it.

1. It would lessen direct relief, which tends to destroy the morale of persons seeking it.

2. It would have a stabilizing influence in sustaining buying power after the war when expenditures are cut down.

3. It would cushion the shock which will be caused by the drop from present full-time employment to the lack of employment after the war.

4. It would give the worker and his family greater peace of mind so that they will make better citizens and do better work.

In the words of the report of the Mather commission:

> Social insurance would remove the spectre of fear which now haunts the wage-earners; it would make him a more contented and better citizen.

If responsible government is to be a success in Canada we must have a united, happy and contented people. Nothing militates against unity, happiness and contentment more than fear.

In introducing social insurance a fund would have to be established out of which to pay those protected by the statute. The contributors should be the employer, the employee and the state.

As to the employer, the additional cost would not discriminate in favour of one employer against another in the same line of business, because all employers would have to contribute. It would be an additional cost that would be added to the cost of the article produced. The additional cost would not make it difficult for a producer in Canada to compete with producers in other parts of the world, because contributory social insurance already exists in the other principal industrial countries.

As to the worker, the cost to the worker with a small income would be considerable. The income of most workers is very small out of which to pay rent, to clothe and feed a family, to pay doctor's bills, and to build up a reserve to carry the worker through sick-

ness and old age. But workers out of their meagre earnings would gladly contribute with their employer and the state to build up an insurance fund. Few with very small incomes build up a reserve where no contributions are coming in from the outside.

As to the state, the additional cost to the public treasury would not be great, as we are already making heavy payments because of insecurity. During the last depression governments in Canada spent more than a billion dollars on unemployment relief alone. In addition to this, large payments had to be made for old age pensions, mothers' allowances, hospitalization, medical and other relief. Social insurance would lessen the burden on provincial and municipal governments. For that reason they should readily agree to share the cost.

It takes many years to build up a contributory social insurance system to the stage where it will carry itself. A system usually takes under its protection workers over eighteen years of age. If the plan is to carry itself from the start, either the older workers would have to pay excessively high premiums, or the younger workers would have to pay a very large share of the pensions of the older workers. To avoid any such hardships Great Britain and Australia subsidized the contributory plan. Canada should also subsidize it.

We should not wait until after the war to introduce social insurance; we should start it right now. There is now more employment than at any time in our history. Wages are now at the highest peak ever reached in Canada. The present time is ideal.

We have been told by the Minister of Finance that under our constitution only a province can carry out a social insurance plan. If the constitution is in the way, let us have it amended. Let us treat it as an instrument to serve and not to shackle reform.

A scheme of social insurance is not enough. It should be supplemented by a system of public assistance to take care of those persons who do not readily fit into a contributory insurance system.

Social insurance would not protect all needy widows and orphans. It would not protect deserted wives; it could not very well protect farm labour and those domestic servants whose employment is seasonal, and others whose income is low and intermittent. These people would not fit into an insurance scheme. Furthermore, their income is so small and sporadic that it is impossible to expect them to provide adequately for themselves in case of serious illness, prolonged unemployment, accident, old age or premature death.

It has been well said that a nation marches forward on the feet of its children. This being the case, the government as well as parents should be concerned in giving children a good start. Governments have to some extent accepted this responsibility. We have public schools. Mothers' allowances are provided for in eight of the provinces. But the health and welfare of children, when death or some disaster has left a family without a breadwinner, is not receiving the support of the state that it should.

Last November the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) told the house "only about fifty-six per cent of the men called up for military training were placed in category A, the only category that is accepted for training at the present time by the Department of National Defence." I believe there would have been far fewer rejections had the children of the nation been better fed and had they been given more and better medical treatment.

The present Old Age Pensions Act makes it possible for old and needy people to go on living in their homes with their own families. This is as it should be. But the age limit is seventy; that is too high. It is particularly too high in the case of ex-service men. By reason of the hardships and sufferings which they endured while on active service, their expectation of life has been shortened. They and their widows are entitled to special consideration. Women too are entitled to special consideration for the reason that their salaries are smaller than the salaries of men and their opportunity for saving is much less. The age limit should be reduced.

When the old age pension act was passed the maximum pension was fixed at $20 per month, which was deemed to be the smallest amount that an old person could live on. That is very little out of which to pay for rent, clothing, food and medical care. A dollar a day asked for by old age pensioners, would be reasonable. They should at least get a cost of living bonus. I urge the government not to wait until the war is over but to get in touch with the provinces and grant relief now.

The state should also do more for those who are in need by reason of having lost their sight. The United States federal law sets no age limit for aid to the blind. Canada fixes the age limit at forty. I cannot understand why we should have this age limit in Canada. A person who is blind is as helpless at twenty-five or thirty as at forty, and is just as much entitled to a pension.

The Canadian people have always believed that all persons who cannot earn a living for themselves, whether because of lack of employment or of illness, age or feebleness, should be

supported by the state. Everyone of us has a stake in this responsibility; we must not shirk it. I urge the government to take the matter up with the provinces without delay and work out some scheme whereby all needy persons in Canada will be provided for either through social insurance or public assistance.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): I would like to speak on the plebiscite and the Japanese, two subjects which are very deeply unpopular in the district I come from, and I think I might say in a more general way, in the province of British Columbia. I have not time to deal with both to-day, and therefore I shall have to leave the Japanese situation until the main motion comes up. That will give me an opportunity also to study the information laid on the table by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). I must therefore confine my remarks to the two amendments.

I deplore two things in connection with this plebiscite—first, its introduction now, and the form of words which will be used when the plebiscite is taken. We have been debating this question for twelve days, and I think we have done the country and the war effort more harm than we shall make good in twelve months. I cannot see any benefit that can accrue. Secondly I deprecate the desperately partisan character of the tone of the debates. We have to go back to 1917 before we can get anything comparable to it in bitterness and unfairness, especially among those who have been defending the plebiscite in the last twelve days.

I will give one or two illustrations. One hon. member alluded to his opponents as employing subterfuge, deception and hypocrisy. Later he said they were ready to besmirch the ballot box and take away the rights of the common people to express themselves; and he talked about ridiculing democratic government. Later on in his speech he said he was going to appeal to the members of this house, and it was going to be an appeal for unity, for understanding, for cool heads and clear thinking.

I hardly think the language I have quoted above is a very likely means of inducing people to keep cool heads and to think clearly. I could give other instances—this one was by a cabinet minister. He referred to "spite-infused and hate-inspired enemies." He was not talking about military enemies; he was talking about political enemies. Then there was the suggestion that Mr. Hepburn, who after all is the elected premier of a province, would rather see Mr. King defeated than Hitler. I think that is a very unfair and scurrilous attack on a public man. Such an attitude and remarks like these add little to our dignity and to the defence of the plebiscite, and certainly they do nothing towards helping the war or our reputation among the nations.

Before dealing with the plebiscite itself I want to make two comments. One is on the question of want of confidence. As the debate goes on more and more pressure will be put on that phase. A minister of the crown the other day described these two amendments as being want of confidence motions, and as time goes on pressure will be put on and we shall be told that if the main motion does not carry it will mean the defeat of the government and a general election. Well, no member wants that, and I am certain the country does not want it either. This threat about want of confidence is of course always trotted out by every government of the day, no matter who they are, to try to get their followers lined up behind them. They always say that a vote for amendments means a want of confidence. It means nothing of the kind unless the house chooses to say so. There is nothing in the constitution or in the rules that demands it unless it is embodied in the motion in words to this effect—that "the house has no confidence" in the government of the day. I have seen this done twice, once here and once in the local house, and on both occasions the government of the day had a slim and unreliable majority.

They could not change the constitution; they did not need to, but they announced they were going to take advantage of it, and said they would not regard the defeat of any measure as a vote of want of confidence unless there was a resolution containing those words, "that this house has no confidence in the government." That is well known; and in this case, with the huge majority of the government, it is absolutely unnecessary to ask anyone to vote for this plebiscite other than on its merits.

There is another matter about which I want to speak. The other day we listened to what I suppose we might call a brilliant fighting speech by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Fraser). The vociferous applause which he received, both while speaking and at the close of his remarks, would indicate not only his own personal popularity but also how acceptable to the members of his party were the sentiments to which he gave expression. The applause afforded him by the cabinet ministers indicated that he was qualified to be their spokesman, or at least that he was uttering sentiments with which they were fully in accord. Let us see just what he said; I am

not going to give my opinion, or anything else, but his own words, at page 334 of *Hansard:*

> There may be features about the plebiscite that are not as we would all like, but I have studied it. I went home and for three days did nothing but turn it over in my mind, and I came to this honest conclusion.

I shall deal with that conclusion in a few minutes. The hon. member is a big business man. During the course of his remarks he seemed rather annoyed at some people who were members of some committee and who were interested in many companies, but he himself, according to the guide, is president of half a dozen companies. There is no shame to it, but he is a big business man, a man of outstanding ability and long experience. Will anyone deny that? He has been elected to this house three times and defeated once, which in experience is equal to two elections. He knows what it is all about; he can think on his feet; he can regulate his thought and analyse a situation accurately. He says that for three days—and presumably three nights, though he does not mention them—he studied this question. He even has a biblical precedent for his action, because three days and three nights was the exact period that Jonah spent in the belly of the whale, re-orientating his own future. Now we have a picture of this very able man pacing up and down, wearing out the carpet in his study during ceaseless days and restless nights, before he could come to any conclusion. I am sure he will not deny—and I can quote his words—that his loyalty and devotion to his leader had much to do with the decision at which he arrived, but it was seventy-two hours before the scale was tipped. And what tipped it? Was it his judgment on the basis of the facts? No. Was it his loyalty? Yes. Let me quote his words, at page 334 of *Hansard,* as to his conclusions after studying the problem for this length of time:

> I was convinced that . . . I should appeal to my fellow Canadians to stand behind the man who for five times has been elected by the ballots of the people of Canada to lead this country.

That is, the Right Hon. Prime Minister. Then, in closing, the hon. member said:

> For God's sake get behind Canada. Don't sell her short. Get behind the Prime Minister, and let us put this thing over.

Those last words, "let us put this thing over" are the only words in his whole speech in which he might be held to express definite approval of the plebiscite. You see, his whole appeal, and what tipped the scale, was his conviction that he should be loyal to his leader. That is a very admirable and beautiful sentiment, which does him credit; but it is

not a very overwhelming argument as to the merits of the plebiscite. And I suggest it is reasonable for us to assume that it was the loyalty of which he speaks so much that governed him in arriving at a decision, rather than the merits of the plebiscite, as to which he says so little.

On the strength of that, having built up that picture on that premise, I ask the house and the country this question, which I might ask the hon. gentleman himself. With all his experience, his knowledge and ability, it took him that period of time, wrestling with himself in the still, dark watches of the night, before coming to his decision. That being so, how long does he expect it will take the ordinary man in the street to come to a decision on a matter of such vital importance, when that ordinary man does not have the hon. member's advantages; when he does not have even such knowledge of war conditions as we have, and certainly no such knowledge as the government undoubtedly possesses? Remember, the man in the street nowadays has not that intense party loyalty that he had formerly, and that consideration would not be as important a factor in his case as it was in the case of the hon. member for Northumberland. So if we concede these points, and I do not believe they can be denied, I believe it cancels the entire weight of the hon. member's eloquent speech. I admit that his speech was eloquent, but it was not necessarily convincing. I submit that it was a powerful demonstration that we should hesitate to repudiate our responsibilities as members of parliament and throw responsibility for the decision—and throw the blame also—on people much less informed than we are, who sent us here to make these decisions.

Some years ago a matter arose in my own district, which I thought I would refer to a committee composed of Liberals and Conservatives, in order to get their decision. It was not a matter of patronage but more the question of a decision. Very shortly thereafter I received a note from the secretary of the committee saying that they were leaving the matter to me. When I went home I discovered that one of the members of the committee had taken the stand, in which the others backed him up, that I was shirking my responsibility. They said, "Neill is trying to pass the buck to us. Tell him it is his business." I made my decision and, since I heard nothing more about it, I guess they approved of it. They said they sent me here to decide these matters, and I should decide them. That was only a small affair, but the principle holds true also in connection with more important things.

There is another important development which has occurred during this debate and which has caused me grief and pain. I always thought it was a characteristic of Liberals to be true and loyal to their party, their principles and their policies. We have heard that echoed from a thousand platforms. Imagine my grief when I discovered that instead of being true to its ideals and all the rest of it the Liberal party was walking out with another young lady! I could hardly believe it, but it is obvious; you can see it even in this house. There is a thin red line—not very thin, either—running between the government benches and the seats occupied by my hon. friends of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. The other day the hon. member for Northumberland was throwing bouquets at them. I need not take time to read what he said, but they were very obvious bouquets, to the effect that in the last few weeks—he was careful to add that—he had occasion to agree with very many of the fundamental truths which have been uttered by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). And there have been other instances. I see in the newspapers that a cabinet minister has agreed with the principles of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation and so on.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NEILL: Well, the members of that group are entitled to cheer. But the lady has been coy; she has not been so willing. At the very moment these wistful advances were being made by the hon. member for Northumberland the same hon. gentleman whom he was eulogizing had and still has on the order paper a motion which the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) says is a motion of want of confidence; and less than an hour later another C.C.F. member referred to the government as a "servile and anti-labour government." The government does not generally throw bouquets at people who move votes of want of confidence. They generally throw bricks; or if there is a bouquet you will find a brick wrapped in it. But this is different. The liaison is still continuing; they are still walking out, and and they have even walked as far as Toronto. According to the press a very prominent member of this house, a reputable man whom I highly esteem, has been speaking over the radio, and there is no doubt of what he did. He was speaking in support of Mr. J. W. Noseworthy, the C.C.F. candidate in the federal by-election in York South. Well, Mr. Speaker, when we have members of the cabinet and reputable men such as I have mentioned doing these things, there must be something in it. Is it possible they would rather back the C.C.F. than see Mr. Meighen elected? I think the Liberal public throughout Canada ought to be advised of this unhallowed alliance that is going on. They ought at least to be warned to prepare for this political foundling which will be put on their doorsteps before long.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): They are getting ready to have a morganatic marriage.

Mr. NEILL: No, I am afraid it is going to be worse than that. They should be warned, because they will have to do something when the baby is put on their doorstep. Perhaps after the election steps will be taken to regularize their relations. I certainly hope so, but I frankly confess that the prospect is not lichtsome, to use a Scotch expression.

I am no prophet, and I always bet on the wrong man in an election—consequently I never bet. But I do express the hope that the Minister of Justice will be returned to-day. He is a capable man, untouched by political background, which seems to be regarded as a taint nowadays. I hope he may be returned, because he is a man capable of filling the position of the man whose memory I shall always revere.

I hope the Minister of Labour will get in, because I believe he is an honest man. I know he is an able man, and I believe he will do as much as any one man can do for labour, among a bunch of seventeen or eighteen members in the cabinet, no matter what cabinet is in office.

I also hope—and I listen for the applause of my friends over there—that the Right Hon. Mr. Meighen will get in.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. NEILL: I thank you. I know that his ability will be of great benefit and advantage in the house in these critical times.

And now to come to the plebiscite. There is a good deal of misunderstanding about this thing. The ordinary man in the street is not versed in legal terms. He is not accustomed to untangle political phrases which can be construed to mean one thing to-day and another to-morrow. What he will say is this: "Oh, I see they are going to take a plebiscite on conscription." That is the way he will think about it, and that will be the greatest misunderstanding there could be, because it isn't anything of the kind.

If it is to be put forward by government agents, it is a deliberate attempt to falsify the issue. The question which will be asked in the plebiscite is this:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

Just look at that. The man on the street is to be asked if he is in favour of releasing the government from commitments. Does it say anything there about conscription? Not a word. Do these men on the street know what commitments mean—commitments about something which took place years ago?

Here is the way I suggest the question should have been put:

> Are you in favour of the government introducing total conscription if and when the government find it necessary?

Would that not put it up to everybody? We would not need to go round telling people how they should vote. They could understand that. Does the government expect the ordinary working man and woman to understand that proposed question, if we cannot agree here on what it means? Half of the house says it means one thing, and the other half says it means another thing—and quite a few of us think it does not mean anything. But apparently the government expects the man on the street to diagnose it, and to give a competent and sensible answer, something which we ourselves do not appear to be able or willing to do.

The language used in the plebiscite question is something like a car on a switchback railway; you can go in any direction you like, up or down. But it does not get you very far, does it? After all, you do not get anywhere by travelling on it. This plebiscite question is just a means of getting up and down, marking time and doing nothing.

But it has one advantage. It can be used either way. To the man favouring conscription it can be quoted like this: "Oh, here we are clearing the way for conscription; what else could it mean?"—and he and his friends are satisfied. To the other man who does not want conscription, and who is complaining that the plebiscite would mean that, the answer is,—"Where do you get that idea? Just look at the wording of it: the word 'conscription' is not mentioned. It is just a gesture; trust to us not to force it on you". That argument is being used in Quebec to-day, and in other places as well—and in language even stronger than I have put it.

The plebiscite, as worded, is simply a piece of political strategy, guaranteeing nothing and imposing no obligation, and leaving it open to take another $2,000,000 plebiscite six months or twelve months from now on the real issue of conscription or no conscription.

My position is somewhat different from that of many others. When the election was held, not being tied to the utterances of any political party leader, possibly with longer vision—although I doubt it—but certainly with more congenital caution than most, I did not commit myself as rigidly as some others. I quoted the two leaders, and I said, "I do not consider conscription is an issue; I do not think conscription is needed at the present time, and I am going down there to vote against it, but" —and here is where the difference came in—"if the situation ever gets so bad that it is needed, and if in my best judgment that is the position, I will vote for it; but I will come home first and tell you I am going to do it." I decided that last June, and I went home. At public meetings, in the press and on every occasion I possibly could I told them that I thought the time had come and, to tell the truth, I thought I was committing political suicide. However I did that, and I was surprised at the reaction. At only one of the meetings, and out of all the resolutions which were passed, only one little man voted against it. He said he was a pacifist, God help him. He called himself a pacifist; I wonder if that word will get him by if he meets a Jap with a bomb in one hand and a bayonet in the other. I hope it does.

Let me explain the meaning of conscription as I explained it then and as I understand it now. I explained it in a speech on November 10 when I described it as a measure warranting the compulsory service of men and women in every form of war work, and the control of industry and money. With the exception of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce), I believe I was the first to take such a stand, in the house, and I have suffered some discrimination since then—discrimination of such a petty character that it provoked nothing but amused contempt on my part. But of that more anon, possibly.

My suggestion then—and this is what I want now—was for total conscription of that character. How can I attain it? My suggestion was and still is that it should be done by means of a union government. Get the best men in the country together to share the responsibility, so that no one party could be crucified by taking alone the necessary steps. Or, if necessary, I would agree to conscription which would leave out sections where the feeling was anti-conscriptionist. That was done in Ireland twice, during the great war and in this war. No trouble resulted, no ill feeling, and no discrimination. Possibly it would be a good idea here.

At any rate I am against a plebiscite in this form. I was much impressed the other day by the speech of the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks). He did not flaunt the fact that he was in uniform. He was very sensible. He did not talk bitterly against those who differed from him, and he made a very sen-

sible speech. He said the plebiscite was an unnecessary and unfair waste of time and money and an evasion of our responsibilities. And it is not merely the waste of time and money taking the plebiscite, I am afraid, because there will be also marking time while we are waiting for the plebiscite to be passed, and we will have to wait after for it to take effect. All this time we are going to stand idly by saying, like Lady Macbeth, "Letting 'I dare not' wait upon 'I would'," for goodness knows how long a period.

Who knows best the needs of the country, and its relation to the war? Certainly the government. Times without number people have said to me, "We send those fellows there to govern; why in — " — why in — " — why on earth don't they govern?" If we leave it to the people, by way of a plebiscite, then in all common decency we must fully inform them —and that would take far too long. And we also must tell them things that only the government knows—and that would be giving information of value to the enemy.

Mr. HOMUTH: It would get on the German radio.

Mr. NEILL: If absolution is needed for a government pledge, then parliament is the place to give it. We are qualified and we are ready. I am sure we are ready. The Prime Minister wishes to know the wishes of the people. There are 230 members of parliament outside the cabinet who should know the wishes of their constitutencies. I will tell the Prime Minister what the wishes of my constituency are, and will stake my seat on its general accuracy: The people of Comox-Alberni want action, in great big capital letters —ACTION! They want action, and they want it now. And they want another thing, and that is leadership. Then they will accept universal service, if it is necessary—universal service of each man and woman, where he or she can best serve. Half the speakers who have spoken in this debate have attempted to prove that we do not need conscription, therefore why have a plebiscite? The other half have said that we do need conscription, so why not bring it in instead of taking a plebiscite?

Another objection I see to this, and I believe it is a bad one, is the effect it will have upon other nations, upon friendly, neutral and enemy nations. They are not familiar with, nor do they understand, our system. They will think that it means doubt, hesitation, cold feet perhaps. It will depress our friends, it will sober neutral nations, while our enemies will be tickled pink. I am sure it will ring through the chancelleries of Europe that Canada stopped in the middle of the war to take a plebiscite as to whether or not she would continue. That is the way it will be interpreted. You do not suppose Germany is going to let us do the interpreting; she is going to do it. This will be twisted in meaning and it will be repeated to all and sundry. Neutral countries will say that Canada stopped to do this in the middle of the war. The Minister of National Defence for Naval Services (Mr. Macdonald) is already on record as having said that the enemy already are quoting speeches made in this house. The other day the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) combated that stand and said that it was not having that effect upon neutral or friendly nations. He quoted from a large newspaper in the United States and from one in Great Britain. He quoted the New York *Times* as being satisfied with our explanation. There is nothing about their being satisfied with the plebiscite. What they say is:

> On this matter it would be impertinent for outsiders to give an opinion.

And then they say:

> The patriotism of Canadians has been demonstrated by their efforts in this war.

Of course they had to say something like that. They were not dealing with the total acceptance of the plebiscite. The minister also quoted the London *Telegraph and Morning Post,* but there is no mention of the plebiscite from beginning to end of that editorial. They say that there has been nothing more splendid than the record of Canada. We have not heard what they said when they went home and attended their cabinet meetings. I think it was on the next day that an hon. member from somewhere along here—I know his name but I cannot remember his constituency;—he is a noble looking man, looks as though he is fit to be appointed a senator —oh, yes; the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lockhart) quoted the Buffalo *Courier-Express.* This is what this large United States paper had to say:

> The natural question which arises on this side of the border is that if we can do it overnight why does Canada hesitate?

I do not think we can take much comfort from that point of view. The "it" refers to conscription. Members of parliament have quoted Churchill. He said that our effort was magnificent, but he could not very well say anything else. Here is the answer: the greater the effort, and it is a great effort, the greater will be the reaction. The argument that will be used in Germany will be that Canada's effort has been magnificent, therefore there must have been something very wrong, something desperately wrong, disloyalty or breakdown or something of the kind, to

make Canada stop in the middle of the war to hold a plebiscite. It can be worked both ways, and be sure that that is the way the Germans will interpret it.

When I was a little chap and happened to be tardy and attempted to make an excuse I was sometimes told that if the dog had not stopped to look for a flea, he might have caught the hare. Then there is that classical quotation that some of us will remember:

For want of a nail, the shoe was lost;
For want of a shoe, the horse was lost;
For want of a horse, the rider was lost;
For want of a rider, the battle was lost;
For want of a battle, the empire was lost,
And all for the want of a horseshoe nail.

History is full of instances in which a comparatively small number of men have turned a battle, or a comparatively short period of time, a few days or even a few hours or minutes, has changed the outcome. The Duke of Wellington always said in his after years about the battle of Waterloo that if the French could have brought up a couple of hundred fresh men, he would have lost the battle. The same thing was true in the Crimea and in the Boer war. In one of the battles of Ypres, I forget which one, the Germans were pushing through with the use of gas and they had nothing between them and Calais but a few broken men. Some one in the back lines rushed up a few cooks and orderlies and they were spaced out so far apart that they could hardly see each other. It looked like such an obvious trap that the Germans hesitated to come forward and they lost their chance and allowed our reinforcements to be brought up. It is thus that a few days or minutes makes such a difference.

The other day the Minister of Finance said that the magnitude of Canada's effort may well tip the scale. That is not my language; that is the language of the Minister of Finance. Yes, but the lack of magnitude may tip it the other way. It would be a bitter, black page in Canada's history if it were to be recorded that Canada paused, turned aside to hunt fleas—political fleas—the fleas of political advantage, the fleas of longer power, the fleas of what might be said about us in the next election three years from now. In a crisis, so little sways the destiny of a nation or an empire.

I have heard man after man proclaim confidence in and affection and almost passionate loyalty for the Prime Minister. I believe in the sincerity of these hon. members. But I ask this question: would not that same loyalty, that same trust, that same confidence rally around three times greater in the support of the Prime Minister if he came out and said that the war emergency overshadowed everything else, and that he had decided, either by means of a union government or on his own initiative, to adopt universal service despite the promises made years ago? There will be a risk, but it would be a glorious risk. Is any great achievement ever attained without taking a risk? He would get support both in this house and throughout the country that would make him the greatest man in Canadian history for a hundred years to come. He would be known as the man who saved time and money when both were of vital importance. He would be known as the man who by the timely increase of Canadian help shortened the war and saved thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of lives. He would be known perhaps as the man who had saved the British empire, perchance civilization itself. What an ideal goal at which to aim! What a magnificent height to scale! The good wishes and blessings of everyone in this house and of all in Canada would follow him if he turned his face with gallant courage to such a noble task.

I want to reiterate that the people want action and leadership. I am told that I am an old man and therefore my viewpoint is that of age and decrepitude. But that is not necessarily so. You may see an old Ford with a good engine still able to give good service. An infirm body may still have a young mind. Experience is sometimes worth something. I certainly can claim to know the feelings of my people and my country. Speaking as a Canadian—and I dare anyone to dispute my claim to be a Canadian, because while I was not born in this country, I have spent fifty-one years here and have grown up with it, taking part in all its activities—speaking for a Canada that is still young, I must say that she is passing from an old era into a new.

In this debate I have heard appeals made along old party lines, attempts made to stir up old party policies, loyalties and so on. I want to tell the house and the government that the people of Canada are no longer moved by the old party appeals, catch-words and shibboleths, of twenty, thirty or fifty years ago. They are no more interested in what was said in 1917 than they are in what was said in 1817. We have turned our backs on the dead, dying past and now face toward the east, where new policies are rising, God-given, Christlike policies, that will give us action and leadership, that will ensure the undivided effort of every man and woman in Canada toward the successful prosecution of the war; policies and leadership that will lead us through victory to peace, and beyond peace to such a reorganization of society as will

guarantee for all time, that all, not just a few, shall live in peace and happiness throughout all their days.

Mr. W. H. MOORE (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) need not fear his views as a result of age, for I find myself largely in agreement with him. What I have to say bears mainly upon the practice of government as it eventually affects the form of government. Some members may think I go back ages to determine how we should govern ourselves in the twentieth century, but it is only for a moment. When our structures topple and some of them come crashing down it seems to me that we ought to examine the footing, and it is very apparent from the wording of the plebiscite, which the member for Comox-Alberni read several times, that a structural change has come over our practice of government, and we would indeed be derelict in our duty as representatives of the people were we to refrain from trying to assess the significance of that change.

At first sight there is high merit in a plebiscite, in a reference to the polls. Is it not within the essence of democracy, almost the forthright expression of the people? In these days in our part of the world we all profess democracy. Do we not say we are at war for the express purpose of throwing off autocracy? Say, we are prepared to give life, property, all we have, to defend the freedoms that lie within democratic institutions?

Then, on second thought, we ask ourselves: what is democracy? The leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) touched upon the subject, but it seemed to me that he did not go far enough to sift the gold from the sand. If the question were really put to a poll of the members I have an idea that the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling), whose distinguished ancestor wrote such a marvellous history of ancient Greece, would tell us something about the factions of Athens, and my French-Canadian friends, versed as they are, steeped almost, in the classics, would tell us something of the work of Polybius, that great man who wrote of autocracy and democracy as the sunrise—the sunshine—and sunset. Well, no matter the source; it was always the same. History has written in parallel lines the downfall of self-government and the factions of the polls. We all know that in course of time our ancestors, French and British alike, hardened their determination that there would never again be a sunset on their freedom. It is not necessary for me here to describe the means which they took to preserve freedom and self-government. We know that there were two main features: first of all, the distribution of power among the constituencies, and secondly, provision made for calm debate. It is not necessary for me to remind the members of this chamber what those provisions are. We know them; the member for Comox-Alberni has referred to them.

What is that structural change that has come over us? It may be, and I believe it is, that we are so close to government that we do not realize from the very wording of that plebiscite that there is change. Who is the government that is to be released from its commitments? We do not see it. However, we can see with the clarity of perspective the change that has come over the structure of the government in Europe. We know that democracy is only flickering in the vestiges of Europe. It is disconcerting to find Mussolini making a claim in his work, "La Dottrina del Fascismo," that the purest form of democracy lies in the expression of the will of the people, through the will of a few, or even the one. We reject that claim; at least I do.

Let us look closely at the fascist structure, then by it try to classify our own practice among the political systems. The Italian Minister of Justice, Alfredo Rocco, in explaining the law of January 31, 1926, which settled—and I will have you, Mr. Speaker, mark these words—the relationship between the executive and the legislature, said:

> A dominant position is accorded to the executive; the government is the representative of the whole of the power of the state and exercises a general function. The other two powers discharge a special function and occupy a secondary position. The judicial and legislative powers are the result of the state having different functions. The executive power possesses and is the organ of all functions of state.

In other words the legislative and judicial powers are limited and specific. The executive power, on the contrary, exercises unlimited and general functions. Now the law of January 31, 1926, concerning the right of the executive to enact measures of a legislative character, reads as follows—the section is short but I would have you notice it because naturally my next step is to compare it with the practice of legislation in Canada. I quote:

> Measures having the force of law—
>
> Or orders in council.
>
> —may be promulgated by royal decrees, after consultation with the cabinet, (1) when the government is so authorized by law, within the scope of such delegated authority; (2) in extraordinary cases when emergency and absolute necessity so demand. The question of emergency or necessity is subject to no other

control than that of parliament. In cases under (2) the decree shall be submitted to parliament for confirmation as a law at one of the first three sessions following its promulgation.

Now before turning directly to comparison with Canada I would have you know the opinion of Kranenburg, who is professor of public law at Leiden university, as to the Italian system. He says:

It need not be demonstrated that political control by a parliament constituted in the way described is of no practical importance; nor is it necessary to point out that the confirmation of a decree—

Or order in council.

—as law by the self-same parliament, at one of its next three sessions, is a bare formality.

Indeed Rocco says in his book, "The Transformation of the State," that parliament is in fact to be reduced to a mere registry for decrees.

How are these orders in council made in Italy? By boards of government; boards that have to deal with the determination of prices —and you must remember we all live in a price world—by boards that have to do with wages; in other words by boards that undertake the distribution of the national income.

When I turn to the Canadian system I want it thoroughly understood that I recognize the impact of crises upon the form of government. In fact it is with the events in mind of 1917, 1918, 1922, 1933 and 1940, bringing revolution in the form of government in Russia, Germany, Italy and France, that I stress the vital importance of taking stock of the structure of government at this time. Moreover, the assumption of power to legislate by order in council in certain matters has always been conceded to the executive body. But structural change came in Italy, as it has come to Canada, and is coming everywhere, with the quantity and the quality of the measures.

With these qualifications I take up P.C. 8253. I am not to be accused of exaggerating the bearing of that matter upon the structure of Canada's government; for speaking directly to the nation over the radio on October 18, 1941, the Prime Minister referred to the subject matter of that order in council in the following words:

I am, therefore, going to speak to you to-night about an action which the government proposes to take in connection with conditions within Canada. I believe that what is proposed will vitally affect our war effort, because it will affect every man, woman and child within Canada.

The action which I am about to explain represents an experiment hitherto untried on this continent, and perhaps having regard to its breadth and variety, hitherto untried by the will and consent of any free people anywhere.

As I listened I confess I found it hard to believe what my ears told me I had heard. The thing seemed incredible. I thought back to declarations made in this House against the arbitrary assumption of power by another administration in the days when nearly every tenth family lived by grace of the public treasury. I thought back to all the definitions I had ever read of a free people. And I confess I did not find that the Prime Minister's words fitted them. As my distinguished namesake, Mr. Tom Moore, who I believe is president of the Trades and Labour Congress, said in a public statement:

Both in its terms and in the manner of its introduction, the new order is the longest step yet taken by any democracy toward the establishment of a totalitarian state.

Action, you say. Action. Wait a minute. Mr. Tom Moore goes on to say:

Is there such urgency that a matter of this kind should be dealt with by order in council when parliament is to meet in two weeks' time?

I find myself in agreement with the statement made by the president of the Trades and Labour Congress. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is there anything on earth that would justify a revolution in the economic structure of the country without parliamentary action, if we still have parliamentary government?

May I also say that there are members in both houses of parliament who could have made valuable contributions to the objective of the measure; members who have given particular attention to the vexed, shall I say, illusive, matter of inflation. We could at least have pointed out the futility of nailing down the ceiling while the doors were wide open; for the turnover in employment is now three or four times the normal rate. And some of us might have added that a government, subject to organized economic pressure and the size of its deputations, with its eyes on the polls, can never distribute equitably the national income.

I shall pass by the declaration of war against Japan, made—I do not want to exaggerate—with almost the easy nonchalance of a man cracking another egg for breakfast; I shall pass that by with this observation. It is not sufficient to say that parliament, had it met, would have made a swift and unanimous declaration of war against Japan—not sufficient because by parliamentary action the people would then have become informed of the social consequences of war on another front, a matter that seems to be vaguely contained in the proposal for a plebiscite before the

house. And so in our attempt to discover the identity of the country's government we come to the matter of broken pledges.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has said—he said it at Vancouver and repeated it in the course of this debate:

> The present unhappy state of the world is in large part the result of broken pledges. Nazi Germany has erected bad faith and broken pledges into a principle of action. Bad faith and broken pledges in disregard of the popular will are the forces against which Canada is fighting to-day.

In a measure I agree. But I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that these pledges, all of them, were given in disregard of parliamentary government. I would go on to add this: I thought we were carrying on war to render it impossible for the one or the few to give pledges in matters of major importance without having first obtained the considered sanction of the representatives of the constituencies through the established procedure of parliamentary government.

No one likes broken pledges. Are we in this house to give a pledge that cannot be kept? For who will say, in the midst of war, that there can be by plebiscite, to use the words of the Prime Minister, "a full and honest expression of the views of the people"? Military secrets that are not to be given to this house are not to be broadcast to the public; and how can there be a full and honest expression of opinion without a knowledge of need? It would seem that some explaining has to be done.

Why is there more urgent need for men in 1942 than in 1940? True, we have taken on another seventy million enemies; but the Japanese were already handicapped with some 450,000,000 unsubdued Chinese; and besides, in 1942, we have 190,000,000 stout Russians and 135,000,000 inventive Americans on our side.

How many men should be sent where? I do not know, and I doubt if anybody can tell us save the Minister of National Defence; and we should not forget, as some seem to do, that the issue before us is not conscription. We have conscription now. The issue is solely as to the need of men serving outside the country—a strange issue; for we know in our hearts that eleven and a half million people cannot by their own resources hold on to one-sixteenth part of the world's surface in a world with great powers grown greedy for conquest. If this country is invaded we must have outside assistance, and we ought not to expect other countries to give us what we are unwilling to give them.

I do not altogether blame the people for not viewing the situation in that light. The blame rests upon those of us in this house who profess to lead public opinion and who ought to have foreseen and long ago prepared against the forces that threaten us. In taking the plebiscite, will there be no resort to the highly developed technique of modern propaganda which from soap to social systems sways the views of the people? Already west and east we can observe the machine being geared and greased for the occasion.

In truth, Mr. Speaker, if it was the part of wisdom to establish parliament, wise to lay down rules as to procedure, that the will of the people should be expressed by reason, then it is unwise to send the matter contained in this particular plebiscite at this time to be disposed of by mass emotion. The plebiscite is packed with explosive materials. Already the tramp of civilian feet has been heard on our city streets. Already family is being set against family. "My boy is overseas; why should yours rest at home?" Members can hear that question no matter what constituency they represent. Class is being turned against class. Already people are talking about relative class exemptions from military service, by this administration or another one.

Recalling the racial and national composition of this country, I will not say it is wicked to submit this matter to a plebiscite; but to those hon. members who in this debate have advocated taking a plebiscite as a means of preserving unity I commend the considered opinion of Ernest Barker—a great English Liberal, and a professor at Cambridge—as to the social consequences of mass decisions. He says:

> Emotion is always waiting for its opportunity. A community which is not on the watch may easily slip down with a run into the abandonment of mere group-sentiment. It may do so all the more easily because the art of advertisement and mass-suggestion, nowadays so highly developed, can readily play entrancing tunes to stir the emotions. When this is done and done successfully the high democratic art of rational discussion is abnegated and induced unanimity of emotion takes its place. The basis of emotion may be class, as it is in Russia. It may be race, as it is in Germany. It may be nation—the nation as a higher personality, superior to all its members, the very anima dell'anima—as it is in Italy.

Here is the conclusion of Barker, a great English Liberal:

> Whatever it be, it necessarily entails, at any rate for the time being, a breakdown of democracy.

As hon. gentlemen know, Barker does not stand alone in his opinion. I might continue on with citations all to the same end.

If in the practice of government we are to disregard the well-determined lines laid down by science, then let us burn the textbooks and declare the bankruptcy of the social sciences. In the meantime let us cease talking about mass controversy as a means of unity. There are pledges and pledges. There was a pledge given by the government, as represented by ministers and the senate and commons; a pledge to our enemies; a pledge to our allies, to the world at large. I express it in the words of the Prime Minister:

> The policy of the government is, and from the outset has been, the achievement of a total national effort for total war.

Shall we keep that pledge, keep it to the letter? Total national effort! How are we to keep that pledge, if the result of the plebiscite taken in all the mad passions of war should be a negative one? You may consult the dictionaries for definitions as you will, but labels mean little in this matter. What may be a plebiscite for the ministers will be a referendum for the members. Personally I could not and I would not vote against the expressed will of the people I represent.

Let me put the matter another way. When parliament declared war against Germany we flaunted the country's unanimity in the face of Berlin and boasted of it to London. How will a substantial vote, say of hundreds of thousands, against relief from total war, be regarded in the outside world? Recalling the collapse of Russia in 1917, and of Germany in 1918, will that vote be interpreted, as was suggested by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), as a sign that Canada has grown war weary? I protest the thought. Burdened we are, but Canada will carry on.

References have been made to the mandates of the general election of 1940. Is it not true that we, the members, came here each with a particular mandate? Personally I thought I came with a mandate to support the practice of making laws in an open chamber, with the suggestions, the criticisms and even, if needs be, the opposition of the other members of all parties. I opposed a national government party because I believed it meant the introduction of the one party system of government that characterizes the new political order of Europe, only to find myself deprived of the right to present the views of my constituents in the making of laws that affect their living. I hope, Mr. Speaker, hon. members to your right and to your left alike will forgive me when I confess that I feel as though I had escaped the regime of a one-party system only to fall into the deep blue sea of order-in-councildom.

[Mr. Moore.]

In the first days of the war we found ourselves facing the paradox of giving up democracy to preserve democracy. Over a period of years the totalitarian powers had mobilized their man-power and heaped up great stores of munitions, not secretly but boastfully, for an attack on the democracies; and all the while the democracies refused to prepare for defence. When the blow fell, the British parliament put the blame on its Prime Minister and replaced him. We of this house shouldered the blame with the Prime Minister, as we should have done.

Action, not words, we said, is the inescapable rule of war time. Wars are not won by debates, at least not in an era of tanks and aeroplanes. Democracy implies government in the face of opposition, while war calls for unity of action. But if action be the rule of war, I repeat the question of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni: Why do we wait months to determine the distribution of the troops by a plebiscite, while Australians are being killed off for lack of reinforcements?

Once aroused, the spirit of inquiry goes on to wonder how far the actions of the cabinet have justified the scope we have given them; for it is not to be forgotten that while we delegate power, we are ourselves the trustees of that power and responsible to the people for its application. The ministers, of course, were much too busy with executive duties to shape the country's legislative requirements and so, in due course, appointed legislative boards to carry on the duties which we were elected to perform. Legislative boards! Let us pass over the method of appointment; it is on the model of the fascist order. Let us pass over the proceedings of those boards; so far as I know, they have no published *Hansard*. Some day the people will become keenly interested in the country's political set-up. It is an extraordinary one. I venture to say that in proportion to population Canada is paying more people for making laws than any other country in the world. The cost is tremendous, the confusion appalling. Away from the provinces, there are two deliberative bodies at Ottawa. One is in continuous session, preparing orders in council; the other, ourselves, when in session, reduced by the executive to a sounding board for speeches, engaged in the "bare formality" of ratification.

Having established a bureaucracy after the manner of the new order in Europe, and having continued to maintain at least the expense of a representative assembly, perhaps it was to be expected that in course of time we would take up with the third form of government, a direct reference to the people. The political structure of this country ought to be

subjected to careful review, not by another commission but by this parliament. Within the time at my disposal I may mention only several matters which in my opinion seem to condemn the new order in Canada. The ministry, by order in council assuming responsibility for distributing prices and wages—in effect, distributing national income—has made no announcement as to the principle of distribution. The law of supply and demand has been repealed by orders in council, but what has been put in its place? What happened is not quite evident, but this much is certain: the economic structure has been put partly into reverse. Instead of penalizing people for combining in restraint of trade, penalties are provided against competitive services. Laissez-faire was the first casualty of the war, I may be told, but that was not altogether so in this country; for, while some people are tucked under the wings of authority, most people are left to scratch for themselves.

The people I represent, however, are particularly concerned over the principle of distributing rewards and sacrifices between the workers in factory and field, as well as the pay of those enrolled in the active service of the armed forces. And again I ask: on what principle are rewards and sacrifices distributed under the new order in Canada? Specifically, why are those who serve in the front line paid less—so very much less—than those who serve in the rear lines. "Economy!" I may be told. Does economy begin with those who offer the sacrifice of their lives? "The menace of inflation!" I am told. But do not the very measures of those who legislate in our stead, lead to inflation? To divert thousands of people from producing "consumers' goods" to regulating the production of "consumers' goods" is an inflationary measure. Having outbid the farms for work in the home services of the government, they borrow, and tax, to maintain artificial prices and dispense subsidies to certain producers—subsidies that increase in number and size as the sessions go by. Surely, those measures are highly inflationary. Paying more for less is inflation.

As I draw toward a conclusion, I would not have you believe, Mr. Speaker, that because I have not recited the good deeds of the ministry, I am unmindful of them; I have not referred to them because I chose to speak on the maxim our British and French ancestors laid down years ago that the form of government is as important as its achievements. The war must be won; but we must not lose its objective—the preservation of democracy. For what would it profit a country to gain the whole world and lose its own soul.

It is this plebiscite that brings up the matter of achievement and puts us on guard that all may not be well with our war effort. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) in an admirable presentation the other day quoted words of unstinted praise for this country's war contribution from the English press. Those quotations are reported in *Hansard* at page 311.

If those words are deserved, then the people are not to be blamed for their bewilderment as to why they are to be thrown into the turmoil of general election by plebiscite.

Looking back, I ask if the British of the Isles, while they faced overwhelming odds, in 1940, were really content when our ministers declared that only Canadians who volunteered were available for the defence of Britain. And, now, the Minister of Justice, by another pledge, makes an even more startling declaration as to our relations within the British commonwealth of nations, as reported on February 5, in the Ottawa *Journal*:

> The sole goal of our effort will be for the defence of the country. Because of a mutual defence agreement with the United States, however, it may be necessary to send men out of the country.

One might have smiled at the naive suggestion that we discharge our duty in the world's battle for freedom, by conscripting men to help 135,000,000 Americans defend the United States, were it not for the express implication that we are unwilling to do as much for the nations within the British commonwealth. By my seat in this house, I refuse to accept that declaration as the policy of this country.

Mr. C. E. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the speech just delivered by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Moore) to the government's most close scrutiny.

Mr. HOMUTH: And to their propaganda bureau.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): It is most unfortunate at this time that the speech from the throne was not worded so that it could have been endorsed by every hon. member, signifying to the country that once and for all the entire house was in favour of an all-out, total war effort, instead of again indulging, as it has been, in a rotten, political mix-up. I cannot conceive of anything which would give Hitler greater joy than to know that this country is split in two, and that while a part of the country has a desire for a total, all-out war effort, another part has not.

We are speaking about a total war effort. Almost every hon. member who has spoken has said that he is in favour of a total war effort. After almost three years of war we find hon. members rising in their places and

stating that they want total war. I wonder where they all were in 1939. I never saw them voting for a total war effort, but I did see them voting against a total war effort. A resolution was put by my party, and without exception they all voted against it. There was only one party, the one to which I belong, which voted for a total war effort; and because we took that stand we lost seven of our members.

We are now about to take a plebiscite. It is indeed unfortunate, as was pointed out by the last speaker, that in order to have a total war effort this government should have placed itself in a position where it now has to go back to the country to ask permission to break some of the pledges it made in 1940. I quite well recall that Liberals, and Conservatives too, were quite unanimous with respect to opposing an all-out effort. In my opinion there is no difference between Liberals and Conservatives, and I do not know that I would rather see Conservatives than Liberals in office. I say that because their policies are just the same, and that is shown by the amendment. The action of the Conservatives as well as that of the Liberals in 1939 must be kept in mind. Only the other day I heard the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) state that he was in favour of the conscription of finance, material wealth and man-power. Yet I saw him stand in his place in 1939 and vote against the conscription of finance. Surely he should make his position clear before he can expect other people in this country—

Mr. ROSS (Souris): He was not in the house.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Yes, he was in the house, and so were you; and you voted against it.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I was not a member of the house and neither was our acting leader in 1939.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): What is your stand now? I will bet you, Mr. Speaker —and I am not a gambling man—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): What are the odds to-day?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): —that if the question came up for a vote in this house of conscripting finance and industry before man-power, my hon. friends of the Conservative party would vote solidly with the Liberals against it.

Mr. BRADETTE: Not much cheering there.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): They voted against conscription of finance on September 12, 1939, as recorded on page 165 of *Hansard*. I shall not read it, but it is there for inspection.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): A lot of water has flowed over the dam since then.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): You bet, and it is some dam too. I should like to refer to the plebiscite a little more in detail. I do not think there has ever been a greater disgrace put upon the people of Canada than this. I should like to read what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said with regard to this on January 26, 1942, as reported on page 51 of *Hansard:*

> The question which the government proposes to submit to the people is the simple and straightforward question:
>
> It is simple, but it is not straightforward.
>
> "Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service."
>
> It will be seen that in seeking freedom for itself to act on all matters pertaining to war in accordance with its judgment, the government is taking a course which will remove all legitimate excuse for controversy, and the course best calculated to maintain the unity of the country in this time of war.

I contend that they are taking the best course to split this country open. The Prime Minister said that this was a simple and straightforward question, but how are the people going to vote upon it? No matter how they vote, we have no information as to what action the government will take. Even though they vote "yes," the Prime Minister has gone out of his way to assure them that there will be no change in policy with regard to the sending of men overseas. He said:

> . . . the government is taking a course which will remove all legitimate excuse for controversy.

The controversy referred to is, in my opinion, political controversy. I think it will be found that the government will proceed exactly along the lines which it is following to-day and which it followed when the war first started. This is one of the meanest political tricks ever perpetrated upon the people of Canada. There are two conceptions to this plebiscite, and I think this has been done intentionally. One is for the people of Quebec and the other is for the people of the remaining eight provinces. I am going to endeavour to prove my point.

I have never been able to find that the Prime Minister has said that there would be conscription for overseas. In fact, that is not the issue as far as he is concerned. I do not think the word "overseas" has been used by him, certainly not in his speech which I have

gone through most carefully. I should like to draw attention to what was said by the late Minister of Justice on September 9, 1939. I am referring to his speech because in my opinion he was the leader of the government at that time and the Prime Minister was taking his advice. Mr. Lapointe is reported on page 68 of *Hansard* as follows:

The whole province of Quebec—and I speak with all the responsibility and all the solemnity I can give to my words—will never agree to accept compulsory service or conscription outside Canada.

That is most definite.

I will go farther than that: when I say the whole province of Quebec I mean that I personally agree with them. I am authorized by my colleagues in the cabinet from the province of Quebec—the veteran leader of the Senate, my good friend and colleague, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin)—

Where is the Minister of Public Works now? It would be interesting for the house to know his stand on this question.

—my friend and fellow townsman and colleague, the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Power)—

Where does the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) stand on this question of conscription for overseas service? It would be interesting to have his opinion in this regard.

—to say that we will never agree to conscription and will never be members or supporters of a government that will try to enforce it. Is that clear enough?

I do not know whether that was for the Prime Minister's benefit or not, but he sat in his seat and he did not contradict the late Minister of Justice. The late minister went on to say:

May I add that if my hon. friends and myself from Quebec were forced to leave the government I question whether anyone would be able to take our place. If my hon. friends in the far corner of the house opposite;—

He was referring to us.

—if the Ottawa *Citizen*, which just now is waging a campaign for conscription, think they are serving Canada by splitting it at the very outset of the war, then I say they are gravely and seriously wrong.

And again:

And those in Quebec who say that we will have conscription, in spite of what some of us are saying, are doing the work of disunity, the work of the foe, the work of the enemy.

He concluded:

I believe the majority in my province trust me; I have never deceived them, and I will not deceive them now.

I do not think there can be any misunderstanding about the question. There was the Minister of Justice at that time; there was the Minister of Public Works at that time who is still in the cabinet, and there was the then Minister of Pensions and National Health, now the Minister of National Defence for Air, who were quoted, and the Prime Minister sat in his seat and never contradicted the statement. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is still their opinion and that this plebiscite is a pure deception. They have no intention of doing anything different. Let me prove that. On January 26, 1942, as reported on page 46 of *Hansard*, the Prime Minister had the following to say about the premier of Quebec, and I quote this to connect him directly with the Prime Minister's stand now:

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 this House of Commons from the province of Quebec, the verdict of the people of that province might have been wholly different.

He refers to the statement that Mr. Lapointe made in 1939.

He then goes on:

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.

The Prime Minister there definitely associated himself with the premier of Quebec. What does the premier of Quebec have to say about this matter? I quote from the Ottawa *Journal* of January 28, 1942:

Premier Godbout told a public meeting tonight that Prime Minister King "has always been against conscription for overseas service. I think that conscription for overseas service actually would be a crime," he added.

Mr. Godbout spoke in French at the annual meeting of the St. Denis-Dorion Liberal Association.

When Mr. Godbout said that Prime Minister King was against conscription for overseas service, someone in the rear of the hall shouted "yes, but he had already sent men overseas."

Discussing the proposed plebiscite, Mr. Godbout said that Prime Minister King could put the question this way: "Are you for conscription," or "Are you against conscription?"

I should like to know what that was if it was not a deliberate attempt to deceive the people. I think Mr. Godbout is right in what

he says. I think also the late Right Hon. Mr. Lapointe was right in what he said. I am not disputing that. The report goes on:

If the majority answered in the affirmative, Mr. King would have to enforce conscription, or else resign. If he resigns, another government, headed by Mr. Meighen (Conservative leader Arthur Meighen) will take his place and will immediately enforce conscription. But Mr. King knows that England doesn't need men, so he will not ask the question that way.

Therefore it was designed for the purpose. The report continues:

Mr. Godbout said he approved of the "defence of our country in our own land, but there are certain territories which must be defended to protect our own land". He mentioned Labrador, and islands off the coast of British Columbia as places to be defended to protect Canada.

The only difference it will make if the people vote "yes" on the plebiscite will be that the government will be permitted to send men outside Canada to Newfoundland, Labrador and some of the islands near the Pacific coast. That is the extent to which there will be a difference.

Let us turn now to the present Minister of Justice, Mr. St. Laurent, who is a minister of the cabinet, the Prime Minister's own choice, and a man in whom the Prime Minister has said on different occasions that he has complete confidence. On February 3, 1942, the Ottawa *Citizen* reproduces a Canadian Press dispatch from Quebec dated February 2, as follows:

Justice Minister St. Laurent said in a radio address to-night that Conservative party supporters in Toronto know "that at the moment and probably for a long time to come conscription for overseas service would harm our war effort.

"What is the attitude of the King government in the face of this double-barrelled menace? You know it, you know its past; know that it is Canadian first and Canadian before all. Have confidence in him (Mr. King), help him to complete his cabinet. When this cabinet will be completed he will ask you if you consent to relieve him of the promises he made when you elected his supporters.

"It is evident," he continued, "that the plebiscite does not give 100 per cent satisfaction either to those who fear that Mr. King will not do enough or to those who fear that he will do too much. But I believe that the government's decision to appeal to the people as to its promises is in conformity with the spirit of our democratic institutions and with the best Liberal traditions."

There the present Minister of Justice admits that the wording of the plebiscite has a dual purpose, one to satisfy the English-speaking part of Canada who may claim that the government is not doing enough in the war, and the other to satisfy those who claim that the government is doing too much—and that, as the minister points out, is in conformity with the best Liberal traditions. Well, Mr. Speaker, knowing them as I do, I can second that last part.

I want to read another extract for the benefit of the Minister of National Defence for Air. This is taken from the Ottawa *Journal* of February 6, 1942:

One answer is what is happening in Quebec East, where one of Mr. Ilsley's most distinguished colleagues, Mr. St. Laurent, is a candidate. On Tuesday night in that riding Mr. Oscar Drouin, a minister of the Godbout cabinet and campaign manager for Mr. St. Laurent, said: "When the time of the plebiscite comes, I pledge myself to ask my electors to reply in the negative."

There is the campaign manager for the present Minister of Justice pledging himself to ask his electors to vote against the plebiscite, and yet a minister of the government running in a Quebec constituency wants his electors to support the plebiscite. So definitely there must be a split in the cabinet. One can come to no other conclusion. The report goes on to say that "on the platform with Mr. Drouin was the Hon. C. G. Power, Minister for Air." Where is he now? What is his stand on this question? There you have the government's attitude in Quebec. What is the government's attitude in the other eight provinces?

All the debate in this house has hinged round the question of conscription of manpower for overseas. The press almost daily is giving the impression throughout the country that there will be conscription for overseas. I was at a picture show the other evening—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): It was on a Wednesday evening; the house was not sitting. What did I see there? There was a picture shown which had been produced by the national film board, and paid for by the government. It was a moving picture of the Prime Minister and the cabinet, and the title was that the cabinet was busy preparing ballots on conscription. That is the government's stand today. Let us see now what the Prime Minister said not long ago. As reported at page 44 of *Hansard* of January 26, the Prime Minister said this:

The government is not announcing a new policy. What we propose to do is to extend what, in fact, we have been doing right along, that is, to apply the principle progressively. In other words, we intend to continue to extend the application of national selective service to meet new needs as they arrive.

On November 12, last, I made it very plain to parliament that, with respect to the mobilization of man-power, the government's policy was one of national selective service; and, also, that an extension of the application of compulsory

selective service—conscription, if you will—was a part of that policy. Let me repeat my exact words.

I want it to be distinctly understood that so far as the principle of compulsory selective national service is concerned for Canada, in Canada, I stand for that principle. I have never taken any other stand. It is the position that I have held all along. It has been applied in connection with military training, and applied in a number of other directions I might mention. How much further it will be applied the house will learn as the government takes its decisions on that matter.

I do not think there is any doubt as to why this plebiscite is being taken. It is again to lull the people into a sense of false security. There is an agitation now for a greater war effort, but rather than increase our war effort the government would sell the country out in order to save its political party. It is quite evident—there is no assumption about it—that there is a decided split within the cabinet on this question; and if the cabinet themselves are not united and the house itself is not, how in the world are the people going to be united?

I do not think there is any question that there is no shortage of men; the government so assure us. The Prime Minister has said that there are plenty for the navy, plenty for the air force, and plenty for the army up to date. The Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) said that it was quite satisfactory; the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) said just a few days ago that on one day alone 500 enlisted; so they are satisfied, surely. Yet the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) said the other day that he was not satisfied, and the Minister of Pensions and National Health is not satisfied. Nevertheless we are going to spend two and a half to three million dollars in order to settle a political quarrel between the Liberal and Conservative parties. And we are going to continue the same policy as before. Who would have the audacity to go out from this parliament and ask the people to contribute to the war loan, ask the children in the schools to give up their nickels and dimes to buy war savings stamps, when this government can so carelessly spend two and a half to three million dollars to settle a political question? It is unfortunate indeed that the government have placed themselves in such an embarrassing position; that is, it is unfortunate for the government. It might be a good thing for Hitler, but it is very tough on Canada.

We advocated in 1939 that the first thing that should be done was the conscription of finance so that money would be available for all the needs of our war effort and for the agricultural effort of the country. We advocated the conscription of industry and of natural resources before the conscription of man-power. I still believe that is the soundest stand that could have been taken then, and I think it is high time it was taken now. One of the things we are short of, as has been shown time and time again, is our equipment for the fighting forces. We saw what happened in Norway because of lack of sufficient material; we saw what happened in France, Holland, Belgium, Greece, Crete, Singapore, Hong Kong and Libya. How much more is it going to take to wake this government up? I do not think anything will wake them up short of a bomb dropped on this building.

I was interested the other day in the discussion of British Columbia defences. This might be interesting to the Minister of Pensions and National Health because he is going to be over there some day, maybe. This is from a letter received on January 26, 1942:

Dear Sir:

There is much talk about conscription now. I'd like to bring to your notice how the 17th Battalion on searchlight duty at Victoria are equipped right now. They have two Bren gun carriers minus the guns and an old rifle each, some with the sights gone and forty-two rounds of ammunition each. Pity the Jap plane that encounters these fellows.

What a tragedy! I do not know whether the statement is true or not, but the Minister of Pensions and National Health probably knows. I know that when a parliamentary committee went to a certain camp, one of the largest in the country, for many thousands of men there was one Bren gun. It is time the people knew these things. Yet we have a book like the one I have in my hand. Here is the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) named right on the first page. "A nation transformed." I should say it is. It is signed "C. D. Howe, Minister of Munitions and Supply." "Canada supplies the tools of war," and anyone who looks at this would not question our war effort. Look at the shells piled up, and the ships and shipbuilding plants. All over the country we are producing war supplies and aeroplanes. Here are mines and factories. It must have cost a nice penny to put out this book; one would just think there was a tremendous flow of materials for our war effort. What does Douglas Bell company say about our war effort?

This is from the Ottawa *Citizen* of February 3 last, reporting a speech by Mr. Hepburn in connection with the Welland by-election:

To switch public attention from the plebiscite issue the federal government had instituted sugar rationing "notwithstanding the fact that there was no shortage and no one was hoarding", Mr. Hepburn said. This was another case of

"fooling the public" just as the federal government had done in speaking of Canadian-made planes and Canadian-made tanks.

He charged that Ralph Bell, director of aircraft production, had stated for the purpose of helping Labour Minister Mitchell's campaign—

This is something for the Minister of Munitions and Supply to listen to:

—that three hundred aeroplane engines a month would soon be turned out at the Chrysler plant in Windsor, Ont. Mr. Hepburn said he had checked on this with John Mansfield, president of the company, who had told him that "if everything goes well it will be eighteen months before we can make one engine and even then parts will have to be imported."

Then in the same paper they speak of the Ottawa Car and Aircraft company that had to close down or at least lay off five hundred men. Over a year ago I brought to the attention of the government this very company, and I do not think the government ever made any investigation regarding the labour conditions there that I pointed out. We had a chance to visit the company, and they were doing good work but the president then told me they were working on aeroplanes for which they had no contract with the government. When I asked him how he knew he would get a contract he said: "We don't know, we just have hopes. We cannot wait on the government, they are too slow." I should like to know what the Minister of Munitions and Supply is doing about these five hundred men laid off. To talk about all-out production is ridiculous. Here we sit around and fiddle away and our factories are only working part time. I was talking to Mr. Quain, president of the Ottawa Car and Aircraft company, again the day before yesterday on the telephone. He said that his company is not the only one in this situation, that there are dozens all over the country just like it.

Not long ago I went to see the rolling mills at Calgary; it closed at five o'clock each afternoon. In June last when I was talking to the Minister of Munitions and Supply about this rolling mill and telling him we wanted to get it open, the minister said they did not need that type of steel.

Mr. HOWE: As a matter of personal privilege I wish to say I made no such statement.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I can refer to it in *Hansard,* but I do not have it with me. The Minister of Munitions and Supply said twice in answer to a question, "We do not need that steel for my department."

Mr. HOWE: I said I made no such statement, and the hon. member is repeating it.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I accept the statement for the time being.

[Mr. C. E. Johnston.]

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Fournier, Hull): I will ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I will withdraw the statement on the condition that I can refer to the words in *Hansard* to-morrow. I think I have the right to read it to-morrow.

That is our all-out war effort. Just to show how much the government knows about our all-out war effort, I asked a question of the former Minister of Labour (Mr. McLarty). I asked the question because I wanted to find out what our total war effort amounted to. I put three questions on the order paper, the first being:

1. How many factories in Canada, producing war supplies, are working 24 hours per day, 365 days in the year?

That would be a one hundred per cent war effort, as the Prime Minister said out west. Listen to what the acting Minister of Labour said, as reported at page 200 of *Hansard* of February 2, 1942:

Except in connection with certain industrial disputes the hours of labour in industrial employment are a matter of provincial jurisdiction and no comprehensive statistics exist to answer the above questions.

In other words, they do not know how many factories are working full time. What a sad plight after nearly three years of war! The second question was:

2. How many factories in Canada producing such supplies are working 24 hours a day, 6 days a week, throughout the year?

That is only part time. This is the answer that was given:

Under the recently established national and regional war labour boards, however, the dominion and provincial governments are cooperating in the handling of most matters relating to employment conditions.

Can you imagine such an answer to a direct question?

The third question was:

3. How many factories in Canada producing war supplies are working less than 6 days a week, 24 hours per day?

Listen to the reply:

In this connection there is being established a joint system of inspection and reporting which is designed to produce the data requested.

This reveals absolute ignorance of the working conditions of industry in the country. Where are we going to end up? If there is not another Hong Kong, it will not be the government's fault.

I remember in 1938 when I was speaking in this house about oil production in Alberta and trying to get the government at that time to develop the oil fields; and again in 1939 when

war first broke out I pointed out to them that it was not beyond the stretch of imagination that the German forces would be down into Iraq and Iran, in the Persian oil fields, taking Britain's supply of oil, and I said that one of the greatest needs was to increase production of oil in Alberta and construct a pipeline across to the Pacific coast. But I was laughed at as frightening the people of Canada. I was regarded as an alarmist. But what is being done to-day? That very thing may happen, though we hope not. But if it does, can we meet our obligations? What is being done by the government now to increase oil production?

A man came into my room during the last session and told me that in Regina there was a refinery which had a system whereby they could extract oil from the tar sands of Athabaska, but he said that they needed a little financial assistance and he was here seeking help from the government. At the time he spoke to me, however, he had not been able to make any headway with the government. The company itself had spent over $15,000 in developing this method of extracting oil. I asked him whether it could extract gasoline and compete with other commercial companies, and he said, "yes; the by-product alone will enable us to do that." But what is the government doing about it? What is being done about working conditions in Kirkland Lake? Those men have complied with every possible request from the government. The only ones who have defied the government are the owners, and the government are deliberately starving the men into submission to the financial interests and doing nothing. Yet they talk about unity. They are even breaking the labour organizations in the country, splitting the country as wide open as races; and they have the audacity to say that they are advocating unity. What a sad plight!

We are surely taking care of profits. The people of the country know quite well that large profits are being made, and yet we are asking soldiers to fight for $1.30 a day. We are asking the farmers to produce at a loss, and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr Gardiner) is saying to them: "You fellows should not expect to make money in war time; you will have to lose a million or two at the beginning of the war and at the end." But here are the banks—what profits are they making? Let me give some figures from a house return filed in 1940. Column 1 of a table I have here shows net profits after published provisions for dominion and provincial taxes shown in column 2 but before appropriations for bank premises, pension funds, etc., shown in column 3; and the percentage of net profits to capital paid up is given as follows for the banks mentioned:

Bank	Percentage of net profits
Montreal	9·54
Nova Scotia	16·18
Toronto	24·08
Provincial	7·28
Commerce	10·02
Royal	10·08
Dominion	13·70
Canadienne Nationale	10·68
Imperial	15·18
Barclays	0·38

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Just before the house rose, there was some difference between the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) and myself in regard to the question of steel. I want to settle that question right now. On June 11, 1941, at page 3812 of *Hansard*, I find these words:

Mr. Johnston (Bow River): The minister speaks of it as being a business proposition and no concern of his department; but if this country needs steel, it is this government's business.

Mr. Howe: We do not need that particular steel.

And later I said:

I think the point is well put by the minister, and I am not going to say any more about it because I understand now that we do not need the steel.

Mr. Howe: I said, we do not need that steel.

Mr. Johnston (Bow River): I understand now that the minister means that we do not need this scrap iron which it is the purpose of the salvage campaign to gather because we do not need the steel which would be produced from that scrap iron.

Mr. Howe: I said nothing of the kind. I said that we did not need that steel.

Then later I said:

There is not a thing that I will not do to help win this war, but I certainly am not going out to ask our people to give this scrap iron if it is not necessary. If we do not need that steel, then I am through as far as that part is concerned.

I think that definitely settles the question which we were discussing before recess.

I was also referring to bank returns, and I should like to mention a few more of the profits being made by industry, in order to see if some of these difficulties cannot be cleared

up. I have in my hand a page from *The Monetary Times* of November 22, 1941, where I find this report:

Report of the International Nickel Company of Canada, Limited, and subsidiaries for the nine months ended September 30, 1941, shows a net profit in terms of United States currency of $25,695,938 after all charges, depreciation, provision for income and franchise taxes, etc. When the preferred dividend requirements were met, this net was equivalent to $1.66 a share on the 14,584,025 no par shares of common stock outstanding. This compared with a net profit of $26,425,104, equal to $1.71 a common share in the corresponding period a year ago, and $26,584,806, or $1.72 a share, in the same nine months of 1939.

Then here is the report on another company:

Present indications are that earnings of Stedman Bros., Limited, will be sufficient to absorb the higher rate of taxation and that net profits for 1941 will be as good as 1940, when net, after all charges, totalled $274,664, equal, after preferred dividends, to $2.85 a share on the common. Sales in the ten months ended October 31, were well ahead of the similar period of 1940 and profits, before provision for taxes, were proportionally higher than the increase in volume.

And another:

Canadian Bakeries, Limited, Calgary, Alberta, reported a net profit of $34,160 for the year ended August 31, 1941. This compared with $20,824 in the preceding year. Net was equal to $3.74 a share on the 5 per cent preference stock compared with $2.26 a share for the preceding fiscal year.

This shows that some companies are still making quite good profits. I believe one of our greatest difficulties, and one that should be faced immediately, is the question of production. I was quite amused to hear the reply given the other day by the Minister of Finance to a question asked by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) in regard to sugar. The minister said, as reported at page 109 of *Hansard:*

If the hon. member is asking that consideration be given to that question, I can assure him that consideration will be given to it. I may say, however, that the sugar administrator advised the beet sugar industry some time ago that they should do everything possible to bring production of beets up to the maximum capacity of their factories. If this were possible in the case of the two factories in Alberta, it would mean that beet sugar production would exceed the total requirements of the three prairie provinces.

My point is this: The minister says the administrator advised the beet sugar industry some time ago to see if it could not bring up production to capacity. I do not think that is the mobilization of industry; I do not think that is the conscription of industry. Why does the responsible minister not go to the industry and say, "Here, we are not asking you to bring production up to capacity; we are telling you to do so." The government should see that industry is carried on in a proper way. If the people know that industry is working to capacity; if they know that industry is completely mobilized, as it certainly is not now, I am quite positive that you will find a much greater degree of unity. It is no use going round to these industries and appealing to their patriotism; that will not work. The Minister of Munitions and Supply tried that. Let me read what he said on September 12, 1939, as reported at page 179 of *Hansard:*

The provision of five per cent was put in the last act after a good deal of consideration as a minimum return for the service rendered, but it was one which men of considerable experience believed to be unworkable. I can say to my hon. friend that from that day to this the defence purchasing board has done its very best to place contracts on that basis and has used every pressure that could be brought to bear in the form of patriotism, and so on, but to date it has not succeeded in placing a single contract on that basis.

Notice that; he appealed to their patriotism, but he was not able to get a single contract on that basis.

To carry that provision into another bill would be out of the question at this time. That part of the act we can consider as having proven to be unworkable.

I believe that is definite proof that industry is not going to do as the government wishes unless pressure is brought to bear. The minister told us he even appealed to patriotism. This is a time of war; apparently the government is not going to appeal to the patriotism of the ordinary man to get him into the army; he is going to be forced in. Why not do the same thing with industry? I think it very unfortunate that in this, the third year of war, this country should be divided within itself. There is great discontent among the working classes, who feel that they are not being given fair treatment. It is the common people who have to bear the burden. They not only have to pay for the war but have to go and fight it as well. The workers, the farmers and the common people are the ones who have to produce the food and make the tools, and now they are being asked to pay for the war as well. As long as we have discontent and disunity we shall never progress as we should. We have a law which provides that anyone found guilty of sabotage resulting either directly or indirectly in loss of life shall be subject to the death penalty. I believe that those responsible for retarding our war effort, no matter who they may be,

should be brought before a court of justice and, if found guilty, given the full penalty provided by law.

I want to conclude with the words of Mr. Bevin, speaking in the British house, which words on this occasion I take as my own. He said:

> Let bitterness and discontent get into the hearts of my army of workers and then, by God, we have lost the war.

Mr. P. C. BLACK (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, we are now approaching the crisis of this, the greatest war in history. All that we hold dear is at stake. Mr. Churchill has said that though the British empire survive for a thousand years, history would regard this as our greatest hour. We all have a responsibility. The people have their responsibility, and members of parliament have a greater responsibility. As a member of parliament I am prepared to assume my responsibility and discharge it according to what I believe to be the interests of Canada, the British people and our allies.

I believe our first duty is to our enlisted men, the men in the fighting services; to give them support; so to organize the resources and man-power of this country that they will have the greatest possible cooperation. This does not mean that every person called up to give service to his country must go into the fighting forces. It means that every person should be called to that station where he can give the best service. In the town of Amherst, for instance, we have working in the liquor store three men who should be working at their trades, one as a machinist, another as an expert moulder, and the third as a sheet metal worker. If they are called upon to do war work, I believe they would be willing to discharge their full duty. My idea of selective service is the calling up of each man to do the work he is best fitted to do.

I believe the county of Cumberland will compare favourably with any other constituency in Canada as to percentage of enlisted men. Some of our districts have as high as 10 per cent of their population in the armed services. Conscription, therefore, would not affect those districts very much, although it might rearrange the man-power, and put some men at more useful war work.

I feel I have a special duty to the returned men and, so far as I am able, I shall carry out their wishes and requests. I owe a special duty to patriotic bodies, groups of women and war workers, and individuals in the community who have appealed to me to take a stand with respect to the conscription plebiscite. I have resolutions from Red Cross organizations, church workers and municipal bodies asking that I make known their wishes to parliament, and that I be guided by what they consider to be in the interests of the country at this time. I am prepared to do that. They are behind the veterans' organizations in Canada calling for a complete, full war effort. So far as I know, there is not an elector in Cumberland who is not prepared to do his full duty in carrying on the war. So far as I know, there is not an elector who does not wish the government to govern the country at this time, and mobilize all our resources and man-power so that we may put forth our greatest effort.

No government ever had more whole-hearted support in carrying on the war than this government has had from the opposition. The complaint with respect to the government is that it has not gone faster and done more. I was nominated in the constituency of Cumberland against my wishes and my interests. I was elected opposed to a partisan administration in a time of war. I promised to support any government in measures to win the war. I do not want office. I do not want the responsibility, myself, in the matter of administration. I wish only to do my duty to the men in the fighting services, the people of Canada and our allies.

The people of Cumberland take great pride in and have the utmost good-will toward the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) in the tremendous task which is his. We want him to work in the Churchill way; let him give direction; let him see that all our resources are harnessed and that each man and woman is placed in his or her proper station. Let him see that the armed services are given all the support they require, that the greatest production is attained from both factories and field, and that everything possible is done to win the war. The government knows the facts; it should lead the way. It should give guidance to the people. It should give direction as to what measures should be adopted in carrying on the war, without a plebiscite.

The people of Cumberland expect me to act for them; they do not want me to shirk responsibility. They do not want the mothers, wives and sisters to have the responsibility of saying what shall be done with respect to conscription. They do not want delay; they do not want expense. They fear disunity, and they fear, too, that bitterness will be created by the plebiscite. They want parliament and the government to act. I have doubts whether more than twenty-five per cent of the electors will go to the polls to vote. There is grave

doubt as to the result. What will our enemies say if the decision is not emphatic? What will our allies do? What do they think now?

There is the question of the present war loan. I have had a personal appeal from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). He has appealed to me as a member of the House of Commons to do what I can to make the victory loan a success, and I am prepared to do that.

We have in Cumberland a committee which operated during the last loan, and will continue to operate. They gave their services without commissions. This committee had the confidence of the people of Cumberland. There is no question of plebiscite, so far as their efforts are concerned; there is no question of party allegiance. They are all working for the country, all trying to do their duty, with no political consideration.

Whether we like it or not, we are in the greatest war of all time; with one task to perform, and that is to get on with the war. I am opposed to a plebiscite because it gives comfort to our enemies and humiliates our partners and allies. I oppose it because it shifts the responsibility from those who were elected to carry it. It does not show strength of leadership; it dampens the spirit of our people and disheartens our fighting forces. Never in their history did the British people take a plebiscite in the face of the enemy, or decide war policies in terms of votes while the battle was raging. Yet, there never were enemies as ruthless as those we are now facing.

During the last election conscription was not an issue in Cumberland, but I cannot say that the government did not make political capital out of it. They endeavoured to offer people an easy, popular war. It is true, too, that the leaders of the Liberal party in Nova Scotia made political capital out of it by saying that while both leaders, the present Prime Minister and Doctor Manion, were on record as being opposed to conscription at the last election, yet Doctor Manion had been in favour of it during the last war and had written a book justifying his action. They left it to the electors to decide whom they could trust to protect them from conscription after the election.

There is no question as to the seriousness of the war, and there is no question that the Prime Minister appreciates that seriousness. During the November sitting he told us "that the war had grown in intensity and extent", "that every conceivable means by which freedom can be crushed is to-day being employed by nazi Germany", "that world domination was Germany's aim", "that it has taken the past two years for most countries to come to see the all-encompassing aspect of the conflict and that the cause is indeed the highest which it has ever been given to man to defend". Since then, Japan has struck and has been on the offensive for two months. We have had Hong Kong and Singapore and the retirement in north Africa. We are threatened on our eastern and western coasts. The hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) and the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) have warned the house of the menace to our western shores. The danger is as great, if not greater on the Atlantic coast. Our shipping, our oil works, our steel works, our mines and our war industries are in danger, and yet we are told that the electors must give direction, that this is not the responsibility of the government.

My constituents expect parliament and the government to take the proper action. We have conscription now for home defence, and we have that without a mandate. The electors were not consulted, so why should they be consulted now? In the past, little respect has been shown for the voters. Responsible government has meant the type of government practised by British people down through the years. An article appearing in the Ottawa *Journal* puts the situation very well:

> In the proposition for a plebiscite which the speech from the throne announces on parliament hill, there is a diabolical ingenuity on Prime Minister King's part. For whatever the result may be, it will free his skirts from obligations and give him a new lease on political life. Consider the proposition:

Then follows a quotation from the speech from the throne:

> "My ministers accordingly, will seek, from the people, by means of a plebiscite, release from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service."

> Now, you who read this, which way are you going to vote?

> If you vote yes, to free Mr. King from all previous commitments, you vote to give Mr. King continued power with a free hand.

> If you vote no, to hold him to his previous commitments, you vote against conscription. Because, Mr. King's essential previous commitment was that he would never introduce conscription.

> So, if you vote yes, you leave Mr. King free in power; if you vote no—not to release him from his pledge—you endorse his stand against conscription.

> And if you happen to be a conscriptionist, and vote to release Mr. King from his pledge against conscription, you don't even get anything out of that. Because, Mr. King, makes no promise to introduce conscription even if the plebiscite gives him a free hand.

That is the situation which is being placed before the electors with the holding of this

plebiscite. We also have the statement by Mr. Godbout, premier of Quebec, by the Minister of Justice, Mr. St. Laurent, that there will be no conscription. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie), and others who have spoken in favour of the plebiscite, indicate that conscription will be put into effect. As yet we have not had a statement from the Minister of National Defence. I feel that the members of parliament and the people of this country should have a definite statement from the minister, and that at once.

I should like to say something with respect to the work of the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe). He has had many commendations, and I wish to add mine. He has done his utmost to harness the industries of this country, but there are many in this house and throughout the country who look upon that as a party accomplishment rather than the work of all the people. The taxpayers are not given very much credit. They are the ones who provide the money when parliament votes huge sums. During the fiscal year 1939-40, a total of $127,000,000 was expended to carry on the war; in the following year, 1940-41, the expenditures amounted to $778,000,000; in 1941-42 a total of $1,450,000,000 was voted, but we have not yet had a report as to how much of that will be expended by the end of the year. The Prime Minister announced in his speech during this session that in 1942-43 a total of $3,000,000,000 would have to be provided. All that is needed is to name a sum up in the billions and parliament votes it without question. The easiest thing to get in this parliament is a vote of one, two, three or five billion dollars provided it is required for carrying on the war. That is, as far as the members of parliament are concerned, and I think they are supported by the people of Canada. In addition to these large sums, there are the expenditures made by this government on behalf of the British government and also in connection with the lease-lend bill of the United States.

All this does not mean that there are not grave misgivings all over Canada as to whether all this money is being wisely expended. Many people are convinced that there is extravagance and waste, but it is popular to spend money, and this is not questioned to any great extent when it is done for the purposes of war. The public are told that they are protected in connection with these expenditures by a parliamentary committee on war expenditures. I have been a member of that committee, and I do not want the members of parliament or the people of this country to get the impression that any committee can safeguard them with regard to these enormous expenditures. We are not looking for scandal; we are not looking for waste, but the responsibility is upon this committee to give as great protection as possible with respect to these expenditures. The committee can touch only the fringe of these expenditures. While the responsibility is placed upon us to safeguard the public interest, it is impossible for us to do that, no matter how hard we try or how great our effort.

Mr. SPEAKER: There should be less conversation in the chamber. It is very disturbing to the hon. member who is addressing the house and I ask hon. members to refrain.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): Apparently the election returns are on the minds of all hon. members rather than what I am trying to say. Capital expenditures in the way of assistance to industry as reported by the Minister of Munitions and Supply on February 5 amounted to $268,499,894. Details were given, and the information was made public through parliament. Among these expenditures was one of $18,450,128, comprising different items for the John Inglis works, where the Bren gun and other automatic guns are being manufactured. Great credit is taken by the Minister of Pensions and National Health for the work done at the John Inglis plant. Canada adopted the Bren gun, and with an expenditure of $18,450,128 of public funds, as of February 25, we should expect substantial results. It is one of the main armament plants of the country. Since February 25, I presume that additional millions may have been provided, and from an industry that is subsidized to that extent we are entitled to get results. It should not be looked upon as a political accomplishment. It is an accomplishment of the taxpayers of this country. They are the ones who provide the money, and we are gratified if good results have been secured from expenditures of this kind.

The Minister of Munitions and Supply made a further report on November 4, that appropriations for capital assistance to industry aggregated, on that date, $550,000,000, or more than double the expenditure reported the previous February 25. I asked for particulars of that expenditure, but up to the present time we have not obtaned them. We have the responsibility at least of knowing where this money has been spent. We have not that information up to the present time.

In the constituency of Cumberland which I represent we have a number of war industries and they have done excellent work. There is a general complaint in the maritime

provinces that they have not had their share of the war expenditure, and I am sure that that complaint is warranted by an examination of the figures. In the town of Amherst we have a large industry, operated by Canadian Car and Foundry company, engaged in the production of aeroplanes. They were late in getting to work, but the results there compare favourably with those of any other like industry in Canada. I want to give credit to the Minister of Munitions and Supply and to Mr. Ralph Bell, director of aeroplane construction, for the splendid work accomplished in aircraft construction. A great deal of the credit in Amherst is due to the men and women employees. It is the expectation that this industry will be further expanded and that it will do still better work in the building of aeroplanes.

There is an air field at Amherst. The land was purchased by the town, and it shared with the government in the cost of the landing field, so that the aeroplanes might be tested. I think it is due the town and the workmen engaged in aircraft production in Amherst that this field be made a standard air field. It is not fair that the taxpayers or the industry should bear the cost, inasmuch as air fields are provided all over Canada out of government funds. I know of no other community that has been called upon to assume such responsibility.

There are other war industries in the town of Amherst which have done splendid work. I take pride in the production from the coal mines in the county of Cumberland. They have increased their production since the beginning of the war, and their output compares favourably with that of coal mines in any other community in Canada. Their production has increased notwithstanding that about ten per cent of the population have put on the uniform. I am also proud of the coal-miners of the county of Cumberland in that there have been no major labour disturbances and no slow-down strikes there. They have done their duty in providing this necessary war material required to operate our industries and our railways. I believe the labour unions in Cumberland county would separate from their parent organization rather than be a party to a slow-down strike.

There are other matters not so directly connected with the war but of great interest to Nova Scotia and the maritime provinces. There is the matter of old age pensions. It is hard for the aged people who are the recipients of the pension to understand why in Nova Scotia the average amount of the old age pension is only $14.90 a month, in New Brunswick, $14.71, and in Prince Edward Island, $11.26, while in Ontario it is $18.55, and in British Columbia, $19.12. British Columbia is not satisfied with this, the largest old age pension paid in Canada, for the provincial government out of its own revenues increases that monthly payment by $5 a month. I believe it is due to the old age pensioner in the maritime provinces, where the cost of living has increased, that there should be a substantial increase.

There are some misgivings in the maritime provinces with respect to the government's shipbuilding programme. There has been some activity in those provinces, but on a very small scale in comparison with other parts of Canada. It is hard for our people to understand why there should be a shipbuilding programme of $500,000,000 in British Columbia, while there is an expenditure of only a few million dollars in the maritime provinces.

The maritime board of trade has made representations with respect to matters affecting the maritime provinces. At their recent meeting in Moncton, a resolution was passed asking that the Prince Edward Island car ferry the S.S. *Charlottetown* that was lost, be replaced as quickly as possible. The people of Springhill, supported by the people of the maritime provinces, feel that the car ferry should be coal-burning rather than oil-burning. There was regret that the present boat was transformed from a coal-burner to an oil-burner.

They passed a resolution asking for a wider distribution of war orders. They asked that transportation facilities across the strait of Canso be improved in the interest of the coal and steel industry of Nova Scotia. I believe that railway carried the heaviest traffic of any railway of its class in this country.

There were other resolutions passed by the maritime boards of trade requiring the attention of the government and the departments at Ottawa. Many people in the maritime provinces want to know why sugar and a hundred and one other articles should be controlled, while there is no control on the importation and distribution of intoxicating liquors. These are representations made by church bodies and others, and they are entitled to consideration by the government.

There is also a feeling in the maritime provinces that they have not had full consideration in the setting up of war industries. There has been more bonusing of industry in this country than was ever dreamed of, amounting to $550,000,000 by November last. Industries that are necessary and vital to Canada's war effort were built up by the national policy in days long gone by. Many of our war industries should be encouraged

that would have a peace-time value and importance; those industries should be located in the outlying parts of Canada, in order that there might be better distribution of industry. I do not believe that the government have taken full advantage of the opportunity to have war industry and peace time industry equitably distributed.

We all believe that we are going to win this war; but until each one is summoned to his or her station, the tendency is to let the other fellow do it. Morale is suffering, and there is lack of confidence. Many think this is a political war. I was sorry the other day to hear the hon. member for Huron-Perth (Mr. Golding), the hon. member for Northumberland, Ontario (Mr. Fraser), the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross), and even the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Mackenzie) make an attack on citizens of this country who believe that the greatest possible effort is not being put forward for the winning of the war. It is hard to understand why there should now be a plebiscite in order to make the government do their duty at this time. I am opposed to the plebiscite. I believe it is the duty of the government to act in this time of war.

I hope some day to see on parliament hill two more statues. I should like to see one to Winston Churchill, the man who has given leadership before the war and during the war, in whom the people of the democratic world have such confidence. I should also like to see a statue to one of our greatest, if not the greatest Canadian, Sir Charles Tupper. It is long overdue.

We are told there should be unity in this country, but there are many indications that such is not the case. I was very much disturbed recently by reading a statement of the Minister of Justice who is running in Quebec East:

> I know that the word "conscription" brings you back to 1917. Do not put us in a position where a Meighen movement will come in and will impose it (conscription) on us with bayonets and machine guns.

I do not know how we are going to have unity in this country when one minister will make a statement of that kind in one part of the country, while the government is calling for unity and the greatest possible effort in other parts of Canada. I know that the people of this country are back of this or any government in the greatest possible effort to bring this war to a successful termination, and statements such as that by one who is seeking a seat in this parliament do not make for unity.

There never was a government that had such support from the opposition as the present government has had. We support them in all measures that are necessary for carrying on the war. We do not want responsibility; we do not want office—I speak for myself and I think for my associates—but we do want to do our duty and help the government and those who have this responsibility. We want action, united action, and we want this country to put forth every effort in winning the war. We all have a duty, and, speaking for myself and for my associates, we are ready to discharge that responsibility. The times in which we live are very serious, too serious to play politics or take any action that would tend to weaken our war effort. It is my belief that Nova Scotia is prepared to discharge its full duty in carrying on the war, but what the people of my province want is leadership. They want the government to govern the country, and they do not believe a plebiscite is necessary at this time.

Mrs. CORA T. CASSELMAN (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, may I extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion for the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I commend them for the excellence and the comprehensive nature of their speeches.

I should like to bring before the house some matters that have already been discussed here and which I have no doubt will be referred to again. I have noticed some repetition in speeches that have already been made, so I am not alone in repeating things that have been said before. Let me add, however, that I am under no obligation to the four hundred or the two hundred, and that I have not submitted my remarks to be blue-pencilled by any member of the government or of the opposition. What I say is my own.

To me there are two main objectives before the country at the present time: first, the winning of the war, and second, the extension of the cause of democracy. I consider, as almost everyone else does, that the winning of the war is the chief of all our aims at this time, and I believe that the carrying of the plebiscite by a sweeping majority will contribute materially to our war effort. At the moment, however, I wish to address myself to the second object I have mentioned, namely, the advancement of the cause of democracy; because, in my opinion, although this may be an inopportune time to bring in measures for the advancement of democracy, nevertheless there may be no better time even after the war. Indeed, these may be the best years that we shall have in which to introduce such measures as I intend to discuss for a moment or two.

Let me refer to a question mentioned frequently before in this house, that of old age pensions. I submit that the amount paid is too small; a sum of twenty dollars a month is inadequate to meet the everyday, inescapable, ordinary expenses of the pensioner. Of course, he is allowed to earn or receive up to one dollar a day, but how can he earn it? It is physically impossible. A senator may earn it; a practising doctor or lawyer may earn it; perhaps you and I may earn it at the age of seventy. But as far as those who apply for the old age pension are concerned, they cannot. They are too old. The age limit is too high. The pensioner was already too old to earn five years before the time he actually applied for pension; that is to say, at the age of 65. Many pensioners were out of work before reaching that age and had a long stretch of hard years ahead of them before becoming eligible. I could tell you stories of pensioners, decent, worthy, upright citizens, who have had to struggle along; but I do not want to appeal to your emotions, but rather appeal to reason. Hon. members can see for themselves in their own constituencies people in receipt of small old age pensions who need some additional help.

Democracy should do two things: It should extend a helping hand to those who are not able to help themselves, and it should also put forth the hand of compulsion to prevent from becoming pensioners those who later on, thirty or forty years hence, might find themselves in such circumstances. This could be done by asking such persons now, during the years of their earning capacity, to contribute to a scheme for their use later on.

I have studied the speech made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) on November 14 on this topic—an excellent speech. He appeals to the logic of the situation. In fact, when he was in Edmonton last year and addressed an audience on the question of taxation, there were many favourable comments afterwards and some people said that his address on taxation made one almost enjoy the paying of taxes. The minister gave reasons for not increasing pensions. At page 4427 of *Hansard* he is reported to have said:

> It will be noted that in several provinces there is considerable leeway for increasing the average amount of pension paid if the province so desires.

That is a good argument. He goes on to speak of the cost-of-living index at the time the act was passed in 1927, which was higher then than it is now. That also is a good argument, though not infallible. The amount paid even then was too low. The things on which the pensioner has to spend money—food and clothing, rent and so on—are all somewhat higher than the average cost-of-living index at the present time, and therefore pensioners are in greater need of assistance now.

In my opinion the administration of this act might be a little more liberal. Sometimes I think the pensioner is not given the benefit of the doubt. Sometimes the conditions imposed, the certificates and forms, partake rather too much of the letter of the law rather than the spirit; so that although checks are necessary, I should like to see more leeway given when the pensioner's view clashes with that of the administrators.

The minister sets out the difference in cost of living between different provinces and indicates the many difficulties there are in the way of raising the old age pension—dual control, dual contribution, on the part of the province 25 per cent, and of the dominion 75 per cent, and the fact that the province administers the act. These difficulties are very real. He also sets forth the reason that there may be need for constitutional amendments in order to make any change in the pension law as it stands at the present time.

I am not alone in advocating changes in the pension law. We have had many speeches touching upon this question. Changes are being asked for not only by pensioners but by others as well; there are thousands who would be glad to see some scheme advanced. I suggest that there should be a short-term policy and a long-term policy in this regard. In the short-term policy I would at least grant a cost-of-living bonus to pensioners. In this connection I would quote a sentence from the minister's speech as reported at page 4429 of *Hansard*:

> If any of the provinces desire to do so—
>
> That is, to increase the pension.
>
> —the government is prepared to amend the regulations and, if necessary, the act, to ensure that such supplementary payments by a province do not entail a reduction in the pension payable under the act.

I am glad to see that British Columbia has taken note of this and increased its pension; and at the present time Alberta is considering the question.

Then there is the long-term policy. In that regard I should like to see some consideration given to the point the minister discusses, the question of a pension on a contributory basis. He says—and I think this is right—that the matter will never be settled satisfactorily until such a scheme is worked out. I would urge the setting up of a committee to look into the matter to find out if it can be linked up with the Unemployment Insurance Act, if that is possible, in order to provide

for contributions to be made during the earning years so that there will be a sum of money which, by right, will be the pensioner's when he reaches the age at which a pension is necessary. There would be need for an amendment to the constitution. The minister said it would be necessary. All right. If so, the constitution was made for man, not man for the constitution, and I think by cooperation, based on good will, between the provinces, such amendment might be adopted.

To me, Mr. Speaker, social security does not depend solely upon the granting of pensions to supplement deficiencies in the earning power of the individual. It depends also upon the right of the individual to earn his own living and upon the conservation and development of the natural resources of the country. That is one direction in which the government could help. In that category I place the question of the bituminous tar sands of Alberta. We need oil at the present time. It may be that oil will help decide the war. In the Athabaska tar sands we have a tremendous reservoir of oil. The *Canadian Mining and Metallurgy Bulletin* of February, 1941, sets forth some of the estimates of the amount of oil in those deposits. The dominion expert, who has occupied that position since 1913, says 100 billion barrels of oil could be extracted from the tar sands of Fort McMurray. The United States expert places the figure at 250 billion barrels, while the potential production of the entire world, apart from this deposit, is given as only 35 billion barrels. Therefore at the lower estimate we have something like three times the potential production of the rest of the world. I realize that provincial control also enters into this question, but it seems to me that the federal government might do something toward the development of that resource. The oil is there and a process has been developed for the extraction. Perhaps I may be permitted to read a paragraph from a bulletin published by the bureau of mines of the Department of Mines and Resources in March, 1941:

> Between 1927 and 1930, a total of two thousand tons was shipped for laboratory investigations, and a further three thousand tons was used in the construction of demonstration pavements and road surfaces. During 1931 to 1938, International Bitumen Company processed small amounts of bituminous sand at its plant at Bitumont, Alberta, producing asphalt for paving and roofing and 37,500 gallons of fuel oil. . . .
>
> During 1940, Abasand Oils, Limited, continued the building of its separation plant and refinery on Horse river near McMurray and the development of a system of quarrying the bituminous sand. The separation plant is designed to treat 400 tons of sand, and the refinery to treat 600 barrels of charging stock per twenty-four hours.

Unfortunately that plant was destroyed, in part, by fire in November, 1941, but the reports state that gasoline, diesel fuel and other refined products have been commercially produced. There, then, is the oil; there is the possible need for military purposes; there is the process that has been developed, and I think we could make something of that at this time of crisis.

Again, there is the question of roads. Hon. members from British Columbia have stated that their great province might be isolated if bombs should be dropped at strategic points, such as bridges or tunnels. There are two railroads into British Columbia, and the Big Bend highway, which is not and cannot be kept open the year round. There is another route which might be developed, that through Yellowhead pass—the Tete Jaune—down along the North Thompson river from Jasper to Vancouver. Some parts of that road have already been constructed. The gravel highway between Blue River and Kamloops, for instance, would have to be made into an all-weather road. There are stretches from Jasper to Blue River that could be joined up by a new road; I believe they amount to about one hundred miles, in three different sections. This is one way in which we could improve our connections between the prairie provinces and British Columbia. Hon. members from that province have pointed out that in British Columbia there are numbers of unwanted Japanese who might provide labour for a project such as this. I should like to stress, however, that our own Canadians who are unemployed, who have not been absorbed into industry in the west, who are perhaps too old or physically unfit for the army but who might do work of this kind, should be given treatment at least equal to if not better than that given any alien in connection with any such scheme. There is need for another route into British Columbia; there is the labour and there is the equipment, for I believe that much of the machinery used in the construction of the air bases on the way to Alaska might be made available for this project. I commend this suggestion to the house. It may be that officials of the government are considering it already, because I have noticed that some of the things we discuss here already are under consideration by the government.

In connection with the question of roads I should like also to mention the suggestion that it might be of military significance to build a road from the United States boundary to Alaska. There are several possible routes. If such a road were built, it might be necessary to use it quickly. I am not unmindful, of course, that this road would pass through

the city of Edmonton. That would be a great advantage to those who travel the road, who also would be brought within reach of Jasper park, one of the most beautiful playgrounds on this continent. Therefore the construction of such a road might have significance, not only now, in connection with military purposes, but in peace time for tourist traffic through the west.

Another matter I should like to mention is the health of the country, than which there is nothing more important both in peace and in war. I think the setting up of a committee on nutrition, in the Department of Pensions and National Health, was a good move, because it will help build up the health of the people. I believe even amid the clamour of war we might consider some health insurance scheme. I believe also we might build up national supplies of food, which would be available to a hungry Europe or Asia when the sea lanes are open once more. Even now, before it becomes necessary, we might also consider creating some reservoir of drugs and medicines, because, if the experience after this war is like that after the last one, there may be need of more drugs and medicines for civilian and military use than may be available. The conditions that prevail at present in Europe are the very conditions that make epidemics likely to occur.

Again, to my mind the man in the ranks in our services should be better paid. I recall that in the statement given by the Minister of Finance on November 14 last, figures were presented to show that the Canadian private is as well paid as any other soldier in the world; yet he receives less in many cases than the industrial worker whose contribution is so all-important now. Would it not be possible to give the privates in our armed forces savings certificates which would be theirs at the end of the war; theirs, because they had earned them by military service; theirs, for their own reestablishment when the war is over? That would ease the situation for many a man and woman if, like the industrial worker, the soldier earned savings certificates, to be repaid when similar loans are repaid in Canada.

I think it would also help toward stability, toward transition from war-time to peace-time economy. Those are just some of the measures about which I have been thinking which would tend to do that which was set out in the Atlantic charter by Roosevelt and Churchill. Give to every man "the right to live out his life, in freedom from want and fear."

These aims are important, but they can be dreams only, if the war is not won. We must be victorious, and to my mind the carrying of the plebiscite is a step forward in that direction. It would free the government from promises made or implied at a time when we felt that if Canada produced the tools for war, then she was making a very great contribution—as indeed she was. She has made a magnificent contribution in that regard.

If we look again at the speech of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, we shall find what contribution Canada has made along the lines of munitions and supply. It gives me a great deal of pleasure in that connection to quote from the *Magazine Digest* of December, 1941, excerpts from a short article commenting on "King of Canada," and setting forth what the Prime Minister has done in the building of Canada, both in peace and in war. I find this:

> Historians, I believe, will have a very special page for King. They will recall how in 1922, by refusing to be stampeded by Lloyd George he caused the British government to think twice, and thus saved the world from a futile war against Turkey.

"Refusing to be stampeded." Then, there is this:

> Long before Kipling's "If" was written, King began associating with all kinds of men and still remained true to himself.

"True to himself," interpreted in the light of doing what he thought was best under the circumstances. And lest there might be some narrow interpretation of that expression "to himself," let me say that it follows those lines of Shakespeare:

> This above all; to thine own self be true,
> And it must follow, as the night the day
> Thou canst not then be false to any man.

There is also this sentence:

> Certain Canadian newspapers accuse him of lacking colour, of failing to inspire his country to an all-out war effort. Yet this colourless country gentleman—

My apologies to him.

> —working always through and with his cabinet, has inspired Canada to the greatest war effort, proportionate to population and wealth, of any English-speaking nation, excepting only Britain.

To come back to the plebiscite, I would say that its purpose is that of freeing from promises implied or definitely stated under a democratic system. It will do that by an appeal to the voice of the people. It was hoped that this might be done in calmness. It was hoped that it would be done while the nation was not yet as closely entangled in war as it might be later—if war comes to our own doorstep. It was hoped that it would be done before emotion ran riot, before alarms which are now in the near distance, were right on our own doorstep.

Canada could dramatically—I repeat the word "dramatically"—put itself on record as being behind whatever sacrifice or duty may be imposed upon us by this war. With his own hand and making his own cross, the individual may stand behind the country's war effort. To me it is not a desertion of our lads overseas; to me it is stating that we are right there behind them, and that no matter what comes and no matter what duty or sacrifice is required, we individually, by the crosses we make with our own hands, place ourselves back of them. To many a person it will be an individual pledge to some soldier, sailor or airman. Let me point out that there are just as many on this side of the house as on the other side who have sons, brothers or other relatives overseas. There are just as many proportionately on this side as on that who served in the last great war. There are just as many who are intimately and personally concerned with the outcome as it will affect the whole country—our Canada.

The critics may say that the taking of the plebiscite will delay the war effort. Yet the raising of troops, the training of men, the building of ships and the making of munitions are going forward right now, just as has been the case in the past. Those troops trained for home service may serve overseas, if it becomes necessary through the passage of events in the next few months. They may be volunteer forces or they may not. Many of our volunteers who are over there now were not coerced, as has been suggested. They have gone of their own free will to fight for the cause, because they know what they are fighting for. They have gone to keep from our shores the war they do not want to fight on these shores.

And let me remind those who may be anti-conscriptionists, if that question arises, that the Germans have fought on foreign soil in many wars over a hundred years. They have fought and lost or won their wars on foreign soil. To those who may be anti-conscriptionist, I ask this question: If other nations took that view, namely the view that their men were valuable only on their own shores, where would Great Britain's navy be right now? It would be in its own home waters, and not over here helping to protect our shores. We must keep these things in mind, if we wish to keep the balance true, and particularly if the anti-conscriptionist issue arises.

But the carrying of the plebiscite does not mean necessarily that the question of conscription will follow, and I do not think it should. The purpose of the plebiscite is that of freeing the government's hands to do whatever is necessary for the winning of the war. But the question of conscription should and must be settled by those to whom conditions are known and who have access to all possible information. In my opinion we should proceed only on that basis, so far as conscription is concerned.

We may fail in our war effort. The League of Nations failed to keep peace, and in my view, the greatest reason for that failure was lack of cooperation among the nations. Hitler's armies have swept through Europe. In my opinion the chief reason was the lack of cooperation among nations. Why should Canada's war effort lag? To my mind it would lag only through a lack of cooperation among the people of Canada—yes, a lack of cooperation.

Czechoslovakia fell not only because of Munich. It broke because three and a half million people living in Sudetenland ceased to cooperate, and because the nationalist cry was raised in their midst. Czechoslovakia broke because Slovakia, another province, ceased to cooperate. Is there a parallel in Canada? I hate to suggest it, and I apologize to loyal Canadians of whatever extraction they may be because the comparison is not an exact one. Yet one of the reasons for Czechoslovakia's downfall was a lack of cooperation within its own borders and the raising of a nationalist cry which laid it open to the treachery of the enemy without.

Let us be a united nation; let us go forward together to the winning of the war. Our greatest contribution may not be made by the men and women in the armed forces, in the fields, in the mines, in the forests, in our industries or on the farms; it may not be won chiefly by our foodstuffs, our munitions, our ships, our war effort; it will be won by the morale of our people, and to that morale every man, woman and child in Canada contributes. That contribution may be a plus quantity or a minus quantity, but every individual contributes to the sum total in Canada of the will for victory.

Perhaps ninety per cent of us will do nothing spectacular to win the war; we shall go about doing our same old jobs, perhaps more thoroughly and cheerfully; perhaps we shall take on some volunteer work that we ourselves find; perhaps we shall take part in the salvage campaign or help with the Red Cross; we practise some economy, we do not buy some extra we had planned to buy; we pay our taxes, subscribe to war loans and buy war savings stamps and certificates. All this may not be spectacular, but it is a real part in

our war effort. It is forever true that the backbone of a country is the people who "obey the law, do the dull tasks to make the nation strong."

Let us remember that Mr. Churchill has told us to keep our eye on the ball. Our goal is to win the war and thus advance the cause of democracy. We must reach out toward that goal which Churchill has called "the march of the common man toward his true and just inheritance."

Mr. R. W. MAYHEW (Victoria, B.C.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) have received many compliments and congratulations upon the speeches which they delivered to this house in response to the speech from the throne. To those compliments and congratulations I think they are justly entitled. When we heard who was going to lead this debate we expected that they would set a high standard for the rest of us to follow. I should like also to congratulate the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) upon speeches which I believe set an all-time high for quality. But they are not the only ones. The leaders of the other two groups should be congratulated. It was rather interesting to listen to those speeches, to read them again, and to note that, after all, there was not much difference in the thing that is essential to us at the present time, that is, the winning of the war.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) suggests that there should be conscription of wealth. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) claims that there is conscription of wealth and that we shall probably realize this more after he announces his budget within a few weeks. Hon. members on the other side think it is not only conscription, but to some extent confiscation of wealth. Whatever it may be, the ordinary taxpayer is not accustomed to thinking of it as we do in this house. He knows that he is having difficulty in paying what taxes are levied against him. But he is doing it without complaint, which is a good indication that the people of Canada are in earnest and are willing to support this war to the utmost. Before I go any further I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mrs. Casselman), who has just resumed her seat, upon what I consider to be a most excellent speech. I understand that this is her first speech in the House of Commons, and I recall that in my first speech I advocated a somewhat similar policy, that we should have an all-out inclusive, contributory superannuation fund in Canada so that our old people might be relieved of fear and have something set by for themselves in their old age.

[Mrs. Casselman.]

I should like to refer briefly to the election of 1940. At that time I asked the people of Victoria to give me their support that I might represent them in this parliament supporting the present government. In doing that, I said repeatedly, and my statement was sincere, that the present Prime Minister and the other members of his government were as capable, sincere and trustworthy as any group of men in Canada who were then available to lead the government in a vigorous war effort. If an election were to be held to-day, I could say the same thing with equal sincerity. In fact I believe I could more easily prove my statement, because since that time we have had some additions to the cabinet which I think has strengthened it greatly.

In this regard I have in mind the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services (Mr. Macdonald) who left the province of Nova Scotia to lend a hand to Canada at this time. We heard nothing but compliments of the naval service and the fine contribution that has been made by it. I cannot help but think of how experience has brought out the worth of some of the other members, such as the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), previously Minister of Finance. I think of the present Minister of Finance and of what he has done. The people of Canada are pleased with his success, and I am sure that his speech in the house on February 4 has greatly encouraged the people of Canada and has added to his own growing prestige.

I am saying this for two purposes. One purpose is to emphasize my personal belief in these men; the other is to increase, if I possibly can, their prestige and the confidence which the people of this country have in their leaders. Confidence in our leaders is one of the things that we absolutely need, and anyone who tries to dissipate that is doing an injustice to Canada. Not only have these men created confidence in themselves, they have produced results. I am sure that as Canadians we are all proud of what Canada has contributed to this war—contributed in the way of naval development, contributed to the army and contributed to the air force. I should not have forgotten the hon. Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power), because the completion of the air-training scheme for which he is responsible will go down in Canada's history and remain for all time a bright jewel in Canada's crown of dignity. To anyone who is lacking in appreciation of Canada's war effort I would recommend a journey from one end of the country

to the other and a visit to our naval docks and naval yards, our shipbuilding plants and our munition industries, and I am sure they would come home delighted with what they saw and encouraged and proud to be Canadians.

This is not the time to eulogize too much our own government or pat them on the back. It is rather a time when we should take perhaps the opposite point of view and do a little criticizing. It is not good enough for us to review what we have done and say: "We have done well and therefore let us be content." Rather is it a time for us to say: "No, have we done our best, have we put everything we have into this struggle, everything in the way of man-power, machinery and resources? Have we extracted the last ounce and given the last penny to help win this war?" Nothing but our utmost should satisfy us at this time, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I thank God for the critics, provided that their criticism is honest and based on facts, or even on their own opinions, even if that opinion may not be so good. I do not care for criticism that is based on prejudice or on politics. I hope that although some of what I have to say will be critical of what has happened, it will be taken in the spirit in which it is given, and I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I have not been trying to build up a straw-man for the purpose of knocking him down again.

I should like to say a word or two in connection with the Japanese situation in British Columbia. Here, again, my first words will be words of commendation of the government. Within a few hours of the Japanese treachery at Pearl Harbour, which has so disjointed our outlook at the present time, this government gave instructions to that portion of the Canadian navy on the Pacific coast to round up and bring into the Fraser river all Japanese boats and their personnel. That operation was conducted in true Canadian navy style. I believe that no offence was given to any of those brought in, but they were brought in. They went past my own door in long lines as they were convoyed from different parts of the island and along the coastline, and it was not an easy task. The Canadian navy had to go into every inlet, every village, every settlement, along a shoreline of over 2,000 miles. It is over one thousand miles around the island on which I live. Yet that task was accomplished, and accomplished without any indignities to the Japanese who were brought in.

But here my compliments, so far as the Japanese situation is concerned, must, I am sorry to say, end. We still leave them free to move around in British Columbia just about where they will. I think our own defence should be the first consideration. The men who were gathered in were afterwards allowed to go back to the islands, and along the shoreline, and do whatever they wished to do, and so far as I know, many of them are still in those places. I wonder whether the government or anyone else can give us any assurance that these Japanese have not already cached munitions and arms of various kinds in different places along that long coastline. If that has not been done, it is just our good fortune, because there was nothing done to hinder them. There were some thousands of fishing boats which were capable of going three or four or five hundred miles out to sea, there was nothing to prevent a Japanese merchant boat from delivering to them arms to be cached along our coastline; and to-day, for all we know, at this very minute, they may be directing their friends to these caches for arms to be used against us.

I listened to what the Prime Minister had to say in the house this afternoon. I am sorry I could not grasp all of it, although I tried hard to follow him. One thing I understood him to say was that the Japanese nationals would be taken care of. I suppose he means that those Japanese who have been naturalized within the last three or four or five years, or ten years if you will, are no longer considered Japanese because they have signed a paper. Well, we have the Pearl Harbour incident to show that the signing of a naturalization paper does not mean a great deal to them. I also understood from the Prime Minister that the government was going to intern only those Japanese who are between the ages of eighteen and forty-five. While I am over forty-five myself, I think I could create quite a lot of trouble yet, and when I was under eighteen I think I could get into quite a lot of devilment too. Therefore I would not care to trust them, and I do not think we have any right to do so. I know that in my city there are a good many people who have lived anywhere from fifteen to fifty years in Japan. They have educated their children in England or in Canada, and although they have lived in Japan all those years, they still count themselves Canadians or British. Can we expect more of a Japanese than we do of our own people? Blood is thicker than water. These people must be taken care of; we ask that it be done with the least inconvenience and that they be provided with proper shelter and proper care. We do not wish one of them molested, or treated in any way that we would not want our own people to be treated, but we want them taken

care of. I would not want to be the one responsible for sorting out the loyal Japanese from the disloyal. Perhaps some of our professors have a special kind of X-ray with which they could distinguish the good from the bad, but it is not in the possession of the common man.

Now a word or two on the plebiscite. I think it was a bad promise. But the promise was given by all parties in this house. The Prime Minister, when he gave that promise, gave it in the hearing of us all, and by our silence we gave our consent and shared in the promise, I think, however, most of us, particularly we old men, should have known better than to give such a promise. No one can tell what is going to happen in war time, and certainly that is true as far as this war is concerned. Nevertheless that promise was made. Much as I dislike the thought of a plebiscite, partly because of the expense and partly because of the delay—the hon. member for Edmonton East said our work is continuing, but if it has not caused any loss of time outside this house it has at least delayed us here, because most of this debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne has been centred round that one point—yet I think it is the least of several evils, and perhaps we can turn what is at present a liability into an asset to this country if as good Canadians we get out and try to put this over eighty or ninety per cent at least. But our good friends from Quebec might surprise some of the people who are doing a great deal of talking about conscription.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of a total war effort, and I believe it is the common desire of all the people of Canada that this total war effort shall be continued until we have won the last battle and also win the peace. I think the resolution of the Canadian Legion calling for total war is not calling for conscription in the narrow sense; it is calling for a reallocation of the man-power of Canada, a reallocation of the activities of industry in Canada. It is calling for the efforts of our women as well as our men and for the maximum effort of finance as well as man-power. The Canadian Legion recognize, as you and I do, that an idle dollar is very little use, any more than an idle man. Therefore they ask for an all-out effort of man-power, woman-power, power of our industries, power of our farms, our mines and our timber, a total war effort. It seems to me rather strange that we have an oil controller, a food controller, a canned fruit controller, and I understand that the other day a controller of men's working gloves was appointed, but we have not anyone yet definitely set apart to reallocate and control man-power and the industrial power of Canada. I would recommend that some such step be taken.

When I think of total war I think back to the farm a few miles up the line here where I was born; I think of the effort it took to convert that land from stubborn bush into a fertile farm. Then I multiply that effort by the hundreds of thousands of farms throughout Canada, particularly eastern Canada. I think also of the institutions that have grown up in Canada, of our churches, schools, universities, the great railroads that span this continent from sea to sea; that represents the work of our fathers and grandfathers and is the corner-stone of Canada. It is upon that corner-stone that we had expected to raise in peace and industry a nation that would be the pride of the world. But we have been thwarted in that endeavour. Perhaps we men from the west are a little impatient. We have not got our roots down in the soil of Canada to the same extent as men in eastern Canada; we have not been accustomed to living year after year and generation after generation in one house.

We have not had to carry in ox-carts and wagons the stones to build our churches, schools and homes. Almost in a few years we found the place grown up, and I am wondering whether we are probably not a little too anxious to rush the older and more settled places in some of the things we would have them do. But if the people in eastern Canada have their roots more solidly embedded in the country; if there is a sentimental tie that is binding them to Canada, greater than in the case of the people in the west, is it not equally clear that they would rather fight the enemy on somebody else's soil than see that enemy desecrate all that their grandfathers and fathers had worked for in Canada? I think they would rather be in the position of burning their enemy's homes than having the enemy burn theirs, and I am satisfied that, when the time comes, the province of Quebec, as it has done on every occasion, will come forward and do the right thing in the interests of Canada. They will do it again. I plead for consideration. Let us not be too hasty in what we are thinking about.

May I make a statement or two about our war defences on the Pacific coast. I should not like to leave for a moment the impression in this house or in the country that I am in any way opposed to the policy which the government has adopted since the beginning of the war, of reorganizing the defence of Great Britain, our first and most urgent defence need. Nor has that position changed greatly,

although at the present time we are a victim of the pincer movement on a world scale that has never been known or thought of before.

Hitler, the leader of the three, set the style by conquering countries one by one and fooling the others as he went along. He started in Norway and went straight through to the Black sea, as Churchill said in 1938 that he would. We have a similar position to-day on the Pacific coast. We have the Japanese, the counterpart of Hitler; starting in Malaya, working their way to Singapore, into the Philippines, into the Indies and to Australia and New Zealand; and how do we know that Canada is not the next? Of what use are we to ourselves or to anybody else if we allow the Japanese to go on indefinitely conquering and getting control of the Pacific? We have a little time to spare. I urge the minister and the government to make use of that time to the utmost of their ability and to see that the west coast of British Columbia is supplied with everything with which it is possible to supply it—with guns and tanks, and not with a company of men, but with divisions of men.

The minister said he would have them ready to move. I should like to see them move at least west of the Great Divide where we know we can get them when we want them. I am not implying that we have no defences on the coast. I know well enough that we have, and I know that the defences on the coast have been greatly increased in the last two months. But when the city of London is not immune from bombs and destruction, with all the defences it has, or when we may go to Berlin and bomb that city at will, surely we cannot say that we have sufficient safeguards to take care of our vital spots.

I do not think for a moment that the Japanese are particularly interested in the bombing or destruction of our cities in British Columbia; that would not be worth their while. It is too risky, and it would cost them too much in effort to drop bombs simply for the purpose of destroying a house. The Japanese know that dropping bombs in civilian places will not hurt the morale of the Canadian people, for that has been too well tested in Great Britain, and there would be no greater effect on us in British Columbia. But there are some vital spots. For instance, he would not mind dropping a bomb and destroying the only remaining dry dock of Great Britain on the Pacific coast, the one at Esquimalt. He would be glad to destroy the only means of communication we have between Australia and New Zealand. He would be only too pleased, as the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Esling) said the other day, to bomb the largest munitions factory in Canada. He would not hesitate to dislocate the rest of Canada from British Columbia if the opportunity came his way—and he will try to make that opportunity. I therefore ask that we be given not only consideration, but men and materials.

I was pleased to notice in the paper the other day that the minister intends making greater use of the reserve forces. I think this move is well taken, but it is a little late. The reserve forces to-day are composed of men who are not in the military category, or if they are in the military category, they are looking after industry or business of some kind and it is more essential to Canada that their services should be given in that direction. But they are willing to spend their nights and holidays in training and equipping themselves for the protection of the people on the coast. I think they should be given a warm welcome and every encouragement and given equipment. They should be given instructions how to train and should be told what is expected of them.

When the Hun was at the very gates of Leningrad, Stalin called on the people of that city to come out en masse and defend the place. We people on the Pacific coast are willing to come out en masse to defend our places, but what good would we be? We would only be in the way of the regular soldiers. I ask the minister, therefore, to give this matter his earnest and, I am sure, immediate consideration.

I have spoken longer than I intended but I wish to finish by a recapitulation or short summary of the points I have tried to bring out in my address. The first thing that is required in Canada is the preservation of unity. This cannot be left to the government alone. They can help, but unity can be maintained in this country only by individual effort, by our trying to understand and to appreciate the other fellow's position, no matter which coast he is on, no matter what his religion or his race may be. One of the things that would help bring about unity in Canada, particularly during the war, would be a complete moratorium on party politics.

I ask for a reallocation of man-power in this country, putting to work those who are idle, training the inefficient so that they may be of value. Just here I should like to mention one point. We have in Canada a group of unwanted men. They are not the Japanese; they are the men fifty years of age and up. There are thousands of them, if not in the east, certainly in the west, who are conscientiously searching for some way to help in this war effort. But they are not being encouraged. To-day there is a definite competition for men between the ages of eighteen and forty-five, competition not

limited to the three services but also between industry and the services. These are the men most useful to us, but in my opinion that competition should cease right away, and we should try to make use of all the man and woman power of Canada.

Then I would ask that the factories be treated on the same basis as the men; that they be asked to do what is needed. They do not need to be told. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman opposite who said a short time ago that industry must be driven to do what we want it to do. There is not an industry that I know of that is not only too anxious to turn over its plant and do what the government wishes it to do.

Then I suggest that the government stop talking about our natural resources, and make use of them. For years I have been telling this government that in British Columbia we have mountains of iron ore that is not being used even yet; and it is still there. Quite recently one industry was set up in the east because it was said there was no power to run it in British Columbia. This plant, I believe, is designed to produce a hundred tons of magnesium a day. Just imagine; no power in British Columbia! Why, if there is anything of which we have plenty, it is power, but no one seems ready to get to work and develop it.

Then I would stop asking our people to do things. We asked them to save gasoline, and it was a flop. We are asking them to save sugar, and that is in a fair way to be another flop. If you want anything done you must tell the people what you want. Over the week-end I went to Winnipeg. Sitting opposite me in the dining car was a gentleman who I thought would know better; but when the sugar bowl was passed and the waiter asked how many lumps he wished he said, "Five." As a member of parliament I almost felt that he was trying to insult me by that action. I went into the observation car, where I overheard two ladies telling each other how they could get all the sugar they wanted because they divided their business between two grocers and could get their five pounds a week from each. As long as we have people like that, it is a great discouragement to those who are glad to help voluntarily.

In conclusion, I suggest that the government tell the people of their plans. Do not be afraid to give us the bad news as well as the good news, when it comes. We have courage; we have intelligence; we are loyal, and we will help you to a man. After the war is over, we may tell you what we think of you, but in this crisis we will all give all we have.

[Mr. Mayhew.]

Mr. WILFRID LaCROIX (Quebec-Montmorency) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, two months ago, the dominion parliament was bereaved by death of one of its greatest debaters, the Liberal party, of the man who embodied the "sound judgment" of the cabinet; the French-Canadian race, of the most noble and worthy leader it has probably ever had, and the country, of one of her greatest statesmen. Accordingly, the whole nation, without any consideration of race, creed or party, paid reverent homage to that statesman and patriot, bitterly mourning his demise.

Never in the history of Canada was such a unanimous tribute paid to a public man called by death while in the service of his country. All the provinces, even the most remote, were represented at the funeral of the great departed. The leaders of all parties paid tribute to his memory. All the newspapers in the country dealt at length with his qualities as a statesman and even as a private citizen. From many European countries came messages of condolence to the right hon. the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King). The pope himself sent his representative to his bedside to bestow his blessing upon him. Cardinal Villeneuve, leader of the Catholic church in Canada, conducted his funeral service and delivered an oration which he entitled "A christian has departed."

Why was there such unanimity before those mortal remains? Why? The reason is that Lapointe was "an honest man." Lapointe never betrayed his race. Lapointe never broke his word. Lapointe never altered his principles.

During forty years spent in political life, Lapointe ever held to the principle of voluntary enlistment, a principle which he learned from Laurier, founder of the real Canadian Liberal doctrine. Lapointe denounced for twenty-five years the conscription enforced in 1917. In 1939, Lapointe asked the province of Quebec, at the time of the provincial elections, for a token of confidence in his war policy. Again in 1940 Lapointe stood for the same principle at the time of the federal election, namely, voluntary enlistment. Were he alive to-day, Lapointe would still be in favour of voluntary enlistment. And I am satisfied that there would be no reference to a plebiscite in the speech from the throne, because Lapointe would have convinced the government of the danger to national unity which such a measure entailed. His sound judgment would have led him to foresee what is happening to-day throughout the country.

Never before in the history of this country have the importance, the great worth and the authority of a political leader been so promptly

appreciated after his death. Can it be that scarcely two months after he has gone there should be no one in Ottawa to retain any respect for the principles or the memory of Lapointe? It seems I can still hear his powerful voice stating:

I will resign from the cabinet and denounce those who would impose conscription for overseas upon my fellow-citizens.

They who advocate conscription for overseas are opposed to national unity.

The sons of Canada will never be compelled to serve outside the borders of Canada, so long as I am a member of the government.

We have there some of the statements made by Mr. Lapointe when he set forth the principle of the "voluntary system". That is what the Liberal leaders in Ottawa, and particularly all members in this house, specially those from Quebec, must not forget. Those are the principles on which Lapointe had sixty-four Quebec members elected to the federal house. Those principles were not advocated through hypocrisy and for electoral purposes only. On the contrary, what Lapointe sought above all was "national unity", the welfare of the country.

Lapointe was and has always been sincere, and we who followed him also were, still are and will remain so.

It is on the principle of the "voluntary system" that the present government in Ottawa secured its own election as well as that of Mr. Godbout in Quebec. The present leader of the Quebec government stated in 1939 that he would stand against his own party if it ever tried to impose conscription for overseas service.

Those are Mr. Lapointe's Liberal principles for which we fought and for which we are still resolved to fight.

Mr. Speaker, I have in the past made tremendous sacrifices for the preservation of principles which I had advocated. To-day I object most emphatically and most decidedly to the statement contained in the speech from the throne and in which we are asked to set aside the promise, the convictions and the sacred principles of Lapointe.

Mr. Speaker, the walls of this house still echo with this great patriot's protests against that infamous measure, conscription, which split the country in 1917.

I shall never forget Mr. Lapointe's protests against that measure and, for that reason, I shall vote against conscription. I shall even cast my vote against the plebiscite which imperialists have thrust upon the cabinet, because it constitutes the first step towards conscription.

I shall respect the memory of Lapointe. Lapointe died on duty. Lapointe died after struggling, particularly for two and a half years, against the financial organization which seeks to impose conscription for service overseas. The whole of Canada, for which Lapointe laid down his life, asks us to revere his memory. Those who die for their country deserve that on their graves people come and pray, and revere their memory.

In his speech of January 26, 1942, Prime Minister the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King informed the house that the question to be submitted to the people when the plebiscite is held, will be as follows:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

By this, the government means: "Will you release us from the pledge we took on March 26, 1940, at the time of the last general election, to refrain from forcibly sending on military service outside the country men who are now or who may later be conscripted for service within Canada?"

Farther on, in this same speech of January 26, 1942, the right hon. the Prime Minister said, and these are his own words:

In the presentation of the plebiscite to the electorate the desire of the administration to possess complete freedom of action will, of course, receive the vigorous and whole-hearted support of all members of the government and of the Canadian people.

I understand the government would have us answer yes; they expressed a strong desire to that effect and they will marshal all their propaganda services to get the people to release them of their promises about conscription for service overseas, promises made to the people just two years ago during a general election and when the war was already started.

Since the government ask the people to release them of their obligations, it is obvious that they intend to use the permission so given and that we shall soon have conscription for service overseas. Moreover, there can be no misunderstanding about it, because in the speech from the throne, the government, through His Excellency the Governor General, have this to say:

The government is of the opinion that, at this time of gravest crisis in the world's history, the administration, subject only to its responsibility to parliament, should in this connection and irrespective of any previous commitments, possess complete freedom to act in accordance with its judgment of the needs of the situation as they may arise.

My ministers accordingly will seek, from the people, by means of a plebiscite, release from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service.

The speech from the throne does not contain the words "conscription for service overseas", but that is what they have in mind. The government do not say directly that the present administration will adopt such a measure, but the clever wording of the document should deceive no one. This plebiscite is in reality on conscription for service overseas, a measure which the government now believe necessary; otherwise, they would not seek to be released of their promises against conscription.

Besides, here is what says on the subject, in its editorial page, the organ of the Liberal Party in western Canada, the Winnipeg *Free Press* on the 27th of January, 1942:

> But, though Mr. King thus limited himself yesterday, the limitation is formal and the commitment to conscription must be regarded as complete. We predict with assurance that the plebiscite will be followed by the introduction of a bill which will incorporate conscription for military service overseas. The bill will be supported by the government and it will pass. This prophecy is made because any other interpretation of Mr. King's speech is meaningless and because neither his government nor any other that could be formed in Canada could survive if this were not done.

I agree entirely with Hon. Adélard Godbout, premier of the province of Quebec, when he said at the annual convention of the Liberal Association of St. Denis-Dorion, on the 26th of January last, as reproduced in *Le Canada* of Tuesday, January 27, 1942:

> I believe that conscription for service overseas would be a crime at the present time. I know that the situation of Australia will guide the wisdom of the man who governs us and might put some sense in the heads of those who have none.

I do not doubt the sincerity of the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King and he wishes no doubt to gain time, in order to put off as much as possible the date, fatal for national unity, when it will become necessary to have conscription for service overseas, but I know too that the shameless blackmail of the group headed by the Right Hon. Mr. Meighen—whose political life has come to an end with the election returns of Ontario—will not stop, and that under the pressure of those members of the cabinet who care the least for Canada, he will have to give in, at the greatest expense of what he and Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe had tried so hard to create, national unity.

For, if we were to release the government from its commitments of the last general election, who knows what might happen in three or four months!

At the present time I consider that it would be a momentous error to send men to foreign lands now that we must actively prepare for the defence of our own country. It is rumoured, just now, that we are considering sending men to England or to Alaska, a United States possession. Gentlemen, please let us not forget that the United States have a population of 130 million and Britain 50 million people, while we have but 11 million inhabitants from which to raise an army to defend a territory as large as the whole of Europe. Let us not make the same mistake as Australia which, after supplying men for Libya, Greece, Singapore and many other theatres of war, has not nearly enough left for the defence of its own shores which may be incessantly subjected to attack by Japan. Australia is now sending an S.O.S. to Britain and Canada, and the United Kingdom, in spite of its 50 million population is turning again to us for supplying the necessary forces.

It is time for us to forsake imperialistic ideals; let us collect our wits and, amidst this general panic, think first of our own country which is presently being submerged under sentiments that are anything but Canadian.

Moreover, let me submit to the attention of the house the utterances of the right hon. the Prime Minister, on January 26, 1942, and the argument he had, over the plebiscite, with the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth), who, as everyone knows, is among the most enthusiastic imperialists in the whole house. I quote:

> It will be seen that in seeking freedom for itself to act on all matters pertaining to war in accordance with its judgment, the government is taking a course which will remove all legitimate excuse for controversy, and the course best calculated to maintain the unity of the country in this time of war.
>
> Mr. Homuth: Then what will they do?
>
> Mr. Mackenzie King: That will depend in part upon what my hon. friend and those who are round him will do.
>
> Mr. Homuth: Do not worry about us.

So, the Prime Minister makes his future decisions dependent upon those of the Tory party, since we all know that the hon. member for Waterloo South is one of the most prominent members of that party.

I cannot see why our policy should be dictated by a party which has passed into oblivion—as shown by the results of to-day's elections—and which is now no more than a historical relic. The Conservative party does not represent public opinion and the few people who still cling to it feel ashamed to say so. On that subject, may I be permitted to quote an editorial from *Le Soleil*, a Liberal newspaper from Quebec, dated January 23, 1942, and which reads as follows:

> An illusion to be dropped and a danger to be avoided.

So the Canadian government had not foreseen everything when they made their promises to the people, before the war and since then, and when some ministers were saying that conscription for overseas service was not advisable. Now the Prime Minister asks the electors to be released from a rash promise so as to replace the Liberal formula of the war effort by the formula of total war which he borrows from the Tories, and he does not tell us how he is going to apply it.

Mr. Mackenzie King admits that the war policy which he has followed so far is no longer sufficient in the present critical turn of the world conflict, and he would like his government to be released from all past commitments which could interfere with his future actions. The date of the plebiscite is not yet announced but its object is very apparent in the speech from the throne.

Consequently, with a view to warding off the criticism and intrigues of the Tory party, the government are placing the electorate in a position to assume direct responsibility for shaping the future government policy.

And it goes on:

Le Soleil, a Liberal paper from Quebec, does not wish to conceal its surprise at the stand taken by the King government. But when it is about to lose a cherished illusion, it will refrain from aggravating, through useless agitation, an already tense situation. The only comment it wishes to make to-day is that such a policy does not seem consistent with parliamentary tradition. Under the circumstances would Sir Wilfrid Laurier have taken the course followed by Mr. King?

In enforcing conscription for service outside this country an endeavour will be made to invoke the stand taken by the Americans. Their participation in the war will of course be decisive, but in order to do what we have accomplished as regards military participation, they will have to raise an army of seven million and a half men and send one million and a half men overseas.

Besides, through the Mobilization Act and voluntary enlistments we have been able to raise 500,000 men in Canada. Having regard to population, England should have an army of two million and a half men, had young Englishmen enlisted in the same proportion as young Canadians. I for one feel that the danger which now threatens our own soil forbids us to weaken our own defence unduly; it even makes it imperative for us to strengthen it. Now, the best way of achieving this, in view of our small population and the extent of the territory to be protected, is to keep our soldiers right here for the defence of the country.

Are not our leaders in duty bound to ensure the protection of our coasts, in order to forestall any threatened landing, and are not those coasts extensive enough to require as many men as we can mobilize without jeopardizing the gigantic building and training programme already under way?

We shall be attacked because we have declared war and I am convinced that parliament would not have declared war if the King-Lapointe compromise had not been accepted by the people of this country and if the people had known then that the intention was to enforce conscription for service outside Canada.

Having voted against the declaration of war, I am in a position to speak of this quite freely. I knew then what would logically follow as a consequence of the policy adopted by the House of Commons. There were those, at the time, who said I was a visionary, but I now find justification for my stand in the following words spoken on January 26, 1942, by the Right Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada. I quote:

> 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 this House of Commons from the province of Quebec, the verdict of the people of that province might have been wholly different.

Once again I would warn my fellow-citizens of the consequences of a plebiscite through which the government asks to be released of its undertaking to oppose conscription for overseas service. I am convinced that we shall have conscription for service outside Canada. If this does not come about under the present Prime Minister, it will be under another, but the people in my constituency and in my province are strongly opposed to any conscription for overseas service, not through any fear of going abroad, but simply from love of country and a determination to ensure its intelligent defence.

Besides, there could be no ambiguity about that, because, answering a question asked in the House of Commons by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), on January 27, 1942, the Prime Minister stated the following, which will be found in *Hansard*, at page 60:

> When my hon. friend goes on to ask me what I am going to do with respect to any expression of view which may be made by the people in connection with any reference which will be made to them, may I say to him that in seeking

to get relief from past commitments I am not going to begin by making new and fresh commitments. In seeking freedom on the part of the ministry I am not going to start in by seeking to tie my own hands.

That is the answer to that part of the question.

My hon. friend asked a further question, whether there was any understanding between myself and Mr. Godbout, express or implied, as to the position which I would take as a result of any plebiscite that would be presented to the people. May I say to him that there is no understanding, express or implied, with Mr. Godbout or with any other person on earth, with respect to the attitude that I propose to take after the people have expressed their views with regard to giving the government a free hand.

May I add that such attitude as I shall take at the time will be taken in the light of all the circumstances as I may know them as a member of the government, and of all conditions as I know them in regard to this country and, as far as I am able to know something about them, conditions in other countries as well.

Consequently, there can be no doubt that if the plebiscite carries, the government will be absolutely free to enact conscription.

In view of my past attitude on this question and of my promises to my constituents, I consider it my duty to vote against the speech from the throne.

Moreover, I am in duty bound, contrary to the Prime Minister's wishes, to urge upon my constituents not to release the government from their commitments.

I sincerely and earnestly hope that the people will refuse to release the government from their pledges, and I am sure my views in this regard will be shared by my constituents and by the whole province of Quebec. If others turn a deaf ear to that fire-brand who seems to be putting conscription even above victory, there is every likelihood that the government's request will be turned down. Such refusal will settle the issue once and for all and, at the same time, will teach a lesson to those imperialists bent on blackmailing the government on that question and who are forcing them to ruin us by donations—a billion at a time—out of all proportion to our means.

Mr. King, being of sound judgment, could try to balance our participation on a rational basis, and none of his possible immediate successors would give us better satisfaction on this point.

If, God forbid, the plebiscite is carried, as the government hopes, and an act establishing conscription for service overseas is passed by a liberal or a union government, I want to tell him right now that the province of Quebec will never accept such a solution, and that it will take advantage of the first opportunity offered at the polls to express its contempt.

There is another matter that I believe my duty to bring before the house; I refer to representatives of big corporations who serve the country as dollar-a-year men. Occupying key positions, or at least posts of observation, it is for them possible to advise their companies as to future contracts and government's projects. As a result, war industry is a profitable proposition.

Besides, proof of it lies in the comparative balance-sheets, for the first nine months of 1941, of the large companies that control industrial production at the present time.

I want to protest emphatically against that policy which gives all contracts to the large industries, at the expense of the small industries. That is particularly true of us, from the district of Quebec, who do not have large industries.

The Truman committee, of the United States senate, which held an inquiry on the subject in the United States, has just handed its report to the council of United States ministers, and already Mr. Roosevelt has taken drastic steps to correct that situation considered disastrous for the small industries. Why not imitate the United States government, for our problem is the same, and it is advisable for us, possibly more than for the United States, to adopt the remedy suggested by the Truman report?

Moreover, I wish to express in this house my disapproval of the one billion dollar gift to England, as well as of the seven hundred million dollar loan, bearing no interest, which, I have every reason to believe, will never be reimbursed.

My compatriots, already bled white by existing taxes, will have to pay for these gifts which no excess of generosity can justify. There are limits to the running of a country, thinly populated, that has been thrown into a conflict by circumstances which I have condemned when war was declared and which I do not wish to discuss again to-day. This imperialistic folly, this shameless blackmail coming from the least Canadian section of the country, to whose will the government always seems ready to yield, will inevitably incite us to break away from the empire after the war, and will throw us into a financial condition which will burden us for generations to come.

I must also, on the floor of this house, as I have done in previous years, protest energetically against the small measure of consideration given to French Canadians in war services and organizations. It seems that the deeper we get into this war, the fewer French Canadians are appointed. Such appointments are becoming so unusual that it has become very hard to locate their recipients; yet, we make up a third of the population and we are incessantly reminded that national unity must be safeguarded. It seems to me, that the best way to promote national unity is by giving fairer treatment, in this country, to the descendants of the first settlers.

The unfair treatment of French Canadians, at the present time, in all fields of endeavour, will convince them more and more that the present conflict is not a Canadian war, but truly a war waged for the exclusive benefit of the British empire.

As a consequence, it would not be at all surprising, after the war, for the Canadian population to seek total independence or annexation to the United States.

We are profoundly attached to our soil, our traditions and our language. No government charged with the administration of this country, may overlook the fact that one-third of its population, although French-speaking, contribute its fair share of tax payments and personal sacrifice for the prosecution of the war.

For this reason, the French Canadian is entitled to his share in the administration, and, being first and emphatically a Canadian, when requested to increase his war effort, it is necessary that he be convinced by deeds that he is serving Canada and Canada only.

No fitter conclusion to my speech could I find but to quote the words of Leslie Roberts, in the *Saturday Night* of January 17, 1942:

> Why does French Canada still hate the idea of conscription for service overseas, despite the assault by Japan and the threat to our own western coast?
>
> The answer is that Quebeckers are Canada-minded but not empire-minded. Like other Canadians, they have heard a lot about serving Britain and the empire and very little about serving Canada.
>
> Says Mr. Roberts: . . . if anybody wants French Canada to accept the idea of fighting anywhere in the world, other than voluntarily, the idea of Canadian survival necessity must first be driven home, not empire survival, not British necessity, not even the survival of democracy.

Mr. OLOF HANSON (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like in a humble way to offer a few remarks in this debate. I shall not speak from the French-Canadian or the Anglo-Saxon point of view because I happen to be an immigrant to this country. I am one of those two million people whom Canada has invited to her shores from other parts of the world. I am pleased to have had that invitation from the two great races in Canada, French and English, and I am trying to be worthy of the privileges extended to me by being a good Canadian.

I feel it is my duty to address the members of the house briefly at this time because I am the representative of a part of Canada the importance of which in the present war effort is absolutely essential. My constituency of Skeena, and particularly its principal city of Prince Rupert, are in the forefront of war activities. It would be unwise to go into details, but the foregoing statement is nevertheless a statement of fact.

None of us at this time should in any way make statements or give out information that might be a comfort to our enemies and an embarrassment to ourselves. I am satisfied that the national defence authorities have done everything possible to provide for the defence of that vital empire link which I represent. My only desire in this respect is to state publicly what I know and feel. The northwest coast of British Columbia and its great seaport of Prince Rupert are of such vast importance that every possible effort should be made to bring its defences to the point where it may continue, in spite of whatever enemy action may come, to serve as part of the life-line between the source of supply in our war and our troops afloat, on land, or in the air who must unfailingly receive from us the supplies and the munitions necessary not only to prevent them from being placed at a disadvantage but to assure them of superiority in this respect. Hand in hand with active defence must go the efforts of the civilian population itself to make sure of a degree of protection in the case of enemy attack.

Canada, since its formation, has taken part in all the wars of the empire. Previously our share, and our proper share, which was undertaken gladly, was to send abroad to a theatre of war far from our own shores our representatives to assist in the preservation of the British empire and of those ideals of fairness and justice for which it stands.

This war has forced upon us a realization that we can no longer ignore our complete duty. The war has been brought home not only to the armed forces of the world but to its civilian population. No man can guarantee that the dread effects of war will not be brought home to our Canadian cities and most surely to those on our coastlines; and those ports which form a part of our supply line will for the same reason be the obvious objective of enemy attack.

I want to dwell for a few moments on the subject of air raid precautions, one of the most essential services and one in which Great Britain has distinguished herself. Throughout the areas of Canada subject to the risk of enemy attack, a civilian organization has been formed, on a purely voluntary basis, to guarantee that our armed forces will be supported by an organized and trained civilian population. These efforts are generally referred to as "air raid precautions." Throughout the riding which I represent, and particularly in the city of Prince Rupert, to which I have referred, patriotic citizens have created voluntary organizations to deal with this matter. In Prince Rupert men and women are freely giving of their time and submitting themselves to training in order to form part of an organized body to meet the dangers that may come their way.

We have all followed what has been happening in the last few days; we realize that Hitler and the axis powers have been trying to destroy our communications by sinking our ships; and if we lose Singapore, which God forbid, the axis powers may next go after the big shipping ports on the British and United States coasts. I have in mind Esquimalt, Prince Rupert and other great sea ports.

I cannot speak too highly of the degree of public service demonstrated by the air raid precautions organization in the city of Prince Rupert. Private citizens and public servants have given freely of their time. They have held practices testing their ability, and I am sure that in the event of enemy action the citizens of the coastal communities will prove as capable as the population of any British city.

Perhaps to a greater degree than is true of any other portion of Canada my constituency is confronted with an alien problem. For many years fishing has been a chief industry of British Columbia and the city of Prince Rupert and my constituency constitute the capital of that industry. The fishing industry of British Columbia has been very largely in the hands of Japanese. It may not be a matter of common knowledge that the largest centre for distribution of what is perhaps the finest edible fish in the world, the halibut, is Prince Rupert. Of the twenty-nine million pounds produced in Canada, British Columbia produces fourteen million and, of that, eleven million pounds come from our district.

So large a place does the halibut fishing occupy in Prince Rupert that a small boy there saying his prayers one night in front of his mother said, "Our Father which are in Heaven, Halibut be Thy Name." That is how vital the halibut fishing industry is to Prince Rupert. If that industry is going to be taken away and left to the oriental who is now our enemy, I wish the government to understand what it means in the development of that part of the country.

There is a concentration of Japanese fishermen in the coastal waters which touch my constituency. Whatever may be said of the possible menace of the large Japanese population there—their numbers are from 20,000 to 30,000—it can be said with truth that it is amongst those of this race who are engaged in the fishing industry that our greatest potential danger lies. It may be that the smaller number of aliens of this race who are engaged in farming do not present a serious problem, but Japanese fishermen do present a problem, and I urge upon this government with all the emphasis I can give this statement that these alien enemies should justly and fairly be removed from the coastal areas where they are capable of doing such great harm. This matter has been brought up by several hon. members from British Columbia, and I urge that all Japanese of military age should be removed from that area.

Long ago I referred to the necessity of highway communication between Prince Rupert and the interior of British Columbia, which means with the rest of Canada. While this has long been desirable from the commercial point of view, because of the war situation it now becomes an absolute necessity. In making this statement at this time I am sure I shall not be considered as talking only for the benefit of the constituency which I have the honour to represent; it is a strategic necessity for the defence of Canada. This government which has done so much in so many ways knows that anything of this kind is of great concern, and will realize without further elaboration on my part the seriousness of the situation and take immediate and effective steps in this matter which is of such importance for the defence of our country. I cannot state too strongly that this is an enterprise which should be undertaken at once.

Personally I think it is unnecessary for me to state my stand regarding this war, because I offered my services, and my son and my son-in-law have done likewise. Not only have

I offered my services, but the money which I have made through the privileges afforded me, an immigrant, I offered at the beginning of the war, free of charge. Therefore I speak for all Canadians, whether we call ourselves French-Canadians or whatever our racial origin may be, those whom you invited to come to Canada and make it a cosmopolitan country. The finest expression of genuine patriotism that has been given in this house in my long experience of its activities was expressed on Friday by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Mackenzie), our minister from British Columbia. I appeal to hon. members and to all Canadians: If you were sincere in the invitation which you gave to people of other lands, including myself, some forty years ago, and which no doubt you are going to give again, in this crisis through which we are now passing, let us all forget whether we are east or west, whether our birthplace was this or that, and all be Canadians.

A word in conclusion. I am not going to refer to what has happened in the elections to-day, but I do wish to say that my namesake, the hon. leader of the opposition has fulfilled his duties with great credit to himself, and it is apparent that there is no one who could do better. Since the electors have shown that the Mackenzie King government still has the support of the people of Canada, let us accept that and all work together to make Canada greater yet.

On motion of Mr. Ward the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Tuesday, February 10, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

INTERNMENTS

READING OF PETITION OF CERTAIN PERSONS INTERNED IN HULL, QUE.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask if the petition laid on the table by the hon. member for North Battleford (Mrs. Nielsen) has been examined and found in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: It has been laid on the table and found in order.

Mr. MacINNIS: Then I suggest, now that it is in order, that the petition be read, and I so move.

Motion agreed to.

(The Clerk Assistant read the petition as follows):

Petition to members of the House of Commons of Canada in parliament assembled, at Ottawa Ontario.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

We the undersigned Canadians in exercising the immemorial privilege of British subjects to petition the House of Commons in parliament assembled are confident that you will honour this ancient right and practice by hearing sympathetically our representations upon a matter affecting the welfare and safety of our nation, and the liberties of its citizens.

We humbly beg to draw to your attention the following facts and considerations:

1. That the undersigned Canadian anti-fascists have been arbitrarily confined, many for as long as twenty months, first in internment camps, together with fascist prisoners of war and, since August 20, 1941, in a concentration camp in Hull jail, at Hull, Quebec, though we have been opposing fascism ever since its evil birth.

2. That we have repeatedly sought to impress persons in authority with our loyalty to Canada and its democratic institutions, our unreserved support of Canada's war effort against the common enemy of our country, and of all free people, Hitlerite Germany and her allies; our abhorrence of and opposition to any and all subversive activities within our country, and our desire for release from detention in order that we may contribute our time and energies to the advancement of these purposes. To this end we have individually sworn affidavits and have dispatched petitions to the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe on June 27, July 1, July 14, July 31, August 7, August 9, August 15, August 22, September 3, and September 4, 1941; and to the Hon. Louis St. Laurent on December 18, 1941; and to the Prime Minister the Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King on September 10, October 1, and November 28, 1941.

3. That on November 28, 1941, we dispatched a letter to the Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King offering our services in the armed forces, industry or other war work, wherever we may be deemed most useful, followed by individual letters to members of the government stating each person's qualifications and making suggestions regarding his future services.

4. That at this hour of greatest strain and peril to our country it is absolutely imperative that all the Canadian people, irrespective of class, party, religion or race be banded together in unity for the supreme effort and sacrifice in the just war waged by Canada, Britain, the U.S.S.R., the United States of America and their allies for victory over fascist enemies; that in this struggle for victory lies the security of Canada, and the identity of interests of the whole nation; that united effort for maximum military operation and war production stands above all other considerations.

5. That the continued arrest, persecution and detention of anti-fascist Canadians in concentration camps is justified neither on the grounds of national security, nor of safety of the state, but appears to be a form of persecution based on class and political prejudice, and moreover tends to create doubt, controversy and disunity to the detriment of our country's war effort.

6. That our release from detention and the restoration of our civil rights as Canadians to

participate in the armed forces and other war services will serve to strengthen public confidence that undemocratic practices are not being allowed to gain ground in our land, and that our government's war effort is truly directed toward the realization and implementation of the eight-point programme enunciated jointly by Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt, and which has become the foundation of the twenty-six united nations agreement, to which our own government has declared its adherence, thus spurring forward the enthusiasm and self-sacrifice of our people in the war effort for decisive victory over the enemy in the shortest period of time.

7. That our release from detention will not only restore us to personal freedom and to our families, and enable us to contribute our abilities, labour and lives to the benefit of our country's war effort, but especially will it enable us, many of whom have considerable public influence, particularly among the workers, to assist in mobilizing the people for the greatest exertions, both in uninterrupted war production and in the armed forces, to assure and hasten the victorious conclusion of the war.

8. That we repeat our solemn pledges contained in our sworn affidavits and our petitions that upon our release all our efforts will be directed loyally, unsparingly and unswervingly to achievement of the fullest national unity for the maximum contribution in all fields of the war effort.

We are resolutely and sincerely opposed to any actions which would be injurious to the unity of Canada, the security of the state and the maximum war effort.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Therefore we humbly pray of the House of Commons, as the elected representatives of the Canadian people, in whose hands rests the sovereignty of government and the direction of national policy, you institute such measures that will restore us our liberties in the interests of the welfare of our country and its war effort in this hour of supreme test and peril.

WHEAT

REPORTED SALE TO UNITED STATES BUYERS FOR LATER DELIVERY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Perley), as reported at page 128 of *Hansard*, quoted the following from a Winnipeg paper:

> Canadian wheat is being purchased by United States buyers for shipment south of the line after the opening of navigation; that warehouse receipts are being taken by the United States buyers, and that, according to reliable authorities, the wheat is being hedged in the Chicago market.

He then proceeded to ask three questions. At that time I promised to look into the matter and bring down a reply as soon as possible. I should like to reply to these questions now.

Question 1: From whom are these United States buyers securing these warehouse receipts, since it is cash wheat?

[Mr. MacInnis.]

Answer: The warehouse receipts are supplied by the seller of the grain to the buyer and are the owner's title to the grain. When grain is unloaded at any terminal elevator a warehouse receipt must be issued to the owner, and only on presentation of this receipt is he entitled to gain possession of the grain that it represents.

Question 2: Why is it being hedged in Chicago?

Answer: If this grain is being hedged in Chicago, presumably it is because the owner wishes to have it hedged there. This is purely a matter for the personal judgment of the owner and it is a fairly common practice for Canadian grain to be hedged in Chicago.

Question 3: What part did the Canadian wheat board play in these trades, and is there any possibility of this wheat coming into competition with the export of other Canadian wheat to the United Kingdom?

Answer: The Canadian wheat board has no direct knowledge of these transactions as their wheat is sold to buyers on the Winnipeg grain exchange. Because the very restricted import quota for Canadian wheat allowed to enter the United States for domestic consumption is full, this wheat will presumably stay in bond in the United States, and therefore remains a part of the visible supply of Canadian wheat and can move into export channels in exactly the same way as other wheat stored by exporters in the United States or Canada.

REPORTED INITIAL PRICE OF NINETY CENTS PER BUSHEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. E. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): I should like to direct a question to either the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Has either of them any knowledge of the broadcast over United States news stations last night to the effect that following the Prime Minister's statement in this house yesterday the Canadian government had decided to set the initial price of wheat at ninety cents per bushel? Why was it announced there rather than in Canada?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I have no information on the subject.

PACIFIC COUNCIL

REPRESENTATION OF CANADA ON COUNCIL TO CONCERT COMMON DEFENCE IN SOUTH PACIFIC

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question relating to a dispatch in to-day's paper from London, England, to the effect

that the Pacific council meets to-day in London. It refers also to a statement by Mr. Curtin, the Prime Minister of Australia. The *Exchange Telegraph* reports Mr. Curtin as having said:

That exclusion of Canada is due to the feeling that Canada's position in the Pacific is less urgent than that of the others.

The countries now represented are Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand and the Netherlands. I should like to ask the Prime Minister why Canada is not a member of this Pacific council? I am one of those who for several years past have contended that our people should know the facts about this Pacific question. They should not have to get them from dispatches from Australia and other places. As I say, Canada is as much interested in this matter as Australia, New Zealand and other dominions and allies, yet we gave nothing to the Singapore base, or to an empire shipping conference in 1937, or to the adoption of the Jellicoe report. The public of Canada want to know the real facts. If the Prime Minister cannot give the information to-day—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CHURCH: Why is not Canada represented at this Pacific conference? Why did not Canada give a grant to the Singapore base? The country should know the real facts.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CHURCH: I know of no reason why this information should not be given. I am quite in order because the same question was asked in the British house. I should like to have the facts. I am entitled to the facts. If the Prime Minister cannot give the information to-day, perhaps he will give it to the house to-morrow.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): May I say to my hon. friend that the question which he has just asked is one that relates to an arrangement that was reached at Washington between the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the President of the United States at the time Mr. Churchill was visiting Washington. The arrangement is in part the outcome of further conferences that have taken place between them and between some of the countries mentioned. The question is an important one. It is one to which I would wish to give a very careful answer, as there are special reasons which govern the matter being in the position in which it is. I shall seek to give my hon. friend a reply at another sitting of the house.

BY-ELECTIONS

DATE OF INTRODUCTION OF NEWLY-ELECTED MEMBERS—LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question which is probably related to the one just asked by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church): Can the Prime Minister say when the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) will take their places in the house?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): It might be a matter of interest to the house to know just how long it takes to have ministers who are duly elected take their seats. As a matter of fact before coming into the house I had asked my secretary to find out from the chief electoral officer how soon returns to the house could be made and how soon the ministers could take their seats in the house. I received the following memorandum:

The chief electoral officer informs me that returning officers are allowed to fix a date for the final addition of the votes, and that the act provides for the holding of the ballots until six days after this final addition. In York South the final addition is on the eleventh; in Quebec East and St. Mary, the twelfth, and in Welland, because of the scattered nature of the riding, difficult road conditions, et cetera, the sixteenth. This means that the new members could not be presented in the house before February 18 for York South, February 19 for Quebec East and St. Mary, and February 23 for Welland.

My hon. friend will see that the act in some particulars is most fearfully and wonderfully made.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister. I am sorry for the delay.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Now that the other party has gone with the wind out of York South, what is going to be the official designation of the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson)? Will it be leader or acting leader? I want to know because I shall have a lot to say in the future about that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

AGRICULTURAL POLICY

GRAIN MARKETING—INQUIRY AS TO ANNOUNCEMENT FOR 1942

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Trade and Commerce when the agricultural policy and the grain marketing policy for 1942 will be announced.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): It will be impossible to have a discussion of the legislation which will have to be presented until we have completed this debate, and I do not know just when that will be.

INCOME TAX

INQUIRY AS TO WHEN 1941 FORMS WILL BE READY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I should like to ask the Minister of National Revenue a question. On February 3 I asked the Minister of Finance when the income tax forms for 1941 would be ready and whether they would have to wait until the tax agreements with the provinces were signed. The minister stated he would bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of National Revenue.

Hon. C. W. G. GIBSON (Minister of National Revenue): I had no knowledge that the question had been asked. There has been some delay in preparing income tax forms for some of the provinces, because we had to wait until consultations could be held with the provinces as to whether we would print on the forms the details necessary for the collection of the provincial income tax. Having obtained the consent of the provinces to leave these details off the forms, the forms are now being printed. If they have not been distributed already, I know that they will be available in a few days.

DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS

AIR RAID PRECAUTIONS—SETTING UP OF COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I should like to ask the Minister of Pensions and National Health a question which relates to the defence of Canada regulations. In view of the changed war, does the minister propose to set up a new committee of this house to deal with these regulations? The regulations passed at the last session provided for federal enforcement, but I understand that these regulations have now been transferred to the provinces and provincial premiers. I appreciate the fact that the people in charge of air raid precautions are doing good work and are splendid citizens, but home defence should not be for them alone, and that work alone will not make our cities and towns secure. The black-outs should not be for more than twenty minutes and should be reasonable. I would ask if the minister could let us know to-morrow what is being done.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): Mr. Speaker, the question of the committee to deal with the defence of Canada regulations is a matter of government policy, on the recommendation of the Minister of Justice, not on mine. May I also inform my hon. friend that the only delegation of authority under the present regulations, so far as I am aware, is under section 35, in which there is a specific delegation of authority in regard to black-outs from the Minister of Pensions and National Health to the provincial attorneys-general of five Canadian provinces. I shall be very glad indeed to table at any time the instrument of delegation if my hon. friend requests it and to give any further information if he will place his question on the order paper.

Mr. CHURCH: Do not the regulations say that invasion must be imminent before central Canada is blacked out?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The regulations speak for themselves. I do not have them under my hand at the moment, but there has been a delegation of authority in regard to black-outs only, on the advice of the Department of Justice.

Mr. CHURCH: For home defence in cities we still have left the police, the boy scouts and girl guides to start with. No city in central Canada has any defence if attacked.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: May I ask the minister if the black-out regulations date from yesterday?

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Monday, February 9, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that what is uppermost in the minds of most if not all of the members of this house this afternoon is the results of the elections of yesterday. I want to say, because I am going to say something on the question of the plebiscite, that I regard the results as an approval by the people of at least three constituencies, and I think one can almost say of four, and not in one province only but

in the two largest provinces of this dominion, of the wisdom of the course of action which was announced in the speech from the throne and which was so effectively and so ably presented by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in his speech in this debate.

May I also be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that these results are a resounding rebuke, and probably the most resounding rebuke which can be given to intemperate and unbridled invective in political campaigns. It teaches us all that these are times when bitterness and personal animosity have no place in the discussion of public questions either in the press or on the platform. I do want to congratulate the Prime Minister. His principle of trusting the people and his faith in their good sense and their ability to distinguish between the sober and serious issues which face this country and the hysterical condemnation of those who have singled him out for virulent attack have been fully demonstrated.

To have just at this time two ministers, one from the province of Quebec and the other from the province of Ontario, both returned on the same day, in spite of the efforts of certain extremists in both provinces to divide this country, is a striking response to the appeal which has been made for unity and tolerance and understanding. The government in the return of these two men, each outstanding in his own field, has been immeasurably encouraged and strengthened, I know that the house generally will join in regret at the illness of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) and join most heartily in sincere good wishes for his early recovery.

May I take just a moment, Mr. Speaker, and I know my hon. friends will pardon me if I do not take longer, to join in all the congratulations which have been extended to the member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) who moved and seconded the motion for the address in reply to the speech from the throne. To say that their accomplishment had the degree of excellence which we expected of them is to say that both made presentations which both in manner and in matter were admirable and in every way worthy of the traditions of this house. I met them both with their colleagues when they were in England. They had two missions: one to take Canada to the United Kingdom, and the other to bring the United Kingdom to Canada. I know a little of how well they accomplished their task on the other side, and I am sure that the messages they have brought us here indicated that they were equally well qualified and competent for the task of bringing to us the results of their observations of the traditions and spirit of the people of Great Britain.

A good deal has been said in this debate with regard to my department. I shall leave these comments and criticisms to be dealt with at another time. I want to-day to discuss directly the matters mentioned in the speech from the throne. After all, these are the matters which are primarily the subject of this debate rather than matters of administration and operation.

Speaking generally my criticism is that in this debate the discussion seems to have centred not around what we shall do to help win the war but how we shall do it, a discussion not of policy but of a particular method or form of procedure; and that is typical of what has been going on in the country for the past six months or more. There really seems to be in some quarters a deliberate attempt to obscure the real measure of Canada's war activity. The idea has been sold and rather subtly sold, to use the expression of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), that Canada is not doing much. And why? Because there is no conscription for overseas service. Nothing else seems to matter. The morale of the Canadian people is being undermined by this insistent and persistent deprecation.

Here is what has happened in this debate. The Prime Minister outlined comprehensively what Canada had done and what she proposes to do. But what course has the debate taken? I know there have been exceptions but I think I am right when I say that, fairly generally, very little attention has been paid to the government's proposals for further activity in the navy, army and air force, the proposals regarding increasing the vast volume of munitions, the proposals for the mobilization of manpower, the proposal to provide one billion dollars' worth of munitions and supplies to Great Britain, the proposal to spend three billion dollars for war this year. I submit that when we are assessing the extent of what we are doing, measures like these are worth noticing. The measure of the contribution which Canada has made up to this date—I say Canada; I am not saying the government—such measures and the concrete measures which are proposed for the future are really tangible things by which we ought to be able to judge and to assess the extent of what we are doing.

The principle of total war has been laid down, and to that we all agree, but the yardstick which has been used to measure the extent and the full-outness, to coin a word, of Canada's contribution has been conscription for overseas service. That causes confusion. That obscures the view that this country

should get of the measure of our war effort. I want this afternoon, as a measure of what we are actually doing, to indicate one or two principles whereby our activities can be judged.

No person can doubt that Canada is committed to total war. We are committed to it not only for the survival of freedom generally but for our own survival and for the survival of this nation, and for the security of our own homes and families. To wage total war is the stated policy of the government and I believe, indeed I am sure, that it is the determined purpose of the Canadian people.

But what do we mean by total war? I think it means the most effective use against the enemy of the country's total resources in materials and people. The different countries have different resources. Total war requires a country to plan its pattern for war according to its resources, and more than that, according to the needs and abilities of other countries with which it is allied. One country, for example, might have great resources in terms of people, and for that country total war would mean concentrating effort in raising men and relying upon allied countries for supplies of food and weapons. Another country might have excess resources of food and materials. Its pattern for total war might mean extra effort in production, and a proportionately less effort in raising armed forces. But I do not want you to think, Mr. Speaker, for a single moment that in my view such a country can sit back comfortably and feel it is doing its duty efficiently by tilling the soil and producing munitions and allowing the other fellow to do all the fighting.

Again, a country at war without allies would follow a different pattern from that which would be followed if it were one of a group.

Now, Canada is a member of a team of united nations, and our pattern for total war has to be shaped by the relation of the extent of her resources in materials and people compared to the needs of the whole team.

These things, Mr. Speaker, are very academic, but perhaps they need to be said, and they certainly need to be understood if we are to realize what total war means for Canada.

Here is the pattern of total war which this dominion, directed by its government and by parliament, is following. It has been shaped by the considerations I have mentioned: first, the nature and extent of Canada's resources in materials and people; second, Canada's needs and abilities in relation to the needs and abilities of other nations with whom we are bound in united purpose to wage this war to the end, or go under.

[Mr. Ralston.]

Canada's pattern of total war has three main parts. I do not pretend to name them in order of importance. I do not think they have any order of importance. Each one is essential. The three are complementary parts of the whole, and that is how they ought to be regarded.

One of the three parts is the production of food; another is the production of materials and weapons of war; and another is the raising of armed forces to combat on sea and on land and in the air. Supporting all these activities is the great civilian effort of the people of this dominion which expresses itself chiefly in the twin essentials of services and morale, and in which no Canadian is too old, too poor, or too humble to have a place and a duty.

So that, put in briefest form, our pattern of total war is a pattern consisting of food, weapons and armed forces. You cannot take one and leave the others in a country like Canada; and the duty of the government is to recognize that each of these three parts—food, weapons and armed forces—is essential to total war by Canada, and to try and determine the proportion which each part ought to bear.

Now let us look at the 1942 programme, which, as I have indicated, has not had too much discussion, to see the place which each one of these parts I have mentioned holds.

First, about food. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), in his speech to the house on January 26, gave statistics on Canada's food production. I will not repeat them. But I want to remind the house of the great increases in essential items which his figures showed. Canada's programme in food production for 1942 is to provide to the limit of our production and to the limit of our productive resources the foods essential to our own people and to Britain. But here, just as in other fields, we must try to utilize as far as possible workers ineligible for military service, in order to release as many as possible of those who are eligible. We still need and expect young men from the farms for our fighting forces. No better fighting men can be found. Many of them have gone into war industry as well, and I freely admit there may be fault in that we have not yet taken full measures to replace those who have come from the farms, by making more certain that workers are provided to keep these farms in operation; and a very important part of the selective service plan which the Prime Minister announced will be to deal with that particular situation, because the indications are that more rather than less workers will be needed in this tremendously vital activity.

Then there is the production of weapons, of ships, tanks, planes, guns, shells, and hundreds of items of equipment which are needed by the united nations. Here is a statement of the weapons programme, if my colleague the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) will permit me, for 1942, just in terms of men and women.

At the close of 1941 there were about 600,000 workers, of whom about 75,000 were women, engaged directly and indirectly in producing and distributing the weapons and supplies of war. Our production is vastly different from that of the last war. Then, it was principally shells and rifles. To-day Canada's munitions production is almost as diversified as the number of items in the arsenal of war. My colleague the Minister of Munitions and Supply told us not long ago that Canadian weapons are already in use by the united nations in practically every field of war in the world. I am told that by the end of the year an additional 100,000 workers will have been employed, and that means a total of about 700,000 men and women engaged directly and indirectly in this essential part of total war, in Canada.

Here again, as in the case of the farms, the selective service plan must function to ensure that as far as possible the workers in these industries are those who are ineligible for the armed forces.

That programme for 1942, which means vastly increased quantities, with some 700,000 workers engaged directly and indirectly, will see Canada approaching its visible limit of material and management.

Those are the first two parts of Canada's war pattern—food and weapons. What that programme means may be emphasized when we remember that Canada is undertaking an outright contribution during the fiscal year of food and weapons amounting to one billion dollars for the use of the people and the forces of Great Britain, who are helping to fight what is Canada's war as well as their own.

Let me come now to the third part of our pattern of total war, and that is the armed forces. Canada has armed forces for combat on the sea, on the land, and in the air. Many people seem to forget that. They still think of military activities only in terms of the army. That was very true in the last war, when Canada had four divisions overseas in the Canadian corps; but to-day that idea is wholly erroneous. To-day Canada's effort in arms is represented by numbers and organizations in the navy, the army and the air force which would certainly impress our friends and, I think, ought to impress Canadians just as certainly. In the navy, Canada's plan has been to raise a navy limited only by the number of ships we could obtain. To put it another way, the plan has been to man every ship which could be built or secured.

In the air, from the start we have concentrated on the air training plan and on air strength as probably the greatest immediate combative contribution this country could make. It has proved to be an activity by which Canada, in geography and resources, and by the character of its young men, has been able to make an incalculable contribution.

Now about the army. The objective has been and is to raise and equip, to reinforce and to maintain, highly motorized and mechanized forces, hard-hitting and complete. In this way we take advantage of our resources and materials, as well as of the qualities of initiative and fighting skill which Canadians in battle have always shown. We also have the obligations for defence in Canada, which are more prominently before us than ever before. Under the army programme for 1942, the Canadian army overseas will be, in proportion, probably the most highly mechanized and mobile army in the world. It is obvious, of course, that a country of eleven and a half million people could not raise mass armies comparable to the forces of other nations, and particularly it could not attempt to do so when the army is just one part of the general pattern of food and weapons, air strength and navy.

Those are the general principles which underlie the extent and strength of Canada's armed forces.

Let us look at the 1942 programme—and by that I mean the fiscal year ending in March 1943. I wish to summarize that programme now with particular reference to the man-power involved, but I will not go into details because I think the figures on man-power will be sufficient for our purposes.

In the navy to date over 27,000 men have enlisted and it has a strength of over 350 ships. This programme for 1942 requires a further 13,000 men.

In the army to date over 295,000 men have been enlisted and its actual strength is over 255,000 men.

While I am speaking of the Canadian army, I am sure that the house and the country will want to join in expressing the pleasure which we all feel at the arrival in Canada of Lieutenant-General McNaughton. He is a man in whom this country has unbounded confidence. He has given the best of his superb talents to the building up of a fighting formation in the United Kingdom of which

we all ought to be proud. We are fortunate indeed to have him at the head of the Canadian army overseas. We do not realize fully how much he has achieved in maintaining the morale and the fighting spirit of Canadians who have been such a long time inactive but constantly alert. It is a hard test both for commanders and for troops, and Canadians under General McNaughton have stood that test magnificently. I know that the country will learn with immense satisfaction that he has made a complete recovery from his illness and will be ready in a short time to resume his high and responsible position.

When I speak of the Canadian corps which is overseas, hon. members will recall that it consists of three infantry divisions, one armoured division, one army tank brigade, a forestry corps and ancillary and specialized units with thousands of reinforcements in reinforcement units.

Perhaps I should refer to reinforcements for a moment. A statement was made in that regard and I should like to make this clear. The number of reinforcements dispatched to the United Kingdom is actually in excess of the schedule recommended by the corps commander, who has expressed himself as entirely satisfied with the reinforcements.

The 1942 programme is to organize, equip and maintain an army of two corps overseas. That programme requires the enlistment of a further 90,000 to 100,000 men during the present fiscal year. That figure is, in the opinion of general staff, the maximum number of new men who can be effectively trained during that period for service overseas. That will put an exceedingly heavy strain upon the instructional staffs and equipment, because, in addition to these new men for overseas, we must train the overseas units still in this country and also about forty to fifty thousand men for service in Canada; and already arrangements are being made to bring back a large number of instructors from the other side for that purpose.

Under the 1942 programme which the Prime Minister announced, we shall have overseas a Canadian army of two corps composed of three infantry divisions, two armoured divisions, two army tank brigades, and there will be additional ancillary corps and line of communication troops. There will be reinforcements and reserves for all these formations and units. As a result of that programme about one-half of the Canadian army overseas will be armoured; and as I have indicated that is a proportion of armoured strength probably greater than that of any other army in the world.

That 1942 programme is the recommendation of general staff. When I was in England in consultation with the Secretary of State for War, he told me that the most effective and useful additional contribution which Canada could make as far as the army was concerned was another armoured division, and this programme provides for that. In the words of General McNaughton, this Canadian army will be a well-balanced, highly effective fighting force, coordinated from the front line back to the rear echelons—a weapon forged and sharpened to play a great part when the time to strike comes.

The cost of the army programme in the fiscal year is estimated at practically one billion dollars. The 1942 all-out programme for the air force calls for between 70,000 and 80,000 men.

Mr. STIRLING: Before the minister leaves the programme for the armed forces overseas, would he care to put a number to that? How many will be required to fill that?

Mr. RALSTON: From 90,000 to 100,000 new men. That is up to March 31, 1943. I will sum that up now. The 1942 all-out programme for the air force calls, as I say, for between 70,000 and 80,000 men. And remember this: From the beginning of the war to the end of 1942 over 422,000 men enlisted voluntarily for general service. To sum up the 1942 programme for the three armed services, it involves as nearly as can be estimated the raising of between 173,000 and 193,000 men for general service, and to carry it out would bring the total Canadian enlistments in all three services up to between 595,000 and 615,000 men. I have here a table showing how this is made up, and I will put it on *Hansard:*

	Enlistments to date	Programme for 1942	Prospective total enlistments up to March 31, 1943
Air force	100,000	70,000– 80,000	170,000–180,000
Navy	27,000	13,000– 13,000	40,000– 40,000
Army	295,000	90,000–100,000	385,000–395,000
Totals	422,000	173,000–193,000	595,000–615,000

I do not want the house to get a wrong idea. The total enlistments at the end of the 1942 programme do not mean that we shall have then armed forces of that size. There have been and will be unfortunately wastage and casualties, and our actual strength will be diminished accordingly. As a matter of fact, of the 90,000 to 100,000 men to be raised this year for the army, probably 25,000 will be for new units and the remainder for reinforcements and reserves. Then there is the defence on the home front here in Canada, a most important part of our effort for total war. I assure the house that these needs are having the closest and most unrelenting attention not only of members from the Pacific coast but also at least on the part of some of us at National Defence headquarters.

Speaking generally, our Canadian defences, so far as the army is concerned, comprise coast defence garrisons at strategic points on both coasts, local reserves for those garrisons on each coast, and general reserves which are available for both coasts. At the present time there is in Canada the fourth division which in due course will be converted into an armoured division. There are also the brigade groups of the sixth division located at strategic points. A number of unbrigaded battalions are on coast defence duties on both coasts and there are coast defence artillery garrisons. Special dispositions have been made where that seemed to be required.

It should be remembered that apart from the 4th division and the brigade groups of the sixth division, we have in Canada over 90,000 active service personnel in training centres and elsewhere, and an emergency organization of a proportion of that personnel is being set up as well. We have also fully in mind the mobilizing of further units for Canadian defence, especially in view of the ultimate dispatch of the fourth division overseas. In addition to these mobilized formations and active service personnel we have reserve units, and we have worked out a special reorganization and regrouping of them across Canada, organizing them in brigade groups under full-time staffs and with special provision for training.

We realize that the matter of anti-aircraft defence is of the utmost importance. Hon. members will understand that this is a joint concern of the three services, but it concerns particularly the air and the army—the army for anti-aircraft guns, and the air for aeroplanes. We realize that the matter of anti-aircraft defence is of the utmost importance, but I am sure that this country realizes, I think the citizens of the Pacific coast do, that no matter how complete our anti-aircraft defences are made we can never prevent the enemy from attempting sporadic raids. What we must do is to utilize the equipment we have and can get from time to time to make such an attempt as costly to the enemy as we can. We are trying to do that. To-day on the Pacific coast there is certain special equipment which does not exist to the same degree anywhere else in the dominion—not all we want, but more than might have been expected under the conditions, and there is more to follow. I can say generally that having regard to the anticipated forms of attack the provisions for Canadian defence have been made up to the limit of our equipment and resources, and we are increasing our defensive strength just as fast as equipment becomes available.

Mr. GREEN: If I may ask a question, does the minister not think it would be well to have a secret session of the house at which the question of the defence of the Pacific coast, or both coasts, could be gone into much more fully than is possible at a regular session?

Mr. RALSTON: The Prime Minister indicated the other day that consideration would be given to the matter of a secret session, and I would assume that the Pacific coast defences would be a subject quite proper for discussion at such session. I may say I should be glad to give to my hon. friend or any hon. members from the Pacific coast generally information in regard to the Pacific coast. I have an idea from reading the newspapers that quite a bit is known out there already.

Mr. GREEN: Of course we cannot get satisfaction in that way; I might personally, but it is a matter for the Canadian parliament to decide, and in order to decide properly they must know the facts. I suggest that it is of vital importance to this nation at this time that there should be a secret session at which this question should be discussed.

Mr. RALSTON: In regard to a secret session, as I have indicated, I think the Prime Minister stated some time ago that he thought arrangements could be made to hold such a session, and I anticipate that the subject to which my hon. friend refers would be one of those discussed there.

I have mentioned the programme of food, weapons and armed forces. As part of the programme for total war there is much to be done in the way of directing the citizens of Canada towards the task where they can serve best. This is going on in a hundred different ways, but it is to be supplemented by much

more comprehensive measures, as the Prime Minister indicated in his speech, from which I shall quote one paragraph:

> The government now proposes to apply the compulsory powers of national selective services to other aspects of the war effort as well as to military service. These powers will be applied selectively and progressively to those activities where it is considered by the government that their application will contribute to the goal of a total effort . . .

I shall not attempt to go into details regarding these proposals, as my colleague the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) will be doing that, I anticipate; but I want to emphasize that the further mobilization of man-power and woman-power is one of the biggest jobs we have in our activities for total war.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Before the minister leaves that—and I want to say that I am impressed and reassured by the nature of the statement which he is making—is it anticipated that the government intends to say to a man: "You shall work here and not there"? The Prime Minister has not made that clear. I do not think you can say to a man: "You must work here and not there." You might not get results. That is what our labour friends will tell you about that.

Mr. RALSTON: That is a matter which has had a great deal of examination and consideration in England as well, and I am sure it will be dealt with when the measures are brought down.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am not sure that you can make a man work.

An hon. MEMBER: Not for less wages.

Mr. RALSTON: There is the old saying that you cannot make an opera singer sing.

Lastly, in this pattern for total war there is that measure in dollars. Our direct expenditures for war this year will be three billion dollars.

I have given Canada's pattern for total war in its comprehensive scope of food, weapons, armed forces, and mobilization of man-power and money. I think I can fairly ask the house and the country to measure that programme as it stands by the programme itself as a whole. Will anyone in this house say that programme is not worthy? Will anyone say that it will not tax our resources in this very year? Will anyone say that the commitment is not enough?

I have tried to portray very briefly and sketchily the development of Canada's programme for total war, not as enforced by the brutal methods of a Gestapo, but through the wholehearted cooperation of a free people under the direction of a democratic government.

I want to deal now with the plebiscite. There are some who, as I intimated at the beginning, will insist on measuring our whole war activity by the one question, whether we are to have conscription for overseas service. But that is not the question. Here is the question, and mixing it up with conscription only adds to the disquiet and confusion. The government tells the people of this dominion that this is the time of greatest crisis in the world's history. The government says that it should be in a position to act in any emergency, and it considers that it ought not to be fettered by past commitments. What the government ask is simply that it be put in a position to be free to act as the circumstances may require in the uncertainties and perils of the days ahead.

There does not seem to be anything morally wrong with that. It seems to be a straightforward course of procedure. But the real trouble is, that it is proposed by the Prime Minister, and to some people that stamps it as sinister. This was the issue that was raised in some of the elections yesterday, and particularly in some of the speeches in York South. The insinuation has been repudiated by the people themselves with an emphasis which no one can mistake.

I do not think this house ever heard a more frank discussion than the Prime Minister's explanation of why the pledge had been given. Among other things he pointed out, with the utmost candour, that the unanimity and speed with which parliament decided to go into the war and stand at the side of Britain could not have been achieved if that pledge had not been given. It was not a pledge on any minor matter. It was a pledge on a subject on which probably feelings are deeper and emotions run higher than on any other one subject in this country.

Members of the house know perfectly well that what the Prime Minister said was true. That was complete frankness, and the Prime Minister was equally frank when he outlined the reasons for considering that release from that assurance should be given in this time of peril. He described at length the critical position of our allies the world over and the new threats which had arisen. He concluded with these words:

> In a world situation so involved, with enemies on every front, with no one able to say what the outcome of battle in other parts of the world may bring of immediate and increased danger to our own land, the government feels strongly that it should be perfectly free to

recommend to parliament whatever course of action it deems essential to the security of our own country and to the preservation of freedom in our own and other lands. . . .

And he proposed to put this question to the people of Canada:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

There is nothing sinister about that. It is a straightforward laying bare of the situation. And it is in dead earnest.

I want to deal with just three points which have been made by those who criticize the government for proposing this plebiscite—although my colleague the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) has dealt with them so effectively and so conclusively that I almost hesitate to take the time of the house to speak of them again.

First may I refer to the objection that the plebiscite is unnecessary because the government already has a mandate from the people to wage total war.

I admit at once that the government was returned to power with a mandate to prosecute the war in the most effective way possible. But there was a restriction attached to that mandate. That is what is overlooked. The limitation arose from the fact that the government, in asking for support, had pledged itself through the Prime Minister that compulsory service for overseas would not be adopted. The national government party, through its leader, Hon. Doctor Manion, gave exactly the same pledge. That simply means—and the government was elected on that pledge—that the government's mandate was not unlimited; and, note this Mr. Speaker, that the position would have been exactly the same if Doctor Manion and his party had been returned to power. The mandate was to prosecute the war as effectively as possible, but subject to this limitation, that the raising of men for overseas should be restricted to voluntary enlistment.

Somebody has said a bad pledge is better broken. But this was not a bad pledge. Surely the leader of the national government party, after consultation with his lieutenants, would not give a bad pledge. It was a pledge on a subject which had torn this country wide open in 1917. As I said a moment ago, it was a pledge on no minor matter. It was a pledge which had great effect, as the Prime Minister has said, in connection with this country's coming into the war with such unanimity.

So binding was the pledge regarded that when the government brought down the National Resources Mobilization Act, by which it was given the most complete power over the person and property of every individual in this dominion, it recognized the limitation imposed by that pledge, and inserted right in the act the condition that this power over persons and property was not to extend to the sending of men compulsorily for military service outside of Canada. The present leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) was in the house at the time; he took no exception to that limitation. His only suggestion was that the act might be extended to service in Labrador. And he and his party supported that measure with that restriction in it.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Did I not say I was prepared to accept that as a half-way measure?

Mr. RALSTON: I am quite satisfied my hon. friend used no such language.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am quite satisfied I did. And I take credit for forcing the government to bring in the act—absolutely.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend should not draw a red herring across the trail. He should look at the record, and he will find that his colleague, the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks), suggested that the act be extended to Labrador, Iceland and Newfoundland, and that he himself suggested that it be extended to Labrador. I do not think he will find anywhere in his speech any suggestion that that was a half-way measure, or any suggestion that he was in any way opposed to that restriction being inserted as it is in the act to-day—with that exception. He and his party supported that measure without division and without adverse comment, too.

So much for the point that the government has a complete mandate to carry on the war. It has that mandate on every point except one, and that was regarded as so important—and I repeat it—as to be the subject of specific pledges of both major parties.

Then it is said that the government, in holding a plebiscite, is shirking responsibility and is trying to pass on to the people the burden of making a decision which the government should make itself. That objection is, in my humble opinion, absolutely groundless. Whatever objections there may be to the plebiscite, it is clear that shirking of responsibility is not one of them. If the government had asked the people to decide for or against conscription, that might have been claimed to be shirking governmental responsibility and placing the responsibility of decision on the people. If the government had stated its future policy in advance of the plebiscite, then the people might have said that the government was putting on the people the

burden of deciding on a policy regarding which the government must be in a better position to judge.

But the question in this plebiscite does not ask the people of Canada to decide for or against conscription—nothing of the kind. What it does do is to ask the people to put squarely on its shoulders—the shoulders of the government itself—the responsibility for deciding, subject to parliament, how men shall be raised for military service. That surely is not shirking responsibility or passing the buck or ducking the issue. The government is not asking the people to decide policy; on the contrary it is asking the people to let it decide policy. That is the very opposite of evading responsibility. What the government does is to state straightforwardly to the people of Canada that in this, the gravest crisis in the history of the world, it must have a free hand, regardless of past commitments. The plebiscite will decide whether the government's forthright statement of the dangers and its request for authority are to be heeded.

The other point—

Mr. SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired. He can proceed only with unanimous consent.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. RALSTON: I thank hon. members for the courtesy extended to me.

The other point is that the plebiscite means delay in carrying out the country's war effort, and this criticism is a prime example of the distortion which emanates from some quarters. It has been made to appear that Canada's whole war programme depends on the plebiscite; that in effect all effort will be suspended for two or three months until the plebiscite result is known, and that not until then can Britain and our other allies know whether Canada continues to stand with them. This, Mr. Speaker, in my humble judgment is absolutely fallacious. The plebiscite concerns only one part of our war programme. It does not concern the factories; it does not concern the navy or the air force. It concerns only the army, to the extent of overseas service.

I have stated that the 1942 army programme involves the raising of 90,000 to 100,000 men during the next fourteen months, for general service. That programme is already under way. It has not been hindered in any way. During the last four months over 32,000 men enlisted for the army, and I am advised and believe—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is that the active army?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes, the active army. I believe that if the intake of men for general service keeps within reasonable distance of that general level we shall be able to carry out the 1942 army programme for overseas, including the reserves regarded as adequate by both British and Canadian authorities in England.

In January we had the biggest enlistment we have had since the campaign in the summer. Some 11,700 men enlisted in the month. In addition to that, the calling up of men for training goes on, whether there is a plebiscite or not. No time is lost in that respect. Our training centres are full and will be kept full. The time which the plebiscite would take will have no effect whatever on that training. As a matter of fact we are having to add to our training facilities to take care of the increased enlistment and of the additional men we are calling up under the National Resources Mobilization Act. So that if indications mean anything the programme will go forward, plebiscite or no plebiscite, and there is not the slightest evidence that the time taken for the plebiscite will hinder or hurt our army programme.

So much has been said, sir, about compulsory service that I want to say a word about voluntary enlistments. I want to see voluntary enlistments kept up. I believe it is better for our volunteer army if the men coming to reinforce it are also volunteers. I believe the public of Canada generally wants to see enlistments kept up. In the midst of all this confusion and argument and bitterness, I am bold enough to make an appeal again to the house and to the people of Canada to make it their business as well as mine to keep enlistments up. It is a national effort, just the same as the raising of war loans. There everybody pitches in and tells people of the need, and helps to persuade them to subscribe. Surely it is even more important to help convince the men of Canada of the needs of the army. Canada's army is a force to be reckoned with. It is an efficient fighting machine, well organized, well officered and well manned. Canada's army holds a key position to preserve the security of this dominion. What we are proposing will add very much to its striking power. And we ought, Mr. Speaker, to be very much more proud of it than we seem to be. I want to ask everyone to recognize the gentlemen in battle dress. Along with the men of the navy and the air force, they are our first citizens. We should all be proud indeed of the response which has already been made by the young men of the country. It has been helped, I know, by the citizens' committees all over the dominion. They are

composed, just as this house is composed, of those who believe in conscription and of those who do not, but they have sunk their differences to help Canada. I am more than grateful to them for what they have done in connection with recruiting and for the support which they have given to the officers of the department, both at headquarters and in the districts.

Here is the record. I have said already that 422,000 young men of Canada have voluntarily enlisted in the armed forces since the war began up to the end of 1941. Enlistments for the year 1941 alone were:

Navy	13,088
Army	99,803
Air force	69,475

That gives a total for 1941 of 182,366 men who enlisted voluntarily in our armed forces.

An hon. MEMBER: In active service.

Mr. RALSTON: In active service. In January the total enlistments were:

Navy	800
Army	11,713
Air force	5,772
Total	18,285

You can hardly say, Mr. Speaker, that the voluntary system has failed. Let us not forget that these enlistments have come not under the patriotic fervour which casualties produces, but at a time when because of comparative inactivity it was naturally harder to convince our people that the army needed men. We at national defence headquarters are going right on, and I ask most sincerely for the active interest of the members of this house and of the citizens generally to back up our efforts.

I have faith in the success of the voluntary method if we all do our part. With the background and traditions which this country possesses, and which it would be folly to ignore, I prefer the voluntary method if it works, and I shall do all I can to make it work. At the same time, we cannot know what is ahead and I feel impelled to say—here I can speak only for myself—that if the voluntary system does not meet the needs of the fateful days before us, then I shall feel it my duty as part of my responsibility to advocate the adoption of the other method.

I want to ask: what is the alternative to the plebiscite which those who complain about it would suggest? What is the alternative to this plebiscite? I think it is suggested plainly that it is to put conscription into effect immediately, regardless of pledges and regardless of the way in which the voluntary system is functioning. My conviction is that an attempt summarily to put compulsory service for overseas into force, especially when enlistments are good, would obviously, apart from any pledge, have caused a deep and almost irrevocable breach in a country which up to the present has stood almost unbelievably united. And to do it in the face of the fact that the government was expressly pledged not to do it without consultation would only have deepened and widened that breach. I have seen the necessity for freedom of action, and I have seen the difficulties too. I have hoped that by asking the country for a release of the pledge in this time of crisis we would avoid disruption which would be sure to follow the breaking of the pledged word. I agreed to this plebiscite in that spirit. I believed that it was worth the time and effort and money which the plebiscite involved, to hold this nation together, not only for the future, but also for the present when Canada needs the combined strength and will and purpose of all her citizens.

This reference to the people is neither shocking nor sinister; it is a part of democracy. This request by the government to be relieved of restrictions will impress on Canadians everywhere the fact that Canada must be prepared to face effectively whatever comes. It will bring home to them the fact that this war is not just the war of Britain and the United States, of Russia and China and the united nations. It is Canada's war and the war of every man and woman in the dominion. Wherever they may be, our troops will be fighting for the safety of Canadian homes and for the security of our free institutions. By this I mean, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, which we have enjoyed so long that we seem to have taken them for granted.

I hoped devoutly that this method of approaching the matter would result in a united acceptance by Canadians of the possibilities which the war may involve; and in spite of the tumult and the shouting, I am not going to give up that hope yet. The winning of the war to avoid slavery must be the supreme consideration to all of us. The farther away from our shores we can keep the war, the less our peril will be. Our common danger requires us to work together for the safety of this dominion. We have too much to lose to pull apart now. Any honourable measure which will help to keep us together is worth trying if there is time, and I believe there is time for this. That is why I have agreed to it. That is why I support it.

We boast of being a nation. I believe that an affirmative answer to the question which will be put is necessary, not only to give the government the freedom of action which any government of a country at war in times like these must have, but also to meet the test of nationhood which we Canadians will face in these coming weeks.

Nationhood requires unity, and unity in Canada requires tolerance and confidence between the different races of which we are composed. The government, whether all citizens like it or not, is the only medium through which unity at this time can be expressed. It can be expressed in an affirmative answer to this plebiscite.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What if it is not?

Mr. RALSTON: Here is where we all can meet on common ground to put on the government the full responsibility for effectively prosecuting the war.

In the uncertain days which lie ahead, in this time of the gravest crisis in the world's history, I earnestly hope that my fellow Canadians, whatever their mother tongue, will curb extreme views on any side; will place on the shoulders of the government the responsibility which it is ready to take; will see the need to unite to meet a common danger, and will meet this test of nationhood and strengthen the common cause of our survival together as a free people.

Mr. J. A. ROSS (Souris): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all congratulate the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) upon his discourse this afternoon. He is one of the able ministers for whom I have great respect. I do not agree with all the views expressed by him this afternoon concerning this plebiscite. Speaking in this debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) had this to say, as reported on page 32 of *Hansard*:

> Whether the government, all circumstances considered, has applied the principle of national selective service as rapidly and as extensively as it should have been applied, is also a fair subject for debate.

In my humble opinion a statement from a responsible minister on the policy of the government in connection with man-power for agriculture, industry and the armed forces in Canada is long overdue. I have received many letters, resolutions and petitions from my constituency, from people of different political affiliations, asking me to urge this government to take immediate action on the matter of national selective service and an all-out war effort. I have sat in this house and listened to some seventy-six speeches in this debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Some forty-six members of all groups have expressed themselves against the taking of this plebiscite, while some thirty have spoken for it. I realize that these numbers may not indicate the results of the votes which will be taken on the amendments, because many hon. members who will not speak will vote as the party whip dictates.

I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Gray) upon the stand that he took in this debate. He certainly had the courage of his convictions. I should also like to compliment the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) and the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Moore). There were many other members who spoke as they did and, in my opinion, placed the welfare of the country ahead of party considerations.

To me the taking of the plebiscite seems a most unwarranted evasion of government responsibility. This is very well borne out by an editorial appearing in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of November 25, 1941, headed "Election? Referendum?" I need not point out to the members that the *Free Press* is consistently a supporter of the King government, and I think I might almost say that they worship the Prime Minister ahead of almost anything else in this country. The editorial states:

> While few developments could be imagined which would compel an appeal to the Canadian people on issues arising from the war, there is nothing in present circumstances which make this either desirable or proper.
>
> If the government, which must accept full responsibility for military policy, is agreed upon the course that ought to be followed and can command the support of parliament, there is no need either for an election or referendum.
>
> This argument, we contend, holds good irrespective of the nature of the policy which the government may pursue. It rests upon the firm unchallengeable foundation that the parliament of Canada cannot be bound by anything which seeks to limit its power when the exercise of this power in a particular form is necessary for the effective protection of the country's highest interests and perhaps of its very existence.
>
> It is said that the people gave the members a mandate not to apply conscription. The accuracy of this statement can be questioned. The question was not in issue at the election of 1940 and consequently there was no registering of opinion for or against. But if it had been an issue and if a definite majority had rendered a decision one way or another on the basis of conditions as they existed at the moment of the election, the soundness of our contention would not be affected a whit.
>
> For this reason: Parliament is a sovereign body charged with the gravest responsibilities and vested with unlimited power to meet these

responsibilities. If parliament, to meet emergent responsibilities as the result of new conditions, changes its policies, its action falls within the ambit of its duties and is therefore justified.

The contrary view derives from the theory that parliament operates with delegated powers and must keep within the limits of instructions given its members or engagements voluntarily offered by these members. Under this theory a member may be nothing higher than a jumping-jack operated by springs in the control of a local committee. This conception, pushed to its logical conclusion, destroys both the dignity and the power of parliament. The classic statement of the doctrine of the unrestricted sovereignty of parliament is that made by Burke to the electors of Bristol upon his election to parliament, November 3, 1774. His colleague, elected at the same time, having avowed himself subordinate to "instructions" from the electors—a question which had been discussed during the election contest—Burke took occasion to express his dissent and to assert the contrary view. His position was that a member of parliament was bound neither by the mandate of an election contest or by instructions transmitted to him by his constituents if in his judgment different counsels should determine policy.

Further on the editorial states:

If, therefore, the government and parliament are in agreement that a particular policy is necessary to the safety of the state, not only is an election not necessary but a resort to it could not but be injurious to the public interest.

An election could only be justified if a deadlock should develop in parliament making definite action of any kind impossible. An election would then become a desperate but inescapable expedient. The probability that any such state of affairs will develop at Ottawa is so remote that it is hardly worth considering.

The editorial goes on to assert the authority of parliament.

The Prime Minister, with his long list of broken pledges, probably more than those of any other prime minister of Canada, was going to reform the senate; he was going to close up the Bennett camps and provide employment for all the young men of this country. We all know what the young men in those camps did when they were closed. They had to ride the rods all across the dominion looking for employment.

During the last election campaign I personally listened to several radio broadcasts by the Prime Minister, and at no time did I hear him distinguish between conscription for overseas service and conscription. Throughout the whole campaign he said that, if he were returned to power, men would not be conscripted during this war. But since then we have had conscription for service in Canada. When young men were drafted for the thirty-day training period it was stated that they must be taught a sense of national obligation. I submit that where there is a lack of recognition in this respect it is solely the result of the policies of the Prime Minister over the past twenty-five years. In this connection may I quote a speech which he delivered in this house on foreign policy on March 30, 1939, as reported at page 2426 of *Hansard:*

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.

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. Profits could and would be rigidly controlled, and profiteering suppressed. But men's lives and men's wills cannot be put on the same basis as goods and profits. 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 Prime Minister and certain of his lieutenants have preached this doctrine especially to the province of Quebec. Within the past few days we have had enunciations by Premier Godbout of Quebec, by the federal Minister of Justice, Mr. St. Laurent, who was elected yesterday, and by others, to the effect that the Prime Minister will never have conscription in this country. Again the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lizotte) stated in this house on February 5 last, as reported at page 367 of *Hansard:*

Personally, since the last war and consequently for the past twenty-five years, I have been opposed to any form of compulsory service for overseas. This way of thinking has been inculcated in me by the leaders of my party, who have persuaded me that Canada should be my first and foremost consideration. Laurier, King and Lapointe have always refused to entertain the idea of conscription for overseas service.

The Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) is reported in the Winnipeg *Free Press* of December 20, 1941, as having spoken the night before in Winnipeg and opposed conscription. The report is headed "Crerar Opposes Conscription," and a subhead says "Does not believe it is" the best contribution Canada could make to win the war. The report goes on to say:

He expressed his disagreement with the request of the Canadian Legion for forty divisions in the army.

The Canadian Legion did not ask for this. The minister is reported to have been present with other members of the cabinet when the Canadian Legion presented their brief to the

government last October. Therefore, why should he make that statement and misrepresent the Canadian Legion?

The Winnipeg *Tribune,* reporting the same speech, says:

Attempts have been made to show that proponents of an all-out war programme for Canada want to conscript vast numbers of soldiers at the expense of Canada's industrial effort. This is nonsense. Hon. T. A. Crerar was raising a straw man of his own making when he directed his arguments concerning conscription against this.

In particular, the Canadian Legion does not propose mobilization of Canadian man-power simply to increase the armed forces. It demands, rather, that mobilization of man-power should be undertaken immediately in order that our resources of man-power may be used for our needs, whether in the field of agriculture or industry or in the fighting services.

An editorial appeared in the Swan River *Star,* a paper which has supported on several occasions the election of Hon. T. A. Crerar in his riding of Churchill. It is rather lengthy, but it points out that if this government have not the conviction and resolution which are necessary, it is their plain duty to make way for men who have; that the responsibility is upon the government, and that a plebiscite at this time is ridiculous. In view of this statement, is the minister now going to campaign in Manitoba for conscription, or where does he stand on this issue?

The Hon. J. T. Thorson, who is Minister of National War Services and, I think, might at times be termed minister of political propaganda for this government, is reported in the Montreal *Gazette* of December 2, 1941, as having spoken against conscription and stated that it might decrease our war effort. On February 3 last, as reported in *Hansard,* page 264, Mr. Thorson said that our enlistments were "quite satisfactory." But according to the Winnipeg *Free Press* of February 4, military district No. 10 reports a sharp decline in recruiting in the past week, and that the previous Monday registered the lowest figures of any Monday since August, 1941.

Will the Minister of National War Services now campaign for conscription in Manitoba, or where does he stand in this matter?

Hon. J. G. Gardiner, Minister of Agriculture, and one time Minister of National War Services, in a reconsecration week broadcast, on September 12, 1941, said:

We can muster a million men for our armed forces, and still have seven million people over sixteen years of age left in Canada. These seven million, properly organized and determined to stand behind the armed forces, can operate all our farms, our factories and places of business in a manner which will give us the production required.

[Mr. J. A. Ross.]

May I add that on the basis of Canada's armed forces in the last great war we should have, according to population to-day, in the present war approximately one million men in the armed forces.

Hon. J. L. Ralston, Minister of National Defence, speaking in this chamber on November 5, 1941, as reported in *Hansard* on page 4415, stated that there was a definite falling off of enlistments:

. . . in the last four months . . . we have asked for 37,000 odd, and something over 24,000 have actually enlisted.

On January 30, during this session, as reported at page 183 of *Hansard,* the minister again implies that there is now a great need of man-power in the country. His remarks occurred during a speech by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker).

Why, Mr. Speaker, are all these diverse views expressed by four different ministers of Canada's war cabinet at this particular time?

When Mr. Churchill recently introduced his man-power bill in the British House of Commons extending compulsion to men up to fifty-one years of age, and to women, for the auxiliary forces, he said:

The crisis of equipment is largely over and an ever-broadening flow is now assured. The crisis of man-power and woman-power is at hand and will dominate the year 1942. This crisis comes upon us for the following reasons:

The great supply plants have largely been constructed; they are finished: they must be staffed.

We must maintain the powerful mobile armies we have created with so much pains, both for home defence and foreign expeditions.

Mr. Roosevelt says that the United States needs men. This, in contrast to the argument to which we listened from the previous speaker. Speaking in Boston in October, 1940, he said:

And while I am talking to you, fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance—I have said this before but I shall say it again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign war.

Let me now quote from the Winnipeg *Free Press* a statement by President Roosevelt in the course of his speech to congress of January 6:

"We shall carry the attack."

We cannot wage this war in a defensive spirit. As our power and our resources are fully mobilized, we shall carry the attack against the enemy—we shall hit him and hit him again wherever and whenever we can reach him.

We must keep him far from our shores, for we intend to bring this battle to him on his own home grounds.

American armed forces must be used at any place in the world where it seems advisable to engage the forces of the enemy. In some cases

these operations will be defensive, in order to protect key positions. In other cases, these operations will be offensive, in order to strike at the common enemy, with a view to his complete encirclement and eventual total defeat.

American armed forces will be on all the oceans—helping to guard the essential communications which are vital to the united nations.

American land and air and sea forces will take stations in the British isles—which constitute an essential fortress in this world struggle.

Those forces, Mr. Speaker, have now taken their place in the British isles. In this connection, imagine the enemy invading New York or Seattle with an eye to coming to Canada: in our present position we could not send our forces across the line to assist the United States. To me this, at the present period in the war, is a most ridiculous state of affairs.

On November 10 last I spoke in this chamber, as reported in *Hansard,* page 4210 requesting the government immediately to put into effect national selective service for agriculture, industry and the fighting forces. I asked for that, in view of the progress of the war up to that particular time. I also asked that such service should be applicable to any theatre of war. Yet members of parliament are still asked to shirk their duty on this great issue, and at the same time the uninformed public of this country are to be requested to vote on a meaningless plebiscite. In this connection I ran across a letter in the Ottawa *Journal* of January 30, which is a striking indication of what the government may expect from the people of this country if the plebiscite is taken. It reads as follows:

I saw a picture in your paper the other day of Hon. Mr. Dunning congratulating his son on getting his wings. His pride in his boy struck me, because I have sons too. I can share his pride—and his anxiety.

But I don't know whether, when the decisive moment comes, I shall have the heart to vote thousands of fine young Canadian boys into this war when I think of the slaughter in Russia—the end of everything in this life for millions.

Or whether I shall remember Dunning and Churchill and vote so that I shall not be afraid to look them in the eye.

The *Journal* comments:

The damnable thing about this plebiscite on compulsory service is that thousands of mothers and fathers will be asked to make a similarly pathetic choice, to make it without guidance from the men who have been elected as leaders of the people in a terrific world mess, to make it without clear knowledge of the appalling facts.

Evading the decision, many will doubtless refrain from voting at all—and by that very lack of action indirectly instruct Mr. Mackenzie King under no circumstances to put compulsory service into effect.

I admit, sir, that I am greatly concerned at what may happen at that time. It may be difficult to get out a large percentage of the voters. It must be remembered that at election time, in spite of the tremendous amount of money which is expended and the great efforts which are put forth by the various parties, little over fifty per cent of the voters can be got out. How in the world are we going to obtain an all-out intelligent expression of opinion, by people who are uninformed, at a time like that? I feel very keenly that we as members of parliament are shirking our duty in this respect. We have yet in this country a party government prosecuting the war, a government returned under what is, in my opinion, an antiquated electoral system whereby fifty-three per cent of the electors who voted returned over 180 members out of 245.

The Prime Minister himself was elected in his riding by a minority of the votes cast. Patronage is still rampant at this stage of the war, no matter what some members may say in that regard. Only yesterday, February 9, an appointment was made in my constituency by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) on the recommendation of the defeated government candidate in that constituency. I am of the opinion that we should have a parliamentary investigation into the Department of Munitions and Supply. Very serious charges were made by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Maybank) almost a year ago concerning the Winnipeg cordite plant, but an investigation has been refused. Just the other day it was announced by the Minister of Munitions and Supply that the policy in future would be that further contracts would not be announced to the public, and the manner in which huge sums of money will be spent will be unknown to the people—a most unsatisfactory state of affairs.

The Truman report submitted to the congress of the United States on January 15 is a most interesting parallel to what might be brought to light in this country. Hundreds of millions of dollars of government money is given in the way of capital assistance to industry, ninety per cent of it in Ontario and Quebec, and this has greatly intensified economic difficulties throughout the rest of Canada. In my opinion, industry should be spread throughout Canada, especially when the taxpayers of the country are putting up the money to assist these industries.

Let me say a word about agriculture. As we are all aware, last week about 440 Saskatchewan farmers spent a couple of days in this capital city. They came here armed with great petitions asking for a parity price for wheat. I need not remind hon. members that,

along with all other members on this side of the house, I have consistently, ever since the outbreak of the war, advocated a parity price for all agricultural products. Certainly with a profit guaranteed industry and with the present status of wages guaranteed organized labour, on the basis of equity, agriculturists are entitled to a parity price. I am also satisfied that something must be done about agricultural help for farms in many sections of the country. There are many deplorable cases at the present time. The present haphazard way of calling men for the draft is unsound and uneconomical from the nation's point of view, and in many instances it causes a real hardship for many older people on the farms at this time. There must also be developed a plan for agriculture in this country —something which to-day is lacking.

I trust that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) will in the very near future announce a policy and a price for the 1942 wheat crop so that the farmers can begin planning their 1942 operations. The Minister of Agriculture stated this afternoon that there were certain difficulties in the way while the debate was going on on the speech from the throne. I would point out that a vast amount of business has been done in the last two or three years by order in council, and I am not so sure that, under this policy enunciated, a good deal of business will not be done by order in council while the house is sitting, as was done a year ago this spring. There is therefore nothing to prevent an announcement of the proposed policy for these people in order that they may begin planning for the coming year, and when we could debate it at a later stage.

Mr. GARDINER: I have already announced, in view of the criticisms of last year, it is the intention this year to bring the whole policy down by way of legislation.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I am pleased to have that answer from the minister. We have certainly made some headway.

Mr. PERLEY: When?

Mr. GARDINER: It was announced a month ago.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): There is one other item I wish to refer to. I was impressed by the speech delivered last evening by the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mrs. Casselman). I was interested in her argument with regard to the plight of old age pensioners in Canada. I was greatly disappointed when last fall the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) laid out his plans for the cost of living bonus for certain other people in the country, that something was not done for these pensioners. It is unfair to expect these old people to live decently on $20 a month at this time. They are entitled to a dollar a day. I think they should be given better consideration. Many of these people were pioneers and have done a great deal to help to develop the country. In old age they find themselves bereft of the savings which they may have laid by for the evening of life, and in my opinion the state should give them some consideration. I hope the government will see their way to do more for these people during this session.

Mrs. DORISE W. NIELSEN (North Battleford): Every member who has risen in his place to take part in this debate has done so, I am sure, with a great sense of responsibility; for the course of events which will shape the destiny of the whole world may come within the next few months. The future of the people of Canada depends to so large a degree upon the realization which Canadians have of the danger to Canada itself, and it depends upon the way we go as Canadians to meet the danger.

War at the present time is world war. It started with the flickering lights of a small beer parlour putsch, but the conflagration which is now spreading the whole world over has assumed gigantic proportions, greater than those of any war at any other time in the world's history. To-day it is not a war of nation against nation; it is a war of the peoples of the world against a new imperialism, an imperialism whose heart, or core, or nucleus, so to speak, is centred in Germany. In German imperialism, then, within this heart, this nucleus, lies the plan for world domination over all peoples and all races.

Democracy, that overworked word, which apparently means many things to many people, is threatened from every point of view. However you look at it, whatever it means to you, it is threatened by this new imperialism. In times of great danger the thoughts of people instinctively turn to methods of escape. In a forest fire the animals do not stop to fight among themselves; you will find the panther and the deer running side by side, the coyote and the rabbit doing the same. To-day, in this world fire which threatens the nations, there is no time for any groups, or people with different ideas, to stop and quarrel among themselves about what should be done. We are different from animals; we do not flee from this world conflagration; we turn to fight it. But to-day it means that people holding different ideals must, for the time being, forget their own particular aims and interests, and turn and unitedly fight the fire

which threatens them. There is a realization by all groups and classes, all religions and all creeds in Canada to-day, that our existence as a nation is threatened. I believe also that there is a growing unity in this nation, becoming stronger as the weeks and months pass, and a determination to make this a national effort in a measure that it has never yet been.

There is no time now for recriminations over the past. There is no time for us to quarrel or discuss among ourselves who is responsible for the present state of affairs. There is no time for us to argue as to whose fault it is that German imperialism to-day has the strength and power which it has. The job of every man or woman is to get into his or her place to fight it. Mr. Churchill himself has expressed that idea very neatly—he is perhaps the world's greatest phrase-maker. He said not very long ago:

> There is no time for the present to quarrel with the past, lest there may be no future.

I have said that I believe unity to-day is growing in Canada, and the results we heard last night of the by-elections tend to prove that to-day there is realization by the Canadian people of need for greater unity in this country. Our differences of racial origin or creed or politics are small compared with the national danger. To-day we must think as a nation and not as members of any one small group to which in the past we may particularly have adhered.

It is true that on the issue of conscription there are differences of long standing; deep-seated differences. But there is such need for understanding now that Canada's position is different from what it has ever been in past wars. If I had my way I should like to banish that word "conscription" from our vocabulary, because of its past associations. It is a word which has been used for petty political purposes, and thereby a stigma is attached to it in the eyes of some of our people. Instead of using that word, why not speak of democratic mobilization? Conscription, after all, is a democratic means whereby men can be rallied and put together in a fighting cause.

Might I use a very homely illustration? Some years ago a farmer asked me if I knew anything about hogs. I did not know a great deal, but I said, "Well, maybe a little." He said, "Could you tell me why it is that in winter time when the little hogs are let loose to run around the fields they go and burrow into the sides of the straw stack?" as they do sometimes in western Canada. I thought that was quite simple, and I answered glibly enough, "To keep themselves warm." The old farmer smiled a little and said, "I am afraid you do not know much about little hogs. Each little hog burrows into the side of the straw stack to keep himself warm. One little hog going in alone would not keep himself warm, but if fifteen little hogs get into the straw stack each burrowing into it for the purpose of keeping himself warm, the heat which is generated from them all keeps them warm."

It is a long way from little hogs to nations, but I would say to-day, Why is America fighting? She is fighting to defend herself. Why is China fighting? To defend herself. Australia? To defend herself. The people of the U.S.S.R.? To defend themselves. The people of the British isles? To defend themselves. The people of Canada? To defend themselves. And the twenty-six United Nations, who to-day have joined in this pact, are all motivated by the same desire, to protect themselves as nations from the menace which threatens the world. Alone any one nation to-day would be powerless before the onslaught of German imperialism. We have seen the small nations of the world try to stand alone. But if we, along with the other twenty-five nations of the world, put everything we have into the fight, the power which is generated by all of us will be sufficient to rid the world forever from the menace of imperialism.

Optimism is a good thing, but false optimism does not help a nation to get on its feet and make its best effort. Not long ago Mr. Churchill, when he spoke in the chamber of the house of representatives in the United States, warned them. He said that the power of the enemy is immense, that Hitler still has control of the greatest accumulation of weapons, equipment and supplies that has ever been gathered under one command. The German production of aluminum and magnesium, two metals essential for both aircraft construction and incendiary bombs, was greater than the combined production of Britain, the United States and Canada right up to the end of 1941. It might be interesting to quote the figures which have recently been presented by the United States bureau of mines, giving an estimate of the amounts of various minerals which are controlled by Germany through her control of Europe at the end of 1941. Germany controls 47 per cent of the world's total coal output, 44 per cent of pig-iron, 46 per cent of iron ore, 27·5 per cent of manganese ore, 10 per cent of chromite, 11 per cent of tungsten, 2·5 per cent of nickel, 7 per cent of copper, 33 per cent of zinc, 25 per cent of lead, 19 per cent of antimony, 50 per cent of bauxite, 47·5 per cent of aluminum, 66 per cent of magnesium, 42 per cent of mercury and 7 per cent of

molybdenite. These are the figures for Europe only, besides which Japan has big ore industries and huge stocks of strategic materials. She has recently seized territory rich in oil, tin, tungsten and other materials.

When I think of this question which at the present time is so paramount in the minds of Canadians as to whether or not we shall have democratic mobilization or, in other words, conscription, I feel that the French-speaking people of our nation, because of past associations, would have a right to question it, if they have not realized the difference in the world situation to-day. I would have agreed with them during the last war and other wars that it would be better not to have conscription. But to-day the French-speaking people of Canada must realize that they are not being asked to go and defend Australia, they are not being asked to give their sons to die for China, they are not being asked to have their sons conscripted to go to foreign soil to die for the sake of communism; or—something which perhaps to them is just as abhorrent—British imperialism. The French-speaking people of Canada are to-day asked to realize the grave necessity which may arise. Although to-day the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) filled us with hope that perhaps the present voluntary system will carry us some time further, yet the French-Canadian people must realize that there may come a time when their sons may have to agree to a form of conscription, democratic enlistment, for the defence of Canada, even if they have to go outside the shores of this country to defend Canada. The loyalty of the French-Canadian people is second to none in Canada. They have a history of which we are all proud, whether we speak their tongue or not. In the years which have passed, their contribution to Canada has been marvellous and magnificent. They would be betraying their splendid past if they did not realize to-day that the necessity may come for their sons to go beyond our shores to defend the soil of the Canada they love so much.

I believe some French-speaking members in the house, including the hon. members who sit to my left, have agreed that they, and others of their nationality, would be pleased to have their sons defend the shores of Canada. But are we going to wait until the shipyards, factories and railways of British Columbia are smashed and completely gone? Are we going to wait until the ancient and beautiful city of Quebec is a smouldering mass of ruins? What then could a little nation of eleven million people hope to do to defend the soil of Canada? It may be necessary for these French-Canadian sons, the same as Anglo-Saxon, Ukrainian and all other sons of Canada to go outside our shores. We may have to conscript them. But let them realize that, if this becomes necessary, it is done to protect the soil of Canada which contains their past and which alone holds the key to their future.

I believe that if the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent), recently elected, during his election campaign had spoken a little more definitely to the people of French Canada, and had told them that in future it may be necessary to go outside our shores, he would have done a greater service to Canada. Following his election campaign, I noted that he made very little mention of the fact that we may have to adopt that kind of conscription. Had he been just a little more truthful with the French-speaking people I believe they would have appreciated the changed situation, and would have gained a greater knowledge of the necessity for their uniting with other Canadians.

Hon. members know perfectly well that I am no defender of government policy. I never have been—not since I have been a member of the house. As I have seen it, government policy has been disastrous for many of those whom I represent. Yet I realize that the plebiscite represents an attempt on the part of the government to preserve the unity of Canada and to give the French-speaking people an opportunity to realize the difference between conditions to-day and those of the past. It has tried through the plebiscite to bring about a recognition of this changed situation. Because of that, I support the idea of the plebiscite. I support it because I feel it is in the greatest interest of all Canadians that we should have the government free, should necessity arise, democratically to take the young men of Canada and, if necessary, place them outside the shores of our country for the defence of our homeland.

The sooner the plebiscite can be taken, the greater safety we shall be able to attain. I would certainly hope that during the Easter recess members of the house would go out among French-Canadian people and try to make the issue clear to them. I would urge them to do that, so that we may have a one hundred per cent affirmative reply to the question of the plebiscite, a reply united from one side of Canada to the other.

Reference was made to-day by the Minister of National Defence to General McNaughton's visit to Canada. I cannot imagine anything which could be of greater value to General McNaughton than to be able to return to England and say to the Canadian boys over there, "Canada is solidly, one hundred per cent behind you and has expressed by its reply to the plebiscite its readiness to relieve

the government of past commitments and to go along with the government, if needs be, in what must be done in the future. Canada is ready to stand beside you." If General McNaughton were able to take back that message, he would certainly have something that Canadian boys in England would be glad to hear.

Perhaps because I am a woman I look at things from a practical viewpoint, but I have some thoughts I should like to place before hon. members. These days we hear a great deal about unity. Hon. members rise in their places and talk about unity. Many appeals are being made to our people for unity. Any father or mother must know that example is better than precept. There is no use in telling your son not to smoke cigarettes if you are smoking a pipe; it is no use for a mother to tell her daughter that she must not drink and smoke if the mother drinks and smokes herself. I say that we, as representatives, should set an example for the people of Canada. Here we have an opportunity greater than we have ever had to show our people that their representatives in the House of Commons are united.

Last night hon. members sitting on the benches of the official opposition received a definite understanding as to whether or not the people were agreeable to the acceptance of their proposals. Would it not be a worthy gesture on the part of the official opposition to take a leaf out of Wendell Willkie's book, a man who was an American first and a Republican second. Could you not be Canadians first and Conservatives second? In deference to the ideal of unity and for the sake of setting an example to the people of Canada, could you not at this time withdraw your amendment? Could you not do that? It would be a great thing not only for you but for the whole of Canada, were you able to do it.

There is also a subamendment, with which I consider that ninety per cent of the people in the country are in agreement. I agree with it, and I believe many hon. members on the government benches, at least to some extent, agree with the proposals contained therein. We know that to carry on this vast war effort we must enlist the material wealth of the nation. We have to take it, if it is necessary to do so. I am going to make another proposal, and I trust it may not be misunderstood by those of my friends in the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group. The people of Canada know that the subamendment has been moved; they know its contents. If hon. members in the C.C.F. group would make a similar gesture and drop their sub-amendment, not with the idea of giving up for one second the principles embodied therein but for the sake of unity, they would be acting for the benefit of the whole nation. I would say to my hon. friends in that group and to those in the Social Credit group, that we who sit in this block will continue to fight to see that wealth is used as it should be used, for the benefit of all. We can do that specifically every time a bill involving the wealth of the nation is brought before the house. Would it not be a worthwhile gesture, so that this first motion of the session might be passed unanimously on all sides, if both the amendment and the subamendment for the time being might be withdrawn? It would be an example.

The most important point in the speech from the throne was the need for increased production, so that the people of Britain and the Soviet Union may have all the material required when the spring offensive is made, as we all expect it will be made, as soon as the weather is sufficiently mild.

To-day there is a realization that in connection with production it is the brains of the ordinary men and women who work in our factories, our mines and our mills; it is their initiative and their cooperation which alone can speed up production and bring it to the peak of one hundred per cent perfection. No one knows better than the men who are on the job what should be done. I have been receiving communications and resolutions from various trade union bodies. It is apparent that in their own particular factories they are undertaking to devise ways and means whereby a greater output can be accomplished. If only the labour forces of this country could be granted a little more of the partnership idea with industry in production, I feel convinced that production would go up by leaps and bounds.

To-day labour is asking for partnership with industry in production, not because labour is demanding merely on its own behalf a share of what the pickings might be, far from it, but because the men and women who form our labour forces realized long ago the danger of fascism. They started to fight it long before this government ever took up the case of democracy against fascism. These men and women who work are anxious to have partnership with industry in production. They are asking that they be given this because it is by that means alone that production can really be brought to its maximum.

I know that in many instances industry is afraid to give certain rights and privileges to labour because it might interfere with its profits, with its way of looking after industry.

But surely the time has come when the leaders of industry in Canada must realize that in war time nothing is run as usual. Life does not go on as usual; business does not go on as usual. They must make adjustments the same as the working people.

In Kirkland Lake a decision was recently arrived at by the miners that they would go back to the mines. For weeks these miners have been obeying to the very letter the laws of this country, but they have been demanding that they have union recognition. The government has taken the stand of being neither for one side nor for the other; in reality that is nothing but a policy of appeasement to the gold-mine owners. Other workers in steel and other industries realized the importance of the fight going on in Kirkland Lake, and they threatened further strikes in sympathy with the miners there. Rather than see industry throughout Canada dislocated, the miners of Kirkland Lake decided to go back to the mines. They have set an example; they have created a precedent; they have negated their own particular wishes and desires and rights because they valued first our national war effort. That is an example, not only to labour itself but to industry. It should be realized that our national needs come before the needs of any one particular group.

If labour could be given a greater share in planning production and in helping to make it efficient, things would go better. Instead, we have these dollar-a-year men who are able to direct the production of this country. The senate defence committee at Washington, after an investigation lasting one year, reported that the dollar-a-year men in that country were still working in the interests of their employers. Evidence from the trade unions in Canada would indicate that the same thing is happening here. Instead of having these dollar-a-year men in key positions with the interests of their employers constantly before their minds rather than the interests of the nation at large, if we could set up a new ministry of production to coordinate production in all the various branches of industry we might have production which was really in the best interests of Canada's war effort instead of a production controlled by any one group. So much for the labour forces.

What of the farmer? It does not seem that the delegation which came to Ottawa has received a great deal of attention. I know, however, that all hon. members were aware that it came here. I noticed in the Ottawa *Citizen* of January 31 a small item in Mr. Bishop's column. I know Mr. Bishop usually writes a good résumé of what goes on in the house, but I could not help taking exception to one sentence which he had at the end of a small paragraph dealing with this delegation. He said:

> The wheat farmer has the idea that other farmers, not to mention war industry, are doing well and they want to get in on it.

There never was a greater lie spoken about the western wheat farmer than that. As a group they have carried on magnificently in the face of the greatest hardships. They have never counted the cost or the loss to themselves but have gone on contributing in such ways as they could because they believed it was their duty to do so. In coming here to ask for parity prices, they did so, not because of any desire to get in on the pickings but because they realized that unless they could get parity prices for their products, they would not be in position to give as much to this war effort as they wanted to.

The production of food is coming more to the fore. Quite often I receive a little leaflet from the United States entitled, "Facts for Farmers", and published monthly by the Farm Research in New York. In this particular copy there is an article which outlines the tremendous increase in food production which is planned by the United States. I quote:

> The administrator of the surplus marketing administration, Roy F. Hendrickson, recently declared in Georgia:
>
> "The reasons for this increased production—of nearly everything outside cotton, wheat and tobacco—are growing. British needs are increasing; Russian needs are coming significantly into the picture. Domestic requirements are expanding. On top of all this, the place of reserves, of stockpiles ready for areas now conquered, when they can cast off Hitler's stranglehold, are being seen more clearly—a staggering total."
>
> The SMA administrator cautioned against complacency and added:
>
> "Many persons have come to assume that, these goals will be attained. Instead, a very real possibility exists that we will fall short of many of them—even though food production and marketings next crop year will be the largest in our history.
>
> As the need for farmstuffs increases, the shift from the former policy of reduction to the policy of all-out production will become more marked. In England bonus plans have been adopted to encourage greater farm production. Though the President recommended such a policy six months ago and congress appropriated one and a quarter billion dollars for this purpose, only a few programmes of this sort have yet been formulated."

When this government begins to realize the contribution which the farmers of our country can make toward victory, then we shall be taking another step forward in this great effort of ours.

It is said, and I suppose it is true, that the allies are making broadcasts to the people of

the conquered nations of Europe. Suppose you were one of these people, maybe a person living in France, Belgium or one of the Scandinavian countries, or in the city of Vienna, and that you loathed the hated axis forces and their domination over your country. Maybe you were a factory worker and had work within your hands day by day which you knew was important. Suppose over the short-wave you heard the voice of the allies speaking to you, and that voice said, "People of the conquered countries, do what you can to sabotage the war effort of Germany. If you are a factory worker, see what you can do to impede and restrict the factory production. If you will do this, if you will help to overthrow the axis powers, the allies will help you afterwards to establish freedom and democracy." Oh, I know that would be a fine thing. I remember the days when I was pretty hungry, yet all the time I never lost my idealism for freedom and democracy. No. But suppose you were hungry and one of the conquered peoples of Europe, and that over the short-wave you heard the voice of the allies calling to you and saying, "People of the conquered countries, do what you can to impede and restrict and halt the war effort of the nazis. Do what you can to sabotage their plans. Help the allies to win, and as soon as the allies have won, before we even take our armies away from your country, we will load our boats down to the water line with food for you. We will send you good wheat to make white bread, and we will send you red meat and eggs and bacon and sugar and all the other foods that you need." You know, Mr. Speaker, the instinct of self-preservation is the strongest instinct that lives in man or woman, and they will do much to eat and to give food to their starving children. If we can build up surpluses of food within this nation and have them ready to give to these people when they are ready to help overthrow the regime which now occupies their country, we would have a weapon in our hands and, think of it, the most marvellous weapon any country could have or any people could have, a weapon which would bring life instead of death.

We need the planned production of food. I know that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) has a good head on him. I would not deny it; he must have, to be able to fool the farmers all these years and get away with it. But, on the basis that two heads are better than one, I would say to him that the time has come when we should have a gathering of all the farm bodies in Canada. Let them plan. Let them know what the requirements of Britain are going to be. Let us correlate our plans for food production with the plans of the United States. Let us see that in this western hemisphere we build up huge stocks of food which will be a weapon for victory in our hands and help us to bring the peace we so much desire.

But, we are told, there is no money for that. I say, Mr. Speaker, that there must be money for these things. They are essential, just as essential as are the munitions which the armed forces need. Not only are they necessary for the people of the conquered countries, but we need increased food production for our own people. If we are to keep healthy and strong our industrial army, we must see that we have no rationing but plenty of everything that is needed for them.

Not only in the production of food should something be done. Plans should also be made to see if the farmers of this country could perhaps go into some other branches of farming which might be necessary at this time. I do not know to what degree the United States has gone ahead with the production of synthetic rubber, but I believe that already some of the states are going ahead with it. To what degree could our Canadian farmers grow dandelions or sow-thistles? Many of them have plenty of these weeds already, and, if synthetic rubber can be made from these weeds, would it not be well to give our farmers a chance to develop that production?

Then there are the soya bean and various other crops to which our farmers could turn in a time of crisis like this, besides going ahead with their ordinary routine. Every day it becomes more evident that Australia may be cut off from us. I know that silk stockings are very nice to wear and to look at, but we can do without them. In this country, however, we cannot do without woollen clothes. There, again, is something our farmers could turn to—increase their flocks of sheep. These are only a few things because, in a speech of a general nature such as this, I have not the time to go into details. But were we to have a conference of all the farm bodies in Canada, I believe that a comprehensive plan could be worked out which would give our farmers the feeling of really belonging to the war effort, and which would place in our hands a weapon for victory.

There is the question of labour. That question comes up whenever one thinks of agriculture. Perhaps there is a solution of that problem. I know already that high school and university students are again going to help in the fruit-picking areas. I would suggest that in certain areas the boys in the army might also go out and help. After all is said and done, I have heard that in many areas

the boys are fed up with being restricted to their routine bit of drill and so on, and at certain times of the year they certainly could and would enjoy helping in some farm operations.

There is the question of women. I have been reading recently quite a little about the women's land army in Britain during the last war and in this war. I am convinced that women could help to fill the demand for farm labour. I have been very much disappointed myself to find that my services cannot be accepted with the armed forces. It is too bad, but I happen to have three children, and because I have three children I cannot go into one of the women's services. Personally, I think that is one of the most idiotic regulations ever made by men. There are numbers of women whose children could be cared for very well and whose services could be used in our war effort. But I would suggest that, since that avenue is closed to me, it might be possible for me to devote some of my time and energy to organizing and mobilizing a women's general service corps. There are a thousand and one things that women could be doing right here and now to release young men for the armed forces and for other work. Take the staffs of the various large hotels in the cities, for instance; street-car conductors, drivers of delivery vans, milk trucks, grocery and vegetable vans. The women are doing this work in Britain, and they could do it here just as well. Women could also be sent to various farm areas to help milk the cows, make cheese, drive tractors and combines, and help with other farm work. Mobilize these women. Give them a strong, sensible, useful sort of uniform and let them do the job that they are anxious and willing to do.

I called up a little while ago and found out that applications to enter the Canadian Women's Army Corps number around 19,000, and yet we have only about 3,200 in uniform. There are hundreds and hundreds of other women who could be mobilized into a general service corps and who would be ready to work so that men could be released for other services. Many a young married woman could, shall we say, drive a delivery van in the morning in the city and go out for a certain number of hours. Maybe she has children, but they could be taken care of. Some of the older women, perhaps some of the wives of the pensionless ex-service men, could be given a job and the children could be kept in a pleasant place for a few hours and minded while their mothers went out to work. If we are going to have total war, let us have it. Do not dally with it any longer. The women of the nation are ready. Let us give them something to work at, and if my services can be used in the mobilization of such a women's service corps I shall be only too pleased.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt, but the hon. member's time is up. She can proceed only with the unanimous consent of the house. I take it that unanimous consent is given.

Mrs. NIELSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There is one other thing which is of great importance and cannot be neglected, and that is the health of our people. I have spoken of this before, but again it is necessary and must be mentioned. I have no idea as to what standing committees are to be set up, but I shall feel that this government has seriously neglected one particular branch of war service if it does not appoint a standing committee on health. There never was a time when such a committee was more necessary. We learn from the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) himself that on any one day in Canada alone fifty thousand industrial workers are not in their places in the machine shops, the factories and elsewhere, because of sickness; and, according to him, the number of man working days lost through industrial accidents and sickness in 1941 came to the startling total of over seventeen million. We could set up factory clinics, we could have more health services, but only if a committee is formed and we have a government ready to get this thing started. It is such a waste of time, of man-power, of energy, to have our people lying sick at home when, but for the lack of a little medical care, or maybe a little better food, they could be at their benches or their desks, in the mines or at the shops, contributing what they have to give.

There were several figures I wished to quote with regard to national health, but as time is passing I shall have to reserve them until another occasion. One point which, however, I cannot omit is the necessity of the government not only setting up clinics but seeing that a health committee of this house is started to definitely find ways and means of giving our people medical attention and suitable food, for food is a very necessary part of maintaining health. I think we should see to it also, before this session closes, that minimum wage laws are passed applicable to the whole length and breadth of this country. Such legislation would particularly benefit the underpaid workers in the province of Quebec, lifting them to the general level of the rest of Canada,

improving their health and their morale, and perhaps helping to cement that feeling of unity which to-day is just a little strained.

Just one further remark on the subject of unity. We still have discrimination against some of the minority peoples. There is much I should like to say on this matter, but time will not permit. We have in this country a group of Ukrainians who are sympathetic to their Ukrainian brethren who to-day are fighting one of the finest battles the world has ever known. Yet this group within our country has had eighty-six of its halls confiscated and some of them have been sold to another group of Ukrainians who have been misled for years by leaders sympathetic to Hitler and German imperialism. It does not seem logical or even possible that such things can still be. If the Ukrainian Labour Farm Temple association had back its eighty-six halls, it could carry on great activity in support of the whole war effort. Already these people have contributed hundreds of thousands of dollars to war charities. Give them their halls and the opportunity to carry on entertainments and other activities and they will render a contribution which we shall be very glad to receive. It is ghastly to think that these people are denied the ordinary privileges and rights of citizens when they are sympathetic to an ally whom we recognize to-day, that they are still under the ban in this country and are called disloyal and unpatriotic, and are not allowed even to have their own property. It is almost unbelievable.

I wish to refer to another matter related to rallying and keeping people in this country united in the national effort. This morning I visited the spokesman of the men who are interned in the Hull gaol. I read the other day a reference to a very interesting item in the New York *Times*. It is short, and I should like hon. members to listen attentively while I read this report:

> The New York *Times* correspondent in Singapore reports that communist party leaders, "just released from prison," attended a public mobilization meeting there, and that the party will have ten of the sixty members on the mobilization council. *Newsweek* reveals that up to the outbreak of war in the far east, the party was illegal, "and every week members were caught and sentenced to six months' hard labour." Now, *Newsweek* says, "without any legal rectification, the communists are welcomed as loyal supporters of the British cause," and manifestos for an all-out war are published by them in the local papers.
>
> It can be suggested that the readiness of the Singapore authorities to welcome the co-operation of the communists is a measure of the gravity of the Malayan situation. If this is so, it may also be suggested that the Canadian government's refusal to welcome the communists' assistance indicates the Ottawa authorities' unwillingness to do everything that can be done to mobilize this country for victory.

The Canadian Seamen's union is trying to enlist six thousand young seamen to go into the merchant marine—a dangerous and difficult job, for which a young man needs to be well versed in the ways of the sea. The union is not having all the success it would like in obtaining these six thousand men, and I will tell you why—because the president of the union is interned in the Hull gaol. If he were free, I should like to guarantee to hon. members that this man Sullivan could recruit six thousand men for the merchant marine. If this is an all-out war effort, you cannot afford to neglect the help of any single man or woman who is ready to do something to enlist the sympathies of the people.

In the camp at Hull there are some young French-speaking Canadians who would be willing to go out and rally their own people; but there they are, making trinkets, doing little odd jobs to keep themselves amused, while this country has to keep them in idleness and support their wives and children. It is almost unbelievable that to-day the government persists in a policy of that kind.

I have overstepped my time considerably, but I cannot help stressing, in conclusion, that if the government wants to keep up the morale of the Canadian people it must enlist all the people and give them their chance to work in this war effort. It must satisfy the men in the armed forces that their fathers and mothers, their wives and children are being taken care of. I should like at this time to support the plea which was made the other evening by the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mrs. Casselman) on behalf of old age pensioners. It is the government's duty to satisfy our Canadian soldiers that the cause for which they fight means that their wives and children will live in a better world. So much can be done to improve morale if the help and sympathy of all kinds of Canadian people, irrespective of creed or politics, is secured. This government can unite Canada, as no government has ever been able to do, for the greatest effort which she can make. I say to them, if you will let the people have an opportunity to fight this war and win it, not only will the people of Canada fight and win the war, but they will build a land wherein every man shall live in security, with freedom, and in perpetual peace.

Mr. H. R. FLEMING (Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, there is little need for me to take up the time of this house in congratulating the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. That has already been done very capably. This house has been treated to oratory, both English and French, in almost the grand manner, and it is something in this modern world when so many people are articulate. I can only record my appreciation of the way in which the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) conducted themselves.

Before, however, I turn to the serious matters confronting this house, perhaps I might be permitted to spend a moment in paying tribute to a great Canadian. It has already been the melancholy task of certain hon. members to recall the memory of the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. I take liberty of associating myself with their sentiments, and to them I would add the thought that when the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe was in this house, members were in the presence of greatness. It was a greatness based upon courage and faith; for, as Cicero says, a man of courage is also full of faith. Our late colleague was such a man. His courage was ever equal to the problem before him. Let us emulate that courage. Let us each possess such a brave heart; for victories are won, not by shining armour, but by brave hearts.

Turning to the business that has been occupying this house now for many days, the discussion of the speech from the throne, I would throw out this observation with regard to a fact that seems to have escaped perhaps some hon. members. We have been regaled by many, many speeches, the contents of which, if hon. members will recall, have been mostly about conscription. I am wondering whether many of these speeches had not been prepared some time in advance, with the notion of springing them on the house and stirring up a hurricane round that word conscription; then when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) brought down his plan for a plebiscite, these hon. gentlemen had been caught slightly short, and rather than prepare new speeches they decided to continue on their predetermined way. That they are not without selfish motives is beside the issue; that they are obscuring the trend of this debate is hardly to be denied. But, then, clarity of our public issues does not mean the same to all men. I suggest to the house that the reiterated arguments about compulsion for overseas service cover, as the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) said this afternoon, only a small part, and a very small part of the problem of our maximum national support of our war effort. Indeed, it is not too much to say that such arguments cover but a relatively unimportant part of the whole problem.

The object of the hon. members who have been so vociferously eloquent in their arguments is quite clear. They want to thrust their way through, and in the confusion that might arise some of them might gain places on the treasury benches. It is a time-worn argument and a time-worn device, but by grace of the wise leadership of the Prime Minister and the government of Canada, it has been frustrated in such a thoroughgoing manner that the hon. gentlemen, I am sure, must to-day be quite furious, because yesterday the people of Quebec and Ontario spoke. They have spoken in no uncertain manner.

It is a just punishment to those who would put obstacles in the way of our total war effort; for that is exactly what this hullabaloo about conscription for overseas service is doing. By pushing such arguments into the forefront of discussion in this house, and thus into the forefront of newspaper columns and the forefront of discussion in the humble homes all across this great Dominion of Canada, the entire thinking of the country is being shunted on to a side-track and away from the main issue; and that is exactly what hon. gentlemen wish to have done. They want to gain by the discord—the Meighens, the Hepburns, the Drews, and that long list that one could put upon the pages of *Hansard*.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us put this matter in its proper perspective, and that will be done by calling the attention of hon. members to various documents. In the first place, may I refer to a speech made before the Canadian club in London, Ontario, recently by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Claxton), one of the new members of this house. He drew attention to that benighted word "conscription." He said:

> The word conscription has come to be identified with compulsory overseas service, and the discussion of conscription in this sense tends to concentrate attention on that feature of our war effort to the exclusion of everything else. I suggest that the word should not even be used. It has become a symbol, or rather two symbols; and symbols are potent emotional forces. Among some Canadians conscription has become the symbol of total war effort; for other Canadians with just as deep a love of their country the word has long been the symbol of racial domination. These symbols get in the way and prevent the matter from being treated on the facts and not on the emotions. The

word should be avoided because it is emotionally charged and focuses attention on only one aspect of the war effort and puts it out of proportion to everything else.

I suggest that this is a most accurate understanding of the problem. Selective service is a modern expression for conscription, and an hon. member who spoke here gave another expression this afternoon. I think that it is the duty of every public speaker to use this expression. It is more than a duty, because it would be more accurate to speak of selective service. It selects. It puts those most fit for specific jobs into those jobs, and according to Canada's National Resources Mobilization Act of 1940 that selection is designed to apply to more than military service. Conscription instead of selective service! What a bedevilment on the part of those whom we credit with enough intelligence to think more clearly, to speak more lucidly, and to act more wisely. Have we been too charitable to those people who would go out through the country, and to those newspapers throughout the country? Have the Prime Minister and the government been too charitable to those people, the Hepburns, the Meighens and the Drews? Conscription! Where is the word in the three paragraphs of the speech from the throne referring to the plebiscite? Since that is the pivot around which everything in this discussion in the house is revolving, it would not be out of the way first to recall to this house what these paragraphs are:

> My advisers believe that the magnitude and balanced nature of Canada's war effort is being obscured and impaired by controversy concerning commitments with respect to the methods of raising men for military service which were made prior to the spread of the war to all parts of the world.
>
> The government is of the opinion that, at this time of gravest crisis in the world's history, the administration, subject only to its responsibility to parliament, should in this connection and irrespective of any previous commitments, possess complete freedom to act in accordance with its judgment of the needs of the situation as they may arise.
>
> My ministers accordingly will seek, from the people, by means of a plebiscite, release from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service.

The issue is just as simple and straightforward as the wording in these paragraphs indicates. Could anything be more clear? The Prime Minister and the government and many members of this house have publicly declared that it would be a mistaken policy, unjust and short-sighted, to impose compulsory military service for overseas. A given set of circumstances obtained then. They were circumstances, when these commitments that the Prime Minister—and not only the Prime Minister but other political parties—made, that rendered such commitments not only advisable in the national interest at that particular time, but as the Minister of National Defence said this afternoon, advisable in the interest of national unity. They were also advisable due to the nature of the war and the situation as it existed at that time. But these circumstances have now altered; and the government, as is honourable and proper and natural, wishes to know whether the electorate which put it in power is willing to release it from those pledges made at that time. There is nothing more in the plebiscite than that, no matter what sort of murk some hon. members may try to throw over the issue.

If there be any argument about this plebiscite, it is certainly not an argument about "conscription"—I put the word in quotation marks. Rather, it is an argument as to the wisdom, justice and probity of holding the plebiscite, and I suggest that there can be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable man of such wisdom, justice and probity. It is wise, it is just, it is honourable. If the government and hon. members who have associated themselves with these commitments are to be released from them because the circumstances have changed, then the only thing and the only people that can release them is the electorate of this dominion. That is the best, quickest, simplest and most effective way of finding out the wishes of the people. We should not be befuddled by newspapers which sometimes we think represent public opinion, such as the Toronto *Globe and Mail,* or the little Ottawa journals which change their minds from day to day and have no stated policy in their editorial columns.

May I draw attention to certain editorial comments on this plebiscite from various Canadian newspapers, both Liberal and Conservative, from all across this country. Their editors should be congratulated upon their fairness and insight.

The Hamilton *Spectator* says:

> Mr. King's course should appeal to all even-tempered persons as a reasonable one. . . . After all there is no safer tribunal in a democracy than the people themselves.

The London *Free Press* says:

> Under all the circumstances . . . the decision which has been reached is both understandable and dependable. If we are to have a plebiscite this is the best form it could take.

The Lethbridge *Herald* says:

> The government appears to have taken the democratic course.

The Toronto *Star* says:

In proposing a plebiscite Mr. King is no doubt taking the course which he thinks will result in maintaining national unity to the greatest possible degree.

The Regina *Leader-Post* says:

It cannot be denied that broad political considerations are involved which many may be inclined to overlook. Sound government is a science with Mr. King as well as a shield. His remarkable sagacity has stood the nation in good stead before. His action in this instance may very well turn out to have been the wisest course.

The Winnipeg *Free Press* says:

We are confident the plebiscite can command the measure of support for the proposition of giving unlimited power to the government—power so decisive it will settle this question finally without an aftermath of bitterness, provided those who favour the result consolidate their efforts and activities to bring it about.

Note the qualifications of the Winnipeg *Free Press* editorial:

. . . provided those who favour the result consolidate their efforts and activities to bring it about.

There is also another qualification. That qualification may be found in the editorials of other Canadian newspapers. The Saint John *Telegraph-Journal* says:

Let us hope the plebiscite will be carried out with a complete lack of bitter argument and debate . . . The gravity of the situation demands extraordinary measures.

The Peterborough *Examiner* says:

Let the plebiscite come, if it has to, and let us get over with troubled weather and press on with our titanic job. Too much time and energy spent in wrangling over the issue will be be an unpardonable waste.

The Halifax *Chronicle* says:

The Canadian people will give a clear, decisive, unequivocal answer. Let us get the plebiscite out of the way, behind us, and forgotten, at the earliest possible moment.

I commend the admonitions of these editors to hon. members and also to sundry gentlemen who have already lost or are in process of losing their perspective on this important matter, and who use such terms as "un-British", "autocratic", "cowardly", and all the rest of the epithets that have been hurled against it.

I think this sums up what is most apropos concerning the forthcoming plebiscite. It is clear that many agree that the step is wise, just, honourable; it is also courageous. As the Toronto *Star* said editorially the other day:

The curious charge is made against Mr. King that he shows a "lack of courage" in holding a plebiscite. Courage to what? To break his pledged word, evidently; to break it without securing a release from the electorate to whom his pledge was given! That would be a poor kind of courage which any man might be proud to lack.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

[Mr. Fleming.]

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—HON. MR. HANSON

LIMITATION UNDER MOBILIZATION ACT WITH RESPECT TO SERVICE OVERSEAS

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. This afternoon when the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) was making his speech relative to the limitation imposed by the National Resources Mobilization Act with respect to service overseas, he made this statement:

The present leader of the opposition was in the house at the time; he took no exception to that limitation. His only suggestion was that the act might be extended to service in Labrador. And he and his party supported that measure with that restriction in it.

I interrupted to say:

Did I not say I was prepared to accept that as a halfway measure?

I am reading from the transcript of this afternoon's proceedings. It continues:

Mr. Ralston: I am quite satisfied my hon. friend used no such language.

I interrupted him again. Then farther on the minister said:

He should look at the record—

Referring to myself.

—and he will find that his colleague, the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks) suggested that the act be extended to Labrador, Iceland and Newfoundland, and that he himself suggested that it be extended to Labrador. I do not think he will find anywhere in his speech any suggestion that that was a half-way measure, or any suggestion that he was in any way opposed to that restriction being inserted as it is in the act to-day—with that exception. He and his party supported that measure without division and without adverse comment, too.

I now desire to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, and the attention of the house to the first column on page 857 of *Hansard* for June 18, 1940. On that occasion I was speaking after the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) had spoken announcing the introduction of the National Resources Mobilization Act. I was referring to what had occurred on the Monday previous, when my colleague and I had called on him. This is what I said on that occasion:

Specifically I recommended three things. . . .

And then I went on:

Second, that this government propose now to take authority to mobilize all the man-power and all the material resources of this nation for the aid of the mother country and for the defence of Canada.

Afterwards, when the bill was in committee, I stated, as reported at pages 913 and 914 of *Hansard* for June 19, 1940—and I am giving only brief excerpts:

I should like to emphasize the fact that the bill is purely and simply enabling legislation, and while it falls short of what many people in this dominion think is necessary and have been demanding, yet on balance and on the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread at all, we on this side of the house are prepared to accept the principle of the bill and to accept the measure for what it is worth.

And again, on the second column of page 917:

I tell the Prime Minister it has not been easy to support the principle of this bill, having regard to the volume of representations I had received beforehand in favour of something more far-reaching, and the protests I have been receiving this morning that we should still have something greater. But as I said before, for the defence of Canada if for nothing else I am willing to support the principle of this bill; because half a loaf is better than no bread.

The reference to Labrador is contained at page 917 of *Hansard,* after the hon. member for Royal (Mr. Brooks) had been speaking. I backed up his suggestion to include the provision of the bill for service in Labrador. I might say that the minister's research department has let him down.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I shall be glad to inform the Minister of National Defence of the observations of my hon. friend.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have already told him about it.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to his Excellency the Governor General in reply to His speech at the opening of the session, and the amendement thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendent to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. FLEMING: Before the house rose at six o'clock I had quoted editorial opinion across Canada in connection with the plebiscite to be held in the near future. It is obvious that the hon. gentlemen who object to the plebiscite have been slightly out of touch with the affairs of the nation. Results of the little general election held yesterday I am sure prove that fact conclusively. That is a regrettable fact, and also an ironic one. It is our privilege, as a free people, to elect a free parliament and a free government. It is also our privilege to criticize those whom we have chosen to govern us. To make criticism orderly, we have his majesty's loyal opposition. But opposition is something entirely different from obstruction and the use of intemperate language. According to the true Canadian ideal, opposition means help to the government by way of constructive criticism.

I would call to the attention of hon. members passages from a little book recently published, "So You Want a War Job," by Charles Clay, which came to my attention the other day. From pages 81 and 82 I read the following:

Loose, perverted, malicious criticism of Canada's war effort can be just as subversive in its effects as statements intended to cause disaffection or statements intended to prejudice recruiting, both of which carry stiff penalties. Such criticism attacks public confidence, undermines morale, produces friction.

The point is to avoid the stupidity of destructive criticism; it invariably degenerates into fault-finding or cynicism, the first productive of general furore and the second productive of individual dismay. It is folly to seek relief from war-economy injuries by wild comment that lacks basis in fact.

Uninformed disparagement is as bad as deliberately destructive criticism; it usually takes the blossoms from the tree along with the caterpillars. As Disraeli once said, "It is much easier to be critical than to be correct."

Those paragraphs will bear the attention of the hon. members in question. Instead of informing themselves of Canada's war effort, they are criticizing, I believe from inadequate information. Not only that, they are allowing their lack of understanding to eclipse the main issues. A recent issue of a weekly newspaper, *The Prairie Messenger,* published at Muenster, Saskatchewan, in my constituency, carried the following editorial in its issue of January 29:

It is extremely important in expressing opinions on the plebiscite to keep to the point.

The editorial concluded:

Throughout all discussions on the plebiscite we must, of course, be on the alert against anti-plebiscite campaigners who hint that Canada has not been doing its part in the war effort with the other parts of the empire. The best answer to any such hint is Prime Minister Churchill's comment on our war effort. He used the word "magnificent". Under the leadership of Mr. King Canada has proved her loyalty to the empire, standing second to none. The coming plebiscite is in the mind of the present government the wisest way not only to a continuation but also an intensification of that war effort.

This is a very important question to be kept in mind at this critical time. Just at this point may I bring to the attention of hon. members another phase of criticism, namely, that against certain people in our country who are not of Anglo-Saxon racial origin. I recall that upon returning to my

constituency after the close of the session last summer, I found that nothing had been done by way of organization in connection with recruiting. There were many loud-mouthed super-patriots who are found all over the countryside, and who were howling for conscription. I discussed the matter with some of these gentlemen, and they said, "None of these people would enlist around here; none of those who are of German racial origin would enlist." Finally I took the matter up with General Foster, the officer commanding that military district, and discussed the problem with him. He sent us a group of five or six military men, and we set up a recruiting centre in charge of Sergeant H. K. Warren, a member of the legislative assembly for Saskatchewan, and one who has differed from me on political issues for a long time. We worked together all summer to organize the district. I must offer the greatest praise to Sergeant Warren and this band of men for the assistance they gave. They did not go around saying, "oh, the voluntary system is no good; what we should have is conscription." Instead of that, they went out and discussed the matter with the people throughout the district. The last report I have is that seventy-eight per cent of those who enlisted voluntarily in the army—I am not speaking of the air force or the navy—were of German racial origin. The voluntary system will work, but it will not work if you go out and tell the people it will not. I hold in my hand a letter which I received from a young Canadian of German racial origin. On December 20 he wrote as follows:

Dear Dr. Fleming:

Kindly dropping a few words which I wanted to see you sometimes. I was in December past twenty years on twenty-first, of age. I would please you to write to the national of registration to Regina they should give me a call for the 8th of January. If I would get my call then I sure would go on active service. I wanted to go to Humboldt and join up but my old folks wouldn't let me go. They say if I get my call to Regina than I could join up. I am six feet high, 170 pounds, pretty good in my health. Please help me to get my call for the other month. I surely would like to be in the uniform.

That letter is typical of the youth from that particular district. It shows how this particular group of people are thinking at the present moment. They have absolute confidence in the administration. I should like to read another short passage from page 93 of Mr. Clay's book:

As a matter of cold fact, European-Canadians constitute over twenty per cent of our population. The overwhelming majority are Canadian in consciousness and sentiment. They have enlisted in the C.A.S.F. in goodly numbers, they support our national war effort in many other ways. And most of us do not deserve much credit for their fine performance. As Mr. N. S. Campbell pointed out:

We Anglo-Saxons have failed deplorably in our duty to our newcomers. Aside from opening our schools to their children we have left them severely alone. They have had to acquire for themselves, by the system of trial and error, a knowledge of democratic institutions and of the machinery by which democracy is made to work. The surprising thing is that democracy has won their loyalty in spite of our indifference.

As I stated before, these people have complete and implicit faith in the pledge that was given by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). What would they think if that pledge were broken before the electorate of this country had a chance to say whether he should be released from his pledges? I think it is only fitting that I should make a few references to the man who has led us so far in our total war effort against nazism and whose energy and vision have contributed so much to our ultimate victory. Fortunate it is for the British empire that we have a Churchill to lead us in our dark hour of peril. Fortunate it is for the United States that they have a Roosevelt. Fortunate it is for us in Canada that we have a William Lyon Mackenzie King. History has produced great leaders in the past, but none greater than these three. It is upon the shoulders of Churchill, Roosevelt and King that the gigantic task rests of once more making this world constructive and progressive.

Canada's Prime Minister is not only one of the greatest friends that Canada has ever known, but also one of the greatest friends of true peace. He is one of the greatest friends the empire has ever known. It was largely because of him that the friendly relationship which now exists between Canada and the United States was brought into being. I remember as a boy when I grew up here in old Ontario there was considerable enmity between Canada and the United States. You heard it in the schools and on the street. The cry was, "No truck or trade with the Yankees." That was heard on the highways and by-ways of those days of long ago. What position would we be in at the present time if that same cry was being heard, or if we followed what this Toronto clique is always preaching?

The leader of our nation in this time of war has been wise unto sobriety. He has undertaken and already partly executed a gigantic task. As a result, Canada is going forward, not only toward a military victory over all her enemies but also to a new and better social order after the war. A grateful Canada to-day salutes a great government headed by

a great Canadian—William Lyon Mackenzie King. He is the leader of this House of Commons, but he is far more than that. He is a devoted patriot, devoted to his country's cause.

I should like to say a few words about Canada's total war effort, and about the lack of truth there is in the charge that Canada is not sufficiently engaged in a total war. Those who say that are inadequately informed. Many steps have been taken to place Canada on a total war basis, and other steps are being taken every day to see that our economic and social machinery is geared up. That is a most important point. It would be folly to race our organization at the start and then have it break down at the crucial moment. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) went into the total war effort in considerable detail this afternoon. His remarks are on the record, so I shall not go further into that at the present time.

There has been considerable criticism of the government's plan for the post-victory period. The amendment of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) and his followers reveals a woeful lack of information about what is going on right under their noses. Here is something they have not seen yet. What do these hon. gentlemen think the restrictions placed upon consumer goods of all kinds mean? They certainly mean more than a present diversion of materials, equipment and man-hours from non-essential, home-front manufacturing to essential, fighting-front manufacturing. They mean that an artificial shortage is being created in literally scores of important consumer goods so that after the victory the men who have been working in war factories will not be out of employment. From the making of machine guns they will turn to the making of typewriters, from the making of bomb-sights to the making of radios, from the making of flares to the making of frigidaires. I could go on down a long list of articles.

All along the line this government has taken steps to create war machinery that has peace-time uses. It is post-victory preparation of the most practical kind. Hon. members who are so much concerned over the post-victory economic life of this dominion could make better use of their energies by supporting some of the measures brought in by this government, rather than by shouting so loudly against them.

Since time is rapidly passing, I would recall to the house that in speaking on the budget the first time I had the honour to speak in this historic chamber, not many years ago, I stated in reference to my distinguished leader, as reported at 2682 of *Hansard* of 1936:

> The Prime Minister's is a leadership that is indigenous to the soil from which have sprung the cardinal principles of Liberalism. It is a leadership provocative of initiative in thought and action among his followers, a leadership which welcomes independent views on the many problems which are pressing for practical solution. It is a leadership which recognizes the political principle enunciated by Edmund Burke over a century ago, a leadership which would call out, from the more circumscribed affairs of constituency interest, the best in both thought and judgment that the representative is capable of giving in the broader field of national affairs. It is a leadership that goes further in encouraging us to study not only national problems, but international issues. It is a leadership that expects us to bring to our discussions and our deliberations the most advanced views on every question pertaining to the nation's welfare.

Those words, Mr. Speaker, are as true to-day as they were when they were uttered a good many years ago before the present world crisis. His leadership stands to-day before the bar of public opinion. Five times he has been elected Prime Minister by the people of Canada. He is not afraid to face an issue, and that is the reason why he is appealing to the people on this plebiscite to release him from the pledges that he made at the last general election.

What could be fairer; what could be more democratic? And yet we have heard such violent language as "cowardly," "dastardly," "un-British" and unpatriotic" which have been hurled even across the floor of this house and throughout the country. It might be well for those who are attacking the right hon. leader of the government to remember the words of our imperial leader when he spoke a very short while ago of those who would wish to destroy the Prime Minister. Mr. Churchill commends Canada's leadership as he said, "in every field of our common endeavour." Our right hon. leader has not played the wretched game of party politics, and we might well use the language that Mr. Churchill used in addressing our Prime Minister, after dealing in the British parliament with a group of obstructionists who were out to destroy him. He said on that occasion:

> At this time, when the utmost efforts of every nation are required for victory you have again made plain to the world that all the resources and energies of Canada are to be counted upon in support of the fight for freedom.

We should indeed be proud that we have such leadership. He has kept this country united from one end to the other. He has not broken faith with any of our people; and, being proud of his leadership, we should not

place upon him the terrific task of having to fight political battles in this house, in newspaper columns, and throughout the country, at the same time that he is giving his all to Canada's great war effort.

In conclusion, I should like to use the words which the Prime Minister himself used many years ago when referring to the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier at a time when the political vultures of that day were out to destroy him. He said:

> His strength may be lessening with the touch of time but his honour stands as unshaken as an oak amid a winter's blast. He is a man
>
> Who never sold the truth to serve the hour,
> Nor palter'd with Eternal God for power;
> Who let the turbid stream of rumour flow
> Thro' either babbling world of high and low:
> Whose life was work, whose language rife
> With rugged maxims hewn from life.

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I desire to congratulate the mover (Mr. Fournier, Hull) and the seconder (Mr. Macdonald, Brantford City) upon the excellent manner in which they ushered into this session the time-honoured motion that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General. On previous occasions since the war began it has been the custom at this time to review the activities of some of the departments which have been involved in war work, and among those was usually included the Department of Agriculture, which has to do with the activities of farmers in different parts of the Dominion of Canada in their efforts to produce food which is required in connection with the war. On this occasion it is not my intention to review the efforts of farmers throughout Canada to perform the task which has been assigned to them, and which is theirs because of the industry in which they are engaged, because the remarks that I have to make to-night I hope to conclude within the forty minutes which are allotted to me, and on some future occasion, when the opportunity presents itself to speak at greater length, I hope to review agricultural activities.

I have listened carefully when in my place and have reviewed the *Hansard* report of the periods when I have been out of the house during the session, and I have been pleased to note that less time has been taken in criticizing the administration of agriculture in the debate on the address this session than in any previous session, and more particularly the sessions since the war began. I suppose that if I were to attempt to outline to the house the reasons for that lack of criticism on this occasion, my remarks would not be accepted as the real reason for the lack of criticism. But I have in my hand a copy of an editorial which was printed in the Ottawa *Farm Journal*, which has been in most issues since the war began, more or less critical of the policies of the Department of Agriculture. In their editorial of February 6, 1942, the first three paragraphs read as follows:

> In contrast to the picture of gloom and dissatisfaction pictured by the prairie wheat growers who invaded Ottawa in numbers early this week was the general air of optimism and well-being which pervaded the meetings of pure-bred men at Toronto—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Must be York South.

Mr. GARDINER: The phrase is not mine but appears in the editorial. It goes on:

> —many of which are reported at some length in this issue. There was no gloom around the Toronto meeting, rather an air of comparative prosperity and satisfaction.
>
> Even the western men who attended the Toronto live stock meetings were cheerful and gave glowing reports. The cattle and hog men from the very prairie areas where wheat men are depressed, had little of a critical nature to offer.
>
> At all the meetings it was most noticeable that prices were hardly mentioned. There was considerable talk of labour shortages, but apparently the general view was that little could be done about this matter except to urge that at least key men on the farms not be conscripted or called up for army service.

The only comment that I wish to make on that editorial is that it outlines more concisely than I could do, and more acceptably perhaps to hon. members opposite than if I were to present them myself, the reasons for the lack of criticism at the present time in relation to agriculture. Prices of farm commodities, more particularly of those other than grain, are on a level to-day which is apparently accepted by the greater number of the farmers throughout the length and breadth of Canada as being more or less reasonable. In view of the fact that there appears to be general satisfaction with prices of live stock and live stock products, I am going to content myself at this time with thanking the farmers of Canada for having more than provided for every war programme placed before them since the war began. I do not believe there is another single industry in the Dominion of Canada that has, on every occasion that a request has been made of them to produce the commodities required, more than measured up to the request made; and every year since

the war began, the request made of the farmers of Canada has been a request which has been passed on to this government by the government of Britain, based on the necessities of food in Great Britain.

I should, however, like to say a word on behalf of the wheat growers of western Canada. There is reason, of course, for the different point of view of the farmers who met in Ottawa last week, and the group of live stock men who met in Toronto. No one in this government, no one in this house, will dispute that those reasons exist. I find, however, that there is a growing feeling in western Canada that the Ontario and Quebec industrial and financial interests are against the farmers of western Canada obtaining more for their wheat; and it is only fair to say that at no time have I heard any eastern industrialist or representative of eastern financial houses oppose western wheat growers receiving more for their wheat. I think it is necessary to state that in order that we may not at this time develop antagonisms as between different parts of Canada that would not assist us in our war effort. The fact is that eastern industrialists and financial interests know that the only way in which they can be paid what may be due to them from the west is, if farmers receive higher returns from the crops which they harvest.

There is, in the policy announced in the speech from the throne, every reason for western wheat farmers to expect to have their position improved, and from the same source as the position of every other branch of industry and agriculture has already been improved since the war began. Legislation having that objective in mind, as I said this afternoon, will be introduced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) and myself as soon as it is possible in this session to do so, and it is the intention that that particular legislation in so far as agriculture is concerned, and, I believe also, in so far as the Department of Trade and Commerce is concerned, shall be referred to a committee on agriculture in order that it may be discussed fully by the members of this house.

I wanted to say that with regard to agriculture before proceeding to discuss some other matters in which this house has been interesting itself during recent weeks. We have before us at the present time, not only the motion to which I referred a few moments ago, but an amendment and a sub-amendment —the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), and the subamendment moved by the house leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group (Mr. Coldwell). The amendment as moved by the leader of the opposition appears at page 30 of *Hansard* of January 26, 1942, and is in these terms:

That the following words be added to the address:

"This house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers, instead of giving to the country the leadership so essential at a time properly described in the speech from the throne as the greatest crisis in the world's history, on the contrary, have sought to evade their responsibility by holding a plebiscite, which, in the view of this house, is the negation of responsible government.

And this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers have not seen fit to recommend to parliament without delay additional measures designed to

(a) completely mobilize the wealth and material resources and, on a selective basis, the full man and woman power of the nation, to the end that the nation may wage total war in any theatre of war;

(b) supply the imperative needs of agriculture, industry, and the fighting forces of the nation; and

(c) prepare for the post-war period."

On page 55 of *Hansard* of the same date is the subamendment moved by the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group:

That all the words after the words "this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"have used the sweeping powers conferred by the National Resources Mobilization Act mainly for the conscription of men for home defence and in the opinion of this house no total effort adequate to meet the present needs of the war, domestic problems and the preparation for post-war conditions is possible without total mobilization of wealth, industry and finance, as well as human resources.

"Therefore this house respectfully requests that the forthcoming plebiscite should seek the support of the people of Canada for the complete and effective conscription of war industries, accumulated wealth and financial institutions, at the same time and on the same basis of sacrifice as the suggested extension of the conscription of man-power."

Along with the second or subamendment should be read, I think, the policy of the group whose leader placed that sub-amendment on *Hansard* a few days ago—the policy as laid down by the same leader in 1939 and reported in *Hansard* of September 9 of that year. With regard to the matter which is referred to here, this statement is made:

Canada should be prepared to defend her own shores, but her assistance overseas should be limited to economic aid and must not include conscription of man-power or the sending of any expeditionary force.

Then, section 3 of the platform as laid down, and placed upon *Hansard*, states:

> No military participation overseas: Any attempt to send a force abroad would rob us of the man-power necessary for the defence of our shores and for home production, would gravely endanger national unity, would threaten our civil liberties and democratic institutions, and would ultimately lead to conscription.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order fully to understand what the subamendment which was placed upon *Hansard* the other day means, one must have this alongside of it, read it along with it, and probably ask oneself the question, is it the intention of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group, through their leader, in moving this particular subamendment, to ask the government to submit to the people of Canada a different question from that which is being submitted under the plebiscite, that they should be relieved, by the submission of that different question, from an obligation they placed themselves under in 1939? Or is it their intention to have us still leave this as the policy of the party as enunciated by the party itself and placed upon *Hansard* as the policy which was to guide the party throughout the war in which we are now engaged?

In proceeding, I think we should call attention to two or three of the phrases which have been used by those who have placed these two motions on *Hansard*.

The leader of the opposition, in replying, made the spearhead of his attacks upon the government an amendment in which he condemned the government for having attempted to evade its responsibility by holding a plebiscite which, he claimed, is the negation of responsible government. The leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group, while not directly condemning the plebiscite, proposed that in that plebiscite advice should be secured on the question of total conscription. We thus have the two leaders, one stating that to secure the opinion of the people is the negation of responsible government, the other stating that the government should consult the people in a plebiscite upon a matter which might conceivably become a question to be considered and decided by the government at a later date.

Now that four by-elections have been held and decided since the address was moved, and the elected and defeated candidates have made their post-election statements, I think it will be obvious that the real reason for moving the amendment and the sub-amendment was to place before the people of two constituencies appeals which those placing them before the constituents thought would have the effect of returning their candidates to this house. I think that will be agreed to even by those who moved them.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. GARDINER: Well, we shall go on and see what the effect is. I do not think one would be justified in contending that either policy was favoured in any one of the four by-elections. It might appear at first glance that the policy enunciated in the subamendment of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation was endorsed in York South.

Mr. MacNICOL: No.

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friend says "no," and I am inclined to agree with him. But it could be just as strongly argued that it was condemned in Welland where their candidate ran at the bottom of the poll, the same appeal being made in both constituencies.

Mr. Meighen attributes his defeat to the cooperation of the Ottawa Liberals and the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. I think it would be more correct to state that the Conservative leader and the leader of the government of Ontario, unintentionally it is true, conspired to elect Mr. Noseworthy. I have never heard that it is good political strategy for a candidate who is handed the support of a political party in a constituency to base his whole campaign on belittling the efforts of that party and its leader; nor has it ever been considered good political strategy to take into his bosom one who has no other reason for opposing the government of the day than that of personal enmity towards its leader. If Mr. Meighen had adopted the attitude, as was said this afternoon, of Willkie towards the government of the day, he would be at the present time the proud leader of a great political party in the House of Commons.

What has been the obvious campaign of those who chose Mr. Meighen to lead the onslaught? It began immediately following the last federal election and has been kept up ever since by a group centred in Toronto who are bent upon gaining control of the government in this war, as they did in the last, and by similar methods. Their first objective was to convince the people of Canada that conscription of man-power immediately for overseas is a necessity. While stating that publicly, it will be noted that in the amendment moved in this house the other day the word "conscription" is not used. The house leader has not even used the words "compulsory selective service." He uses the much milder term "selective basis" as applied to man- and woman-power. In the open, however, the

attempt was made to convince the public that conscription of man-power for overseas service is necessary immediately.

The next effort was to convince the public —and this is why, Mr. Speaker, I find it necessary to speak on behalf of myself and on behalf of those who sent me to this house— the additional position, I say, was taken, in making representations, that two-thirds of the members of the government are in favour of immediate conscription, but are only held back by the leader of the party, supported by the French-speaking members of the cabinet and a few other personal friends.

For some considerable time I thought that the propagandist of the opposition to this government, who writes articles in that great periodical which is printed in the city of Toronto, known as *Maclean's* magazine, and who at the same time writes editorials in some newspapers in the dominion, would do me the honour of not mentioning me at all. But in the second last issue of that periodical he included my name among those who, he presumes, were ready to take certain action if the leader of the Liberal party and Prime Minister of this dominion did not do certain things.

If they had established these two facts, it was hoped that it could be made to appear that the only obstacle in the way of immediate conscription was the promise made by the Prime Minister personally, under the influence of members of the government, as was stated, from Quebec, in the election of 1939 in that province and in the general election of 1940, that there would be no conscription of man-power for overseas. It was stated in season and out of season that the only way in which we could get immediate conscription in this country, which it was maintained had been proved as a necessity in order to win the war, was that we should get rid of the Prime Minister of Canada and set up another government under some other leadership.

If this plan could have succeeded, it was hoped that the present Prime Minister of Canada could have been forced from his position and a so-called national government, with no past commitments, and therefore no obligations to anyone, established in its place. The Prime Minister, as he has done on previous occasions, accepted the challenge of those who are his opponents. He said: "All right; we will ask the people of Canada whether they are prepared to free this government from any pledges given and permit it to act as a totally free, responsible government in dealing with war matters."

The cry immediately went up from outside and from the other side of this house: "Wasting time; procrastination". Members of the government with sons overseas, it was said in editorials written in the newspapers, should rise up in their might and smite those who would delay at a time when the whole future of humanity rests upon the question of conscription in Canada of man-power for overseas.

Well, some of the ministers have given answer to that statement. My colleague the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), speaking this afternoon and on previous occasions, has said that there is no immediate need for conscription of man-power for overseas. He has said that our voluntary enlistment of men up to date has provided us with the number of men that are required for all the services up to the present time, and that there are reserves ready to take the place of any who, for any reason, may be put out of that service. He stated to us that there is no immediate cause for bringing in conscription in the dominion in order to get man-power. My colleague the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe), speaking the other day in the Welland by-election, and thus placing the issue squarely before the people before the vote was taken, said that there is no immediate need for conscripting man-power for supply as far as giving service to our people overseas is concerned. In other words, man-power was being obtained for the plants that are manufacturing the necessities of war, including the machines and munitions of war; and in so far as he knew, there was, as well, no reason for conscripting man-power to serve in the fighting forces overseas. I, as Minister of Agriculture, have stated that the only real difficulty having to do with help upon the farm is one which could not be improved by conscription but which, as a matter of fact, has been accentuated by the degree of conscription we already have.

I have been astounded in this house during this debate, listening to man after man, particularly in the official opposition, proclaiming that immediate conscription of men for the armies overseas is necessary; and then before they have taken their seats, stating that men on the farms should not be taken off the farms under the conditions of conscription that we already have. I am inclined to agree with the statement that the difficulty we are having in connection with labour on the farms of Canada to-day is threefold. There is the difficulty that exists about the industrial cities of eastern Canada, where men, because of better wages, have gone off the farms into the cities. There is the problem related to the fact that on

70,000 farms old men and women over sixty years of age are on their farms alone, most of them alone because their sons went over in the last war and did not come back. These old people are without help.

This war in turn, under the conscription which we already have, is taking the young man who is as much a key man for agriculture as any key man in industry, namely the young man who is the natural inheritor of the farm, who does not think in terms of wages, whom wages will not draw to a factory. When such men are taken away, there is a real difficulty involved in connection with labour upon the farms of this country.

I am prepared to state that if the only thing desired is more men for overseas, more men can be secured now or at any time in the immediate future under the voluntary system properly applied than could be secured under the policies advocated in either the amendment or the sub-amendment.

We have had four by-elections, in which these views were presented before the four constituencies, and the vote was taken yesterday. In my opinion a number of things were settled in those elections in so far as the voters in these constituencies are concerned. When one considers the past history of the four constituencies, I think it is correct to state that on the same issues every other constituency in Canada would vote in much the same way.

The constituency of Quebec East is located at the historic gateway to central Canada. It has been represented in this house by two of Canada's outstanding statesmen, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. As a result of the poll yesterday it is now represented by another outstanding French-Canadian who is destined to write his name beside these other outstanding Canadians in the history of our country.

The constituency of St. Mary has been traditionally Liberal since 1896. It is located in the great commercial and financial metropolis of Canada. The constituency of Welland has a varied political history, sharing its allegiance between the two main parties since confederation. The constituency of York South has been consistently Conservative since confederation. It is located on the outskirts of the most imperialistic and Conservative-minded city in the whole Dominion of Canada.

Two of these constituencies are almost entirely French-Canadian; the other two have few French-Canadians in them. One of them is among the most cosmopolitan constituencies of Canada, and in that regard is typical of many of the constituencies in western Canada. Yet all four of these constituencies made decisions on a number of questions which were presented to them, not only by this government but by opposition candidates and others, including no less a person than the premier of Ontario who spoke on the side of Mr. Meighen and Mr. Drew.

The first thing they agreed upon is that conscription is not immediately necessary to a total war effort in Canada. I cannot conceive of any constituency in Canada at the present time casting a vote which the voters believed not to be in the interest of a total war effort by Canada. These constituencies, all four of them, with their varied interests and varied history, voted first that they agreed that conscription was not immediately necessary to a total war effort by Canada.

The second thing they agreed on is that a so-called national government is not necessary to the successful prosecution of the war. If any of my hon. friends are not prepared to accept that statement, then the alternative is that the present government is the nearest approach to a national government which Canada can have at the present time.

The third thing they agreed upon is that the pledged word of any public man, or for that matter any great political party, should be sacred and be withdrawn only when consent is given by those to whom it was pledged.

Two of the constituencies, namely York South and Welland, declared themselves on another question, which was not submitted to the two constituencies in Quebec. They declared in unmistakable terms that the great Sir Wilfrid Laurier was right when he said: "It does not do to cherish resentment in public life." I do not think anything could have been more clearly declared to the people of Canada than the truth of that statement.

I wish to discuss at somewhat greater length the second and third of these expressions of opinion. When Mr. Meighen was chosen leader of the Conservative party he stated that he was prepared to lead a crusade for conscription, which could be consummated only by a national government, in which he was prepared to serve. Mr. Hepburn and Mr. Drew declared their willingness to accept both his policy and his methods. The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party, federally, and provincially in British Columbia, and, I think, elsewhere throughout Canada, have declared in season and out that they would have no part in a so-called national or union government. The people of the strongest Conservative constituency in Canada, by an unprecedentedly heavy vote, have declared that they would rather do without

Mr. Meighen, Mr. Hepburn and Mr. Drew than submit to either their policies or their methods.

This government is the nearest approach to a national government which is possible in Canada to-day. It is led by the one man who can unite behind him and has united behind him the greatest number of people from coast to coast. The election of 1940 proved that; the Gallup poll of last week proved it; the elections of yesterday proved it, and the vote in this house on these amendments and on the main motion will prove that he can muster the strongest vote in this house of any man either inside or outside it.

That being the case, it is hard to understand what our friends in the opposition mean when they speak of responsible government. Responsible government is a government headed by the man who can command the majority in the House of Commons. And he is at the head of that group because that group can command the largest vote in the country. I would ask this question: If my friends in the opposition either inside or outside this house are in favour of an all-out war effort, why do not these sniping politicians and "gold-diggers," as my hon. friend called them the other day, and their sabotaging propagandists, as my hon. friend over here called some others, listen to the voice of Canada and adopt the Willkie attitude, "he is my Prime Minister", until the constitution gives them an opportunity to show that a change is necessary?

If our friends opposite had been adopting that attitude throughout this war, in the two and a half years that have elapsed, their leader would not have been defeated by a majority of upwards of five thousand. The Prime Minister has stated that the by-elections have shown that the Canadian people do not propose to allow bad faith and the broken pledge to be erected into a principle of action in this country. It is because the Prime Minister and his government will not break their pledged word that the plebiscite is necessary. It is because the people of Canada know that the Prime Minister and his government will not lightly discard the pledged word of their party given under its two greatest leaders, Laurier and the present Prime Minister, that they will vote "yes" on the plebiscite when it is placed before them. They will place the responsibility squarely upon the government of Canada, led by the present Prime Minister, to prosecute this war to a successful conclusion, in so far as twelve million people can contribute toward that solution.

This government has only one desire, and that is to lead Canada forward in a united, balanced, three-fold effort, as was described to the house this afternoon by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), to assist in driving nazism and fascism from the world forever. If that desire is to be consummated, it can be done only by keeping as many as should be employed producing munitions and machines of war, by keeping as many as should be employed in producing food, but by refusing to allow either one or both under a selective or any other system to interfere with the placing of an effective fighting force in the air, on the sea and on the land, wherever required.

Mr. Speaker, to enlarge upon that slightly, may I say this: the Dominion of Canada, with its unlimited lands, could put every available young man in Canada to work producing food, and every bit of that food would be required some place before the end of this war. Just suppose that every last young man of military age taken from the twelve million population of this country with its unlimited natural resources in the form of minerals, in the form of timber, in the form of oil, in the form of power, could be put to work producing machines and munitions of war. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the policy of the C.C.F., as enunciated in September, 1939. We did not need to declare war to do that. Great Britain would have taken all the munitions that could be produced in this country; she would have had to. Great Britain could take all the arms we could make. Great Britain would have taken all the tanks, all the planes and all the food we could produce, if we had not declared war at all. When we declared war we only declared our intention to do one thing, and that one thing was to fight shoulder to shoulder with Britain and her allies until this war is won. And, Mr. Speaker, numbers in the army, numbers in the air force and numbers in the navy should compare favourably with the numbers from other countries, in proportion to the population.

I should like for a moment to deal with the British attitude and action in connection with conscription. British action in the last war in relation to Ireland, and their action again in this war in relation to northern Ireland, and south African action in the last and in this war, as well as Canadian experience in the last war and since, are indications that it is dangerous to come to a general academic conclusion about a matter such as conscription, and attempt to apply it to any country, without considering all the facts.

What are we trying to do in Canada? Are we trying to get as many men as possible to the front, or are we trying to satisfy our views on a theory? When we ask for leadership are we asking someone to try to stem the tide of unreasoned propaganda, or are we asking someone to climb on horseback, as King Richard did at the time of the peasants' revolt, and shout, "I am your leader; follow me,"—and then lead them somewhere they did not intend to go?

I shall never say that under no circumstance will I support conscription, but I will say that until such time as I am convinced that we can get in Canada a more effective force under conscription than under voluntary enlistment for overseas service I am against conscription. So far as I am concerned a vote of "yes" on the plebiscite will leave me free to make my decision, as a member of this government, with all the facts before me, when the time comes to make that decision.

I am not called upon at this moment, neither is anyone else in the house, nor anybody else in Canada, to make a decision on conscription at a time when the best authority in Canada states that at the moment it is not necessary.

Mr. Meighen need not check the events of the last few months, or the last few weeks, or the last few days, to find the cause of his many defeats in Canadian politics, including this last, held in one of the most imperialistic constituencies in Canada.

The British race is a proud one, and many of the people of that race live in that constituency. Their greatest pride is in their pledged word. If anyone does not understand that, then he should negotiate an agreement respecting farm produce with the British government. If he did so, what would he find? He would find that even if the agreement is to their disadvantage, they will carry it out to the letter, to the bitter end, and try to make a better one the next time.

Two great nations were born in America out of the struggles of the seven years' war. One was Canada and the other the United States. The constitution of the United States was written in an effort to prevent any central government, even their own, from ever again imposing its will upon an unwilling state. Bryce, when writing his history of the American commonwealth, stated that toward the end of the last century a great church body in that country was searching for a short sentence in which to call down God's blessing on every person in the country. They chose, "God bless this nation". The next day the matter was reconsidered by the same men, and rewritten in the words "God bless these United States." In those two sentences there is all the difference between what is known in Europe as a united nation governed, if you like, by a democratic, central government, and a federated state such as the United States and Canada. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that no country so great in extent as Canada or the United States can be governed in a democratic way for any considerable period of time under any system other than a federated form of government. That has been the history of that kind of thing in the world, and it is the condition existing to-day.

If we did not have a federated form of government we would never have had less than four or five dominions, instead of one, in what is Canada. Some of those who are questioning our right to impose things upon them to-day would have been serving, not under a central government here, but under a central British government which has established the principle that they will not coerce the people of any land which has come under the union jack, without first persuading those people to accept the condition, themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. GARDINER: I have a few more words to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carry on.

Mr. GARDINER: The same idea has been written by the British parliament into every change in our constitution in Canada. It runs through the decision of the privy council.

According to the census of 1931, forty-eight per cent of the population of Canada is not of British descent. The figures of the new census are not out. Practically all of them are Canadians by either birth or naturalization. Those who are Canadians by birth know no other allegiance; those who are Canadians by naturalization have taken the oath of allegiance to our king and country, and their king and country have signed on the naturalization papers a solemn pledge. The individual pledges himself to be loyal, to stand by this country, to serve in our armies if necessary; the king and country pledge to him the right of the ballot, the right of citizenship, and the right to all the freedom to which any British-born subject is entitled.

I am not going back into old history, but the remark I am going to make will bring up old history. When it becomes necessary to release the individual from that pledge or break our own toward him in order to enforce any law, that law should not be passed in a

British country. The British government has followed the practice since the days of Pitt and Burke through the time of Peel, Gladstone, Disraeli, Asquith and Churchill, of winning support through persuasion, not by coercion. Any system which has to substitute coercion for persuasion in Canada is doomed to failure. Conscription will get results in a democracy only when it is a regulation of the will of the people. Quebec, under our federated democratic system, is a democracy which can never, in conformity with British custom, practise and the pledged word of Britain's statesmen, be coerced in connection with matters of this kind.

Our whole constitution is the proof of this. We have developed it from the days of the most totalitarian form of government the world has ever known, royal government as practised under Louis XIV. Step by step, with the consent of the people of Quebec, from the old days when the British government had absolute control, this constitution has been developed until now we have representative, responsible government. That is the course which any British house that is guided by British principles will follow in connection with this or any other great public matter.

The great performance of Quebec under the leadership of the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, through registration, through production of food, through production of munitions, supplies, equipment and ships, through providing men for the defence of Canada and sending them to Britain—as General McNaughton said the other day, some of the finest units in the Canadian army have come from Quebec—has placed her in a position where her representatives in this house do not need to plead her cause. I remember when the registration was first mentioned, people said that we could not take a registration in Canada. We did take a registration, and the only province in the dominion where we had to place policemen at the booths in order to regulate traffic made up of people who wanted to get in their signatures was in the province of Quebec. In some districts in which the propriety was most questioned they signed to the last man. As I say, the members from Quebec do not need to plead her cause. Welland has so stated. York South has so stated.

Every English Liberal member in this house pledges himself to the British Liberal principle of persuasion, even to persuading the people to accept conscription. The effort of every man who believes in conscription should not be one of coercion, it should be an effort to persuade. I am sure that if this country is ever face to face with a condition where its interests or institutions are threatened to a point where greater man-power from Canada can save them by fighting any place in the world, and conscription is the only method by which they can be secured, it will be possible to convince the people of this country that it is necessary.

Right across Canada are scattered those of nationalities other than British. In my own province of Saskatchewan only 45·8 per cent are of British descent and only 5·4 per cent are of French-Canadian descent. This leaves 48·8 per cent of the population of non-English and non-French descent. These people have a record in food production, in both this and the last war, in the production of munitions and arms and in the providing of men for the fighting services, of which they have reason to be proud. You cannot make unwilling conscripts fly planes. You cannot make unwilling conscripts fight tanks. You cannot put a whole band of conscripts on corvettes. This is a job for soldiers inspired by a conviction which compels them to fight.

After the Franco-Prussian war the Germans compelled the French to abandon their practices of conscription established by Napoleon. After that decision they then built up an army stronger than the conscript army of Germany. After the last great war the allies compelled the Prussians to abandon the conscription they had practised from the time of Napoleon. The nazis substituted for conscription an idea for which to fight. They developed it into a fanatical desire on the part of the whole youth of their country to inflict their views upon the world. They took the United States plane, truck and submarine and the British tank and manned them with fighting fanatics for a cause. They were inspired as were the Mohammedans of old. The Japanese were not permitted in the last war to display their will to fight. The greatest glory in the existence of a Jap is to be killed in battle and join his fathers in the great beyond.

There is nothing in the theory of government based upon coercion and force which would inspire a British subject to willing battle. But his religious beliefs and his love of freedom know no bounds as a means of inspiration. We must fill our planes, our tanks, our ships, with men inspired with a love of freedom. We must send them forth to war, not with a grudge in their hearts but with a song upon their lips. The task of creating that attitude is the task of this parliament, our churches, our schools and our press. God help Canada if the future prosecution of this war is to be interfered with by the back-room scribblings of paid writers, rather than by the

freely expressed opinions of the representatives of the people in church and state and press. We, the members of this house, have a duty to perform. Every hon. member can perform this duty by selling the idea that our men are fighting for a cause that is worthy of the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. PIERRE GAUTHIER (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, almost two years have elapsed since March 26, 1940, when the people of this country, in giving a mandate of five years to this parliament, clearly expressed their opposition to conscription for overseas service. At the very beginning of the new parliament, however, the obstinate advocates of this troublesome measure opened fire in this house. As to-day, they were supported by a gathering of so-called patriots whose purpose is to divide this country and perpetrate their unavowable purposes and release themselves and their friends from a part of the duties imposed upon them by the state of war. They need a smoke-screen to hide their movements, their manoeuvres, their intrigues, and to accomplish their work. As in 1917, their work is conscription. They know that a good part of the population, the larger part of the Canadian people, is against this measure; but knowing the almighty power of gold, backed by a strong press organization, they carry on with a sardonic smile, anxious to attain to that national disunity on which they live. We had conscription in 1917. It was voted on at the election, and all the men who had been called for service under that coercive and hateful law were exempted because the election was coming, but a few months after the election had been held the draftees were called back. The Union government was in power, and behind the smoke-screen of conscription scandals had a wonderful time. But to gain that conscription law they had to divide the country, and they had to have a scapegoat.

In Australia they tried to impose conscription, but in that country they could not find a scapegoat, and twice the people of English descent gave a negative answer to the conscription referendum. They are trying it again this time, and they are so blinded by their appetite for gold profits that they have not even bothered to face the question of their country being directly attacked by Japan. There, too, they have their helpers, their tools, with which they hope to succeed. But Australian patriots in every class of society protest and have no intention of sending their soldiers elsewhere when they are so much needed at home. If they had a right to protest there, we, too, have a right to protest here and to ask that our soldiers be kept at home. The defence of this country comes first. To those who place our first line of defence in Europe we are motivated to say that if the unprotected countries of the commonwealth fall one after another, England will not be provided with the food and munitions she needs.

Because Quebec is against conscription, some of these birds of passage, some of them after a lifetime of political and financial success, go back home to England or to evade taxes live in sunny isles; because the people of Quebec have lived in this land since the first trip of Jacques Cartier and have had patience to overcome all obstacles and have kept this country united to Britain in 1775 and 1813, because French-Canadians believe in Canada before and above everything else, because they ask for their share in the economic and social life of the country which they have opened and helped to build up, because Quebec raised her voice and played her part in the last war, and much more in this one, and wants to do it voluntarily, some of these narrow-minded colonials—imperialists, if it serves their purpose—Americans if it meets their contentions—Canadians if the patriotic bell has to sound louder, although they never think as real Canadians, admitting that gold has no colour, no odour, no race, no nationality, direct their insinuating speeches or press articles, on the scapegoat whom they had chosen in 1917 and whom they are still trying to immolate on the altar of their fanaticism.

The "two hundred" as they have been called, ask for total war and unity of sacrifice. Why do they not ask for equality of sacrifice? Why do they not ask themselves for the real conscription of money? That at least would show a little sincerity. But no, they ask for the conscription of men for overseas service, to send men abroad, far away. It will fatten the big contracts for armament and equipment. There will always be a way to replace the men. By immigration probably. But have they enough money to pay for the life of one Canadian soldier? Have they enough guts, those who are of military age, to leave their pleasures, their money and their pretentious homes and enlist for overseas service? I believe they are well protected by age, and I would not be surprised if among them one could find a few conscientious objectors whose faith forbids them to fight against human beings but permits them to send others to war. They are safer behind the counters and better situated to grab the savings of their clients.

France had her "two hundreds". In 1935 they were lending money to Hitler, and giving as a pretext that it was the best way to kill

communism. Their political friends were receiving German and Italian funds for political propaganda. Anything was good that helped them accomplish their unpatriotic schemes. There it was not Quebec; it was communism. These "two hundreds" in France had complete control of the Bank of France.

In our country our "two hundred" had their friends too. They control banks, insurance companies, mining corporations, steel works, construction companies, large departmental stores, naval construction, office specialties, et cetera. They have connections in every circle of our economic life. They have friends in the provincial and federal administrations. For a disguise they patronize charitable organizations. They are everywhere. They are the octopus with numerous and strong tentacles, sucking the very life-blood of the country—at least what is left of it.

Have they frightened the government—this government with the largest majority ever given by the people since confederation? Have they succeeded in making this parliament believe that the people of this country have changed their minds on the conscription issue? I do not recall any special occasion on which the people have expressed a change of opinion on this question. Of course, a strongly organized press campaign has been going on for months, and even a member of the British parliament has been touring Canada to try to convince our people that conscription was the really crowning glory of the total national war effort. But the Prime Minister of England, when he was called upon to express his opinion, said, "I usually mind my own business."

Prominent members of this parliament keep saying, especially during by-election time, that they do not need men over there, that conscription will not be necessary here for overseas service. Personally I think that it would not be necessary if everyone gave a really helping hand to voluntary enlistment. I am not the only one witnessing all kinds of impediments arising from the fact that some people in Canada want this system to fail in order to draw this parliament into a conscription policy against the very will and opinion of this country. I shall have further opportunity to explain more clearly what I have in mind. If we do not need conscription, why ask the people to release the government and, I will say, parliament from its commitments concerning conscription? To have liberty of action?

We have witnessed since 1937 a series of events gradually progressing year by year. Some Liberal members rose in opposition to the increased subsidies for national defence; not because they did not care for home defence, but because they were anticipating that this new move of the government was the start of an empire defence plan; they were told then that this was not the case. I, myself, quoted Sir Wilfrid Laurier speaking on the Guthrie amendment to bill No. 21 introduced during the 1912-1913 session by Sir Robert Borden, the then prime minister. At page 7232 of *Hansard,* Sir Wilfrid Laurier is reported as having said:

> I now come to a consideration of the fact, made manifest by one of the last speeches of Mr. Churchill, that the admiralty favours contribution and not autonomous organization. This is not a new thing: the British admiralty has always preferred a system of imperial contribution to the idea of autonomous organization. At the imperial conference in 1902, Lord Selborne, the predecessor of Mr. Churchill, made a proposal that we should have imperial contributions.

The Canadian press of February 5, 1937, has reported the words of Sir Samuel Hoare speaking at a lunch given by the chamber of commerce of Bradford. He, too, was stating that any programme of defence should be an empire-wide one. It is clear that the lords of the admiralty have not changed their mind.

This group of members asked for the exact location of Canada's boundaries. A bill sponsored by Mr. MacNeill suggested an amendment to the Militia Act: the bill had a first-class funeral.

I heard in this house some members of the same group saying that our geographical situation placed us in a safe position, should the axis powers direct an attack on Canada; we were told that it was cowardice to count on others to defend our country.

During by-elections in 1937 and 1938, the people were told that there would not be any participation in external wars. I remember very well that one participant had learned his lesson over there; the other would advise his compatriots not to enlist for overseas. When the participation came, it was to be a moderate one, very moderate; it was accepted by the people and by the dissident members in a provincial election because of the assurance given that there would not be any conscription for overseas. Part of the verdict of that provincial election was in favour of providing England and her allies with men and munitions; the larger part of this verdict was an expression of disapproval of the Union National government.

Then the barometer of our war effort made a jump. The "two hundred" had not yet gathered around their loaded tables for their "ever notorious dinner" having as a result a dangerous elevation of colonial blood pressure, but they were already on the job.

The people of this country have accepted and we have voted almost unanimously the mobilization act for Canada. All Canadians are ready to do anything for the country, to defend its soil, their property, their families, their privileges, their freedom of speech—even within the party lines—their freedom of religion, against any invader. As a matter of fact, those farmers' sons whose exemption we have so much trouble in obtaining in some districts, come and tell us that they are ready, when able to leave the farm, to undergo their military service during the winter. Why not give them a definite exemption? It would save a lot of trouble and avoid a certain uneasiness. Many of our industrial workers have left their jobs to enlist; some of them are the only support of a family of ten children.

In some districts where I have been last summer, all the young men of military age—from eighteen and up—are gone for active service. When the notices from the registrar come in, they are sent back with the answer, "already in active service." The farmers cannot find anyone to help them. The other day I read in western papers that there will be a scarcity of men for the next crop. In Arvida, a construction company cannot find the men needed to go on with the operations. Our lumbering industries are also short of men. Where shall we find men if conscription for overseas is voted by this parliament? Certainly not in the United States, because it is not patriotic to count on others to defend our country.

If total war effort means that we have to give others everything we have in man-power, munitions, food stuffs and money, have we not reached that point?

It was announced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that Canada was giving one billion dollars to England and lending $700,000,000 without interest for the duration of the war. Is there any other nation of the British commonwealth going as far as we are? We cannot hide from the people of this country the fact that England, only a few days after our gift and loan were announced, was lending £50,000,000 to China. Of course we understand that China and Russia are helping the democracies to save freedom in the world. But we have also to think of our own Canadian democracy; we have to foresee the danger of exhausting the economic structure of the country as well as the necessary recuperative power of our people. There will, of course, be a period of prosperity which is produced by reconstruction after the war. Money will be abundant; the war industries will not be closing their doors immediately because they will have to provide a reserve of munitions for the small frictions that they will have to organize and feed during the twenty-five years before the next big war. But there will come a period when the market, perfectly controlled and smothering under the murderous grip of the "two hundreds" and their friends, will fall down in order that these Caesars may get their shares back at the lowest possible price. Another crash will send the people down on their knees begging for the dole or place them on the waiting bread-lines.

If the Canadian body has not any strength left, it will be an easy prey. If we have not prepared a plan to meet the reasonable claim of those who have been enduring the miseries of war, of those who have sweated, of the cripples of the families of our soldiers lost and dead somewhere in Europe or in the orient—if we do not organize our economic life to make them love the country for which they have left everything, they will be right in saying that we promise too much and do not give enough.

This is the history of the twenty years we have lived between the first and second world wars. It might be worse this time because our effort is unlimited.

The defence of our country should be our first and most important goal. The remainder of our men available are urgently needed for the protection of both our eastern and western coasts. We have mobilization for our country; it is what we need most. The people of this country would not be asked to release the government from its commitments on conscription for overseas unless there were a possibility that we were going to have it.

The Tory party would have preferred that the Liberals should have this parliament vote conscription sponsored by the government. Then the two parties would have been on an equal footing before the people of Canada. They will never forget that they have been repeatedly defeated in general elections on the conscription issue. That is the only place where they want equality of sacrifice.

I have been a member of both provincial and federal parliaments for fifteen years. I have been supporting the Liberal policy as strongly as my convictions permitted me to do so for over twenty years. I have always asked the people of my county, of my province, to vote in favour of those opposed to any external war participation or to conscription for overseas. I believed, and I still believe, we were right and that this country is entitled to its own decision and direction. I believe, even when I witness the colonial way in which some people are acting in this war, that Canada still can be a nation.

I cannot go back to my people and ask them to release me from my word of honour, because I think it would be retreating. Even if I admit that, under an unreasonable and fanatical pressure, this government has taken the only democratic way, it should, supported by the verdict of the people on the 26th of March, 1940, resist and not let them tear to pieces the magnificent effort Canada has made up till now in this war.

And I will tell the "two hundred" and their friends that if they go on with their scheme and their sabotage of the national economy of this country, with their appeal to fanaticism and their stingy operations, they will throw Canada into the arms of the United States sooner than they think. Canadian opinion, if not already there, is rapidly moving towards the United States of America. Canada is a county of America.

Some people in this country have endeavoured to make the French-Canadian hate England. Our genealogy starts from France and we have been here for centuries; but our mother, real and forever beloved country, is Canada. Canada we want definitely to become a nation.

Much has been said about Quebec. Some have even said that we were ignorant of certain facts, and thus lacking in judgment about certain aspects of Canadian policy as it should be. We are used to that; we pity those who feed themselves with "Down Quebec". Let me read to you a letter of a correspondent of the Montreal *Daily Star:*

One Who is Weary of Mud Slingers

Sir:—It is high time that someone, and especially an English-speaking Canadian took his fellow-countrymen to task. However, I fully believe that this biased, bigoted, and ignorant criticism of our province of Quebec, usually originates from a small minority of our neighbouring province of Ontario, especially from Toronto, and also from people residing in the province of Quebec, but who were not born in this province. In other words the slams and mud-slinging come from people who detest Quebec for its French-speaking people, or for the bulk of its Roman Catholic population.

For Ontario critics and their ilk I would like to add my protest to that of your correspondent "Jeanne Quebec" (an English Canadian), and inform these know-it-alls, and consistent "flag-wavers" that if it had not been for the support the empire received from French Canada at the time of the American revolution, Canada to-day would not be a part of the commonwealth. Furthermore do not forget that the Maisonneuve regiment was the first to complete its ranks when the war started. Is this regiment an English-speaking one?

There has been too much mud-slinging from these people who do not like Quebec. We have heard from that very broad-minded society, the Orange Order in Ontario. They protested against the celebration of the mass on parliament hill. They protested about the bilingual notices sent out by the dominion government.

I have listened to these critics of our province until I get sick and tired, and wonder how we expect to have a united Canada when, what we believe should be well informed men, deride this province right and left. As a Montrealer, born and educated, I say if they do not like Quebec, let them get out, go somewhere else; we didn't ask them to come here in the first place, and in the name of justice, let them just remember that the people of Quebec, particularly the French-speaking people, are just as good as they are, maybe even better. Furthermore that this is Canada, and because a Canadian may be of some other origin than English he is every bit as good. The flag-wavers should remember that there is no super-race; that is what we are fighting this war to prove.

Do I know what I'm writing about? Yes. One of my friends at this moment together with many of his own are fighting with the British navy overseas, and strange as it may seem they are French Canadians.

Am I French? No, Irish descent, but a Canadian first, last and always. Can the critics of Quebec admit they are Canadian first, last and always? A toast to you Jeanne Quebec. More power to your pen.

Frank J. Meagher.

This is a letter of a man belonging to a minority in Quebec. He knows the fair treatment we give to minorities in our province. They have their share, their freedom of action, and we get along with every one of them. Were he of English descent, he would say the same thing.

This is the example Quebec gives. We have unity in Quebec because we have equality of concessions. We shall have it in Canada if we have equality of concessions. Otherwise I am afraid it will never be permanent.

Mr. W. F. RICKARD (Durham): It is rather a coincidence that two farmers, particularly from the government side, should speak in this house on the one evening. Farmers, of course, are not gifted as speech-makers like men of some other callings.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) gave us a short survey of the agricultural situation in Canada, and I hope for a few minutes to speak of conditions as I know them in Ontario and more especially perhaps in the riding which I have the honour to represent. Before doing that, however, I wish to discuss two or three other matters in regard to our war effort.

Living as I do some fifty miles from the city of Toronto where this committee for total war had its birth, and where the *Globe and Mail* has quite a large circulation—although I must say not nearly as large as it once was, which condition I believe is characteristic not only of our part of the country but of all the province of Ontario—in speaking of the

Globe and Mail I endorse everything the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. McLean) said the other evening. To my mind the *Globe and Mail* not only has tried to discredit the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the government of Canada, but has, to say the least, done no good to Canada's war effort.

We have in the constituency of Durham four weekly newspapers and one daily, all of which carry full-page or half-page advertisements advocating a total war effort, and urging the voters to write their member asking for total war. I have received thirty-six clippings from newspapers, representing about fifty names, and ten letters from individuals and organizations, some in support of an all-out war effort, some absolutely opposed to conscription, others telling me to use my own judgment and do what I think right. I was glad to get these communications because I always like to hear from the people of my constituency on any subject in which they are interested. I believe the people who wrote me were sincere, and I am always glad to get their opinions.

Before I came to Ottawa I was asked by the press to state my position. I declined to do so until I had had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the facts as far as it was possible to get them, and thinking, of course, that parliament is the proper place in which to express my opinions on such an important subject.

Before continuing what I have to say, I want to add my word of congratulation to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Both hon. members did admirably; I only wish I had at my command the eloquence to do as well. I also want to congratulate the Prime Minister upon his wonderfully clear explanation of Canada's war effort. That speech will go down in history as one of the greatest he ever made. More than that, when his career is written the Prime Minister will be classed as one of the greatest statesmen in the world. I only wish every Canadian might have an opportunity of reading that speech. Canada is indeed fortunate that we have a man like our Prime Minister at the head of its government to-day. Notwithstanding all the criticisms that have been hurled at him from all sides, not only inside the house but from outside, by men who want to vent their personal feelings even in war time, notwithstanding all these things, the Prime Minister believes that his word is as good as his bond. I am glad to follow a man of that kind.

The Conservative party, as has been said many times, under the leadership of Doctor Manion definitely opposed conscription in the last election. Hon. members can read the speeches he made in this house, in Brockville, in Quebec, in many western cities and in every part of Canada. He opposed conscription throughout, because of the effect it had in 1917. I was going to say also that the present leader of the Conservative party, Mr. Meighen—but I must now leave out the word "present"—opposed conscription for overseas service without the consent of the people or without the people being consulted. He did this in his Hamilton speech, in his Winnipeg speech, but now, of course, we hear nothing but conscription for overseas service.

Conscription has been made a political football, as if it were the only issue in connection with our war effort. The Prime Minister made certain pledges and promises to the people, and he intends to keep them. Personally I made no promises for or against conscription, but I feel, as every hon. member must, no matter to what party he belongs, that having accepted the policy of his leader, we are practically all in the same boat, we cannot take a different course to-day. The fact that men in high positions and entrusted with the government of certain countries broke their word, regarded their promises as mere scraps of paper is one of the reasons why we are at war to-day. Someone may say, we are at war, we have no time to take a plebiscite. But our war effort will go on just the same.

Then it is said that the Prime Minister is evading responsibility. To my mind, as has been said before, he is asking for responsibility, not evading it. If the time ever comes that in my opinion we need conscription of men for overseas service, then I shall be for it. But I want conscription of everything else as well, man-power, woman-power, industry, labour, wealth and all natural resources, to win this war. I am not interested in politics; I am not interested in any personal gain that may come to me; my sole ambition is, as is that of every hon. member and every one in Canada for that matter, to win this war. That is the paramount concern in our minds to-day.

It is my intention to do everything I can to put this plebiscite across. I am going to ask the people of my riding to vote for the plebiscite, and I am sure they will. I hope hon. members to my left will do likewise. I was very glad to hear the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris) the other night say that if this plebiscite is put to the people, he is going to vote for it. That is the true spirit. Here I might remark that the hon. member for Danforth may be the next leader of the Conservative party.

I saw an editorial in the Toronto *Daily Star* of January 30, 1942, headed "Ignore the Plebiscite." It reads:

Certain conscriptionists hostile to Mr. King and the government—they include an evening contemporary—are advising those of similar views to ignore the plebiscite instead of helping to secure a favourable verdict on it. They must surely not have realized what a favourable verdict will involve.

A favourable verdict will release Mr. King from his pledge not to impose conscription for overseas service. But what does that mean, if not this—that a favourable verdict will remove one of the arguments against the imposition of conscription, namely that conscription is prevented by a government pledge. The issue will then have to be debated in parliament on its merits only. Surely that is what conscriptionists wish. Yet our contemporary advises people to ignore the plebiscite which would, if carried, bring this about.

If the plebiscite carries, Mr. King will have to debate conscription on its merits alone. Our contemporary thinks its merits are overwhelming. How then could it better achieve its well known ambition to put Mr. King on the spot than to put him on this spot, where he will be on what it considers the very weak side of an argument, without any pledge to obscure the issue?

In justice to other newspapers which are opposed to Mr. King on the conscription issue, it must be said that while most of them criticize the holding of a plebiscite, the great majority say that the patriotic thing to do is to carry the plebiscite now that it is to be held. That, of course, is true. Canada should free the government's hands, and thus free the discussion from everything not pertaining to the merits or demerits of conscription as a Canadian policy.

It is not my intention to discuss the war effort at great length. This has been done by many hon. members much better than I could possibly expect to do it. But as I see it, Canada's war effort is divided three ways—the army, munitions of war, and food. Men are required for the army, the navy and the air force—and the army is only one part of the whole war programme. The question seems to be: How shall we raise a part of that part of the war effort? Munitions to-day are reaching a point where it will tax the capacity of this country in money, men for industry and food from the farms. In the air force, of course, the sky is the limit as far as enlistments are concerned. The same is true of the navy. In both these forces we have at present several thousand men on the waiting list. But in the army, as far as overseas service is concerned, there must be a limit, if we are going to provide munitions of war in industry, and production from the farms.

This war is different from the last one, in that we have an air force. We had no such thing in the last war. We had no tanks or tank trailers, or any of dozens of other forms of the mechanized equipment we have in this war.

A survey of man-power under the voluntary system to December 31, 1941, shows that we have enlisted in all branches nearly 425,000 men. In 1941 alone we had over 180,000 in all branches. And from October to January, a period of four months, 32,000 enlisted in the army. In January alone 11,000 enlisted in that branch of the service, and it is expected that this month 15,000 men will enlist. In addition to this, we have 550,000 men and about 75,000 women in industry and munitions.

As was said this afternoon by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), we shall soon reach 700,000. While the population of Canada is somewhat larger than it was in the last war, yet the number of men of military age who are physically fit is not so much greater. In the last war we had four divisions of armed forces overseas, and in this war we have 425,000 men in the forces, and three or four times as many men in munitions, as at the time of the last war. At the present time we have overseas about 130,000 men, and enlistments for overseas are about 120,000 to 125,000. The Minister of National Defence has definitely stated that he is opposed to calling up men faster than they can be trained. With this I entirely agree. There is no use in taking men if we have no munitions to fight with. It does not matter how brave a man may be, if he has not the proper equipment he is not of much use. Our capacity for training is about 11,000 a month, and we shall have this month about 15,000. These figures are for the army alone. Besides this, we have many battalions on the Pacific and elsewhere in Canada for our own defence.

At this point I want to pay tribute to the armed forces—the boys in the army, the navy and the air force, both officers and men. I pay tribute to industry and to labour, and not the least, to farmers, and to all others who are in any way making this splendid war effort possible; for without the cooperation of everyone of these it would not have been possible.

For a few minutes I should like to discuss agriculture. Given an average crop, and provided they get help, the farmers of Canada should be in a fairly satisfactory position this year. There will be good markets for nearly all they produce, and most likely very fair prices will be offered. The price ceiling which has been enforced has been placed on almost all the farmer has to buy, but it has not been enforced to so great an extent with respect to all he has to sell. Of course in the west, if crops are poor the farmers will have at least a guaranteed minimum return, or some form

of government assistance. Wheat and wheat farming constitute, of course, the biggest and the most contentious problem. Despite that, we shall have less wheat to carry over than we have had in previous years.

No farmer can expect to compete with industry and its high wages, when no surplus of labour is offered. Men have left the farm at an alarming rate, and the farmer cannot pay the wages to entice them back. We cannot blame the men for this, because naturally a man or a woman will go where he or she can get the best return for his or her labour. With Great Britain calling for increased supplies of food, as the Prime Minister told us in his speech, the farm labour situation is serious, and is going to be more serious. Something will have to be done about it if we are to produce the maximum of food to feed our allies and ourselves.

I happen to live in an area close to General Motors and the Pickering explosives plant where hundreds of farmers' sons and hired men have gone to work at wages far above those the farmers can afford to pay. I am told there are about 6,000 people working at that plant, and half of them are women. This has crippled agriculture in our district. I believe the same condition is true in many other parts of Ontario.

We are told, of course, that agriculture is the basic industry of Canada and, as I said before, Great Britain needs all we can produce of bacon, cheese, milk, eggs and many other commodities. If we are to produce those things there will have to be some sort of selective service for the farmers. If this is not possible, then I would suggest that the farmer be given some kind of bonus. I do not like the word "bonus" and I do not like bonuses, because I do not agree with that principle. But the farmers must be given some sort of financial assistance so as to compete with wages paid in industry. This must be done at once so that the farmer can plan his production, because that cannot possibly be done at a moment's notice.

Recently a survey was made in my county, and I believe a similar survey has been made generally throughout Ontario. While nothing definite has as yet been published with respect to it, I believe it has been done with the sole purpose of finding out the position of the farmers in that province, and particularly, perhaps, with regard to farm labour. I venture to say that in my county from one-quarter to one-third of the farmers will be asking for an increase by way of help.

I would suggest one other thing with respect to agriculture, and that is that the committee on agriculture be allowed to meet. We are told that there must be something specific or definite to be considered before the committee can be called together. Surely in these times there are enough problems confronting our farmers to warrant this committee functioning. I think there are enough hon. members interested in agriculture to work up some programme that will be of assistance to the government in formulating a policy. I hope the chairman of the agriculture committee will bear these suggestions in mind.

I should like to refer briefly to the four months' training as it affects farmers' sons. Many of these boys have taken their four months' training expecting to be released in order to be able to help on the farm. But this has been found to be almost impossible. I must say that the local board in our district, No. 3 in Kingston, has been most considerate. A great many young men have been given a postponement of a few months, but that is most unsatisfactory. I should like to see some system worked out whereby these boys could be given total exemption as long as they stay on the farm. I believe they can do just as much for Canada's war effort by producing food as they can by serving in any other branch. Instead of setting up boards in districts like Kingston and Toronto, I think it would be much better if smaller boards were set up in the counties or townships. The members of these boards would have a better chance of becoming acquainted with the situation existing in their particular section of the country.

I believe in selective service if it can be worked out, but it presents a great problem. It is no use putting a man who knows nothing about farming on a farm. I have had some experience in that connection, particularly with apple pickers. Men have been sent out from the cities who knew nothing about this work, and we would have been better off without them. There must be something done in this regard. I leave these few thoughts with the government in the hope that they will receive consideration.

In closing let me say: Let us forget our petty differences; let us forget our party politics and all work together to help win this war. In the words of Churchill:

> Come then—let us to the task to the battle and the toil.
>
> Each to our part, each to our station, fill the armies, rule the air, pour out the munitions, strangle the U-boats, sweep the mines, plough the land, build the ships, guard the streets, succour the wounded, uplift the downcast and honour the brave.
>
> Let us go forward together . . . in all parts of the empire, in all parts of this island. There is not a week, nor a day, nor an hour to be lost.

Mr. W. R. McDONALD (Pontiac) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, as representative of a constituency the population of which is in majority French-Canadian and knowing how interested they are in the present debate, I feel bound to briefly state in French my position in connection with the plebiscite mentioned in the speech from the throne.

Like many other members of the House of Commons, during the electoral campaign, not only have I supported the platform of my leader, the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), on conscription, but I have also formally pledged myself to vote against any form of compulsion for overseas service.

The Prime Minister, in the speech delivered in this house and published in the press, has stated the reasons for which his government would submit the following question to the Canadian population by means of a plebiscite:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligations arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

By this democratic measure, the Prime Minister keeps his promises to the Canadian people, setting aside, at the same time, the advice proffered by the opposition and the group of so-called patriots at a recent meeting held in Toronto. Resting my faith in him and in the ministers from my province, I intend to support this proposition. I refuse to betray the confidence of my electors by voting for the amendment of the opposition, which would eventually lead to conscription. I remember with sorrow this evil measure and the methods of its enforcement in our province during the last war. I shall state my special reasons in the English portion of my speech.

(Text) Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can be accused of being a frequent offender in taking up the time of this house. My reason for doing so to-night is the fact that the questions at issue in this debate, particularly those relating to the plebiscite, are of the greatest importance to the people of Canada and are none the less interesting to my constituents.

Before proceeding to make known my attitude regarding the plebiscite, I should like to refer to the National Resources Mobilization Act, which, in my humble opinion, should be amended. I refer particularly to that section under which farmers and farmers' sons may have their call to service postponed by making application to the registrar of the district from which they receive their notice. Several hon. members who have preceded me in this debate, particularly the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette), have revealed the hardships imposed upon those who are entitled to postponement of their services when they are making application because of the fact that the committee charged with the duty of studying their case and rendering judgment is located at too great a distance from the applicant's home to give him an opportunity of appearing in person or of being represented by someone in order that his case may be submitted in the proper light. I am in complete accord with the hon. member when he submits that a change in this procedure is necessary. I believe there should be set up in each county a tribunal or committee of some kind to deal with this.

I would go so far as to suggest an amendment to the act whereby those persons who fall into the category of those entitled to postponement of service would be granted an exemption. No great amount of argument is necessary to prove that the presence of a farmer or a farmer's son is necessary upon the farm, not only for three or six months, but for the entire year, if the farm is to be worked to its full productive capacity and the farming community throughout Canada enabled to answer the call of the government for an all-out production during this war period.

As is the case no doubt with many other members of this house, I have received numerous letters from farmers in my constituency asking me to use my influence to have their sons exempted. Of course, mine was the stereotyped reply:

> I beg to inform you that I can exercise no influence on your behalf, much as I appreciate your position and am desirous to assist you to attain that to which you or your son should be entitled—not postponement only—but exemption from service.

I have before me several letters along this line from which I shall quote briefly. One is from a farmer who relates to me that his eldest son enlisted voluntarily in the service last fall, and to that he takes no objection. In fact the father says, "I am proud of him." But now his other son, the only help he has on the farm, is being called for service under the mobilization act, and the father says, "I am of the opinion in all justice that he should be exempted from service." Another letter is from a young farmer up in the northern part of my county, a young married man who is established on a farm of one hundred acres. He mentions that he has horses, cattle and

sheep, and that twenty-five acres of his hundred acres is ready for sowing next spring, but a call for service will mean that his farm will remain uncultivated next year.

I also received to-day a largely signed petition to the same effect from a group of farmers in my county. I shall present the petition to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) to-morrow because it is addressed to him. I respectfully suggest to the government that serious consideration be given to this proposed amendment. I am well aware that there might be abuses in regard to these exemptions, but I am strongly of opinion that there can be found throughout the country men sufficiently imbued with a sense of responsibility and patriotic enough to act upon these tribunals, if established, in each county, who will perform their duties in a conscientious manner.

Let me return to the question of the plebiscite mentioned in the speech from the throne and already discussed at some length in this chamber. Like many other members of this house, during the election campaign of 1940 I accepted the candidature of the Liberal party under the leadership of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), and in that capacity I accepted in its entirety the programme submitted by him to the people of Canada. Included therein was a clause providing for the enlistment of Canada's army under a voluntary system and a direct promise that conscription would not be introduced. My election is a direct consequence of my acceptance of the candidature of the party and its programme during the campaign and I consider myself in honour bound to give my loyal support to my leader and my party, even if I were not further bound by a personal pledge to my constituents who voted against conscription. That pledge, conscientiously given at the time and with a full knowledge and experience of the baneful effects of conscription in the last war, I intend to honour, notwithstanding certain intimations here and in the press of the country that one should consider himself automatically absolved from these commitments, having in mind the serious war situation prevailing to-day. But, Mr. Speaker, it has been my honour and privilege to represent the provincial county of Pontiac in the legislature of Quebec for sixteen years and the greater county of Pontiac in the federal house for seven years, making in all a total representation of twenty-three years. I am bound to say, sir, knowing positively that I have retained the confidence of my electorate over that period of time chiefly by respecting the mandates which they gave me, never violating my pledged word to them and never fearing to face squarely any issue which confronted me, that it is now too late for me to change my attitude and adopt a course which I would condemn in another and which in myself I could not conscientiously condone. Therefore on this occasion I shall stand or fall by my leader and my party, and in doing so I am not only following the dictates of my conscience but retaining my self-respect.

Conscription recalls memories to me, memories of the introduction of the Military Service Act and of the manner in which it was adopted in this chamber by use of the closure, memories of the War-time Elections Act, characterized by Sir Wilfrid Laurier as a blot upon every instinct of justice, and memories in particular of the shameful election campaign of 1917, in which it was the main issue.

Certain members on the other side of the house criticize the members from the province of Quebec for having made use of this issue and continuing to do so during our election campaigns even to the present day. To that accusation I plead guilty. I, as a humble member from the province of Quebec, shall continue this course without any apology to anyone for my conduct so long as there remain in the ranks of the Conservative party both inside and outside this house the men who planned and carried out that slanderous campaign against my native province. The memories of that campaign linger; in fact, they are seared in my mind. I can quite appreciate the attitude of certain Conservatives who honestly seek an end to this kind of controversy, but let me suggest to them in all sincerity, if they are sincere in this attitude, to use their influence in their own party to see that these political, racial and religious bigots of 1917 and their imitators of to-day are ostracized once and for all.

Might I also suggest to them to use their influence to quash the movement started during the last session, and daily gaining momentum again to make the province of Quebec the butt of an unjust and unfair criticism, trying once again to inflame public sentiment against our people. Let them not delude themselves with the idea that we are not aware of this movement, sometimes openly carried on in the press in Ontario and at other times by ingratiating speeches in this house—sometimes often whispered from mouth to mouth that these blankety-blank Frenchmen in the province of Quebec must be made to enlist and do their duty. They have no evidence to support their statement that the French-Canadians in the province of Quebec are not enlisting in as large numbers as those of any other nationality; but they must use this insinuation against them. I might state here—and I am pleased to state it—that I know a messenger of this

house, whom I am proud to name—his name is Guertin—the father of eight sons, five of them of military age, and all five overseas.

Such an ingratiating speech as I referred to a while ago was made by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) on June 13, 1941, and reported in *Hansard,* at pages 3947 and 3948, from which I quote:

I received a clipping the other day from the Winnipeg *Tribune* of May 28 containing a letter in favour of conscription. I shall not read the letter, but I should like to refer to the editor's footnote which is as follows:

"Recruiting figures show that the number of active service force volunteers, per thousand of population, is higher for French-Canadians than for English-speaking Canadians."

The Winnipeg *Tribune* was paying that tribute to the French-Canadians. But the hon. member for Parkdale goes on to say in his ingratiating manner:

No one would be more pleased than I if that were true—

The doubt is sown there.

—but so far as I am aware no reply has been given by the minister to the questions which have been asked in connection with recruiting in the various provinces, unless it was in his speech of May 12 last. . . .

He would be pleased, Mr. Speaker, if that were true! He wants evidence of it, and he will await the reply of the minister before he will make up his mind. In *Hansard* of the same date, as reported at page 3948, he stated:

I should now like to quote from a French-Canadian newspaper to show the changed attitude in that province—

Speaking of Quebec.

—in respect of Canada's participation in war outside of Canada.

In respect to that, I have this to say. Quebec entered fully and completely into the war in 1939. She has made no change, and she is as completely into the war to-day as any other province of Canada. That is my answer to the hon. member for Parkdale in this ingratiating and insinuating speech of his.

Quite in contrast to that speech—and I commend the hon. member upon it—is the speech the same day of the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker). I am sorry that the hon. member is not at the moment in the chamber; I wish to compliment him upon it. He said, as reported at page 3954 of *Hansard:*

I have no French blood in my veins, but I believe that those who do come from that part of Canada are as anxious and as willing to serve as those from any other part of this dominion and to assert the contrary is to do a great disservice to Canada and its unity of purpose.

I thank the hon. member for Lake Centre for that expression of opinion.

The hon. member for Rosedale (Mr. Jackman) also devoted a considerable part of his speech to the province of Quebec, taking issue with the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier), the mover of the address. I fully concur in the views of the hon. member for Hull, and I congratulate him most heartily upon the subject matter of his address in both languages, also upon the manner of its delivery.

This propaganda campaign, because it is nothing else, prompted Mrs. Black, wife of the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Black), who herself graced this chamber with her presence in the last parliament, to publish a letter of protest in the Ottawa *Journal,* from which I quote:

With extreme regret, as well as great annoyance, I have noted a growing habit of accusing Quebec of lack of loyalty to Canada and the empire, because of an aversion to compulsory military service.

Probably no member of parliament, with his wife, does of necessity cover more of Canada from the far north to the east than do George Black, M.P. for Yukon, and I. In our many trips across Canada we have observed as much apathy and lack of enthusiasm for active service in the armed forces of Canada in other provinces as in Quebec.

Let us of the other parts of this dominion forget our smug complacency and force ourselves to realize that Quebec is as loyal as the other provinces.

We are component parts of a great empire. Let each one do his, or her, part to unite Canada in support of that empire, forgetting petty racial and religious prejudices. We must work, we must fight for the right to worship one God, to be loyal to one King, and to hold a united empire, that our children's children may enjoy the freedom we hold so dear.

I sincerely thank Mrs. Black, wife of the hon. member for the Yukon, for those words.

This campaign of propaganda also reached the ears of the provincial treasurer of Quebec, Hon. J. A. Mathewson. He had occasion to address a district convention of Kiwanis International in Montreal on September 22, 1941, when, as reported in the Montreal *Star,* he said:

In his preliminary remarks the provincial treasurer declared his belief that a really serious misunderstanding existed in Canada concerning the attitude of French Canada and French-Catholic Quebec. "There are no more true-hearted Canadians in all this broad dominion than French-Canadians", declared Mr. Mathewson, "and no people who more thoroughly appreciate and understand the value of the British empire so deeply as French-Canadians."

The speaker expressed the opinion that Quebec has fallen into the unfortunate position of being the whipping boy of the dominion—

Note the expression, Mr. Speaker, "the whipping boy"; and that is true.

—those things that are not desired by other provinces any more than by this province are not carried out because of the fear it would not please Quebec and Quebec would not like this or that.

"That is a mask, and an insincere pretext," declared Mr. Mathewson. "If the other provinces come out and say what they would like to be done, we are prepared to sit down and reason with them as to the contribution we can make to the common cause. We may have fanatics in this province, but we have no monopoly of that odious animal, he is found in every province in no less vigorous form than he is found here."

Commenting on that speech of the provincial treasurer, the Montreal *Star* of September 23, said in part as follows. After referring to the fact that Mr. Mathewson had said, "There are no more true-hearted Canadians in all this broad dominion than French-Canadians, and no people more thoroughly appreciate and understand the value of the British empire so deeply as French-Canadians," the *Star* goes on to say:

Critics of the province should understand these things. Mr. Mathewson says that Quebec has fallen into the unfortunate position of being a "whipping boy" of the dominion, and while the statement is perhaps too broad a generalization, there exists the tendency to blame Quebec for any gaps in Canadian unity when, as a matter of fact, there are many people outside this province who would not close the gaps if they could, preferring their emotional prejudices and private interests to unity based on common understanding and an identity of social and economic interest.

Much is made, as Mr. Mathewson inferred, of political fears that this or that cannot be done in Canada because it might not please Quebec. A great deal of arrant nonsense is talked around this idea. Such a consideration might influence the petty politician, but we are growing up politically, and if Quebec's possible reactions are factors in determining a course of action, in common with every other province, that is as it should be, for this province is a unit in our federal system and has an equal right to be heard with all the other units.

So much for the propaganda campaign.

Let me consider this conscription issue from another angle, that of national unity. In its issue of January 16 the Ottawa *Journal* published editorially, under the heading, "Speaking of National Unity", an article a copy of which I have, in which the idea of the disruption of national unity was pooh-poohed if conscription should be adopted in this country. The article states in part:

This country is united in this war. All its provinces are united. That being admitted everywhere, and proclaimed ardently everywhere, what is the basis of this talk that adoption of a particular method of waging war would disrupt national unity? To hear certain people talking almost in bated breath about conscription and national unity, one might almost imagine that conscription would bring rebellion.

What section, what part of Canada is thus bring stigmatized with potential treason? Is it Quebec?

In answer to that question, "What section, what part of Canada is thus being stigmatized with potential treason—is it Quebec?", if the inference is that it is Quebec, it is most unfair. Quebec has always been loyal. It is loyal to-day and will continue to be loyal. If the time ever comes, which God forbid, when Quebec should decide that her future does not lie within the confines of the confederation pact, she will proceed in a constitutional manner to attain her end. Quebec is loyal.

Let me digress for a moment to read an excerpt from an address given by Mr. Louis St. Laurent, who was elected yesterday as Minister of Justice, replacing our late lamented friend, the Right Hon. Mr. Lapointe. Speaking before the Canadian Life Insurance Officers' Association in Toronto, as reported in the Montreal *Star* of May 30, 1941, he said:

"Let me take you back to a little settlement over 130 years ago, to be exact to August 30, 1807," he said.

"It is Sunday morning in the parish of La Baie St. Paul, a settlement on the north shore of the St. Lawrence about 60 miles below Quebec. A proclamation calling volunteers to take up arms to defend their country against a threatened invasion from the United States has been posted on the church door. The people are all agog over the ominous news of war. They troop into the little church and kneel in prayer and at the appointed moment, the parish priest, Father Louis Lelievre, mounts the pulpit. For this occasion, he has written out what he will say to his flock.

Here are two paragraphs from those notes which a friend of mine recently found among his books and papers which he bequeathed to the library of his alma mater, the old seminary of Quebec:

"Brethren, it is my duty at this time to express my views to you on the terrible scourge (still uncertain I hope) with which we are threatened. We are told by political leaders that war between England and the United States appears to be unavoidable. For my part I trust that with the Lord's grace, appeasement can still be achieved and that the peace we have enjoyed for 48 years may continue. But assuming that the forecast be realized, what else can we do in such a crisis but show ourselves to be faithful and loyal subjects and give our gracious sovereign, King George, shining proof of our attachment to his crown and of our devotion to his interests which are our own and of our readiness to shed our blood for the defence of our homeland. In a word, be ready my brethren, to show by your deeds, your zeal and your courage to support a government which has treated you so generously. In so doing you will make yourselves worthy of the countless advantages you have enjoyed and especially of that liberty which has ever been yours since we have been so fortunate as to live under British government.

That was the voice of a humble priest in the province of Quebec in 1807, about forty years odd after the conquest. Yet there are men in Canada to-day who will say that there is disloyalty among the French-Canadians. We Anglo-Saxons in Canada are of yesterday. The French-Canadian has been rooted in the soil for a period of almost 400 years; and yet he is not supposed to be loyal to that country wherein he has lived for 400 years. It is ridiculous.

Returning to the point of national unity, I wonder whether the organizers of the election campaign of 1917, and those newspapers which gave publicity to the literature of that time, realize how close they came to bringing about disruption. I would ask them in all sincerity if the publication and circulation of those pamphlets, excerpts from which I am about to quote, tended to bring about unity. I have before me Union government election pamphlets of 1917, and I will give one or two quotations just to show what they used against us at that time, what false accusations they made against us, what false charges they made, and how they slandered the name of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Here is one item:

> Make no mistake. If Laurier wins Canada will send no more reinforcements to the front, which practically means quitting the war and placing the country in the same class as Russia.

And number two:

> French-Canadians who have shirked their duty in this war will be the dominating force in the government of the country. Are the English-speaking people prepared to stand for that?

That is from literature of the campaign of 1917 by the Union government which some distinguished patriots whom we have in Toronto to-day would like to carry on.

There is another one, and this is the "most unkindest cut of all." This is furthest away from the truth of anything that could be published. Listen to it; you are from the province of Quebec, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and it will be news to you:

> Laurier gladly takes Bourassa to his bosom.

Then there are extracts from French-Canadian newspapers. But that title in particular caught my eye, "Laurier gladly takes Bourassa to his bosom." Laurier did not take Bourassa to his bosom. The Conservative party took Bourassa to its bosom in 1911. I stated in my speech in March last year, that we had fought on two occasions, in a provincial election and a dominion election against sixty-five nationalists in Quebec—and an election was fought against one of them yesterday in that province. How did they attain the influence they exercised in Quebec, particularly in 1911? By the very fact that Sir Robert Borden and his government made a pact with Bourassa to finance his candidates in Quebec and paid for subscriptions to his newspaper *Le Devoir* to spread his propaganda throughout this country.

My belief, Mr. Speaker, is that that propaganda was not the most loyal ever propagated. Then turn round and say that Laurier took Bourassa to his bosom after they took him to their bosom, and we have had from that time to the present the reflection of these men in the province of Quebec, due to this loyal Conservative party. They cast aside everything they stood for, including their patriotism in 1911, to gain a victory over Laurier. They won twenty-seven seats out of sixty-five in Quebec by that, and to-day they would like to charge the Liberals of Quebec with having taken these men to our bosom. They are reaping what they sowed, but they cannot cast a reflection on us.

The resultant effect of this campaign of insult and slander directed particularly against the French-Canadians in Quebec was the introduction of the following resolution in the legislature during the session of 1918:

> That this house is of opinion that the province of Quebec would be disposed to accept the breaking of the confederation pact of 1867 if, in the other provinces, it is believed that she is an obstacle to the union, progress and development of Canada.

That motion was proposed by Mr. J. N. Francoeur. The premier at that time was Sir Lomer Gouin, and through his influence the motion was withdrawn. But I say this to-day, having in mind this propaganda directed against us, if it continues, are we certain that there will always be men like Sir Lomer Gouin at the head of public affairs in Quebec? Can we reasonably expect these French-Canadians to continue to lend a deaf ear to these reflections on their loyalty, these gratuitous insults directed at them by a blind, fanatical group? My advice to them is, Beware, Watch, Look, Listen.

I am not going to undertake the defence of the war effort of Quebec since 1939; that was very ably done to-night by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), and I personally thank him. This province has done her duty thus far and is determined to continue to do so, and in return she asks only that she be treated with the respect and consideration which are rightly her due.

In the by-elections of yesterday the people in no uncertain manner gave their answer to those who, by their speeches and writings, would destroy the unity of this country. They

have definitely consigned to the limbo of forgotten men the Meighens, the Hepburns, the Drews and others of their ilk, whence we hope they will never be resurrected.

In discussing this issue of conscription to-night, my mind reverts to my last conversation with the late Minister of Justice, the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, in his office on the morning of November 3 last, the date of resumption of the last session. The conversation having turned on conscription, he expressed his unalterable opposition to it, chiefly upon the ground that it would disrupt national unity. His last words to me were: "I will oppose this measure with all my strength, even to my last breath." Alas, Mr. Speaker, he made his last appearance in this chamber that afternoon. To the memory of this earnest advocate and fearless champion of Canadian unity, loyal follower and worthy successor of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, I pay my humble tribute of respect. To his wife and family I extend my sincere sympathy, while o'er his grave I reverently breathe a fervent *Requiescat in pace.*

On motion of Mr. Crète the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at 10.56 p.m.

Wednesday, February 11, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

WAGE CEILING

ORDER IN COUNCIL AMENDING ORIGINAL ORDER AS TO PROMOTIONS, NEW APPOINTMENTS AND BONUSES

On the order for motions:

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I desire to lay on the table order in council dated February 6, 1942, relating to a ceiling on salaries and to make a brief statement in explanation. I am tabling for comparison a copy of the original order.

This amending order is intended to clarify the application of the original order and to alter some details of its provisions in regard particularly to promotions, new appointments, and the payment of bonuses. I should like to draw attention to the fact that in clarifying the definition of salaried official, this amending order definitely places some employees under the wages and cost of living bonus order, thereby entitling them to the cost of living bonus from their employers.

All persons receiving salaries or wages of less than $175 a month are excluded from the class of salaried official and made subject to the wages and cost of living bonus order. All those receiving $250 or more a month are considered to be salaried officials unless their duties or responsibilities show clearly that they are not above the rank of foreman or comparable rank, in which case they are subject to the wages order. The national war labour board, or its regional boards, are made responsible for determining the status of any employee or any class of employees in case of doubt or dispute. The national board has already issued a number of general interpretative rulings on this matter and will be issuing others in due course.

Another change is intended to remove the source of what is regarded as discrimination within many organizations where highly paid workmen or foremen are entitled to a cost of living bonus under the wages order while junior salaried officials earning no more, or even less, are prevented from receiving such a bonus by the provisions of the salaries order. The amending order permits an employer to pay a cost of living bonus to salaried officials earning no more than other employees of the same employer who are entitled to such bonus under the wages order. This special permission is not allowed to apply to officials receiving more than $4,200 per year, and the general limit of $3,000 on those permitted to receive the bonus remains applicable where the special circumstances are not present.

Other provisions of the amending order extend the control to salaries of those hired after the original order went into effect. An employer is not permitted to pay to a newly-appointed salaried official a rate of salary higher than the rate previously paid to another official performing substantially the same services, or if there is no such guide, the employer shall not pay a rate of salary higher than is reasonable and proper, having regard to the rates paid to salaried officials for similar services in like business. This provision is intended, among other things, to check the practice of employers trying to entice employees from one another by the promise of higher salaries.

To avert any danger of an employer paying a higher initial rate of salary than he otherwise would to a newly-hired or newly-promoted official because that rate must not be subsequently increased under the terms of the order, the amending order provides that an employer may, in accord with his established practice, and by arrangement, pay first a probationary or temporary rate of salary, to be followed by a higher rate, in cases of new appointments or promotions taking place after the order went into effect.

There are a considerable number of minor changes in wording, and definitions. A specific limitation is put on directors' fees instead of relying upon the general restrictions on salaries being applied. The intent of the original order is made clear by explicitly stating that the amount of any cost of living bonus being paid when the order went into effect shall be considered as part of the rate of salary at that time. The definition of employers subject to the order is altered to exclude all public hospitals, and all religious, charitable and educational institutions not carried on for gain. Notification is required of promotions within three months of the first payment of the increased salary, where it is not already required in advance. I will not attempt to go into further detail, as copies of the order are available to all those interested.

Perhaps I should add that in the administration of this order by the income tax division, it is possible to obtain a close check on what is happening to all salaries by an inspection both of employee's and employer's tax returns. There is one other minor change which it may be necessary to make for administrative reasons, in addition to these amendments, and this may involve another brief order shortly.

PRIVILEGE—MR. RALSTON

LIMITATION UNDER MOBILIZATION ACT WITH RESPECT TO SERVICE OVERSEAS

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): Last night while I was not in the house the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) raised a question of privilege with respect to a passage between himself and myself when I was speaking yesterday afternoon. My hon. friend mentioned the matter to me in the corridor, and I do not accuse him of any intention to cause embarrassment by raising it while I was not in the house. I really did not understand from him that he was going to raise it in the house; I thought he was going to mention it to me. In the short time at my disposal I have endeavoured to have gone over by my "research department," as he calls it, the matter of the speeches which were made and the effect of what was said at the time. I should like to refer to the language a little more extensively than he has. When speaking yesterday I referred to the passing of the National Resources Mobilization Act and the limitation which was contained in section 3 which restricts compulsory service under the act to service in Canada. I said, as reported on page 453 of *Hansard:*

The present leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) was in the house at the time; he took no exception to that limitation. His only suggestion was that the act might be extended to service in Labrador. And he and his party supported that measure with that restriction in it.

The leader of the opposition then said:

Did I not say I was prepared to accept that as a half-way measure?

I took it that he was referring to the limitation to service in Canada. I then said:

I am quite satisfied my hon. friend used no such language.

My hon. friend then referred to my research department having let me down. Apparently he then started his research department going over the debate. I must say that if my department let me down, his department has worked overtime because he has gone back to the speech which he made, not while the bill was under discussion or in committee, but before it was even introduced, a speech which was made after the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) had announced the general terms of the measure. Last night he quoted a passage saying that he had made a proposal to the government that the government should take authority to mobilize all the man-power and all the material resources of this nation for the aid of the mother country and for the defence of Canada. I say again, that speech was made considerably before the bill was introduced, before even the resolution was introduced, and I do not think he would find that phrase again repeated when the bill was under discusssion.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): When in committee.

Mr. RALSTON: But he has referred to two passages in which he did, I freely admit, refer to half a loaf being better than no bread. That is on pages 913 and 914 of *Hansard* of June 19, 1940. And he quoted these two passages last night (see page 471 of *Hansard* of yesterday) to show what he had said when the bill was in committee. There he says:

I should like to emphasize the fact that the bill is purely and simply enabling legislation, and while it falls short of what many people in this dominion think is necessary and have been demanding, yet on balance and on the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread at all, we on this side of the house are prepared to accept the principle of the bill and to accept the measure for what it is worth.

Then in the second column of page 917 of *Hansard* of 1940 he says about the same thing. I quote his remarks on page 917 (see page 471 of *Hansard* of yesterday):

I tell the Prime Minister it has not been easy to support the principle of this bill, having regard to the volume of representations I had received beforehand in favour of something more far-reaching, and the protests I have been receiving this morning that we should still have

something greater. But as I said before, for the defence of Canada if for nothing else I am willing to support the principle of this bill; because half a loaf is better than no bread.

My hon. friend, I freely admit, did use that expression; I had forgotten that; in fact, it had not been called to my attention for, I think, the fairly obvious reason that I was discussing what was said with regard to section 3 of the bill which has to do with the matter of restriction of compulsory service. These two passages which my hon. friend quoted last night were spoken on section 2 of the bill.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh, no, on the whole bill.

Mr. RALSTON: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. It was while section 2 of the bill was being discussed in committee. I referred my hon. friend to the pages of *Hansard,* and he will find that is the fact. I have had my research department go back through my hon. friend's speech to find out what he was referring to when he said that half a loaf was better than no bread. Was he referring to the matter of restriction of compulsory service in Canada, or what was he referring to? I am not going to trouble the house to read all the passages, but I say this to my hon. friend, and he can look it up for himself. The four objections he was taking to the bill were: first, that the emergency declaration—he did not make this objection very clearly—which he had asked for from the Prime Minister was, he thought, not sufficient if simply put in the preamble to the bill. Second, he protested or complained that it was only enabling legislation and that therefore the government could do nothing or something just as they saw fit. Third, he went extensively into the procedure as to the Military Service Act of 1917, and hon. gentlemen will find when they read his long speech, made before the bill was introduced at all, that he was suggesting that there should be inserted in the mobilization bill all the provisions which were in the Military Service Act of 1917, or similar provisions with regard to exemptions and so on. His fourth objection —and he brought this out particularly—was that there was not sufficient indication of how the government was to act with regard to the mobilization of wealth. That was very much on his mind, and he dealt with it extensively in his speech.

These were the four things I found which he might have referred to as half a loaf. But what I did not find is that he ever thought or suggested that it was half a loaf simply because compulsory service was confined to Canada. Let me read a passage from that same speech from which my hon. friend first quoted last night—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, is this a matter of privilege?

Mr. POULIOT: You are greatly disturbed and perturbed since Monday night.

Mr. RALSTON: Here is what my hon. friend said—and I remind the house that the Prime Minister had in his statement prior to the bill said that recruitment for overseas service would be maintained on a voluntary basis.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, surely this is carrying a question of privilege beyond all reasonable limits. We may disagree about the interpretation of what I said, but the point to which I referred last night was the minister's denial that I had ever said that I accepted the principle of the bill on the theory that half a loaf was better than no bread. It looks now as though it was simply a question of interpretation of my remarks, and I am sure there is no question of privilege in that.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The minister is entitled to speak on that.

Mr. RALSTON: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I point out to my hon. friend that he interrupted me when I had referred to the restriction of the bill and said:

> Did I not say I was prepared to accept that as a halfway measure?

Meaning, I took it, the restriction in the bill, and I am pointing out that if that was the interpretation, I was justified in what I said. He did not say that that restriction of the bill made it a halfway measure.

Mr. SPEAKER: With regard to the point of order raised by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), the hon. minister is entitled, of course, to reply, on a question of privilege, to what was said last night, but he is not entitled to bring in new matter. He must confine himself solely to rebuttal of what was said. I have not noticed that any new matter has been introduced by the minister in rebuttal, but I must urge upon him that he must confine himself strictly to rebuttal.

Mr. RALSTON: I am certainly not bringing in any new matter, Mr. Speaker. I am dealing with the question whether my hon. friend objected to the restriction in the bill and whether, when he said that he referred to it as a halfway measure, he was referring to the restriction in the bill. I am proposing on that point to quote what my hon. friend said

in the house in the same speech to which he has referred as indicating that he was not objecting to that restriction.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is simply a matter of interpretation.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): No; it was a question of privilege.

Mr. RALSTON: I was going on to say that at page 859 of *Hansard* of June 18, 1940, after the Prime Minister had announced that recruiting for overseas would be maintained, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition said:

> The Prime Minister has announced that a bill will be introduced to-day to empower the government to mobilize all the resources of the nation, human and material, for the defence of Canada. That is good; everybody will applaud it. Material aid to the mother country will come from it; that result cannot help following. The trend of events in Canada and in the struggle will indicate how much farther the government should go.
>
> I am pleased to note that recruitment for overseas service will be continued. I hope the enforcement of national service in Canada will in no degree retard our contribution for overseas service. If the war is to cease on continental Europe I can quite understand that we shall not require to send as much manpower overseas. But there will still be great need for material things being sent over—there will be the need for food, clothing, and shelter for the aid and comfort of our people. There will be the need for munitions, and then more munitions, and then more munitions, from Canada.

I say that that indicates clearly that my hon. friend did not object to section 3 of the bill, which was the point I was endeavouring to make.

May I conclude with this. My point was that my hon. friend did not object to that restriction, and the best evidence of that is his own remarks at pages 967 and 968 of *Hansard* of 1940, where you will find exactly what I said he said, namely, that the only suggestion he made was that compulsory service be extended to Labrador. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, to have taken the time of the house for so long. I thought that some hon. members might want to read and enjoy these passages as Sunday reading or in their leisure time, and so I am giving the house the references to enable them to do so. They are all that my "research department" are able to find: *Hansard*, 1940, pages 853 to 855; 857 to 861; 913 to 932; 939 to 967; 967 to 976.

Mr. CASSELMAN: What is the situation at Singapore to-day?

THE WAR IN THE FAR EAST

INQUIRY AS TO FURTHER NEWS OF DEVELOPMENTS AT SINGAPORE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): We have been disputing—the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) and myself—over a matter of interpretation and not of very much consequence. Now would the Prime Minister be good enough to tell us what is the latest news from Singapore?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have to make the same reply as I made to my hon. friend a day or two ago. Such word as the government has received with respect to Singapore differs in no essential particular from what has appeared in the press.

Mr. CASSELMAN: The situation is very serious.

AID TO THE EMPIRE AND ALLIED FORCES IN THE PACIFIC AND EASTERN ASIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I would like to ask the government if one of its members, before the close of the present debate, will clarify various statements already given regarding the trouble in the Pacific and the far east, so that the country can understand what we are doing and are ready to do for our empire and allies in those areas where the danger is.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I really am prepared to answer some aspects of the question of my hon. friend, but I thought it desirable before making a reply to communicate further with London, as perhaps he would be better pleased to have the reply from that source. I hope to have it soon.

Mr. CHURCH: Our belated air bases on the Pacific are of very little real value without adequate sea power back of them.

TAXATION CONFERENCE

AVAILABILITY OF REPORT—CANADIANS AT SINGAPORE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the government to make the report of the last interprovincial conference available to all members of parliament; and if so, will it be an unrevised copy?

I have two other questions to ask as a private Liberal member of this hon. house: (1) Did any member of the government inform the provincial representatives attending this conference that there were Canadian soldiers, sailors or airmen at Singapore as well as at Hong Kong? (2) If so, (a) how many of each branch of the army; (b) who are their commanding officers; (c) does the government get in touch with those men now?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend's questions are too long to answer on the orders of the day, but they will be noted as a question.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): For fear there may be a misapprehension in the mind of the hon. member for Témiscouata, may I add a short statement. He asked whether or not at a conference with provincial representatives some member of the government had advised that Canadian troops were at Singapore. I do not know anything about what took place at the conference. But I want to say for the information of the hon. member and of the house that there are no Canadian troops at Singapore. There may be, of course, and there are, Canadian individuals in the air force and the navy and, probably, in the British forces, but there are no Canadian forces.

AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION

QUESTION AS TO RESUMPTION OF WORK BY OTTAWA CAR AND AIRCRAFT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. E. JOHNSTON (Bow River): In view of the great need of aircraft, as exemplified by the statement which came over the radio yesterday that the defenders of Singapore were using obsolete aeroplanes, what action does the government propose to take to see to it that the five hundred employees of Ottawa Car and Aircraft Limited who were laid off are again put back to the work of producing aircraft?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): I may say that Ottawa Car and Aircraft Limited were never prime contractors for aircraft. They make parts, and largely for other contractors. They are not prime contractors of the government except in a very small way. There has been some reorganization there, and I sincerely hope that the work can be restored shortly.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

EFFECT OF INCREASED ALLOWANCE BY BRITISH COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): I should like to ask the acting Minister of Labour (Mr. McLarty) a question based on the report which appeared in the press a few days ago announcing that old age pensions have been advanced by the British Columbia government from $20 to $25 a month. Is it the intention of this government to see to it, if the matter is within their power, that old age pensions are advanced in all the provinces to assist in meeting the increased cost of living?

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): I believe the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) has directed his question to the wrong department. The Department of Labour has nothing to do with the administration or the payment of old age pensions. My hon. friend will remember that both are functions of the Department of Finance.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can answer the question. The action taken by the British Columbia government is for the account of the province of British Columbia alone. The dominion government makes no contribution to the additional $5 a month. The position of this government was made clear in a statement which I made to this house in November. If the hon. member will look at it he will see to what extent this government is prepared to go with regard to old age pensions.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): Has the Canadian government by order in council amended the old age pension regulations so that the increased pension being paid by the government of British Columbia will not involve a corresponding reduction on the part of the federal government?

Mr. ILSLEY: Steps have been taken towards that end, but I do not know what stage they have reached. I believe we have communicated with all the provinces with regard to such an amendment of the regulations, and I do not know that replies have been received from all the provinces. I will find out what the present position is, and let my hon. friend know.

Mr. QUELCH: Can the minister say what is the immediate situation in British Columbia? Will there be an increase, or will no increase be effected until action has been taken by the federal government?

Mr. ILSLEY: I cannot say what is the situation in this respect at the moment.

MERCHANT SHIPPING

REQUEST FOR DETAILS OF CANADIAN PRODUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. R. ADAMSON (York West): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Munitions and Supply. The statement is attributed to him that this year Canada will produce a tonnage of merchant shipping equal to that produced in the United Kingdom. If this is so, it is a magnificent effort. Can the minister give the details to this house, or if not, will he furnish particulars to hon. members in whose ridings shipyards are located?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): The statement I made was that the programme of production in Canada of merchant ships during 1942 is practically as large as the programme for Great Britain. These two statements, perhaps, are parallel; at least both are statements of intention, and I think the accomplishment will follow the intention. I am not particularly interested in giving statements to hon. members representing particular ridings, but I should be very glad to supply full details of our merchant shipping construction programme to all hon. members at a convenient time.

YUKON AIRPORTS

QUESTION AS TO DEFENCE MEASURES IN STRATEGIC AREAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): On Friday last I asked what steps, if any, are being taken for the defence of the airports in the Yukon. The Minister of National Defence said he would consult with the Minister of National Defence for Air. I wonder if he can give an answer now.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): My hon. friend knows, as I spoke to him personally, that the matter is at present under discussion between the Minister of National Defence for Air and myself and the chiefs of staff.

[Mr. Ilsley.]

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Tuesday, February 10, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. J. ALPHIDA CRETE (St. Maurice-Laflèche) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I regret my inability to associate myself with the members of the Conservative opposition in the cruel loss they have just sustained.

Throughout the present debate I have followed with an attention and a patience worthy of a better cause the speeches of the Tory group which constitutes the official opposition in this house. These hon. gentlemen can scarcely be taxed with originality. They all dwell in the same house—the Hotel Empire—utter the same words and use the same gestures, the only slight difference being in the tone of voice. Their very limited vocabulary partakes rather of finance than of the academy. They have only got to the letter C of the dictionary, and even then by skipping A and B. The word "conscription" is their only question and their only answer. Outside of this word, which they appear to be able to articulate correctly, there is total paralysis of the tongue and of the brain. They are somewhat like those monks who when meeting each other say "you will die" or like whippoorwills uttering the same continuous cry throughout the night.

When these gentlemen want conscription nothing must stand in the way, not even a plebiscite. They are deaf to all arguments. Whenever someone utters the word "conscription," these portly gentlemen jump up from their sleep. They show anxiety or joyfulness, according as conscription is hidden by a cloud or becomes more visible. One would think they had already begun to reckon their war profits.

Two questions may quite properly be asked: Firstly, who is demanding the enactment of this supremely detestable measure? Secondly, against whom is their attempt aimed? It might also be asked what benefit would thereby accrue to our war effort and what serious harm might not thereby be caused to this effort, as well as to national unity.

Let us get to the bottom of things and realize that behind the veil of words there is concealed no more no less than the matter of conscription for overseas service. Now, who

is demanding this sort of conscription and who is seeking to impose it upon the country, if not a small group of Canadian financiers and of super-imperialists from Toronto? Even though concealed behind the folds of the flag, their purpose is still quite clear. What they want is to get into power. For what purpose? The record will show. As in 1917 when they did get into power they will build up huge fortunes by shameful speculation in war contracts and in commodities essential to the existence of the Canadian people. These financiers of to-day, like their fellows of 1917 whose memory is still execrated, control powerful means of propaganda—newspapers, magazines and radio stations. The Wall Streets of Toronto and Montreal are their instruments. For these people who see in war only a means to get rich, all methods are good. They seek to set aside the people's representatives who refuse to submit. Already in many quarters intimidation has been used.

In the light of the still vivid teachings of the last war, ended less than a quarter of a century ago, what must we think of the present campaign in favour of conscription for military service overseas?

To-day as in 1917 conscription for overseas service seems to be a campaign directed against the province of Quebec, that is, against those who have committed no other crime than to love Canada before and above all else. What good would such a brand of conscription do to Canada beyond swelling, as I said just now, the fortunes of a few Tory speculators and stripping our lines of defence to add a few thousand men to a potential of 25 million soldiers from the United States, Russia, China and all the British and allied countries?

If the speculators who want to seize power were to succeed in their antinational design, it may be considered as a certainty that they would start tampering with our tax system not only to protect their own interests but also to fasten upon the lower brackets of rate payers and the common people a heavier share of the economic load of our splendid war effort.

What would be the drawbacks of such coercive legislation?

Speaking on behalf of the Saint-Maurice district, which I represent here, and of the whole province of Quebec, I may emphasize that the voluntary system, both as regards the air force and our motorized and other units, has given on many occasions in that area more recruits than some districts near Toronto. The response of my compatriots to conscription for service in Canada has been surpassed in no other area of Canada.

[Mr. Créte.]

Moreover, reference to statistics will show that our districts have greatly oversubscribed the quota that had been allotted to them in the last loan. Members and mayors, and in short all leaders in our province have identified themselves with the voluntary enlistment movement; and with the campaign for the Victory Loan, the Red Cross, and the Queen's Fund for the London bombing victims. Salvage committees are being established in every centre of our province. Of their own free will, and enthusiastically, the workmen in our factories devote part of their weekly salary to the purchase of war savings certificates. A considerable number of people—and I am one of them—have pledged their bank credit to the limit for months to come in order to borrow—at a loss as great as three per cent—money to place in the victory loan. We have put away over fifty per cent of our motor cars in order to save gasoline, which might be needed for our war effort. I do not know of one person among our people who does not already feel the impact of these troublous times and who does not make heavy sacrifices with a view to helping our soldiers.

We can say with a clear conscience and without boasting that no group of people in this country has a right to give us lessons in patriotism. The pilgrims of imperialism in Canada should understand that our deep and unshakeable love for the land of our fathers represents the highest form of patriotism. Those same champions of imperialism should realize that the province of Quebec has hitherto patiently borne the continued attacks launched against it in this house and among certain Toronto groups where, from generation to generation, fanaticism has been carefully nurtured. We feel that such repeated injuries to our pride are a poor way of acknowledging the spirit of loyalty displayed by French Canadians in the past as well as in the present crisis. It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that the Quebec people have an untiring patience since they still tolerate among them a bumptious upstart, a profiteer in the last war, who has taken it upon himself since the beginning of this war, to issue orders to our people in his Montreal *Gazette,* and to presume to regiment them.

Let it be understood once for all that the patience of the province of Quebec is not eternal. If unity and the preservation of the Canadian confederation are only possible provided we always make concessions and put up with every kind of insult and provocation, I fear very much that a measure like conscrip-

tion for overseas service will mean the definite severance of the ties that have hitherto kept our country united.

It has been said time and again that the Quebec French Canadians would accept all sacrifices that are necessary for the defence of British institutions. That is right, and such is my own view. But on condition—and I wish to emphasize this point—that Canada be a British institution, for the defence of Canada.

"The French Canadians will give even unto their last sons." True, but let us be quite clear about this. Speaking on behalf of my compatriots, I may state that the love of their country is too deep-rooted in their hearts to allow them to endanger their own defence by sending their fellow-citizens abroad to take part in the defence of African or Asiatic possession or to else support the vanguard of General Chiang-Kai-Shek's armies.

I may add that a handful of saboteurs of Canadian unity could possibly succeed in enforcing conscription for overseas service, that a few domineering soldiers from Toronto could, as they did in 1917 and 1918, wander through Quebec, terrorizing our brave and peaceful mothers, setting up puppet courts to sell exemptions to the highest bidders; but I solemnly declare that Canada and the whole empire does not contain enough Tories to reduce to slavery and thraldom a people as enamoured as they are of the small country which they were the first to settle and where they intend to sleep their last sleep. If, coming into our province, you use coercion and compulsion, if you disorganize our agriculture and industries of such a great importance to the war effort; if you force our young men in their prime, our sons, to serve and die on foreign lands, you will, in that same gesture, paralyze our splendid war effort. Then, national unity will have become but an empty memory, a thing of the past which, in all probability, can never be revived.

If you should wish the abolition of the present status of Canada, if you should wish the dislocation of confederation, conscription would be an appropriate measure to accomplish this fatal and hateful task.

However, Mr. Speaker, I could not conclude my remarks without expressing the confidence I place in the common sense of the majority of members of this house, in the fairness of my fellow-citizens of British origin, for I am convinced that a measure requiring such a degree of compulsion could never command the support of the majority of our population.

I conclude by stating that I remain irreducibly opposed to any kind of conscription for overseas service and that I shall not request my constituents to release me from past commitments in this connection.

Mr. RALPH MAYBANK (Winnipeg South Centre): Naturally, Mr. Speaker, I find it somewhat difficult to follow a speaker such as the last, because I am under the same disability as perhaps the great majority of us of not understanding the French language. Therefore I have lost the benefit of his remarks. Many hon. members have the advantage of us there, something that I think nearly all English-speaking members regret.

This afternoon I shall be as brief as possible, and as direct as possible. I think this debate has run long enough now that brevity is an even greater virtue than ordinarily. It is my desire not to transgress at all in respect of making lengthy remarks. Moreover I consider that this is a time when no person should endeavour to hide, by words, what he is thinking, but should rather try to use words as they should be used, to express exactly and deliberately his views.

I fancy that if I were to give a caption to such remarks as I shall make, the caption would be "In Praise of Restraint." I have, of course, no right to criticize any person, and I do not criticize any person. I merely wish to say that as a Canadian and a member of this house, where I have many pleasant associations, I do deprecate some of the language that has been used in the course of this debate. Such words as "dastardly," "cowardly," "infamous," hurled across the chamber seem to me out of place in any debate in Canada, faced as we are with the most serious crisis that has ever been upon us and the most serious I hope that we shall ever face. It is interesting to note just how far that sort of language can sometimes lead us. I have not read the morning newspaper to-day, but I have been told by another member of the house that there is in the newspaper to-day a reference to a question asked of President Roosevelt, relating apparently to a statement made by the premier of Ontario to the effect that the United States navy was hiding from the Japanese "tissue paper" navy. That just illustrates the heat which has been generated in the last few weeks and how far sometimes people will go under the spur of partisanship. I suppose there could not be anything more reprehensible than a remark of the sort attributed to the premier of Ontario. While I do not feel that I have any right really to criticize any other person, and I do not wish my remarks to be taken in that way, I do wish to say that I deprecate most strongly any extreme language used in debate, at the present time particularly.

Again I think it is a mistake on the part of hon. members supporting the government to sneer at those who would advocate "total war without restriction," as it is called, as being quite willing to break pledges easily, and that sort of thing. As a matter of fact the point about which most of the controversy, in fact practically all the controversy, runs to-day is a point which has been raised by the Canadian Legion. That legion, with some 1,470 branches, has put out what is called a "Call for Total War." And arising out of one phrase in it a controversy has developed. It seems to me wrong to denominate organizations that have supported that call, or the Canadian Legion itself, as mere pressure groups, or individuals influenced by it simply as people who are weakly influenced by pressure groups. I know that in Manitoba a great many organizations supported the legion call, a great many service bodies and other organizations.

Mr. MacNICOL: And the Manitoba legislature.

Mr. MAYBANK: I was coming to that. The organization that comes most readily to my mind is the Rotarians of Winnipeg. Their membership is so varied that to dub them a pressure group is particularly inept. Incidentally the person who sponsored in that organization support of the legion's call was himself a Liberal of long standing. The legislature of Manitoba, headed at the present time by a non-partisan government, can hardly be called just a pressure group. This body supported the legion; and the lead was given to the legislature in large part by an outstanding Liberal, Mr. Rhodes Smith, of the city of Winnipeg. He was supported by Mr. McDiarmid, provincial minister of mines and natural resources and a former Liberal member of this house for Winnipeg South; by Mr. Schultz, provincial minister of education, a Liberal of long standing and by Mr. Garson, provincial treasurer, also a Liberal; and I do not think there was a dissenting voice in that assembly. Then the union of municipalities of the province supported it, together with the organization of school trustees covering the province.

I mention these facts only because I believe that to attempt to fob off such organizations by calling them pressure groups is as foolish as it is wrong. Of course I am well aware that when the Canadian Legion had, without very much trouble, worked up considerable support for its proposals, then for reasons political, financial or otherwise selfish, others came running forward in an endeavour to ride the crest of the wave. Just as vultures will smell out a fight and fly to the spot to get a meal, so, unfortunately, when controversies arise in a country, there are some who will endeavour to attach themselves to one side or the other, having no interest in the particular matter about which the dispute arises, but only hoping for some material benefit to themselves.

This is a sad fact of life, but we shall be mistaken, if we allow ourselves to believe that such people are in the majority or anywhere near it.

Of similar cloth is the extravagant condemnation of this government, of its war work, which is expressed or implied by many speakers. Sober reflection should show people that they are mistaken in that sort of condemnation. I am one of those who believe that it will be necessary to get away from the voluntary principle in carrying on the war; but in honesty you cannot say that up to now—and I emphasize those words, "up to now"—the voluntary system of getting men into the armed forces has been a failure. I do not see how any reasonable person can make that assertion about the situation up to now, with something in the neighbourhood of four hundred thousand persons in the armed forces. And again, it is only one who is purblind or ill-intentioned who can minimize the solid achievements of Canada in the war. Churchill, standing here, called them magnificent. Some think that was a mere rhetorical flourish, but it seems to me that upon a cold examination of what has been done it is more reasonable to conclude that it was not a rhetorical flourish but something that he deeply believed and sincerely meant. Only a short time ago, on November 8 of last year to be exact, *The Economist* of London, England, appraised Canada's war effort, and the opening paragraph of the statement was as follows:

> To the student of war economics, Canada presents a puzzle. By all the statistical tests, the war effort of the dominion is very large. Perhaps it could hardly be expected that a country more than three thousand miles away from the aggressor could bring its mobilization for war to quite the pitch of intensity that a beleaguered island can achieve, and the comparison with Great Britain is, for that reason, hardly a realistic one. But, by any test, Canada has done more than any other overseas member of the democratic alliance.

I wish to repeat that:

> But, by any test, Canada has done more than any other overseas member of the democratic alliance.

I continue the quotation:

> Her output of munitions of war is wide in range and large in volume. Proportionately, she has something like twice as many men under arms as the United States, and her Minister of Finance has stated that the expenditures of the dominion government, including the

assistance given to the United Kingdom, but excluding all provincial and municipal expenditures, will this year amount to nearly 50 per cent of the national income.

The whole article is a cold appraisal of the situation, such as one would expect to find in an economic journal, and it is all in tune with the opening paragraph. I might add that the explanation given of the first sentence, in which the writer remarks that the position of Canada is in the nature of a puzzle, is this: he observes from the statistical record a tremendous amount of work being done: in going through Canada he observes that it has not affected Canadian life to anything like the extent one might have expected: and he comes to the conclusion that we may be understating the total of our national income. That is the reason why I draw particular attention to the opening words.

The only purpose of my remarks this far, Mr. Speaker, is the discouragement of intemperate and inaccurate criticism of policies and works; nothing less and nothing more than that. In other words, surely we can disagree without being disagreeable. I think every person knows that I do not fully favour the present course; yet, as circumstances have developed, I feel it is the only course now open to us. I do not like the plebiscite procedure. I do not like it because of the delay of action that it entails. I do not like it because of its cost. A large sum of money is involved, variously estimated at from half a million to two million dollars. Certainly the expenditure of a sum of money of those dimensions, when we are straining every effort to pay for tanks, Spitfires and shells, is not likely to commend itself to the people, and it does not commend itself to me. It has raised all manner of criticism in the country, with a consequent lowering of the spirit of the country; and the sooner we can get over that the better. I consider, however, that as matters have developed, it is the only course open to us. One has to be practical; one has to make allowance for the views of other people. There is one other difficulty with relation to the plebiscite. It is the somewhat less than clear attitude of the government. That is something I believe will be taken care of by official statements that will subsequently be made in urging an affirmative vote on the ballot.

While there is much about the policy that I do not like, certainly I shall vote for the main resolution before the house at the present time. I could not, under any circumstances, vote for the Conservative amendment. It really has nothing whatever to commend it. It is the usual political amendment. Its prototype can be found, I think, in the opening days of every session of parliament from confederation down to the present time.

I feel that it has been proposed, not for the simple purpose of advocating or condemning a policy, but rather, it has been proposed, because of its quotability on future political platforms. In addition to asking that the government should proceed some other way than by plebiscite, it says that the government has not done anything for agriculture or has not done what it should do, and has not worked out a post-war programme. I could not vote for that amendment, both for the reasons given and because it is an amendment of general no confidence, a condition of mind which is very remote indeed from my condition of mind.

This reminds me to say just a word about the position of the Conservative house leader. In my opinion it does not lie in his mouth to criticize action or lack of action on the part of the government. He must take some responsibility for the situation that exists to-day. It is only in recent times that he or any member of his party became vocal in favour of a change in recruiting methods. During his tour of the country his speeches were models of how to avoid making any pronouncement on anything. In my opinion the best description of his speeches would be that they were woefully wary.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I said I was listening, not making pronouncements.

Mr. MAYBANK: Then we are both agreed that the hon. gentleman was not making pronouncements.

As to the second amendment moved by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, I should like to point out that one of the difficulties about this plebiscite policy is that the public seem to be somewhat confused. Everywhere you hear complaints, the burden of which is that the position is not clear. This second amendment proposes that the government should, in addition to asking a release from its pledges, also invite the people to direct parliament to conscript wealth. The effect of this amendment is not to clarify, but to becloud. It is a confounding of confusion. By introducing additional matter into the submission to the people, the tendency is to cut down the chances of an affirmative vote. The government seeks an affirmative vote. I want to see an affirmative vote. I have much sympathy with some parts of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation amendment, some of the preamble I might call it, but since the

amendment lessens the likelihood of removing restraint upon action, it seems to me that it should be voted down.

In all the circumstances, my view is that the most important thing before us at the present time is to get the plebiscite under way and make sure by all honest means that the ballots show a large favourable vote. I wish to appeal to all members of the house to cast aside all differences of opinion as to which was the right course to follow up to the present time and to exert their united efforts toward wiping out any vestige of restraint upon governmental action.

Unfortunately there is a class in the community to whom words of appeal are useless. There are some who, to gain their own private ends, will go to any length to hamper the war effort of this country. These are they who would hope by defeating this plebiscite to induce a situation which might conceivably be so confused that they might perchance be called in as doctors to remedy the situation. Of course with moral derelicts of this kind appeals are useless, and no self-respecting person would waste his time or breath in appealing to them. It might, however, not be out of place to issue a warning to them that if this sort of thing is attempted in Canada at the present time, they will not be able to direct their efforts from behind closed doors.

I appeal particularly to members of the Conservative party who have expressed the liveliest dissatisfaction with the government's course. If members of that party think, or if any hon. member thinks the government is hiding behind a subterfuge or using past pledges as an alibi, all he has to do is to effect the knockout of the "subterfuge" in the voting booth. The "alibi" can be destroyed.

I should like to point out to them also that there is a danger of carrying expressions of dissatisfaction too far. They may be creating such a dissatisfaction in the minds of the electorate that the vote in the ridings which they represent will be less in the affirmative than it is desired that it should be. I say to them that they must be careful not to represent to their people that an affirmative vote is a vote of confidence in the government and, as a consequence of this sort of representation, urge the people to vote in the negative.

Let us remember that if this vote does not carry, there will be chaotic conditions in this dominion which have not hitherto existed. Thanks to a generally wise policy, the government has kept this country marching along pretty well united, and a great many telling blows have been delivered against the foe by Canada. As I say, if this vote does not carry we may expect to have a more or less chaotic condition in this country. It behooves all of us, by such advice and counsel as we can give, to see that restraint upon action is removed; in short, that an affirmative answer is recorded upon the ballots in this plebiscite.

It may be tempting to try to seize political advantage, but I do not think the Conservative party will do that at the present time. At any rate, I urge them not to do it. In the main, since 1939, the members of this house have acted reasonably well together in an atmosphere of mutual trust and forbearance. There have been clashes from time to time, but we have got along fairly well together because we have all known that while we might differ sharply as to methods, we all aimed at the same target, defeat of a barbarous foe. We should forget our differences as to what was the right course up to now and make sure that all restraint upon action is removed.

At the commencement of my remarks I said that I hoped to be brief. In closing, I should like to say that apparently there was some mix-up betwen the whips as to who would follow whom upon the Speaker's list to-day. The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black) understood that he would follow the hon. member who took his seat just before I rose. There was an exchange of notes back and forth, and I went to see the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black) telling him that I had understood that I was to be the second speaker. Although the hon. member counted upon speaking then, he promptly and very generously gave way to me. He is a man senior to me in this house and, in a former parliament, graced the chair in which you now sit, Mr. Speaker. I should not care to close my remarks without expressing my thanks to him and to the whips of both parties for their cooperation in working out another of these numerous tangles that, from time to time, occur.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, those of us who have had many years of parliamentary experience will, I think, agree that many speeches from the throne that have been made to the houses of parliament have been more noted for what they do not contain than for what they do contain as indicating what may be the policy of the government at the then session of parliament, but that cannot so correctly be said of the speech from the throne that we are now considering.

After careful consideration of especially that part of the speech which states that the

government is of opinion that it should have complete freedom to act in accordance with its judgment of the needs of the situation as they arise in this gravest crisis of the world's history, and that the government will seek that freedom by submitting the question of its release from former commitments to the people by a plebiscite, I feel that I should add something to what has already been said on that subject.

The words of the speech from the throne make it apparent that the government appreciates, as we all do, the gravity of the crisis we are facing, and I think it is fair to infer from the words of that speech that the government feels that Canada should be doing more and wishes more to be done than we have done and are doing to face that crisis, and so, appreciating the danger of continuing to follow its policy as announced during the general election of March, 1940, and since, wishes to be freed from those commitments.

Let me quote briefly from the speech from the throne:

> The government is of the opinion that, at this time of gravest crisis in the world's history, the administration, subject only to its responsibility to parliament, should in this connection and irrespective of any previous commitments, possess complete freedom to act in accordance with its judgment of the needs of the situation as they may arise.

Why should not parliament accept the responsibility of giving to the government the necessary authority to act in this crisis in accordance with its judgment? The members of parliament are the representatives of the people of Canada. Let those representatives, let us as those representatives, speak and act for the people. That is what we are here for.

I am happy to say, to repeat, that during the election campaign of 1940 I did not make any such bid for support. May I quote from what I said in this house on the 2nd day of June last, as reported at page 3398 of *Hansard:*

> The word "conscription," meaning compulsory military service, is taboo. Why? Every member of this house knows why. It is for political reasons and nothing else. Leaders of both great Canadian political parties in the last election pledged those parties against conscription; but notwithstanding the fact that the leader of the party I have supported took that attitude, I did not hesitate during that campaign to say publicly, as I say now, that in my opinion the only fair and just way to raise an army is by compulsion. Capital owes a debt to the state. It is compelled by law to contribute the sinews of war; it is compelled by taxation. It would be as reasonable to say that only those who volunteer to do so should pay income tax. The payment of income tax, the payment of any tax, is the performance of a duty to the state, the payment of a debt to the state. All fit young men in Canada owe to the state a debt which can be paid only by their entry into the fighting forces. If they join voluntarily, so much the better; all honour to them for it. But if they fail in that duty, if they fail to pay that debt which they owe their country, they like the taxpayer should be made to pay. It is manifestly unfair to carry on recruiting in any other way.

What I said then, nearly a year ago, I repeat and stand by to-day. It is even more appropriate to the conditions of to-day than it was then.

Let us face the situation as it is to-day. The Militia Act of Canada, assented to May 22, 1868, provides by section 61 as follows:

> Her Majesty may call out the militia or any part thereof for actual service, either within or without the dominion, at any time, whenever it appears advisable so to do by reason of war, invasion or insurrection, or danger of any of them; and the militiamen, when so called out for actual service, shall continue to serve for at least one year from the date of their being called out for actual service, if required so to do, or for any longer period which Her Majesty may appoint.

What did the Militia Act define the militia to mean? The definition is as follows:

> The militia shall consist of all the male inhabitants of Canada, of the age of eighteen years and upwards, and under sixty—not exempted or disqualified by law, and being British subjects by birth or naturalization; but Her Majesty may require all the male inhabitants of the dominion—

All the male inhabitants—not just necessarily citizens:

> —capable of bearing arms, to serve in case of a *levée en masse.*

Under that Militia Act, even foreigners could be called up to serve in our armed forces.

The National Resources Mobilization Act, enacted by this parliament in June, 1940, in effect nullified the provisions of the Militia Act which I have quoted, and by that act of 1940 the government willingly surrendered and limited the powers and authority had by the government of Canada practically ever since confederation. The nullifying and limiting sections of the National Resources Mobilization Act of 1940 are sections 2 and 3, which provide:

> 2. Subject to the provision of section three hereof, the governor in council may do and authorize such acts and things, and make from time to time such orders and regulations, requiring persons to place themselves, their services and their property at the disposal of His Majesty in the right of Canada, as may be deemed necessary or expedient for securing the public safety, the defence of Canada, the maintenance of public order, or the efficient prosecution of the war, or for maintaining supplies or services essential to the life of the community.

3. The powers conferred by the next preceding section may not be exercised for the purpose of requiring persons to serve in the military, naval or air forces outside of Canada and the territorial waters thereof.

Having willingly passed that legislation so limiting itself, the government now refuses to pass legislation freeing itself from those limitations, which it could do, and leaves it for the country to say whether it should or should not be freed.

Will the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston)—I dislike that word "defence"; I prefer "attack" and suggest that the title should properly be Minister for War—tell the house and the country whether or not voluntary enlistment, under the law as it is since the amendment I have quoted has been in force, is providing for the army enough men to enable Canada to take the part she should take in this empire's battle for existence; enough men to man the fighting fronts, which fighting fronts are, and have been since Canada declared war, our fighting fronts; enough men to be trained and equipped to fight this war as war is fought to-day; enough men to be trained and equipped to become a sufficient part of that vast army which the empire will need before this war is won?

If the British commonwealth of nations and our allies are to win this war—and to lose it is unthinkable—our armies must be strong enough to be sent into Europe, into Japan, to defeat the murdering Germans, Italians and Japanese, to defeat them, to crush them, so to deal with them that they must and will keep the peace for all time.

Possibly Canada has already enlisted, trained, equipped and sent over enough men to aid in the successful defence of the British isles, where, as yet, few army casualties have been suffered, but possibly not enough men and engines of war to replace those who will fall, are bound to fall and be destroyed if those islands are invaded by the enemy.

To win, the enemy must invade Britain, just as to win we must invade the countries of our enemies. We cannot win by defence. We must attack to conquer. We should have here in Canada continually enough fully-trained, prepared and equipped fighting men to replace and reinforce those who are now there, as and when such reinforcements are needed.

As I see it, we in Canada need an army of at least 600,000 men, fully trained, fully equipped with all the up-to-date engines of war, so that they may go with the great armies that the commonwealth of nations, Russia, the United States of America and all the allied nations must send to invade and conquer Germany, Italy and Japan and keep them conquered.

Germany in the last hundred years has provoked no less than five wars. Let us arm and prepare this time to achieve a victory that will result in permanent world peace. The people of the world, with the exception of the Germans, Italians and Japanese, want peace, love peace. Let us make that peace possible; let us restore to freedom the nations now enslaved by their brutal conquerors. Let us make the Germans, the Italians and the Japanese keep the peace.

Those of us who were with Canada's fighting forces in the last great war face the sad but indisputable fact that all we fought for, all the sacrifices made, all the lives lost, were made and lost in vain. We fought through to victory, but the good that might have resulted from that victory was literally thrown away.

Instead of making the defeated and conquered enemy keep the peace that had been won at such a cost and such a sacrifice, our government, the governments of our allies, the governments of the democracies, sat placidly by and allowed those armies to rearm, in fact supplied them with funds, with material for armament, with material with which to make and manufacture the munitions and engines of war now actually being used against us; allowed them to deliberately and publicly—not secretly—plan and prepare for this war, more terrible, if that were possible, than the last war, when by taking proper precautions, and without cruelty, without unfairness to those conquered enemies, this war could so easily have been prevented.

But there is no use in threshing old straw. That has all passed and gone, as have most of those responsible for it. We must face the present crisis and carry on again to victory, seeing to it and making sure that when victory does come there will not be a repetition of the fiasco and neglect of duty that has allowed this fearful war to come upon us.

I have done all I can, and will continue to do so, in encouraging men to enlist. In proportion to its population, Yukon has done and is doing its share in enlistments, as it did in the last war. All those of my family who were fit were in Canada's fighting forces in the last war, and all who are fit are in the service now. It was easier for me to say to men, "I am going; come along" than to say now—to have to say now—"Go; I am staying at home."

If the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) says that voluntary enlistment is producing enough fighting men—and I take it

from his statement of yesterday to the house that it is—fighting men who, when trained and equipped to fight, will enable Canada to do her full duty in the gigantic battles ahead of us, battles that will have to be fought and won before the enemy can be defeated, then the government does not need release from its commitments in that respect. No plebiscite is needed, and compulsory selective service—call it conscription if you will—is not needed. But if voluntary enlistment is not getting enough men to form and keep reinforced the armies we need and will need, it is the duty of the government to take them—take them as it would take an income tax from an unwilling taxpayer, and with as little compunction. The government owes that duty to the state, just as the men who should be in the army owe that duty to the state, and if they will not voluntarily perform that duty, then they should be taken.

As I see it, the government does not need to devote the time, incur the expense, or provoke the arguments and disputes that have already arisen between loyal and disloyal people, that are bound to arise if the people are to be asked if they will allow the government to do what in its judgment it should do, what it may have to do if it is to lead Canada to victory.

As a Canadian, as a member of this parliament, which parliament was elected to form a government to lead and govern the people of Canada, and speaking for the people who elected me, I release the Prime Minister and his government, as I am confident they would release them, from any preelection commitments, commitments which, if adhered to, will tend to hamper the government, to weaken Canada's part in the war—this war that Canada declared and entered upon over two years ago as a part of the British empire, as a member of the British commonwealth of nations.

Bear with me while I again quote those remarkable words from the speech from the throne, which appear in *Hansard* of January 22, at page 1:

> The government is of the opinion that, at this time of gravest crisis in the world's history, the administration, subject only to its responsibility to parliament, should in this connection and irrespective of any previous commitments, possess complete freedom to act in accordance with its judgment of the needs of the situation as they may arise.

Then I say to the government, not in a spirit of criticism, but with a sincere desire to assist and support it in its task of leading Canada to victory in this fight for freedom, that it should take that complete freedom to act in accordance with its judgment of the needs of the situation as they arise, that it should accept its responsibility to parliament and let parliament act for the people.

What course did the president of the great republic to the south of us, our ally in this war, say at the end of December, 1940, in a national broadcast? These are his reported words:

> There is no demand for sending an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth.

Strong words. Conclusive words. After they were uttered that same president secured the unanimous passage through congress of a bill providing for service of United States soldiers wherever they may be needed. President Roosevelt did not ask for a plebiscite to release him from that pledge; and, faced with national peril, as we are, as Canada is, congress did not remind the president of that undertaking. The people of the United States accepted the selective draft system for overseas service as a national necessity, and did it without argument and without question, just as Canada should.

I say to this government: Accept the proposal, follow the lead given by the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Gray), who sits to your right, Mr. Speaker, and is a loyal supporter of the government. Speaking in this house in this debate on January 27 last, the hon. gentleman said, as reported at page 76 of *Hansard:*

> Mr. Speaker, I submit that in this crisis the government would be justified in now—and by "now" I mean immediately—asking parliament to extend the provisions of the National Resources Mobilization Act in order to eliminate the restrictions concerning service in Canada only, in order that our armed forces both here and overseas, including reserves and reinforcements, may be maintained at the highest possible strength consistent with the maintenance of our food supply and industrial production.

I am confident that if the government submitted that proposal to this house and to this parliament, representing the people of Canada, speaking and acting for the people of Canada, it would be given the freedom which it desires and should have in order to pursue this war to victory. I for one would support it, and I am confident that my constituents would approve my action in that respect.

What more can I say? Never yet have I been accused of timidity; but candidly I tell the government, I tell the house, that I dread the proposed plebiscite. I dread to have this government and this house take that risk, fearing what may be the result. Why do I fear the result? you may ask. My reply is that it is a foregone conclusion that the disloyal people now in Canada, if any there be,

the slackers, those opposed to compulsory service, the timid ones, those who are so fearful of the safety of their loved ones that they would even see them fail to do their duty, those who wish to embarrass the government—all these I fear will give a negative answer to the question to be proposed to them in the plebiscite.

What will be the situation if they are in the majority, if the electors refuse to release the government from its election commitments? I dread to think of the unenviable position in which Canada will be placed in the eyes of the world, in the eyes of our allies in this life and death struggle for freedom; and I dread to contemplate the delight of our enemies if as a result of the proposed plebiscite the government is placed in such an impossible position.

Mr. MAURICE LALONDE (Labelle): The mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne are entitled to our sincere congratulations. The elegance, clarity and fluency of their speeches are equalled only by the sincerity of their ideas. The moderation of their views, dictated by noble patriotism, has confirmed us in our opinion that both hon. gentlemen are worthily serving their electors and their country.

To the memory of the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe I bring affectionate tribute from the farmers, the working men and the settlers of the county of Labelle. We have all lost a great friend and a powerful protector. Like the drop of water gradually working its mark into the rock, his name has found its way into the hearts of the settlers of Labelle, leaving a deep and indelible impression. The Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin), will henceforth be his successor as leader of the Quebec Liberals. Like the late Mr. Lapointe, he is devoting to the task all the energy of his patriotic Canadian heart. We highly appreciate the heroism of this man, who has given to his country the last remnants of strength and health left to him following his severe illness. He may rely on the loyal and sincere support of the younger members in the great struggle which is forthcoming.

The speech from the throne, in my opinion, should have satisfied the proponents of a total war effort. It announces the most tremendous programme of help to the allies which has ever been submitted to the representatives of the Canadian people. Never in the history of this country have we been called upon for such a heavy contribution to the operations of war. Never have we been so brutally awakened to the reality that Canada is a belligerent nation faced with immediate danger threatening her territorial integrity.

[Mr. G. Black.]

(Translation): The world-wide extension of this conflict bringing face to face two diametrically opposed ideologies has convinced us of the futility of isolationism.

We did not want this war, but the Master of peoples has decided otherwise. A madman, the unconscious instrument of the divine will, has let loose on the terrestrial globe the destructive whirlwind of a Prussian militarism recognizing no law but brutal force and denying the principles of justice and collective morality on which our Christian civilization is based. In this new order militarism, destruction, nihilism and "Mein Kampf" have replaced charity, mercy, justice, material and spiritual progress and the gospel of peace.

Of course, man's shortcomings, the deification of materialism, the thirst for money and a multiform imperialism have been the remote causes of the present conflict. But international egoism inspiring a desire for vengeance on the part of the vanquished of 1918 has accelerated the race towards the present horrible slaughter which is called the struggle of democracy against dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne should have led the members of this hon. house to discuss each and every aspect of our war effort. It is a mistake, in my view, to concentrate on conscription during the present debate, leaving the essential questions aside.

I shall say only a few words on the question of the day—the plebiscite. The leader of the government is to be congratulated on recognizing the pledge he has given to the Canadian people. His action is highly appreciated by those who have retained the elementary notions of honesty in public life. Opinions may differ regarding the advisableness of holding a plebiscite, but the Prime Minister must be given credit for having the courage to keep his word. Did he not declare that he would not propose conscription for overseas service without consulting the people of Canada? On the 12th of November, 1941, he stated in this house:

(Text) So far as I am concerned, without any consultation of the people on that subject, I do not intend to take the responsibility of supporting any policy of conscription for service overseas. *(Hansard,* page 4321.)

The government of Canada thus found itself bound by a formal pledge of which, because of uncontrollable circumstances, it asks to be relieved. We recognize this sacred pledge. I do not wish to have it broken at the behest of those for whom contracts and pledges are but scraps of paper, at the behest of this band of profiteers who want to get their hands on war contracts, this group of two hundred pirates of high finance, unrestricted masters of great

properties, unscrupulous dictators holding in their nimble fingers the strings which lead the Hepburns, the Meighens, the Murdochs; frock-coated speculators who have unloosed upon the country their propaganda in favour of conscription for overseas services, which, unfortunately, has spread even to the confines of the Liberal party. I request the leader of the government to remain firm and not allow himself to be imposed upon by political fifth-columnists from the Tory party and parachutists from outside whose task it is to undermine the foundations of the Liberal party in order to replace it by the blackmailing regime which in 1917 gorged itself with scandalous profits while our brothers were dying in the cold mud of Flanders.

The Prime Minister has nothing to fear. He has behind him the indefectible legion of men of the people who have fought with him for the people. If there are in the Liberal party men who might differ from him on minor matters, I do not think there is a single one who, having eaten from his hand, will refuse to stand between the foe and their old leader.

Together with the Liberals I wish to remain faithful to my pledges. More than ever do I see the futility of ordering our young men to leave Canada when the flames of the Asiatic conflict are almost licking the walls of Vancouver and Seattle. I cannot understand the reasoning of men who, like the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green), blame the government for not having sufficiently protected our western coast yet at the same time want to send our soldiers to far-away Europe.

Mr. GREEN: I said we should do both.

Mr. LALONDE: Well, I accept the hon. member's correction, but I understood him in the sense of what I have just stated. I cannot understand the reasoning of men like the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) who, while crying out for increased production of armaments, persist in demanding compulsory military service overseas, knowing as well as anyone that our plants are short of men, that our mines and shipyards are working on short time, and that our most vital industry, agriculture, cannot and must not be deserted by the farmer and his children.

(Translation) Mr. Speaker, a certain number of men called up for military service for the defence of Canada have already undergone their four months training. I am not the only one here who receives requests from young men wishing to return home for serious reasons. I have vainly tried on several occasions to bring their cases before the authorities, but there does not seem to be at present any legally constituted body authorized to receive such requests, to consider them and to make decisions. The soldiers in camp are told to apply to their commanding officer. But, Mr. Speaker, the officer commanding a military camp is not in a position to decide whether a man is needed on the farm. With the greatest good will he cannot carry through the investigation which is absolutely necessary to ensure a fair and just decision. Yet, in my constituency as elsewhere, there are young men who, for one reason or another, particularly in order to perform their military service in wintertime, decided to answer the call but who must return to the farm in the spring. One young man applied for permission to return home because his old father was laid up with paralysis. From office to office, from one commanding officer to another, the matter dragged such a long time that the cattle had to be sold, the crop was lost, and to-day this soldier is still in camp and his father's farm is idle. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to say that this is a general condition, but I particularly draw the government's attention in an official manner to this state of affairs which, I sincerely believe, should be remedied without delay.

(Text) I now come back to this question of a plebiscite. The people are to be consulted. The people will decide whether it is advisable to release the Prime Minister from his pledges. In this regard I am quite ready to defend my position as member for the county of Labelle. I have not changed my view; I am still opposed to compulsory military service overseas. So long as my electors do not change the mandate they gave me to oppose such a measure, I cannot accept it, from whichever side of the house it may come. Is not a consultation of the people by means of a plebiscite the best way of finding out the present opinion of my people? The motives which have impelled the government to take such a step are quite clear: to be relieved of their obligations in order to be free to impose any other method of recruiting considered necessary in the light of existing circumstances. They do not say that conscription will be enacted for overseas service, for the defence of Labrador, of Newfoundland, of Alaska, and of the territory of the two Americas. But the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) has said in this house that they will not have recourse to conscription if voluntary enlistment continues at the present rate.

The government could not do better than order a plebiscite, because, according to the definition of the word itself, a plebiscite is the free expression of public opinion on a given subject. As the answer to be given is left to the free determination of every citizen, it

follows that in approving the principle of the plebiscite we do not bind ourselves to answer either in the affirmative or in the negative. In asking for an affirmative answer the government does not seek a vote of confidence. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, I humbly submit that a plebiscite would not be in order, but rather a general election. Therefore in approving the calling of a plebiscite while reserving for the future the expression of our opinion on the proposed method, we are not voting non-confidence in the government. I do not pledge myself to ask my electors, after giving them all necessary explanations, anything more than to register their votes freely and without coercion according to their own consciences. What shall be the result in any constituency time alone will tell. Should the answer be in the negative, as I think and fear it will be, I urge the government not to consider that as a mark of non-confidence. On the contrary, my electors are so anxious to have as prime minister of this country a man like Mackenzie King that they do not want to run the slightest risk of plunging him into that sea of conscription where the Tory party foundered, dragging with it such geniuses as Arthur Meighen and Mitchell Hepburn. To those who oppose conscription the very name of the Prime Minister of Canada is the best guarantee that their standpoint will prevail. This is also my view. We must keep King at the helm of this country; otherwise it would mean anarchy, disorder, national disunion, as well as the sabotaging of our war effort for the benefit of Hitler alone.

Notwithstanding some statements made in the speech from the throne which may seem far-fetched, I cannot by my vote sanction a motion of absolute want of confidence. Should the tragedy of 1911 be reenacted and King be turned down, as Laurier was, an out-and-out conscriptionist would be the next Prime Minister of Canada; conscription for overseas service would be soon in force, and we would again witness the unfortunate scenes that occurred in 1917 and 1918.

(Translation) The opposition to conscription of manpower for overseas service has led some of our English-speaking fellow citizens to question our loyalty to the British crown. Such opposition does not arise from purely emotional feelings. It is rather based on pure reason. Of course, I am willing to admit that we have not the same reasons as our fellow-citizens for rushing to the rescue of the commonwealth, but unbiased observers should not, in the face of historical facts, tax us with disloyalty towards our obligations. We do not have to be prodded to discharge our national duty.

After the conquest, only 65,000 of our people were left in America, without religious or lay leaders to resist the tremendous power of assimilation, but nevertheless we have remained faithful to the king of England.

Until 1774 we had to submit to the affront of the Test and we did not rise in revolt.

Under the constitution of 1791 we were denied the highest positions in the magistrature, in the administration, and in politics. This debasing system only ended in the middle of the following century. For eighty years after the conquest, we had to withstand an offensive launched against the teaching of French, but in our distress we did not enter the cry *Non possumus* as oppressed people are wont to do. Yet, Mr. Speaker, have we not in spite of that, remained faithful subjects of the British crown? In 1812, did not the French-Canadians rise to hold this country for the British crown? In 1837, in the face of oligarchical exactions, did not a group of patriots throw off a yoke that had become too heavy and shed their blood in order to save the last remnants of the liberties guaranteed to us by peace treaties and other agreements?

In 1867 did we not, disregarding racial and religious prejudice, join hands with the Anglo-Saxon majority in order to establish the Canadian confederation and further by our common efforts, the greatness of our young nation? Have we not, since that time, borne the injustice of Regulation XVII and suffered the effects of the unfair Tory campaigns against the teaching of French in the schools of the Northwest? Have we not under the federative system, struggled unceasingly for the full maintenance of the federal tie in spite of the humiliating situation in which our compatriots have been placed as regards employment in the federal service, through the all too notorious civil service commission? Yet, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding all that, have we not remained faithful and loyal subjects of the British crown?

And when war came in 1914 did we not shed our blood for the maintenance of the imperial tie in spite of the shameful conscription act put forward by Messrs. Meighen and Borden against the Quebec people? And since the present tragedy has cast its gloom upon the whole world have we not given the best evidence of our loyalty in bearing our share of the heavy taxes and of the blood sacrifice that the government have demanded from the Canadian nation? Have we not also accepted the humiliation of seeing very few French-Canadians appointed as heads of the numerous war-time boards, as if we were always and in spite of everything to be

relegated to the rear ranks of the fighters for freedom? Yet, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we are less loyal than our Anglo-Saxon fellow citizens or that we refuse to defend the ideals of the free nations of the world. To the forces of assimilation, we have only opposed our unconquerable will to survive; against attempts at conquest we have raised our staunch loyalty to our traditions. We have remained the solid block of a Christian and Latin civilization which has helped, through its modest influence, to consolidate the expansion of Anglo-Saxon capital whose all too patient servants we have been. Before the urgent necessity of ensuring the survival of Canadian unity we have sacrificed some prerogatives and privileges, and, from one concession to another, we have reached the extreme limit. I even wonder whether any other people in the world would have been willing, as we have been, to submit to the upheaval of conquest, to the collective insults of fanaticism and to the onslaughts of British imperialism while still remaining loyal subjects of His Most Excellent Majesty the King of England.

(Text) We are in this war, Mr. Speaker, and we are determined to win it. But we should not be compelled to make the ultimate sacrifice, from which would arise confusion and disorder. Canada has voluntarily consented to enter the fight against Hitler. Voluntarily? Perhaps, but with a comparative freedom; for I realize to-day more than ever the strength of Canada's ties of dependence toward the unavoidable obligations arising from her association with the nations of the commonwealth. The world-wide character of this war makes it impossible, of course, for us to claim that we are fighting solely for just one country, but I am more than ever convinced that this is a Canadian dependence from the point of view of sacrifice.

May this war be the starting point of the economic and constitutional independence of my country, Canada, among the free nations of the world. May our sacrifices consolidate the union of the two great races in a true spirit of national cooperation.

UNITED STATES NAVY

REFERENCE TO STATEMENT OF PREMIER HEPBURN OF ONTARIO AS REPORTED IN THE PRESS

Hon. ANGUS L. MACDONALD (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a short statement at this time which perhaps should have been made before the orders of the day were called. However, the matter out of which this statement arises was not drawn to my attention until shortly before three o'clock and I wished to take some advice on the matter from my staff before dealing with it in the house.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I assume the hon. minister has the unanimous consent of the house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Granted.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): The statement upon which I should like to comment is alleged to have been made by the premier of Ontario. The premier of Ontario is reported in several Canadian papers to-day in the following words:

> The premier said that on his return from a visit to Australia in 1937, Americans on the boat had scoffed at his fears of the Japanese navy, had declared it to be "a tissue-paper navy" which American forces would wipe off the seas "within a week" after a war in the Pacific was started.
>
> "Well, you've seen what that tissue-paper navy has done", Mr. Hepburn said. "Because of Pearl Harbour the main fleet of the United States navy is in hiding, although it's true that it has carried out hit-and-run raids in the last few days."

I understand that some reference to this statement has been made over United States radio stations, and that it has been drawn to the attention of the President of the United States. Lest there should be any misapprehension in the United States, I should like to make the following comment:

1. The statement of the premier of Ontario does not represent my view, nor the view of the department of naval services, nor the view of the government of this country.

2. The dispositions of naval vessels are not like the movements of certain Hollywood actresses. Not always can they be made known to the world. There are usually very excellent reasons why they should not be made known. But the fact that the disposition and movements of ships are not known, is not to be taken as an indication that they are in hiding.

3. Japanese treachery at Pearl Harbour dealt a heavy blow to the United States fleet, but, notwithstanding, it is mighty and powerful. The courage of its personnel has already been proved and will, I know, be further proved whenever the opportunity offers.

4. This country has every reason to be eternally grateful for the moral support and the material aid that has come to us and our cause from the United States. A year and a half ago, and long before that country entered the war, she gave to the Royal Navy forty-

three destroyers, and seven destroyers to the Canadian navy. These have proved to be of the greatest value.

Furthermore, at this very moment, ships carrying the United States flag are engaged, along with Canadian ships of war, in protecting convoys that are sailing from the American continent to the United Kingdom. They certainly are not in hiding.

It is no secret to say that vessels of the United States navy are dispersed in two great oceans, the Atlantic and the Pacific. I shall not say where these vessels are, nor in what strength they stand. But I can say this: each of these United States naval forces represents a fleet in being, and therefore each constitutes a threat against any enemy attempt to carry the war into the vicinity of the coast-line of north America. Wherever they are, they are a shield for Canada and for the United States, as well as a powerful attacking force against the enemy.

Our cause is one. For myself, I thank heaven that it is so. I thank heaven that the United States fleet and the United States army and the industrial might of that great country are with us in this war.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. C. J. VENIOT (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate I wish to present the viewpoint of one of the representatives of 225,000 Acadians who form about one-fifth of the population of the maritime provinces and who are the direct descendants of the 5,000 Acadians who were expatriated and deported by Governor Lawrence in 1755 and scattered over the uninhabited shores of the Atlantic ocean from Boston to the Mexican border. Gradually these expatriates trickled back to their farms in the land of Acadie, as the poet Longfellow calls it. They settled there and lived under great difficulties; for a century they were considered practically as a conquered people. These people to-day bear no resentment or animosity against anyone for the sufferings which they underwent during that crucial period. They are loyal subjects of the British crown and of the Dominion of Canada, just as loyal as any of their fellow citizens in the maritime provinces or anywhere else in Canada. Unlike our fellow Canadians whose traditions and loyalties are linked up with the British empire, we Acadians have no European ties except our mother tongue. France practically abandoned us to our fate two centuries ago.

But with our historic background of persecution, expulsion and suffering, we emphasize our opposition to compulsion for overseas service during any war until we have been shown the supreme need for such a measure. We do assert our desire and our right to choose between compulsion and voluntary enlistment for overseas service. In the last war we did our full share under the voluntary system. It is true that we rebelled against conscription, but we rebelled because of the unfair and unjust way in which it was enforced in our peaceful villages. There was bloodshed in our midst, and we do not want a repetition of these atrocities.

We do recognize that the best way to defeat our enemy is to fight him outside of Canada and to prevent him from reaching our shores. To this end we are prepared to give freely of our lives and to the limit of our man-power and of our meagre means. But we want no more guns and no more bayonets tracking down our youth like wild beasts in our hills and our forests. We have open minds, but the way to convince us is not by making us guzzle conscription by ramming it down our throats.

I present the views of a man whose broad mentality is patterned on that of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and on that of the man whom I have succeeded in this chamber, who was brought up and educated among the Scotch people of Pictou county, Nova Scotia. Like him, next to my religious faith, I place my Canadian citizenship ahead of everything else this side of eternity.

The present debate revolves around two chief topics, conscription for overseas service and the proposed plebiscite. While most of the speakers heard so far, have admitted or applauded the excellence of Canada's war effort as a whole, a certain minority persist in bitter criticisms of the methods employed by the government to raise man-power for overseas. On this particular point the country and this house are divided into two groups, those who favour voluntary enlistment and those who favour conscription for overseas service.

The advocates of the voluntary system—and they are more numerous than certain newspapers and the Gallup poll would indicate—claim that each individual has the sacred right to determine of his own volition whether or not his life should be exposed to the supreme sacrifice in overseas service outside his native land. They refuse to be

taken by the scruff of the neck and hurled into foreign fields of battle to forfeit their lives, while the possessors of flat feet and owners of wealth are permitted to go scot-free by certain processes of exemption, as occurred in the last war. They consider themselves justified in saying: "You members of parliament may think it proper to pass legislation regimenting men for overseas service, but it will not be you armchair legislators or members of your families who will endure the hardships, who will do the fighting, who will take the risks and do the dying." Those are words I heard with my own ears not very long ago.

The supporters of voluntary enlistment claim that up to the present time all the requirements of our own forces, army, navy and air force, have been met one hundred per cent. Statements to this effect were made in the house this week by three ministers, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie), and very forcefully yesterday by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner). Statements to this effect have been made just within the past few days by the commander in chief of the Canadian forces, by no less a person than General McNaughton, when he stated that the Canadian people have met to the hilt all the requirements so far of man-power in England.

Each year since the beginning of the war a programme of man-power has been outlined for overseas service. This programme has been set by the Department of National Defence in consultation with the highest military authorities both in England and in Canada. The extent of the requirements is established in the light of all existing circumstances at the time of the formulation of the plan, and all requirements thus far decided upon have been met to the hilt.

The programme for 1942 has just been announced by the Minister of National Defence. It involves the raising of a considerable number of men, running from 173,000 to 193,000. This is a large programme, and at the present rate of enlistments there can be no doubt in the mind of any member of this house that we shall again meet all the requirements by voluntary enlistment. At this particular date and without knowledge of what the government further proposes in the way of plans, how can the opposition truthfully say that voluntary enlistment has failed? I need not insist upon the reports which come from the different sections of Canada. I have here reports from New Brunswick published in the Saint John *Telegraph-Journal,* and here is one headline: "Surge in army recruiting." And here is a report in the Ottawa *Citizen,* showing that 500 recruits were signed up in the month of January in the city of Ottawa. Similar reports come from all over Canada. The Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) a few days ago stated that in the last seven months our enlistments have averaged 20,000 a month, which makes 140,000 in seven months. Why, then, the clamor that the nation's war effort is going to be delayed if not ruined by the proposed plebiscite? Must recruiting in every part of Canada cease while the plebiscite is on? Are the different military divisions and depots to be closed down and all training suspended during that time? Why make such childish statements to an intelligent public?

It has been frequently and truthfully said in this house that raising an army for overseas service is only one part of an all-out war effort. The methods heretofore adopted for providing men, voluntary enlistment and conscription, are only means to that end. Conscription for that purpose is and will remain of debatable, doubtful value. It may be equitable in certain respects, it may be just in some ways, but it is most provocative and irritating to all elements, and charged with racial dynamite. In fact, I submit, sir, that by the odious way in which it was applied in 1917 by the arch-imperialists of this country, it was transformed into a racial issue. This is a strong statement. Nevertheless it is the bald truth, as I shall proceed to show.

I again reiterate that conscription now is, and always will be, a racial issue in Canada. It was forced into such a place in our thoughts by the unforgivable and unforgettable circumstances with which the Conservative party surrounded the birth of conscription and the way in which it was carried out in the last war, and proposed again in the present war. All of us Canadians must recognize this fact without delay before our national edifice is too far ablaze with passion.

Deep down in his heart every Canadian knows that conscription, more than ever to-day, contains the germs of strife, of division, of violent resistance, and possibly of bloodshed as in the last war. We never shall win this war while we are divided by a racial issue, and just now, with passions burning to white heat in certain sections of the country, we are headed for catastrophe.

Unity cannot be maintained by such fiery statements as those of Premier Hepburn when he charged the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) with deliberately trying to set the French against the British through his lieutenant, Mr. Godbout. I do not know the

nature of the evil spirits which move the premier of Ontario to speak in such a way and make other firebrand statements against the Prime Minister of the nation. None of his violent utterances are in harmony with the fundamental principles of confederation which brought together two peoples of different tongues, different race and different religion.

Any fair-minded person who has studied the history of Canada since its conquest by the British, and who has a knowledge of the background of strife and struggle which took place between these two racial groups during a century of adjustment, realizes what a tremendous undertaking confederation was, and still is. Why does French Canada feel as it does toward conscription?

All of us need in the worst way to dig into history, to learn the facts, to recall the fundamental principles of bonne entente, and review the problem of the relations of French Canada to the rest of the dominion. May I be permitted merely to enumerate a few points in history which all of us should study with the deepest concern.

First, one which I have already mentioned, and which still lingers in the heart and soul of every Acadian in the maritime provinces, and which is handed down as a tradition from mother to child on her knees—the expulsion of the Acadians in 1755. Has anything ever been done to rehabilitate and to compensate these innocent victims of the racial hate which existed at that time? No further comments are necessary.

Second, the Quebec Act of 1774.

Third, the Constitutional Act of 1791, by which Canada was divided into Upper and Lower Canada.

Fourth, the war of 1812, when French Canada stuck to England and saved this colony for the British.

Fifth, the rebellion of 1837.

Sixth, the union of Upper and Lower Canada in 1841, by which Lord Durham hoped that the French-Canadians could be manipulated into adopting the language and the customs of the English and assimilated by them. These words are related in history verbatim.

Seventh, the Confederation Act of 1867, by which English- and French-speaking Canadians shook hands and agreed to forget their past differences in order to make Canada one of the greatest countries in the world.

Eighth, the War-time Elections Act and the Military Service Act of 1917, of which I shall say more later.

Ninth, the statute of Westminster.

Tenth, the school acts in eight provinces where French-Canadians are a minority group. Contrast these with the treatment accorded the English minority in the province of Quebec.

The defenders of conscription are loud in their vociferations for equality of sacrifice. Equality of sacrifice in my estimation naturally presupposes equality of citizenship. I ask this house, is there equality of citizenship for the three-quarters of a million French-Canadians who live outside Quebec and who are denied the right of separate schools for the education of their children in their mother tongue?

These are a few of the historical facts. Let us now confront them with certain other facts.

First, practically all Canadians who support conscription for overseas are of British descent.

Second, there is a very large number of Canadians, also of British descent, who oppose conscription, some because it is their intimate conviction; others because, although favouring conscription as a means of raising troops for overseas service, they view it as a racial issue which nearly wrecked Canada in the last war.

Third, practically every Canadian of French descent is irrevocably opposed to conscription; he holds these views as sacred to him as his religion and his mother tongue. May I recall that there are over three and a half million French-Canadians in Canada, of whom, as I have already said, three-quarters of a million reside outside Quebec.

I ask my hon. friends to recall these facts and figures in their moments of calm reflection.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1917 recognized the racial implications of conscription and the dangers which it contained. Since that time, Mackenzie King, Lapointe and their followers have all been of the same opinion. In the session of 1939, the then leader of the opposition, Doctor Manion, was shrewd enough to perceive it, and in 1940 during the election campaign he repeated from one end of the country to the other the statements he had made in the house. I concede to him in all fairness that he was expressing this opinion not as a bait for vote-catching, but because deep down in his soul he knew the implications of conscription as a racial issue and a danger for Canada. The trouble with us all is that up to the present time none of us has had the courage frankly to put this view before the public in its true light. We have avoided the issue. We have neglected to place before the public the true perspective, to call a spade a spade, to derive from it the only logical conclusion to which this fact leads, namely that during a world war crisis such as we are facing to-day the English

and French elements of our population must come together without delay and arrive at a reasoned understanding on this vital question.

Unfortunately, extremists of both major political parties in this house beclouded the issue when each accused the other of using conscription as a vote-getter in and out of the province of Quebec. I cannot see how the continuance of violent public statements during an election campaign, such as those of the premier of Ontario, which I have already mentioned, are going to help to bridge the gap between the two races. Equally violent utterances in the opposite direction come from the province of Quebec, and will not span the breach. Nor can I see how the presence of the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen in this house could have helped in any way to bring about unity of purpose, when all French Canada recalls his share in the framing and execution of the conscription act in the last war. And what an execution that was!

Here may I be permitted to quote words uttered by Hon. H. C. Nixon a few days ago in this connection. Said he:

> I believe it would be a national calamity if Arthur Meighen were returned to public life by South York on Monday.
>
> I recall how Canada was divided in 1917 and 1918 by the War-time Elections Act and the Military Service Act, and which were applied in such an iniquitous way that millions of people still see red when they think of it, and not in Quebec alone either. For this condition no man living to-day is more responsible than Mr. Meighen.

There are certain amenities, Mr. Speaker, which peoples as well as gentlemen owe one another, and the things just mentioned are not of the proper taste nor are they suitable to men occupying such high responsibility in a dual nation like ours, where susceptibilities are always so keen. Fortunately there always exists a great measure of tolerance and fair-mindedness in this country. I have discussed this thorny question of conscription with many of my numerous friends of British origin. Here are the views of a distinguished gentleman, a non-Catholic clergyman with whom I had the pleasure of travelling on the train when returning from the funeral of the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. He told me that personally he considered the conscription of all man-power the most equitable way of raising troops for overseas if it could be harmoniously carried out. With his knowledge of the historical background of Canada's different peoples he could not conceive of the possibility of any such utopia, and he opposes conscription in the interests of Canadian unity because he regards it essentially as a racial issue fraught with extreme danger to the solidarity of the nation. Never before had it entered my mind that conscription could have such an implication and it was the expression of this thought that made it enter my mind, namely, that conscription in Canada at the present time has become a racial issue. In his estimation, to force conscription would split the nation asunder and ruin our otherwise splendid war effort.

In further discussion he expressed other opinions. Here are some of them. Conscription, according to him, would never be thought of as a method of raising troops in south Africa. Why? Because there also it would be a racial issue between the Boers and the British. In Ireland it would be a religious issue between the north and the south. In Australia, where the population is 97 per cent of British origin, Prime Minister Hughes on two different occasions in the last war called a referendum on this question; on both occasions the measure was thrown out, and the feeling against the prime minister at that time for his conscriptionist view was so strong that, as you know, he had to resign his position as prime minister.

At the present date there is no conscription for overseas service in Australia. Are we Canadians any the less British or any the less patriotic than the Australians? In the United States there is no racial cleavage. There, conscription, such as they are imposing it, is purely a matter of policy or expediency. In line with these thoughts, I should like to call the attention of the house to a little book which appeared some time ago entitled "Canadian Peoples," by Mr. B. K. Sandwell, in which he shows the entire historical background of some of the thoughts I have been expressing in this house. The views of this man are those of many broad-minded and informed English-speaking Canadians with whom I have discussed this thorn in the side of our nation.

Conscription as enforced in the last war was recognized as a national blunder and failure as a man-power-producing measure, by the leaders of all political parties, immediately before and during the last election. All Liberal supporters have always proclaimed its failure from the very beginning. The then National Conservative leader, Doctor Manion, as I said, spoke in the house against conscription and, as I have already mentioned, repeated the same speech from coast to coast

The futility of conscription for producing men in numbers is demonstrated by the following figures, some of which were given last week by the Minister of Pensions and

National Health. The first class of unmarried men from 20 to 34 years of age, registered in 1917, numbered 404,000. Of these, there were 380,000 exemptions claimed for one reason or another, leaving only a difference of 24,000 men to come under arms. By the end of March, 1918, in Ontario, 118,000 claimed exemption and 104,000 exemptions were approved. In Quebec, 108,000 out of 115,000 called received exemption. By the end of March, 1918, in the whole dominion, 31,000 men had been called up of whom 5,000 had defaulted. At the end of the war, as the Minister of Pensions and National Health pointed out a few days ago, only 83,000 men were enrolled under the act, but there was something which the minister did not say. Of this number 22,000 were released on farm leave or on compassionate leave. In the final analysis, 61,000 men formed the total contribution of conscription to the last war effort.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this an effort that is worth while, produced by a measure which certain interests are seeking to impose upon Canada to-day? Yet, in spite of this evident failure, in spite of the futility which I have just shown; in spite of the disruption which it caused to national unity; in spite of the hatred which it engendered, the spectre of conscription hovers over this house again to-day as the battlecry of the Conservative party and the ultimate and only means of saving this nation. To cap the climax, the same party calls in as the standard-bearer of conscription the one man in Canada whose very name is anathema to the province of Quebec and wherever there exists in Canada a group of Canadians of French descent—the very man who in 1917 framed the War-time Elections Act and the Military Service Act and saw to their application in the province of Quebec in the odious and provocative manner which all of us recall so well and so sorrowfully.

That wound still bleeds in Quebec. Can members of the Conservative party sincerely believe that their choice of the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen last fall as their leader was a tactful one in these difficult times when unity of purpose and harmony and unstinted cooperation of all classes and creeds and races are more important than gold and guns? Do hon. members opposite honestly think that they can heal Quebec's wounds and many other injuries of the last war by selecting as their chief the very man who inflicted those wounds and who is regarded as the personification of intolerance?

I say that the choice of the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen at that time was a direct challenge to the province of Quebec—

[Mr. Veniot.]

Mr. POULIOT: A blunder.

Mr. VENIOT: I submit that this choice at such a time, when spirits were aready heated up, was the greatest political strategic error since confederation, which may lead even yet, although the Right Hon. Mr. Meighen was defeated, to dire consequences for the nation. Shortly after the selection of the Right Hon. Mr. Meighen as leader of his party was announced, one of my Conservative friends said to me, "Bennett wrecked the Conservative party by his autocracy, and now Meighen comes to bury it."

As I view the deliberate, gradually worked up conscription agitation, the main object of it seems to be to pit the province of Quebec against the rest of the nation, as a political move the sinister objective of which is to wreck the Liberal party. Only last Thursday the Ottawa *Citizen* seemed to gloat already over its victim in an editorial saying:

> Collapse is bound to come on parliament hill. The signs of disintegration are already to be seen. While the ship of state is being attacked from without by the most terrible forces of barbarism, Canada is being scuttled internally by party politics.

The evil spirits which inspire and guide the backers of conscription at the present time seem to say weirdly: "If we can create a clamour sufficiently strong to stampede a certain number of English-speaking Liberals into supporting conscription, and thus split the Liberal fold, potential victory and power is ours. Perish unity, perish the nation, so long as the Liberal party and King are destroyed!"

If this allegation be denied, and no doubt it will be—I do not blame my friends of the opposition for denying it, because it is a terrible indictment—then I would ask my hon. friends to prove their honesty and sincerity, their love of country, their desire for peace and unity, by considering the generous suggestion made in this house on January 29 by one of their own party, the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) when he proposed to exclude Quebec from the operation of compulsory selective service. The same thought was expressed on February 9 by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) when he said, as reported on page 408 of *Hansard:*

> If necessary, I would agree to conscription which would leave out sections where the feeling was anti-conscriptionist. That was done in Ireland twice, during the great war and in this war. No trouble resulted, no ill feeling, and no discrimination. Possibly it would be a good idea here.

As I previously remarked, nearly one-third of the dominion's population is made up of Canadians of French descent, and three-quarters of a million of these reside outside

of the province of Quebec. I presume that the magnanimous suggestion of the hon. member for Parkdale would include these latter in the scope of his intentions, for to a man, this part of the population is opposed to conscription for overseas service. On every other single point of any all-out total war effort every French-Canadian in this country is in complete harmony with his fellow citizens, as Premier Godbout proclaimed some time ago, and is prepared to go to the very limits of sacrifice in order to win this war.

On the other hand, as I have already pointed out, the absolute totality of the advocates for conscription are of British origin. Upon these, then, I presume the hon. member for Parkdale would impose conscription for overseas service, preserving the system of voluntary enlistment for all Canadians of French descent. May I congratulate the hon. member for having had such a brilliant thought and making such a magnanimous gesture of friendship. It certainly is one of the finest statements I ever heard in this parliament or outside of it, and he has the unqualified blessing of every mother's heart in French Canada.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, give the French-Canadians more of their own commanding officers whose language they understand, more of their own training centres, where they can be taught the intricacies of military technique in their own mother tongue. Can you see the leader of the opposition training in a military school where French is the only language in use? Give them, I say, their own regiments, their own battalions under the voluntary system, and you will see the old French spirit of valour and chivalry showing this nation and the whole world that French-Canadians are not slackers—as I have heard it said within the very walls of this building. They will show that they can repeat many times over the numbers and the valiant deeds of the crack Royal 22nd French-Canadian regiment. They will show that their love of Canada is equal to, if not greater than, that of any other group of Canadians in this country.

We do not seek to shirk our obligations, but we demand respect for the convictions that we hold as deeply rooted in our souls as our religious faith. Barring this one point of conscription for overseas service, we are ready for any sacrifice. Aye, we welcome it, and there is no limit to our possibilities.

I challenge the opposition to support their fellow member in his suggestion. If this were done I should like to see side by side battalions composed of conscripts and of volunteers from the province of Quebec.

I quote the following passage from the Montreal *Standard* of January 24:

> The basis of Canadian confederation, the union of two peoples of different tongue is compromise; the art of effecting compromises that will preserve the unity of Canada has become the chief measurement of Canadian statesmanship. Without the spirit of compromise, the historians of the future will likely find the mixed federation of peoples and institutions that are bound together in the Dominion of Canada would dissolve.

This, Mr. Speaker, explains Baldwin and Lafontaine, Macdonald and Cartier, Laurier and Fielding, King and Lapointe. Such compromise establishes the law of fair exchange in mutual friendship, mutual understanding and agreement, without which this country cannot continue to exist, upon which the survival of the nation is based.

Will some wise man tell the country why such dual leadership has ceased to exist in the Conservative party since the last war? Will someone name the French associates of Borden, Bennett, Meighen, comparable to those of their predecessors, and say why there is not one single Conservative of French extraction in the present parliament, and why there was only one in the last? The hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Roy) found the atmosphere bitterly cold during the short time he sat on the Conservative benches. Why has French Canada no outstanding representative in the Tory party to-day? Because this party in the last war and since that time ignored the lesson of true statesmanship, given heretofore by the leaders of both major political parties, former leaders whose names will go down in history as the foster-fathers of union and harmony between the two great races of Canada, while Borden, Meighen and Bennett will be relegated to the background because they ignored the important fact that by their own machinations conscription in Canada will always remain a race issue, whatever their views to the contrary now may be.

Personally, I am prepared to support the proposed plebiscite, and to ask my people to back it up one hundred per cent; not that I favour conscription, but because I feel that a middle course can be worked out which will be just and equitable and less disruptive than conscription as it was and is still conceived by the Conservative party; because I have the utmost confidence in my chief and in his government; because I know that their judgment will be exercised with the utmost caution in the light of all existing circumstances—war conditions, economic conditions and racial difficulties—if and when the moment of supreme danger arises for the safety of our country and of our allies.

If conscription ever did become a supreme necessity and I could be persuaded of this necessity I would rather see its enforcement

in the hands of the Prime Minister, noted for his moderation and his broadness of views, and the men surrounding him, than in the hands of the men who made conscription such a flop by the odious way it was enforced in Quebec during the last war.

I submit that there can and must be found some middle course between the two extreme views which now split the country on the issue of conscription. Men of moderate views from all parties and from both racial groups must get together somehow and calmly study the situation from its every angle. The handwriting of disaster is all too plainly emblazoned on the ceiling over our heads. A truce must be called on the question. The nation's interest is greater than that of the Liberal, the Conservative or any other party at the present time; for if conscription in its 1917 form is put into effect, even at the hour of supreme danger, even as remotely as a year or two hence, I dare not say what will take place in my county and in other sections of the country, unless other means than those of the past are used to persuade the people.

These are terrific things to say, but no sane man can ignore any longer the rumblings that reach us from the cities as well as from the back settlements in opposition to conscription, since Meighen relaunched it as his supreme war cry on November 13 last. Let me quote, in conclusion, a paragraph by Leslie Roberts in a recent issue of *Saturday Night*:

> It can be said that war in the Pacific rather than tending to change French Canada's attitude to conscription, has stiffened Quebec's determination to have nothing to do with the idea. There continues to be a complete lack of comprehension in hundreds of thousands, possibly millions of English-Canadians' minds as to the root cause of this opposition. Basically, it must be charged to the poorest piece of political and journalistic salesmanship in our history, coupled with a determination on the part of a few editors and orators to cram conscription down Quebec's throat no matter what happens. You do not change the opinions of a democratic minority that way. You merely stiffen their determination not to be browbeaten, and sooner or later, if the process continues, Donnybrook ensues.

Fortunately there are many English-Canadians of this writer's type, educated Canadians who have studied the fundamentals of racial, ethnical economics, who do not let themselves be carried away by passion, whose reasoned outlook on the present situation will help to preserve unity and harmony among our peoples.

May divine providence enlighten a greater number of such minds, chasten our hearts of the bitterness which has welled up during the past three months, and infuse into our souls the kindly balm of mutual tolerance.

[Mr. Veniot.]

On motion of Mr. Douglas (Weyburn) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Thursday, February 12, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Wednesday, February 11, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. T. C. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, like those who have preceded me I should like to extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion for an address in reply to the speech from the throne.

It has already been said that we are not winning this war, but that in fact we have just barely missed losing it. However, there is something which disturbs me even more than our failure to win battles abroad and to get more efficient production at home, and that is the confusion and disillusionment which exists in the minds of the Canadian public to-day. It is doubtful if there ever was such factional and sectional strife in Canada as there is right now. Much of the discussion in the press and in this house regarding our war effort has been shaped by our emotions rather than by our reason. We are throwing catchwords and slogans at each other rather than sober facts. It is in a welter of mental confusion like this that nazism triumphs. Whenever a nation has lost its sense of national purpose it is ripe for defeat.

I am more concerned for the future of this country to-day than I was even in the dark days of midsummer of 1940. Only wise and courageous statesmanship can save this country from that psychological disintegration which was the prelude to defeat in France. We must all accept some share of responsibility for this state of affairs. None of us is without guilt in this regard. I think it is possibly true, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) claimed, that several powerful groups have fostered the cry for the conscription of man-power with a view to gaining political advantage and embarrassing the government. Others were motivated by a desire to regiment

labour and exploit the farmer under the guise of winning the war. Still others were thinking in terms of the first great war and failed to recognize that this was a mechanized war in which large armies were useless unless adequately equipped with modern weapons.

I say that there may have been small groups in Canada acting from such motives. But that, Mr. Speaker, is not the whole story. That does not explain the widespread dissatisfaction with the government's war effort. The real fact is that the government itself must accept a large share of the blame. This country has been looking for courageous and aggressive leadership. It has not been getting it. We have been having a Chamberlain government in Canada, with neither a Churchill nor a Bevin in sight. The least that the people have a right to expect is that their leaders will lead them. This country's leaders have had to be pushed. It is true that no leader can afford to get too far ahead of public opinion, but public opinion in this country is far ahead of the government and is now waiting impatiently for the government to catch up, and I submit that it will not wait much longer.

Nor should the government make the mistake of being lulled into a sense of security because of the by-elections which it won last Monday. The three by-elections which were won by the government—

Mr. MacNICOL: Four.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I shall deal with the fourth in a moment. The three by-elections which were won by the government were won because the sanity of the people of Canada voted not so much for the government as against the alternatives. In Quebec it was a vote against a group of irresponsible nationalists, and I was pleased as a matter of fact, to see the people of Quebec show their sanity and belief in the destiny of Canada to the extent which they did. In Welland constituency the vote was a vote against reaction and demagoguery, although I want to point out to the government that in that constituency the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation more than doubled its vote.

I come to York South, which has been mentioned by my hon. friend the member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol). The leader of the Conservative party made the statement to the press that his defeat was due to a partnership between the dominion government and the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. The Toronto *Daily Star* gives an analysis of the vote in that constituency, in which it says:

In York township, the working class section of the riding, the election was lost for the Conservatives and won for the C.C.F. Conservatives dropped from 12,067 to 7,669, a decrease nothing in any other part of the riding could offset. The C.C.F. polled 13,467 votes in York township.

The remarkable turnover from Conservative to C.C.F. was evident when the first polling subdivision results were known. They came from No. 9, which in 1940 gave Cockeram 218 and the C.C.F. 42. Yesterday's vote was 112 for Meighen and 141 for Noseworthy. This advantage was held throughout.

In other words, the York South by-election was a demonstration by the common people that they did not propose to have leadership foisted on them from above. But I warn the government that these by-elections do not mean that there is no discontent or dissatisfaction in the Dominion of Canada. They will make a great mistake it they are lulled into a sense of security because of their victories in these by-elections.

I would like to ask the house to examine some of the reasons for this agitated state of the public mind. First, there is a feeling that the government has been less than frank in discussing the production of war material. Always we are told of orders given or money spent, but these do not always mean weapons produced. The Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) said last fall that he could equip a division every six weeks. Did he mean that literally? That means equipping eight divisions a year. Yet in November last the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) said that perhaps one or two tanks from Canada had reached our troops in England.

To illustrate what I mean, let me refer to something which may be small, but it is indicative. The other evening, when the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green) was speaking, he said that at the coast men were equipped with United States Springfield rifles which could not be fired. The Minister of National Defence interrupted to say that they could be fired. Does the minister mean that? Surely the Minister of National Defence knows that these Springfield rifles are twenty-five years old and are marked with red paint to prevent any of our men from trying to fire them.

Mr. RALSTON: Will my hon. friend permit me? My hon. friend is absolutely misinformed. They are marked with that red paint because they are a different calibre to the Mark III rifles. We have Lee-Enfield rifles, many of which are twenty-five years old but are perfectly good.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I am coming to that. I will give the minister all the information if he wants it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The United States Springfield rifle, which thousands of these men are carrying, takes a ·300 cartridge, while our ammunition is ·303; and since our men are not supplied with American ·300 ammunition they cannot possibly fire those rifles.

Mr. RALSTON: May I interrupt my hon. friend again. The government has a considerable supply of ·300 ammunition in Canada.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): May I ask the minister if he has ever seen one of those rifles fired?

Mr. RALSTON: No.

Mr. HOWE: I can say that I fired one.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The only man whom I ever saw try to fire one of them had a broken jaw when he was finished.

Mr. RALSTON: That may be so, but that might also be true with a Lee-Enfield or a Ross.

An hon. MEMBER: Is that speaking as a German?

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I am alarmed at the amount of cynicism and the sense of frustration which are present among some of our armed forces. They feel that we are just playing at war. For instance, last summer, when the Prime Minister came to visit Dundurn camp there were a number of reserve units there as well as active units—about 22,000 in all. The Prime Minister will remember that the men of the reserve units wore a heavy winter battle dress although the thermometer was close to 100 degrees in the shade. The reason was not far to seek: the men had no summer parade uniforms. He will remember that they did not carry rifles, because there were rifles for less than half the men. I had 139 men under my care and we were given thirty-six rifles, all American Springfields, and one Lewis machine gun which could not be fired—and that for only half of each day, another company requiring it for the remainder of the day.

Since the entrance of Japan into the war certain newspapers have intimated that the reserve army may assume a defensive role in protecting Canada. How many of the reserve units could be used in the event of an invasion on the Pacific coast? Most of them have no equipment. In the unit to which I am attached most of the men have had a maximum of six hours on the rifle range. They have never fired a Bren machine gun and have never seen, let alone fired, a trench mortar. Is this the army that is to play a defensive role "in the event of invasion"? Does the government wonder that the public are becoming somewhat sceptical of the rosy pictures which are constantly being painted?

The second factor which has undermined public confidence is the ill-fated Hong Kong expedition. I shall not review the facts already placed on the record by the Minister of National Defence, although the house has a right to expect some explanation as to why 138 to 148 men with less than sixteen weeks' training were sent overseas to meet seasoned enemy troops. Over one hundred officers and men from Saskatchewan units were transferred to the Winnipeg Grenadiers. Last year I lived in barracks with some of these men, and I know just how little training some of them had, and when the house committee is set up to investigate the matter I hope to have something to say about it. Five of the officers who went to Hong Kong are men with whom I had lived and worked for weeks. One expects to lose one's comrades in war time, but not through incompetence and negligence, and if there have been blunders we expect the government to see that the persons responsible are properly punished. May I say to the government that the Pearl Harbour incident was investigated, the report filed, and those responsible punished weeks ago and this government has not yet set up any body to carry on an investigation. There is a growing feeling across Canada that the government is merely stalling on this issue.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say just a word to my hon. friend with regard to the government "stalling on" the matter? As the house will recollect, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) suggested that there should be a parliamentary inquiry into this question. Being anxious to have hon. members assured that the government intended to proceed with an inquiry immediately, I accepted the proposal which my hon. friend made and assured him that an inquiry would be held. In replying to the leader of the opposition, I used the same language which he used in putting the question to me, that it would be a parliamentary inquiry, without restriction. I confess that I had no sooner made the reply I did than there came to my mind what had taken place with respect to the inquiry into Pearl Harbour, which was made, as my hon. friend knows, by a member of the Supreme Court of the United States with whom others were associated. I felt that the same reasons as to procedure which governed in the case of

the inquiry into the Pearl Harbour situation should govern in regard to the inquiry to be made into the situation at Hong Kong; and for that reason it seemed to me that an inquiry by a royal commission, with—if possible—a member of the judiciary at its head, would be a more appropriate way of proceeding.

Having come to that conclusion, I had a conference with the leader of the opposition, also with the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group (Mr. Coldwell), and with the leader of the Social Credit group (Mr. Blackmore). I pointed out to them the different aspects of the situation to be considered in deciding as between an inquiry by a parliamentary committee and an inquiry by royal commission conducted by some member of the judiciary, and they agreed with me that, all circumstances considered, the latter course of procedure would be the preferable one.

I had then to ascertain whether I could secure for a commission of the kind some member of the judiciary who would be, I will not say persona grata to all persons, but so far as the country was concerned the one who in every way would represent the best possible choice that could be made.

I felt that no one, if his services could be obtained, would give the same sense of security, of impartiality and of wisdom, in a matter of the kind, as the chief justice of Canada, the Right Honourable Sir Lyman Duff. I had then to see the chief justice to ascertain whether or not his services could be obtained. Before the chief justice could give me an answer he had himself to review the situation with respect to his court and the arrangements it might be necessary to make for the time required for the inquiry. He finally said to me that in a matter of this kind, where it was the duty of everyone to do whatever he could to help in a crisis such as the world is faced with at the present time, no one should say no to any request that might be made of him by the government, and that he would be prepared to undertake the inquiry.

The chief justice has undertaken to conduct an inquiry under royal commission; in speaking to him, I said that the government would place no restriction whatever upon him with respect to the scope of the inquiry or any phase of it, and that he would be allowed to choose whomever he wished in the way of counsel, for secretarial staff and the like. In other words, I was assuring him that he would have entire freedom as regards the proceedings and the scope of the inquiry and that the government would not seek even to suggest the persons who might be associated with himself. It would be for him to name the personnel he might wish to have associated with him in the inquiry if he should undertake the task.

The chief justice has accepted and the government has before it at this moment my recommendation to the cabinet to have the chief justice appointed. I had hoped to be able to announce that the chief justice would act and that the order had been passed, and to table the reference this afternoon. However, some matters that turned up this morning have occupied my time unexpectedly and made that impossible. I hope to lay on the table of the house to-morrow the order which will have been passed meanwhile, and which will assign to the chief justice the duty of making this investigation.

I trust that will be a complete answer to my hon. friend.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): With the indulgence of the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas), may I add a word to what the Prime Minister has said?

Mr. COLDWELL: I rise to a point of order. I do not think it is fair to interrupt the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): By way of explanation I said, "with his indulgence." If that is denied me I will sit down. I am asking the hon. member for Weyburn if he will be good enough to allow me to proceed.

Mr. COLDWELL: He objects.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does he now?

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Will the hon. member be very long?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No, just five minutes; I do not intend to make a speech. When I asked for the inquiry I did not believe it was open to me to ask for anything else than a parliamentary inquiry, although I was quite cognizant of the fact that that would not be as satisfactory to the people of Canada, I had it almost on the tip of my tongue to suggest the other as an alternative, though I refrained from doing so. I had not lost sight of the fact for a moment, and when the Prime Minister came to see me, as he has said, I welcomed the suggestion he made, and I think I told him at the time that I thought it was far preferable that the inquiry should be made by a judge of the supreme court rather than by a partisan committee of this house. I acceded to the suggestion and it is a matter of record.

The only point that has arisen since, so far as I can recall, was with respect to the

terms of the reference. I made it quite clear to the Prime Minister that I thought that section 13 of the Inquiries Act which was invoked in the Bren gun inquiry and which precluded the commissioner from making certain findings, should be waived in this instance. I wish to say at once that the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) both acquiesced in that suggestion.

The only other question that has remained open was with respect to making the reference sufficiently broad to include the whole question of trained man-power available in Canada. That is not quite settled. On every other score I think I can subscribe to everything the Prime Minister has said, and I believe the public are entitled to this explanation. I believe the public will welcome an investigation of this kind, as I do.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I wish to thank the Prime Minister for his statement that this judicial body is to be set-up, though I do suggest that it is three weeks since the house met and seven weeks since Hong Kong fell. That is a considerable period and the people are anxious to know what steps are being taken to deal with those who may have been responsible for this situation.

May I say to the Prime Minister that when this commission is being appointed the terms of reference ought to be as wide as possible. This house and the country have a right to know a great deal more than was told us the other day by the Minister of National Defence. We should know whether the Canadian general staff was consulted regarding the dispatch of men to Hong Kong. We should know why it took ten days to reply to the British government and another ten days before instructions were issued to prepare the men for embarkation. We should know whether the government was informed as to the impossibility of successfully defending the island. We should know whether or not it is true that all heavy artillery was useful only for resisting a seaborne invasion and that only light field artillery was available to resist the Japanese invasion. We should know whether or not it is true that the water supply was on the mainland and that no adequate provision had been made for water storage on the island itself. We should know whether the two counter-attacks staged by the Winnipeg Grenadiers were attempted without the support of mechanized equipment—because if they were, then the terse statement by the minister that the counter-attacks failed, takes on an ominous significance.

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

The country has a right to know whether, in the event of a dispatch of more troops to the far east, Canada will be on the Pacific council and whether that council will have executive authority or be merely an advisory body. I suggest to the government that the Canadian people will not take cheerfully the placing of Canadian troops at the disposal of those over whose policies and strategy we have no effective control.

The third factor contributing to public confusion is the appeasement policy which is being followed by the government in international affairs. For years they tried to appease Germany and then Italy. We were told later that it was unwise to prevent scrap iron going to Japan because we might antagonize that nation. All attempts at appeasement failed because the nazi appetite only grows on what it feeds. Now we are trying to appease Vichy France. The Prime Minister says that Churchill wants the Vichy legation kept open. The Prime Minister has the marvellous faculty of finding someone else's skirts behind which to hide; if the United Kingdom wants to retain contact with Vichy it ought to get someone else to do that job. They have Sir Samuel Hoare at Madrid, and there are legations in Portugal and Sweden. We fail to understand why Canada should be singled out to play the host to the emissaries of Vichy. British sailors died in combat with Vichy naval forces. Imperial, Australian and New Zealand troops lost their lives in taking Syria. At the present time Hitler is building a railway across North Africa. It is now proven almost beyond the shadow of doubt that the nazi General Rommel has received substantial reinforcements through French Tunisia. In Egypt the British government had to ask the Egyptian government to close the Vichy legation because the latter had become the clearing house for nazi and Italian spies. Have we any assurance that the situation is any better here in Canada?

When the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon were seized by the free French forces the statements issued by the Canadian Department of External Affairs and the State department of the United States were, to say the least, unfortunate. Reading them one would think the free French forces were our enemies, rather than men risking their lives in the cause for which we are fighting. The time has come for the government to stop halting between two opinions. Those who are not with us are against us; there is no middle ground. We are either with those who betrayed France or with those who are fighting for her liberation. Then let us have an end

of this dilly-dallying. If there are Vichy-minded men in the government let them be dismissed and let us set our own house in order. How can we expect our people to be enthusiastic in the cause of freedom if the government itself is half-hearted?

Contrast our attitude towards Vichy with our refusal until a few days ago to open diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. We sustained relations with those who have slain blood of our blood and bone of our bone, and on the other hand continued to ignore a nation which we refer to almost daily as "our gallant ally." The time has come when the people of Canada believe the Prime Minister ought to give the representative of Vichy his hat with orders to go home.

The fourth contributing cause to the public confusion has been the failure of the government to enunciate a comprehensive policy with regard to the use of man-power. With the powers given to the government under the National Resources Mobilization Act, 1940, and the information gathered in the national registration of the same year, the country had a right to expect some far-reaching scheme dealing with the allocation of man-power. Instead we have had a hit-and-miss policy composed of improvisations, based on the method of trial and error. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) calls for more food production to win the war, while at the same time young men have been forced to sell their stock in order to take training or go to work at Banff national park. The other day I drew the attention of the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) to the case of a young man who had almost completed his course as an aeroplane construction mechanic. When called for training he registered as a conscientious objector and is now wielding a pick and shovel in Banff. Cases like this can be cited by the dozen.

Some of the engineers engaged in war work tell me that they have had difficulty holding their mechanics and draughtsmen because the latter can join the active army and get promotion due to their technical training, whereas if they are called for compulsory training they will be put in the infantry. There has been no attempt to put the right men in the right place and to insist on their staying there. Not only should we not want a skilled munitions-maker in the army; we should not let him in the army as long as we are short of mechanized equipment.

At the present moment all departments of government are competing against each other for man-power, with disastrous results. Has any survey been made of our man-power? If so, the government ought to tell us just how it proposes to utilize the man-power of this nation. We should know how many men are required to produce sufficient food to feed ourselves and our allies. We should know what is the maximum munitions production possible in Canada, how many skilled men will be required, and to what extent woman-power will be available for that work. Then and then only can we estimate the number of men that can be spared for the fighting services. These in turn must be allocated on the basis of which branch of the fighting service we can best contribute to, and in the light of our need for defence.

The Prime Minister has spoken of a balanced programme, but so far there has been no indication that the government has reduced this balanced programme to a definite scheme, as has been done in the United Kingdom. I agree with the Prime Minister when he said that conscription of man-power is not the solution to all our difficulties; the problem is much more complicated than that. But the clamour for conscription has arisen because the government has so far failed to tackle the problem of allocating man-power in such a way as to guarantee our maximum efficiency in the prosecution of the war.

This brings me to the question of the proposed plebiscite. No one can object to a democratic reference to the people of any public question. But there are many aspects which ought to be considered. I cannot agree with those who say that the holding of this plebiscite will delay Canada's war effort. That argument will not bear realistic examination. Under the National Resources Mobilization Act the government has power to call up and train all the able-bodied men for which it has training facilities and the necessary equipment. Later, if the government is given a mandate to that end, these men would be available for service in any part of the world. It is idle to say that the taking of the plebiscite is holding up Canada's war effort. If the Prime Minister feels that his pledge not to conscript men for overseas service binds him, he has a perfect right to take whatever means he thinks proper to be released from that pledge.

There is however another side to this question, to which the government ought to give some thought. The plebiscite as outlined by the Prime Minister is so vague as to be almost meaningless, and is already being interpreted differently in different parts of Canada. Consequently, instead of the plebiscite settling some of the sectional disputes, it may only postpone them. In the plebiscite the Prime Minister intends to ask the following question:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

What exactly does this question mean? In Quebec it is being interpreted as meaning that even if the plebiscite is answered in the affirmative, immediate conscription of manpower for overseas service is unlikely. This is amply demonstrated by the statement of Premier Godbout, who assured the people of Quebec that Mr. King's attitude was still anti-conscription. On February 2, Mr. St. Laurent, the newly-elected Minister of Justice, said in a radio speech opening his campaign in Quebec East:

> At the moment, and probably for a long time to come, conscription for overseas would harm our war effort.

And again in the same speech:

> The Prime Minister does not renounce the promises, and if you do not consent to relieve him of them, he will keep the word he has given. But these promises of Mr. King permit his adversaries to make many believe that because he does not propose obligatory military service it is not because he judges it dangerous or inopportune, but simply because his hands are tied.

That is how the plebiscite is being interpreted in Quebec by prominent Liberal speakers.

On the other hand, in western Canada Liberal newspapers such as the Winnipeg *Free Press* and the Regina *Leader-Post* are saying editorially that if the plebiscite is answered in the affirmative the government will proceed to conscript man-power for overseas service. Does the government see th trouble it is storing up for itself? Why does the plebiscite not call for a straightforward answer to the question: "Are you in favour of conscription of man-power for overseas service; Yes or No"?

All attempts the other day by the Minister of National Defence and the Minister of Agriculture to say that this was not a vote on conscription were evading the issue and will fool no one. If I as a citizen release the government from its pledge so as to give it power to bring down conscription if it thinks conscription necessary, then I am saying that I am in favour of conscription if the government believes that conscription is essential to winning the war. That issue cannot be evaded.

I wonder whether the government has thought of the effect this plebiscite will have on the national unity which it professes to be so anxious to maintain. What will happen if one part of Canada votes preponderantly in the affirmative and another part of Canada votes preponderantly in the negative? What will happen to neighbouring communities of different racial origin when one votes for the plebiscite and the other against? For years to come the results of this plebiscite may be used in charges and counter-charges as to the relative patriotism of the different parts of Canada. Has the government thought what will happen if the plebiscite is not answered in the affirmative? Because I want to warn them that hundreds of people have intimated in the last few weeks that unless there is to be conscription of wealth and industry they will not vote "yes" for the plebiscite. If the government's request is refused then their hands are tied more completely than ever, and all the factional disputes that are tearing our country apart at the present moment may be fanned into open flame. Canada never needed courageous and dynamic leadership as she needs it at the present time, and so far the government is failing to give that leadership.

I come now to a discusssion of the amendment to the amendment proposed by the leader of this group, the hon. member for Rosetown Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). The other evening the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) said this amendment should be read in the light of the statement made by this group in September, 1939. Surely the minister knows that is not a fair statement. Surely the minister knows there is not a group in this house that has not changed its attitude with reference to the prosecution of this war, as the war has progressed. Surely the minister knows that in March, 1940, his own party fought an election on a moderate war effort. No one to-day on either side of the house will talk about a moderate war effort.

Mr. MARTIN: No one ever did.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): During the last two weeks we have heard one Quebec member after another chiding the government because they were not keeping their promise of a moderate war effort. As a matter of fact this group have repeatedly stated their stand on the war, through the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. He pointed out in Septemtem of 1939 that we had no confidence in the government that was controlling the British war effort at that time, either in their international policies or their war policies. That government changed; there came to power in Great Britain a new government, with a powerful labour influence, headed by a man in whom we all had confidence. The C.C.F. stated at that time, and have stated repeatedly since, their stand on the war; and the Minister of Agriculture is not playing the game when he tries to tie up the present amendment with statements made in September, 1939, when conditions were totally different.

In this amendment we urge the government, if they are determined to proceed with the plebiscite, to add a second question in which we would have them ask:

Are you in favour of the conscription of war industries, accumulated wealth and financial institutions, at the same time and on the same basis of sacrifice as the proposed extension of the conscription of man-power?

We make this proposal for three reasons. The first is that we are convinced that a large section of the Canadian people are not prepared to support the conscription of man-power for overseas service unless it is accompanied by the conscription of wealth and vital war industries. The second is that we are convinced that the conscription of man-power in itself will not enable us to win the war. President Roosevelt has said that this war is going to be won or lost in the factories. As has been said so often, this is a mechanized war, in which the production of tanks, planes and modern equipment is an integral part of our war effort. A million men in uniform armed with rifles and machine guns, without the mechanized equipment essential to modern war, would be almost useless. This has become a war not of masses of men but of the productive power of entire nations; and to talk in terms of the conscription of man-power while leaving industry in its present haphazard condition would be to fight the war of 1942 with the mentality of 1914.

The third reason for proposing this sub-amendment is that we believe the government's oft-repeated promise of equality of sacrifice ought to be made a reality rather than a mere euphonious platitude.

In June, 1940, the National Resources Mobilization Act was before this house. It proposed to give the government power to conscript material and human resources. At that time some of us in this corner said we did not doubt that the government would use its power to conscript human resources, but we had neither confidence nor assurance that the government would use its power to conscript wealth or industry. It will be remembered that the Prime Minister was somewhat indignant; he repudiated the idea that he, the Prime Minister of Canada, would place more value on material things than on human life. However, the record speaks for itself. The National Resources Mobilization Act has been on the statute books of Canada for a year and a half. What industries have been conscripted under that act? What wealth has been conscripted? What financial institutions have been taken over? So far the government's legislation has been used for one thing; that is, the securing of man-power for home defence. To two successive budgets this group has moved an amendment calling for interest-free compulsory loans to be levied on the basis of ability to pay. Twice the government has rejected this proposal. It is becoming increasingly apparent that when the government talks about conscription it has in mind the conscription of man-power only, with wealth and industry left in the hands of those who operate them for private and personal gain. If the government wants the whole-hearted cooperation of the great mass of the people of Canada, then it will accept this subamendment. If it is still determined to take a plebiscite it will give the man on the street a chance to express his opinion on this very vital matter. If the government refuses it can have only one meaning; that is, that it is afraid the question would be greeted with an overwhelming vote in the affirmative. I challenge the government to put this vote to the test and see.

I should like to touch very briefly on one or two things I believe ought to be done, in order that we may make a more effective contribution to the winning of this war. The first is that the government, having conscripted wealth and industry, ought to submit a plan for the utilization of our man-power similar to the one which has been outlined in Great Britain, as described in the *Economist* of December 14, 1941. The government ought to know the maximum number of men that can be spared from industry and agriculture for the fighting services. They should know, in turn, how the men available for the fighting services should be divided between the respective arms. The public should be told frankly that we cannot raise unlimited numbers of men for the army. At present six divisions are contemplated. Allowing two men in reinforcements for every man in an army division, that means we ought to have 50,000 men for each division, which would mean in the neighbourhood of 300,000 men. If we add to this number 150,000 men for the air force, 25,000 men for the navy and say 200,000 men required for the defence of Canada, we are getting close to 750,000 men, which may be the most we can spare from agriculture and industry without seriously affecting our contribution in these two important fields of operation. I do not know. It may be possible to take men out of agriculture and industry and replace them with women, but certainly the government ought to know. Some comprehensive plan ought to be placed before parliament and before the Canadian people if anything like an intelligent and united effort is to be obtained.

Another thing which must be done, in addition, is to provide for those with small fixed incomes who have been adversely affected by the increased cost of living and who have no means by which they can increase their income

proportionately. I refer particularly to the old age pensioners and soldiers' dependents, whose cost of living has increased in the neighbourhood of 25 per cent on the basis of the commodities people commonly buy, and whose standards of living have had to be reduced to that extent. It does not help our war effort to have the parents and relatives of our men overseas feeling the pinch of poverty. Case after case has come to my attention of parents whose old age pensions have been stopped because their soldier sons have assigned part of their pay to them. Soldiers' dependents are receiving the same allowance now as they received in 1939 when the cost of living was much lower than it is to-day. Canada's war effort can be strengthened by taking steps to remedy this lamentable situation.

Third, Canada's war effort can be assisted materially if the government will institute a new deal for agriculture. I do not propose at this time to go into the conditions of western agriculture. I did that on November 14 last and there will be opportunities for doing so again during the present session, but I want to say that it is to the everlasting disgrace of this government, and to the Saskatchewan members who support it, that over four hundred farmers had to come all the way from Saskatchewan to place their grievances before the cabinet. There has been some criticism of these people for the money which was spent to bring them here. The criticism should be directed toward the government which made it necessary to spend that money. The Prime Minister told the Saskatchewan delegation that almost all the facts which they had presented to the government had already been presented to council at some time or another. If that is so, then why did not the government do something about it? What have they been waiting for? Do they never take any steps unless they are pushed and shoved by an irate and angry public?

I warn the government that the representations made by the Saskatchewan delegation ought not to be taken lightly. They represent the point of view of a great majority of the people of that province and in fact of practically all of western Canada.

There has been some talk in the press of the possibility of the government bringing down legislation to provide ninety cents per bushel as initial payment and discontinuing the bonus. Let me say to the government, in advance, that the bulk of western farmers will not be satisfied with ninety cents. If discontinuance of the bonus is to mean discontinuance of the Prairie Farm Income bonus, there will be no objection, provided the initial price is $1 per bushel. But that is not true of the prairie farm assistance bonus, or the wheat acreage reduction bonus. These bonuses have nothing to do with the price of wheat. The prairie farm assistance bonus is to compensate a farmer for crop loss, and the wheat acreage reduction bonus is paid to encourage the farmer not to grow wheat. Any increase in price will not remove the need for these two bonuses, and they must be continued.

Before I take my seat let me add this further thought. Those who listened the other evening to Mr. Evans, administrator of the A.A.A. programme in the United States, outlining the new deal that had been given to agriculture in that country during the past eight years, must have felt ashamed at the halting and feeble attempts that have been made in this country to assist agriculture. Mr. Evans told the delegates to the Canadian federation of agriculture convention about the "Food for Freedom" programme which is being put on by the American farmers. He completed his speech with a sentence which ought to be emblazoned on the walls of this chamber. He said "The American farmer is working for democracy because democracy is now working for him."

We talk often about fighting to save democracy. We cannot fight to save democracy; we can only fight for the right to practise democracy, but democracy must save itself. In the final analysis we cannot save democracy by fighting, unless democracy serves the needs of the common people. And unless the government is prepared to make democracy work for the farming and labouring population of the country, we cannot hope to get from them that enthusiasm and wholehearted cooperation without which a total war effort is impossible.

Mr. LUCIEN DUBOIS (Nicolet-Yamaska) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I wish first to congratulate the Right Hon. the Prime Minister on the magnificent personal triumph he has just obtained at the by-elections.

I have followed with close attention the discussion which has been going on ever since the opening of the session. The tone of the speeches of those who are resolved at any price to establish conscription for overseas service has in no way surprised me. However, I view with a rather skeptical smile their claim to be serving national unity when I see them propose a measure so coercitive as to destroy the very foundations of that same national unit.

Conscription for overseas service and Canadian unity! Could there possibly be a greater paradox? Even before the question of conscription is submitted to the house, hon. members opposite seem to be running a marathon

in order to see which one of them will shout quickest and loudest the "Aye, aye, ready" of the greatest blunderer Canadian public life has ever known.

I should have preferred leaving the discussion of this question to the proper time, but the opponents of national unity having thrown down the glove, there is no option but to take it up. Since they insist on talking conscription, let us talk conscription.

Conscription for what? Conscription for whom? Conscription for the benefit of what cause? The answers to these questions are to be found in agitation stirred up by the two hundred Toronto fanatics in the hire of the jackals of high finance, of the exploiters of prejudice, of the dealers in tanks and guns. For such is the infamous gang at the back of the committee of 200.

Why should we enact conscription for overseas service when we know that the voluntary system has given quite satisfactory results and that our war effort, as was stated in this house not so very long ago by the most authoritative representative of the nation chiefly interested in Canada's war effort, Right Hon. Mr. Churchill, is truly magnificent?

Does the opposition lay claim to a higher brand of patriotism than that of the Prime Minister of Great Britain? Besides, what does England ask of us? Men or equipment? Hon. members know full well that on many occasions the British government has said: We have a sufficient number of men; what we need is tools and munitions. Let us delve into the statistics regarding our war effort in terms of man-power. Canada has supplied so far:

Seamen, soldiers and airmen overseas, more than 150,000 men.

Seamen, soldiers and airmen voluntarily enlisted for service anywhere, more than 387,000 men.

Active force in Canada, more than 260,000 men.

Royal Canadian Air Force, more than 100,000 men.

Canadian navy, more than 27,000 men.

Reserve force in Canada, more than 155,000 men.

Add to that Canada's production of tools—corvettes, tanks, machine guns, munitions of all kinds, etc. etc.

Judging by the speeches of certain hon. members opposite, their plea in favour of conscription for overseas service constitutes the strongest possible argument against the conscription they demand. Let us face the facts.

Since 1940 there have arisen a number of circumstances compelling us, if we want to be logical, to reason out the matter as follows: Either Canada is or is not likely to be attacked. If it is, common sense requires that we keep our men here to defend their own country and if Canada is not likely to be attacked, what is the sense of all our war effort?

Conscription for whom? If our country is likely to be attacked, what is the sense of the suggestion made in this house by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) that the province of Quebec should be left in isolation? Have the hon. member's white hairs caused him, perchance, to forget the history of his adopted country? Is he not aware that if he has been able to spend happy days in Canada under the mantle of the British flag he owes it to my ancestors and to the ancestors of my French-Canadian fellow-countrymen who saved Canada for the British crown in 1776 and again in 1812? I should like to give him credit for ignorance, but his social position does not allow me to do so. It is disgraceful, Mr. Speaker, and unworthy of a man of his age to make himself the accomplice of the opponents of national unity in their endeavour to whip up the fanaticism of the committee of 200. Such despicable attempts will not scare us. Moreover, the hon. member and his friends have not had much success. Out of the 3,756,632 Canadians constituting the population of Ontario, these so-called patriots have been able to gather only 200 supporters —only 200—and that at the price of a heavy expenditure on the part of high finance.

My hon. leader has no need to worry. We are not afraid of that crowd. We shall in due time bring them to their sense. Should it be necessary to give them a lesson, my fellow-citizens and theirs will do so.

I have too much faith in the broadmindedness of my English-speaking fellow-citizens to believe that they will endorse a movement which aims not only at obtaining control of the government by any means, but also to stir up against each other the two great races which were already beginning to agree.

Conscription for the benefit of what cause? For the benefit of our war effort? This effort would be gravely prejudiced by recourse to compulsion. Have we not heard in this house during the present debate eminent military men state—I emphasize this point because it is also my view—that one volunteer is worth

more than ten conscripts? And to borrow the words of my friend the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Brunelle):

> Who will believe that 50,000 more conscripts are more likely to bring victory than 120,000 volunteers at present enlisting at the rate of ten or eleven thousand a month?

No, all that is eye-wash. All that is trickery designed to cover the game of those who seek to reap large profits out of the whole business.

I have always been opposed to conscription for overseas service. I still am, and if ever the question comes before the house I will show still more convincingly, if possible, my opposition to anything of the kind.

As to the holding of the plebiscite announced in the speech from the throne, I must say that when I proposed such a measure in 1937—see *Votes and Proceedings* of February 9—I was far from foreseeing that it would be submitted to us in 1942. How could I vote against such a democratic measure when I proposed it myself five years ago? In conclusion, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that I am happy to associate myself under the circumstances, with the students of Laval university and with all the youth of my country, the group most vitally interested, and to say with them: Mr. King's government having need of us, we must give it our help. But, by the same token, we must help the government respect the pledges they have given to the people, leaving the latter free to express their views. Let us not lose our heads in the tragic hours we are going through. The tempest may rage with frightful severity during the next five or six months. Let us prepare ourselves to meet it with wisdom, firmness and courage, remembering that just as night is always followed by morning, storms are always succeeded by sunshine.

Mr. L.-PHILIPPE PICARD (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention at first to take part in this debate, but many statements by members from my province make it necessary for me to go on record and explain the position I intend to take on the address and the measure that may be introduced immediately after.

Before proceeding with my remarks it is a pleasure for me to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the address, who have so well and so eloquently discharged their duties after having both been Canadian ambassadors of goodwill to Great Britain last fall.

During these last weeks remarks have been made which might have better been left unsaid by extremists of the two schools of thought that exist on conscription. This issue has been forced on the public mind at the present time by high pressure propaganda of a financial-political group whose main enterprise fortunately flopped last Monday. It would have been preferable for the war effort of the country if it had not been used as a political weapon by the *Globe-Gazette*-Meighen imperialistic group. Playing with matches is a dangerous game. If it had only the effect of burning the fingers of those who hold the match, as was the case with Mr. Meighen, it would not be so bad; it might even teach a good lesson. But matches are more dangerous than that, and the fires of suspicion, fear and doubt can do more to hinder the war effort than a slowdown in the tempo of enlistment.

However, although conscription is not officially before us, everyone has talked on the matter in connection with the plebiscite referred to in the speech from the throne. It was of course to be expected that we would have an outburst of conscription fever, and I really think it has not been as bad as it might have been. The main arguments of most people who advocated conscription for overseas service failed to touch me because it overlooked for the most part Canadian interests and centred mainly on the defence of the empire and of Britain. If ever a good case could be built for conscription, it should be based upon the urgency to do it as a necessity for the defence of Canada, never on the advisability of helping Britain.

If some statements of the ultra-imperialists have annoyed me, I can say the same of some of the extreme statements of so-called nationalists of my province. Fortunately both groups received an appropriate answer last Monday from the intelligent electorate of the two largest provinces of this dominion. By their attitude since that election we can easily see how things would have become in this country had the conscriptionist press been encouraged by even a partial victory. As it is, the people of the two largest provinces have extended arms across the border to shake hands and unite in giving a vote of confidence to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) by electing the ministers he asked them to return and defeating the man who was selected by his enemies to lead a savage assault against him. No matter how the people have voted, this press is at it again. But it is not my intention to bother with them except in one case, that of an article published in the

Ottawa *Citizen* of yesterday, entitled "Racial Policies Cannot Prevail." The *Citizen* is a paper with an excellent tradition of public service to the federal capital, which made my surprise greater to find in it such an article drawing dangerous and false conclusions from the Quebec East election and the vote given to the Nationalist candidate. Would it not have been a better contribution to national unity to point out the marvellous judgment of the 16,000 Quebec electors who elected Mr. St. Laurent rather than to pretend that the 12,000 electors who supported Bouchard have all sombre designs against their fellow-Canadians? A closer study of the past elections in Quebec East would strongly invalidate the conclusions of the *Citizen*. In 1935 a modest Conservative lawyer of Quebec polled 10,000 votes against the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. These were straight party votes—Conservative votes, not Nationalist votes. In 1940, just three days before the election, the Conservative candidate—I mean the national government candidate—was withdrawn and Conservative support, in the hope of defeating Mr. Lapointe, was switched unofficially but efficiently to the Nationalist candidate, Paul Bouchard, the same man who was defeated by the present Minister of Justice; and Bouchard polled 12,000 votes against Mr. Lapointe—the same number of votes he polled against Mr. St. Laurent this week. The source of these votes is easily found by this study of previous election results—unavowed Conservative work to divide Canada and undermine confidence in the Prime Minister. Editors would render more service to the country at this time by helping to make known the accomplishments of the government rather than searching for arguments as weak as those contained in that article in order to divide Canadians one against the other.

As the questions of enlistment and mobilization have been widely discussed in this debate, Mr. Speaker, I will avail myself of the occasion to bring four suggestions to the attention of the government.

The first concerns farmers and farmers' sons. I admit readily that it would be hard to uphold that the agricultural class should benefit by special treatment that is not granted to other classes of people who do their share of war work. The primary consideration is the service rendered to the country by the land tiller and the necessity to maintain or raise the production of food in order to help feed Britain, and, above all, to maintain Canada's health and vigour by proper diets, ensured by increased supplies of food. Therefore what appears to be important is to maintain a sufficient number of experienced men to cultivate the farm lands of the country. Although I am a layman in agriculture, I imagine it could be very easy for experts in that domain to determine how many men are needed to farm land of a definite number of acres with a given type of equipment and a certain number of head of cattle and hogs, and so on. It would be quite easy then to state that a farm of thirty acres operated with horse-drawn implements, with fifteen head of cattle, three horses and the usual small poultry yard, needs so many men. The owner, with three boys of military age, whose farm would fall under a category considered to need three men, and who is still able-bodied, would be allowed to keep two sons on the farm and would give the third to the armed services. This classification of farms could be fairly accurately established, and the decisions of boards of the war services department could then be arrived at with a maximum of security against favoritism and law-evasion.

The second point I meant to mention was the allowances granted to married men enlisting for active service overseas. At present allowances are paid to the wife and for the children up to two. It may be that these figures were arrived at upon statistical data in an apparent scholarly way, but I cannot understand why fathers of large families are discriminated against. It surely is a much greater financial burden to raise six children than two, and it appears therefore that the father of six should in all justice receive more than the father of two. The mother of six children left behind, when the wage-earner of the family enlists, has to feed, clothe and educate six children on the same amount that is received by the mother of two. I cannot understand the justice and equity of such a decision. It is felt in the province of Quebec, where families of more than two children are the majority, that this rule is a discrimination that works against enlistment.

Another anomaly in connection with allowances to dependents of enlisted men has been mentioned to me by one of my constituents, and I report it although I have not yet verified the fact. It is said that the mother of an enlisted unmarried man who was supporting her before his enlistment receives substantially less than does the wife of an enlisted man. If this is true I cannot understand the "what-for" of this discrimination against mothers.

Concerning also allowance to mothers, this other case came to my knowledge. In order to receive an allowance upon the enlistment of her unmarried son a mother must prove her son was supporting her before he enlisted.

There are cases when a young man of eighteen to twenty-one enlists before he ever had a chance to find employment after his coming out of school, and where the mother was painfully supporting her family by hard work. Because the son never had the opportunity to support her before his enlistment, I am told no allowance is paid to the mother.

I submit these problems to the minister and trust he will give the matter further consideration.

My fourth suggestion is to the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). Speaking on the address on November 21, 1940, I stated, as reported at page 328 of *Hansard:*

> . . . that letters to members of the Canadian army should be sent free of charge, and parcels which bring cheer to a man should be sent without costs to the sender. There are many enlisted men whose families have very little personal means. While it may be fairly easy for them to send a piece of cake or some other small gift, when it comes to paying forty or fifty cents postage on a parcel it cuts into their budget quite deeply and they hesitate to send it. The man overseas wonders if his friends have forgotten him. Perhaps it could be arranged to have parcels of a certain size sent free of charge, either through the different units of the army or otherwise. If the government wants to include letters in this scheme, I am all for it. Many of these men have been away from home a long time and they deserve every encouragement they can get from those of us who are in comparative safety in this land across the sea.

I am not aware that anything of the kind has been done. I know that a bill was introduced in the United States Congress to ensure free mail to the American armed forces. I do not know what was the fate of that bill, but I imagine that something could be done here along these lines. I renew my suggestion made a year ago and I think it is just as advisable to-day.

Much has been said, Mr. Speaker, up to now about the plebiscite. I view it as a measure resulting from a desire to keep unity in the country and preserve faith in the given word. I do not think it was necessary, and I think that, had we disregarded the alarm cries of the Tories and the inspired campaign for conscription, we would have rendered a better service to the country. However, if the government consider that a release from their given pledge is going to be more conducive to public confidence in the proper carrying on of the war, the plebiscite is the only proper method for them to use. I do not personally think it necessary, as I said; but how can a man who pretends to fight for democracy and liberty object to a government using the most democratic way to make sure if the people they govern have the same views on certain aspects of the conduct of the war that they had two years ago? I cannot logically vote against such a measure when it is introduced in parliament. As to advice to be given the electorate I have decided to tell my constituents to vote according to their views and their conscience, and I will not attempt to influence them one way or the other.

I did not think it would be necessary, Mr. Speaker, to explain the sentiment of French Canada on conscription for service overseas, but a word from an hon. member appealing to us to abandon what was called our narrow-mindedness on the question indicates there are yet people who do not fully understand our position. I will therefore try briefly to explain it.

French Canada is still and definitely opposed to compulsory service overseas, because French-Canadians are interested only in Canada and nobody has convinced them yet that compulsory service overseas is a necessity for the defence of our land. It looks too much like help to Britain and defence of the empire and too little for the defence of Canada. French-Canadians could be persuaded to accept compulsory service for overseas solely if they knew that it was the only practical way of defending their own country, and it is not an easy task to convince us of that fact. First of all, according to me, expeditionary forces have never been, up to this war, our best and only way of defending our soil, but they have been a way of proving the solidarity of the empire; they have been the product of a patriotic urge of Anglo-Saxons exiled from their homeland but still attached to it.

Our participation in the South African war was of that nature as was, in great part, our participation in the last war. As to the present war, the situation is different: we have to co-operate with all the remaining free nations of the world in the fight to stop barbarism if we are going to survive as a nation. However, in order to do that, we must not endanger our own safety by a wrong conception of our defence problems, and I am of the opinion that there is no necessity of conscription for overseas if a proper mobilization of our human resources is made now for service in Canada, and I will refer to that in a moment.

I was explaining the French-Canadian reaction to conscription. For us there is only one country—Canada—and we do not consider that help to Britain, to maintain British trade and enlarge British benefits, as was the case in our participation in the last war, was worth the cost. French-Canadians were opposed to conscription in the last war because to them it meant only risking their lives for Britain,

for the prestige of the British empire trade in the world, and not for the safeguard of their country.

When the National Resources Mobilization Act was presented in 1940 and the principle was established that compulsory service was provided for Canada and not for participation in overseas expeditions, the vote was unanimous and the two faint murmurs of protest heard in this house had no echo in the hearts or minds of Quebec. Why was this? Because French-Canadians never objected to the defence of their country. They have proved it gallantly in the past. Some of them were even willing to help the empire; they proved it in South Africa, they proved it in 1914, and they are proving it during the present war. But as was said once by a French-Canadian leader, their participation was dictated by their mind, not by their heart.

When it comes to waging the imperial wars of Britain, or when it comes to defending Britain, we are bound to have in Canada different opinions and different viewpoints. You who were born in the British isles, as is the case with seventeen members of this house, or you who are sons of people born in the British isles, and there are fifty-three of you in the house, and all those who are more or less connected by blood to Britain, are bound to feel a call to defend your mother country, to wish to risk the ruin of your adopted country, to give everything for your mother country. It is a noble sentiment and it is bound to exist. You would not be normal if you were not stirred by these patriotic sentiments; and, mind you, I admire all those who hear the call to the defence of their mother country. But I claim that Canadians who are not of British blood who volunteer for service overseas deserve even more admiration. They deserve your gratitude and your respect because they are motivated purely by an enlarged sense of duty to Canada and by a reasoned determination to fight abroad for the preservation of the British institutions under which they have been able to develop.

A few minutes of unbiased thought, Mr. Speaker, should make people realize that men whose families have been established on the same land, or at least in the same part of the country, for from two hundred to three hundred years, are bound to have attachment to and love for their land, their country, and for no other country. They are a homogeneous group whose survival as such, and their expansion into a distinct nationality, is a miracle in itself. It has been attained by considerable sacrifice and self-denial on the part of past generations, and I am yet to find a student of ethnology or of human geography who has not marvelled at the sturdy qualities of the French settlers and their descendants who have fought an unfavourable nature, fierce tribes of aborigines, and numerous battles, to be loyal to their flag, be it French or British. They have done all that because this land was their land and being loyal to their flag meant the defence of their country; but you must try to realize that they cannot have the same feelings of the heart for a distant land, which to most of you is the mother country, but to them is only the source of a governmental system which has given them a fair treatment when vanquished and the opportunity to wangle equality with their fellow citizens with great pains and persistence through their efforts and through their loyalty when the country was attacked.

To them, expeditions to the crown colonies will always remain imperial adventures in which their country, Canada, has no patriotic duty nor material interest; and to them expeditions across the seas will remain help to Britain and they will subscribe to it only as it remains voluntary. They would accept conscription for overseas solely if it could be proven to them that it is the only remaining way of defence of our own territory, and this is and will remain a most debatable question. As for myself I am as much opposed to it to-day as I have been in the past.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is something even more important to consider now than the reaction of a large part of the population of the country to conscription, and it is the study of the situation Canada faces now and how best it can cope with it.

In a world ablaze, in a universe in process of revolution, what was the position Canada could take to ensure its survival, the survival of its liberty, of all the institutions it held as sacred and precious? Could it have remained outside of the conflict, as was suggested by the member who boasted the other night that he had voted against the declaration of war? Could it have remained outside the conflict and survive? I think not. The ethnical composition of the country for one thing would have made it impossible, as two-thirds of the population would not have sat quiet and silent while the country of their fathers was in peril. But more than that, our geographical and economic position, in relation to our southern neighbour, would have made it impossible, and our position both economic and political within the commonwealth of British nations would have made it difficult. Granted, as it is by all clear-thinking citizens, that it had to enter the conflict, Canada was facing two roads to participation; entering the war as a

free nation providing first of all for its own defence, and secondly organizing ways of meeting the enemy and fighting it before it reached our shores; or entering the war as a British dominion to grant all possible help, in men, munitions and food, to the mother country, as was attempted during the last war.

My opinion is that the only way consistent with our status as defined by the act of Westminster was the first alternative. To all intents and purposes this is what has been done and the government is to be thanked for having taken the right road. But it is important to examine whether all the aspects of our war programme have been consistent with our avowed intention of waging the war for Canada and only for Canada. I think, sir, there is no harm in examining what has been done and what could be done.

I am convinced of one thing: this government has up to now done more to arm the country and gear its production for war than is realized by most of its citizens, and this splendid achievement has been reached with a minimum of inconvenience to the normal life of the country, with a wise system of economic adjustment, and while maintaining a better spirit among all citizens in the country, marred only by the alarming, politically-inspired cries of a few survivors of the Tory tribe and a few bitter, poisoned minds of the pseudo-nationalist clique. The government is to be given credit for this accomplishment and there should be no hesitancy in voting confidence in it on the address.

The nature and direction of our war effort has therefore to be looked into to determine whether or not it is the most consistent with our proclaimed goal—the defence of Canada. The programme outlined by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) puts all the emphasis on the expeditionary forces, and although it provides for a certain protection for the country we must candidly admit that it is not entirely adequate protection should an attack be made as was done at Pearl Harbour, for instance. I admit that at the beginning of the war the most urgent need was our participation in the resistance to the enemy far from our shores, and I approve of what was done in that regard. But is it not time to revise some of our theories in view of what is happening in a rapidly evolving war, which to-morrow may mean the invasion of Australia, because it provided too much for meeting the enemy far from its shores and not enough for meeting the enemy at home?

I may be a poor strategist, Mr. Speaker, but my contention is that the time has come to reconsider our commitments for the expeditionary force and to look more after ourselves. A mere look at a map of the country shows that it is impossible to defend its boundaries with our present population. Taking into account our joint defence agreements with the United States, which leave our forces free for our eastern and western boundaries, we are still facing the defence of hundreds of miles of shore line on the Pacific and the Atlantic, including Newfoundland and not overlooking the valley of the St. Lawrence, the direct route to the heart of industrial Canada.

To foresee the future according to my view would mean stationing at least 100,000 men in the maritimes, 50,000 in Newfoundland, 100,000 in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, in order that they may be easily rushed to the defence of the St. Lawrence valley, and 200,000 would not be too many for the Pacific coast. This means that the most elementary defence of the country would need a minimum of 450,000 troops.

Let us look now at our man-power. With a population of 11,500,000, Canada has about 1,102,000 unmarried men or widowers without children between the ages of 18 and 45, and 1,201,000 married men between those ages. According to the statistics of 1931 some 62 per cent of the total active male population was between these ages, and 58 per cent of the population between these ages was engaged in gainful occupations. Also about 60 per cent of the people needed in industry were between these ages, and 55 per cent of the agricultural class also fell between the ages of 18 and 45.

We can therefore take it that more than 50 per cent of that population is essentially needed for the normal life of the country. We are therefore left with 1,150,000 men, married and unmarried, between the ages of 18 and 45. From this figure ten per cent should be deducted as being the lowest number of men of military age who are at present in jobs vital to national defence, or who are neccessary to the agricultural production, to which would already have been reallotted a large number of men unfit for military service or not of military age.

We are therefore left with a rough total of one million men. At least 25 per cent of this number are medically unfit to serve in the army. Even if a reallotment of civilian employment to citizens unfit or beyond military age could be effected with one hundred per cent success, it is highly improbable that it would leave a total available man-power for the armed services of 750,000 men.

We have already 422,000 enlisted in the three services, and the programme for 1942 outlined by the minister demands another

190,000 for overseas service, a total of 612,000 men when the programme is completed. If we carry this programme on where shall we find the men necessary for the immediate defence of the country?

My view is that our forces should be divided into two distinct categories, the Canadian territorial army and the Canadian expeditionary force. The territorial army could be mobilized through selective service under the National Resources Mobilization Act, which provides all the authority necessary to do it. This army should be trained in sufficient numbers and in the same manner as the active service force is now trained, and enough of the troops scheduled now to go abroad should be kept in Canada and assigned to this army so that the country would at all times have the necessary minimum protection.

The United States army is now spread on all the battlefields of the world, yet I doubt whether they will not keep at home enough troops for their defence. Every country should think of itself, of its own protection first. Britain did it at all times since the start of the war, and she did well. She kept a huge army at home, considering it more important—and rightly so—than to send vast armies to the other points it had to defend in order to maintain the empire intact. My contention is that Canada now should do the same.

As to the Canadian expeditionary army, it already constitutes a magnificent contribution to the fight for freedom, but should be limited in the future to a size consistent with the safety of Canada at home. Its organization should be revised so as to make it possible to reinforce, maintain and equip it while keeping a sufficient protection for the country itself.

Needless to say, the expeditionary army would be recruited, like the navy and the air force, by voluntary enlistment of civilians not yet called to the colours, and by a steady flow of volunteers from the ranks of the territorial army, which would be composed of men drafted under the selective service system. With such a balanced plan, Canada, like other belligerents, would look after its security at home while at the same time doing its share in stemming the tide of the invader on other continents.

My views may not be acceptable to the minister or his advisers, but I thought it my duty to express them to-day, encouraged as I was by the reading of British *Hansard*. In the British House of Commons every other day supporters of the government press forward their suggestions on the conduct of the war, which seem to be accepted in the best spirit, even if they are not always adopted.

Mr. GREEN: May I ask the hon. member a question before he passes from that? Does he not think it would be wise to extend the provisions of the National Resources Mobilization Act so that the troops serving under that act could at least be sent to say Newfoundland, Labrador and Alaska?

Mr. PICARD: Personally I would have no objection to Newfoundland, Labrador and Alaska. I would approve of that as long as it extended to continental defence. I shall speak in a moment of a meeting I had with my own constituents at which I explained to them the same plan, and I did not hear or find many protests against that, so long as it was limited to continental hemispheric defence, which was more especially concerned with the defence of our own territory.

In conclusion, I wish to state that I shall vote for the address, because I have confidence in the Prime Minister, and I think his government deserves credit for their handling of the war effort. I might differ, as I have outlined previously, on certain methods adopted for home defence and the expeditionary force; nevertheless I consider that the government have done a splendid job and deserve approval.

As to the plebiscite, I shall approve of the measure when brought before the house, as I explained at the beginning of my remarks. And I should like, although as a newcomer in this house, I have no particular authority to do so, to make an appeal to all hon. members from my province to stand by the Prime Minister in this hour of crisis, as have stood by him the electorate of Quebec and Montreal as well as of Toronto and Welland. I am pleased to have been privileged to take part in the Quebec East by-election; it was a satisfaction to speak to crowds of serious-looking people intent on giving an intelligent verdict based on moderation and understanding and not on bigotry and prejudice. Previous to that I had invited eighty leaders from my own constituency to meet me in Quebec; one hundred and twenty came. I explained to them my attitude, told them what I have said here to-day, and I received their approval of it. Anyone would have had the same result.

I appeal to my colleagues from Quebec who might be hesitant to vote for the address. They will make no mistake in supporting the Prime Minister and the government. Let not the splendid lesson in national unity given this week by Ontario and Quebec go unheeded. The results of the four by-elections were the fruit of tolerance. Tolerance, the hope of the

world, may yet save Canada. Let us all work to that end, in the same spirit of cooperation for victory.

Mr. A. G. SLAGHT (Parry Sound): Mr. Speaker, permit me first to congratulate my good friends the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier), the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald), the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) and the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore), upon their very fine contributions to this debate. The excellence of their addresses was not a surprise to me, because I was privileged to travel with them for a month throughout the mother country, where they presented Canada's position to the people of the motherland in a way creditable indeed. I endorse to the full, in order to save time and not repeat it in detail, what was so well put by the hon. member for Lethbridge with reference to the friendship engendered among all six of us on our English trip, and also his tribute to the devotion and hospitality of our hosts over there and the thoughtfulness of those on this side of the water who made our trip possible.

Much has already been said in this house by my associates in that journey, about the trip itself, so I shall content myself with looking forward to making addresses throughout the country, as I have already done in part, in order that those not so fortunate as we were may better understand the devastation, the sorrow and the destruction which we found; but also, transcending all that, the quiet, grim determination of the British people in all walks of life to see this war through to final victory. We did not confine our visit to the well-to-do people or the white-collar folk. We went down into the holds of ships; we went through the dockyards; we saw the trawler men; we talked with people at work at their machines in the munition factories, to farmers tilling the soil and to our own soldiers and airmen, in order that we might learn at first hand the very innermost life of the British people. From the humblest, battered home right through the picture to Buckingham Palace we as Canadians were received with the utmost cordiality and friendship. At the many places we visited and the many receptions, luncheons and dinners we enjoyed, people who previously had been strangers to us were eager to listen to the story of our Canadian war effort, and in every case seemed reluctant to let us go on our way. Let me conclude this reference by saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that everywhere we went, the British people were happy and contented with Canada and Canada's war effort, and they marvelled that we had been able to do so much.

[Mr. Picard.]

Let me now turn to a consideration of the speech from the throne, and first I desire to utter a friendly word to my friends from the province of Quebec. Personally I have a great regard for the province of Quebec and its people. I number among my warmest and most cherished friends Canadians of French descent both within and without this House of Commons. I have the most abiding faith in their loyalty to the British empire, and there is still fresh in my mind a picture of the devastated homes of old France, of the sufferings, the sacrifices and the magnificent contributions made by that country, now suffering under the cruel heel of a conquering enemy, side by side with us in the last great war. To those of my friends from Quebec who entertain genuine doubts as to the wisdom of the course being pursued by this government, let me point out in the most friendly spirit that we must be free to adopt whatever course the welfare of our country demands, whether it be compulsory service for overseas or whether voluntary enlistment should prove fully to meet the needs. I appeal to them for their support for this plebiscite; for their continuing contribution, as in the past, to the various armed forces of this country, in order to throw back into their teeth the words of those hot-headed, uncharitable people who may by evil or insulting speeches impugn the loyalty of the great French-Canadian race to the British empire.

Never was there a time in history when the people of that great race, by their conduct toward this plebiscite, by their continuing voluntary enlistment, have had such a splendid opportunity to prove once and for all that this country is united and will go through to victory as a powerful national unit, in order that we may take our place at the peace table and make our voice heard in the final declarations that will settle the future happiness of the civilized world. Nor does the disturbance last night in Montreal, referred to in the press to-day, much as it is to be regretted, indicate to me anything more than that a small, misguided group of youths, stirred up by inflammatory doctrine, saw fit for the moment to carry on unseemly demonstrations. Let us not forget that when the Duplessis government of Quebec went to the people, there was much more noise of a disruptive character than occurred last night. At that time the great French-Canadian people had their opportunity to weigh the effort that was made to take them away from their loyalty to Britain; and after that misguided campaign, to use a mild expression, they gave an overwhelming answer to those who desired

to take them down a path that could only lead ultimately to the destruction of the unity of this country.

Before I deal with the plebiscite, Mr. Speaker, permit me to make a personal statement as to my conception of my duty in connection with this war. I will take from no man any imputation that I have not always striven to place our country at the side of the motherland and to take the most effective possible measures to defeat our enemies and make victory sure. On March 24, 1938, I begged this House of Commons to double the estimates for the air service in Canada. I urged the house to set up training schools across Canada, at Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, the Royal Military College at Kingston, Toronto, Winnipeg, Calgary, Regina, Vancouver and Victoria, to turn out 8,000 well trained men, consisting of one thousand pilots who would be capable of operating the highest speed machines, with seven thousand mechanics on the ground to service them. I told the house on that occasion we would have 8,000 men who, in my humble judgment, would be of as great value in war time as 200,000 men would be, enlisted in the other branches of the service, and who would make a greater contribution to empire war service and to empire defence. Not a word of encouragement or approval for such a course did I obtain from any of my hon. friends sitting across from me, or, in fact, from any of the members of the house.

The following session, on May 13, 1939—and note the date—for which year the estimates for the air service had been notably increased, being brought down at $29,000,000, I again urged the house to double that year's appropriation, repeated my plea of the year before, and again urged for its support grounds which I have just detailed to hon. members.

On that occasion, I made a statement relative to the use those 8,000 trained airmen would be. My statement is found at page 4041 of *Hansard* as follows:

> I have verified this by conversation with one of the greatest airmen of the world, a distinguished Canadian. . . .

I had had the privilege of doing that, before speaking. The statement I verified was that 8,000 trained airmen, 1,000 of whom would be pilots, would be as great a contribution to defence as 200,000 men in the other forces.

Not a word of support on that occasion. Let me be fair to the then Minister of National Defence, the present Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie). On both occasions before speaking I secured his approval for my urging upon the house the adoption of this proposal. If it had been adopted, what untold value such a force might have been at Dunkirk, or at Hong Kong, or to-day at Singapore, or to-morrow in British Columbia.

I do not wish to be misunderstood in recalling my plea of 1938 and 1939 when I got no response from the house. I felt strongly on the subject. I could have followed it up in the country with speeches on public platforms. I did not do so. Therefore I am as much to be indicted as any other hon. member for not having followed up what seemed to me something we should then do, and something which involved the youth of our land going across and fighting in the British channel in defence of the motherland. Therefore there is no question about it, so far as I am concerned, that I approved meeting the enemy anywhere he might be found.

There recently appeared on the horizon a new leader for the great Conservative party. When he appeared on the horizon, when some by-elections were in sight, with the possible exception of that caused by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) who, I am sorry, is not at the moment in his seat—he is a friend of mine, and one for whom I have high regard —there was no pother or stir about the question of conscription or compulsory service for overseas. In the house and in the country we had travelled down the road of preparation. Canada was making a splendid contribution, with not only national unity and cooperation up to that time among various peoples of different racial origin throughout the country, but also real and honest cooperation among the various parties and groups in the house who, in the main, have all directed their efforts toward a united front in the prosecution of the war.

Speaking only for myself—and I want to be the one to say this—I think it is time in the debate to pay tribute to the leader of the official Conservative opposition (Mr. Hanson), and to his group in the house; also to the leaders of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation and Social Credit groups, whose friendship I cherish, and have had the privilege of developing in an intimate way in the past few months.

Nor would it be fair for me to close my speech without reference to the Hon. R. J. Manion who, during part of the war period, led his party in the house, who, since, has followed and is still following the splendid example set by Wendell Willkie in the United States, and who under this government is now conducting a most important an onerous war task, as director of the A.R.P. activities throughout Canada. I am told he is doing an extremely good job of it.

I say this, not because we have not had differences, and sometimes a bit of heat across the floor of the chamber—and not only across the floor of the chamber, but some fairly warm blasts and counterblasts passing up and down the side-lines on the other side of the chamber among men who differ from each other on various points. But the point I emphasize right now—and I am glad to do it—is that all groups in the house have cooperated splendidly for the common purpose. What I want to deprecate is that, fanned up by partisan influence, by expletive, high-powered adjectives and denunciation, a little group of high-powered politicians outside the house have picked this time, on the eve of our new victory loan, to try to tear the country wide apart, when there is no need in the world to do so.

A number of people in Canada are in favour of compulsory service for overseas, beginning right now. Many hold to the honest opinion that conditions have changed, that they have become more serious, and that the need for increased man-power has brought us to the place where, in their view, voluntary enlistment has perhaps begun to lag a little, and the other system should be adopted. But do not let us forget that right down to a month ago, when this new politician appeared on the scene and stirred the kettle with inflammatory attacks upon the government—a government by the way which had graciously refused to oppose him in York South—down to that time, I say, practically everybody in Canada had endorsed and approved the system of voluntary enlistment, a system which is now so viciously attacked by those who heretofore voted for and supported it.

My hon. friends of the Conservative party across the floor, with the single exception of the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church), of whom I am not sure—and I stand corrected if in any way I am in error—all came into the house and were elected under the banner of the Hon. R. J. Manion in March, 1940, and all adopted Mr. Manion's platform, the man who was their leader, in calling for a so-called national government. They worked for him and he worked for them, and they were elected under that banner.

Let me place on *Hansard* what their leader on their behalf and for himself pledged the people of Canada on March 4, 1940. Two weeks before polling he issued a press release, only two paragraphs of which I shall place on record:

> Conscription to my mind was a failure in the last war, as it raised only about 10,000 men out of more than 500,000, and it stirred up much misunderstanding in our country. For that reason and because conscription is not necessary in this war, and because as I have said on other occasions, it is the duty of a public man to hold Canada together as a nation, I am absolutely opposed to conscription.

My hon. friends opposite—and if I am not right, let them stand up and say so—adopted the policy of this Conservative leader, as enunciated to the people. They went to their constituencies and made speeches, tacitly relying, at all events, on the platform he was putting forward, and owing their seats in the house to-day to that kind of pledge.

But that is not all. I have a word for my hon. friends of the two other parties. The leader of the Social Credit party, (Mr. Blackmore), a good friend of mine, said this on May 26:

> The Liberal party obtained the mandate of the people in the last election while opposing the conscription of man-power. It is clear therefore that the question of conscription is a dead issue in Canada until another mandate is given by the people at a new election.

My hon. friend always stands by his word.

The leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party, (Mr. Coldwell)—I am sorry he is not in his seat at the moment,—as reported in the *Globe* of March 14, reiterated his party's unalterable opposition to conscription, and I think my hon. friends will feel that I am fair when I say that that was their policy in the last election. It is small wonder that we do not hear Doctor Manion's voice supporting his party in this campaign. He believes in the Willkie way of doing things. That is why every place you turn, Mr. Speaker, you get right back to the one man who has stirred up this whole agitation, the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, the man who prided himself for years as one of the leaders of a party whose slogan was, "No truck or trade with the Yankees." That was emblazoned on banners above his platform at his political meetings. He is the same man who accepted from former Prime Minister Bennett a seat in that other place and supported Mr. Bennett in his campaign to blast Canada's way into the markets of the United States and of the world. Are the people of Canada to trade our magnificent Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) who is the leader of this country to-day, for this "no truck or trade" politician and this "blaster" fellow? Is he the right man to place at the head of this country when we have just concluded a treaty with the United States for the mutual defence of North America, and when we have sitting to-day a joint commission for the greater protection of North America, and have established the most friendly relations between Canada and the United States that have ever existed since

confederation? Is he the type of man to lead Canada through a war when only within the last few weeks the United States have said to us, "We will give you equal priorities with us on our steel. We have got our arms around your shoulders. We want your nickel in return for some of the things you want, but we will go hand in hand with you from now on." Could they entirely forget that he affronted them a few short years ago with the most insulting slogan that ever man tried to ride into office on—"no truck or trade with the Yankees"? Over there, "Yankee" is a word that is used only when somebody tries to insult someone. He is the leader you are asked to place in power as against the present Prime Minister, who has devoted at least the last five years of his life most faithfully and earnestly to cultivating, fostering and cementing the most friendly feelings and relations not only between Canada and the United States but also between Great Britain and the United States. This man has lived to see his dream come true, and is he to be rewarded with vilification and abuse because, instead of breaking his word to the people as these outside Tories would have him do, he proposes to ask the people to relieve him from the solemn pledge he gave and which every other member of this House of Commons on both sides of the house gave to their people either by implication or directly?

What is all this bother about? Stripped of its political trappings and torn from its coating of hypocrisy, it all boils down to a denunciation of the government because they want to permit the people of Canada to give them a free hand to enact whatever measures they may deem to be best in the interests of this country.

I was glad to hear my hon. friend the member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas), with whom I am not always in accord, state that he believes the proper form of government was, when a pledge had been given, to consult the people on the great issues before forcing something to the contrary down their throats.

Let me quote an authority that I commend to my hon. friends of the French-Canadian race. In 1917 our great and departed leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, after the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, who was then leading the government, had proposed a measure of compulsory service overseas without consulting the people in any way, begged Sir Robert not to ram this measure down the throats of the people of Canada but to consult them in a referendum, and this is the language he used on that occasion, which will be found at page 2403 of *Hansard* of June 18, 1917:

> What I propose is that we should have a referendum and a consultation of the people upon this question. I have taken the referendum, not that I have been very favourable towards it, but I find that the idea of the referendum has made enormous progress in Canada, and that it has been adopted by the political associations in the western provinces as a method of political action.

My hon. friends from the west will be prepared to bear out the statement of those early days. Sir Wilfrid goes on:

> If we are to have peace, if there is to be unity, we must meet the wishes of the labouring classes, who have asked for this privilege. When the consultation with the people has been had, when the verdict has been pronounced, I pledge my word, my reputation that to the verdict, such as it is, every man will submit, and I claim to speak at least so far as is concerned the province from which I come.

I commend to my French-Canadian fellow members as they pass that great statue standing in our grounds, in this noble enclosure on parliament hill, to remember at least those words of their great leader; and, following them, they cannot go far astray.

Two main points have been advanced against the taking of the plebiscite. First, that it will cost some money, estimated, I think properly, at about one and a half million dollars—out of a total annual expenditure of three billion dollars. Is it worth a million and a half dollars to have a government which has kept its word instead of breaking it? Is it worth a million and a half dollars and sixty or seventy days of time to have a government carry on the business of the country in war time which cannot be pointed at with an accusing finger and told by the people of the country, "Your word is no good. You have breached your trust to me." I am going to watch with interest if and when my hon. friends of the Conservative party rise and bow to a negation of this plebiscite because if they do, and vote against it, who that listened to their pledges of that day can not but come and say, "You are a liar?" And what will their answer be? "Oh, well, but, my dear friend, times have changed." Let my hon. friends take that course if they see fit. They are only—I do not hold this against them—a small item in this House of Commons proportionately. But I do not want the government, the great Liberal party in this house, to have to sit with a blush of shame on their cheeks when any of their constituents who heard them make that pledge come forward and say, "You are a liar." And that is what they can do unless this simple, honourable course of consulting the people is taken.

Does any honest man—I put it that way because this is one of the arguments we have heard used, although I do not think it has been used in this chamber; I have unfor-

tunately not been here all the time—does any honest man say that those reinforcements now under arms in Canada in the active service army who have volunteered to go overseas if we want to send them, the 120,000 of them now in uniform, are not sufficient to replace even the most dire casualties which might occur in our overseas army of 130,000 men? That is sheer political bunk, fed to the people to inflame them. That sort of inflammatory, false argument is whipped up to try to create political prejudice against this government in the minds of those splendid people—fathers, mothers, wives and sisters—who have menfolk in the army overseas. This whole move is largely an effort to defeat our Prime Minister. It is directed to him by some gentlemen who want to get rid of him. I am glad to see that the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) has returned to his seat. Not long ago I paid him a personal tribute which I desire to repeat in his presence; he has not had, perhaps, many friends politically.

We know what the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen thinks and says about the Prime Minister of Canada. We know also the views of a little group of other gentlemen. I am going to put on *Hansard* the opinions of some men who are not interested in playing politics in Canada. The first one to whom I refer is the Right Hon. Winston Spencer Churchill, who on September 4, 1941, said, in London, with regard to our war effort:

> The war effort of Canada is immense in ships, aircraft, air training, in finance and in food, and constitutes an element in the resistance of the British empire without which that resistance could not be successfully maintained.

Then, speaking to the distinguished gathering which had cheered our leader's outstanding address in the Guildhall a few months before, Mr. Churchill said of our Canadian war Prime Minister:

> To-day you have listened to a memorable and momentous declaration made here amid our ruins of London. You have listened to a speech which, I think, all those who have heard it will feel, explains the long-continued authority which Mr. Mackenzie King has wielded when, during more than fifteen years, he has been Prime Minister of Canada.

Then this further tribute: Mr. Churchill said, with regard to our Prime Minister:

> You have a great knowledge of the flexible organization, a system ever changing and expanding, yet ever growing into a greater harmony, by which the British commonwealth of nations is conducted.
>
> You have also knowledge of your own people and your association with them is so long and so intimate it has enabled you to realize and express in these hours of trouble a more complete unity of Canada than has ever before been achieved.

If you were jurors on a lawsuit, would you prefer the evidence of Arthur Meighen or the evidence of Winston Churchill?

Mr. LOCKHART: The smashing of windows in Montreal does not look very much like unity.

Mr. SLAGHT: Well, without being unfair to the hon. member, that is the sort of talk which, if it is indulged in on the floor of this house, will tear this country limb from limb. Did my hon. friend hear the Duplessis talk from Quebec for a time, and does he not remember that, with the aid of the leaders of the government of this house, and the sound, sane thinking people of Quebec, Duplessis was snowed under and disgraced by the vote of the overwhelming majority of the people of that province?

Just one more tribute from Mr. Winston Churchill, and this, remember, after he and the great president of the United States had met upon a vessel in the Atlantic ocean. He said:

> Canada, with those relations of friendly, affectionate intimacy with the United States on the one hand and with her unswerving fidelity to the British commonwealth and motherland on the other is the link which joins together these great branches of the human family. In Mr. King we have a Canadian statesman who always has preserved the most intimate relations with the great republic of the United States and whose name and voice are honoured there as they are on this side of the Atlantic.
>
> I had an opportunity of meeting the president of the United States a few weeks ago and I know from him of the great esteem in which Mr. Mackenzie King is held and how much he has contributed to joining together in close, sympathetic action, the republic of the United States and the Dominion of Canada. Canada is the linchpin of the English-speaking world.

What does General McNaughton say, that man for whom I fancy every hon. member has the greatest and highest esteem and regard? What did he say in his message to the Canadian troops at Christmas time? It has already been put upon *Hansard*, of February 5, 1942, at page 346, and I shall not read it all, but I shall just quote that passage wherein he says:

> From a very small beginning the Canadian army has now grown to many tens of thousands of men and women. New units and formations and reserves have come to us as quickly as ships could be found to bring them here, and as they have arrived the organization of our military headquarters, reinforcement units, hospitals, schools, repair establishments and many other needed facilities have been pressed forward; . . .
>
> Throughout this long period of preparation which circumstances have given us, the corps, divisions, armoured formations and other field units have been completed in equipment, and trained together and with squadrons of the Royal Canadian Air Force assigned to army cooperation.

That is the tribute. Is it false or is it true? Who will stand up and gainsay the language of General McNaughton? Yet, by implication, a great many of those who have denounced the war effort of this government are doing just that thing.

Let me appeal to my hon. friends opposite. I suppose it is too much to expect that they would drop their amendment and let this house get on as a unit. Let us have this plebiscite; let us bring in the bill next week or as fast as possible, put it through, and take the plebiscite. I have the greatest faith that every province in this dominion, when that plebiscite is taken, will entrust this government with continued control of the Canadian war effort.

One point which has been advanced against the plebiscite by a great many, including I believe Mr. Drew—I am not sure whether any hon. member has raised it—is, "If you hold a plebiscite, what will they say of us in the United States? Oh, that will be terrible! What will they have to say of us?"

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Let us vote on this question this afternoon.

Mr. SLAGHT: What did the hon. member say?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I said, about your question of withdrawing the amendment, why not call a vote right now, and get along with the business of the house?

Mr. SLAGHT: How would you vote if it were called?

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I would vote for the amendment and, if it were defeated, I would go into my riding and ask them all to vote "yes" as fast as possible.

Mr. SLAGHT: I commend the hon. member for that; he is a splendid adherent to the cause. Let my friends who feel that way about the United States console themselves with this. The New York *Times* is admittedly the greatest friend of Britain so far as daily newspapers across the border are concerned, and it stands almost in a class by itself. This is what that great organ, expressing public opinion in that great republic, has to say. On January 26 the *Times* said editorially:

> . . . that when opponents of conscription in Canada assert that the forthcoming plebiscite will throw doubt upon the dominion's "exertion of her full power" in the war, "her friends—and we are all her friends—must protest."

That is what our friends in the United States are protesting—the statements made by the opponents of this plebiscite.

There is one matter to which I should like to turn for a moment if I may be allowed to do so. It has nothing to do with the plebiscite, but to me it is important. I refer to the question of our introducing as rapidly as possible a system of parliamentary secretaryships. The house may recall—and this is non-political, I am sure—that in the speech from the throne in 1936 there appeared this clause, that there would be brought in a bill to provide for the creation of parliamentary secretaryships. I had the honour to move the address in reply on that occasion, and I used in *Hansard* certain language in which I commended the idea. I suppose most young speakers commend the speech from the throne, and I did so on that occasion, giving the reasons therefor. This is what I said on that occasion—I hope hon. members will bear with me because the matter is, in my judgment, ten times more important now than it was at that time—and I commend it to the consideration of the Prime Minister and of the government. I said, as reported at page 31 of *Hansard* of 1936:

> Then we find a proposal to create parliamentary secretaryships, and this proposal will, I hope, meet with the approval of every hon. member of this house. It is established in the mother of parliaments, and I believe is fully approved by British statesmen regardless of party affiliations. It should create the building up in this house of a body of men who because of the experience gained as under-secretaries will be better able in the future to carry on the responsible duties attaching to cabinet positions. I fancy that the right hon. leader of the opposition and some of those who sit beside him will agree with me that it will afford a measure of relief to the ministers of the day who can very properly turn over some of the exacting details of their offices to under-secretaries, and do so without impairing the efficiency of their work. From every viewpoint I submit to the house that this administrative reform is one that will be found of benefit to Canada.

My recent visit to England has confirmed me tenfold in that view, and I will mention one incident. We were privileged to visit eleven cabinet ministers, including every member of the war cabinet, for half an hour privately in their rooms. I was in Mr. Herbert Morrison's room, and there was with him, a young gentleman, a member of the house, whom he introduced as his parliamentary secretary. Mr. Morrison turned to him at times for verification of certain figures, and this young gentleman was very helpful. I said to Mr. Morrison, "I don't suppose you could carry on without your parliamentary secretary." He answered, "Carry on? I could not possibly. I have three parliamentary secretaries, and with them I find it difficult to dc all the work I have to do." And why not? There is plenty of material in this house. There are eighteen members of this house whom I

could mention. Of course, I have not the privilege of picking either cabinet associates or parliamentary secretaries. I am putting this on *Hansard* merely as a recommendation to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. Let me run over the list as rapidly as possible. There are the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Bradette), the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. McCann), the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. McNiven), the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck), the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross), the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Edwards), the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. McKinnon), the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. McIlraith), the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid). Those bagpipes would, I am sure, give an extra swirl if we had the hon. member for New Westminster as a parliamentary secretary. Then there is a wealth of material from Quebec—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Why stop there?

Mr. SLAGHT: I don't. I could name twenty more just as good as the eighteen. Let me mention some, and I think my hon. friend will agree with me. There are the hon. member for Laurier (Mr. Bertrand), the hon. member for St. Antoine-Westmount (Mr. Abbott), the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Claxton), for example; and down in the maritimes there is the member for Pictou (Mr. McCulloch). One could go across the floor of the house and find some splendid men there as wartime material for parliamentary secretaryships—and I am sincere in this.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. SLAGHT: My friend says "no." I remind him that this is war time—there is a war on. What better material could one have than the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Green)?

Mr. GREEN: You had better stay on your own side.

Mr. SLAGHT: Do I understand that you decline?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Will my hon. friend allow me? He is making a very constructive suggestion—there is no doubt about it—and one that is worthy of great consideration. But during the last war Sir Robert Borden tried that question of under-secretaries, and it was abandoned. I have often wondered why. I do not know.

Mr. SLAGHT: Perhaps he did not have the material I am now suggesting. Then there is the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), for whom I have high respect. There is the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis). Where is he now? He is a man with a real knowledge of labour problems; if he threw off the mantle of politics, I believe he would be an able under-secretary to the Minister of Labour, and in that capacity he would make a great contribution to Canada's war effort.

That is my view of the war. I speak for myself alone, but I commend this idea to the government of the day.

One word more if I have time. I wish to say something about British Columbia, and I am sorry that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) is not at the moment in his seat. May I refer to British Columbia and the Japanese situation and the fifth column in that province?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has exceeded his time, and he may proceed only with unanimous consent.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. SLAGHT: I will be brief. The fifth-column question, the matter of internment, is one to which I have devoted myself particularly for the last two years, under the guidance of, in cooperation with, and at the request of the late lamented Minister of Justice, to whose memory I pay great tribute to-day. I know something about this matter. I went to British Columbia at my own expense a year ago to look into the Japanese question, and I say this to the Minister of National Defence: Get those interned Japs across the mountains out of British Columbia without any more delay. You cannot move too fast. Three days from now you may be too late.

An hon. MEMBER: One day.

Mr. SLAGHT: Well, one day, if you like. But let us have it done. Someone says, "But where will you house them?" Well, two or three contractors from Calgary or Edmonton could put up temporary housing for 1,500 or 2,000 men in two or three weeks' time, and they could be taken care of, fed, guarded and protected.

One word more and I close. I am on the indulgence of the house. To what was the downfall of Norway due? The Quislings within. When did she learn of that danger? Not until the hun was over the border into Norway and the traitors cropped up like mushrooms overnight. To what was the downfall of France, Belgium, Holland due? The cream of the British army, 350,000 men, found that Hitler had whipped eight million men in thirty-three days. Why? Because of enemy treachery from within. There is no question about that. Now then, do not let us wait. We have the machinery; we have

them picked up in the area proclaimed to be a war area; let us get them out of that province before irreparable damage may be done. I offer that as my view, from one who thinks he knows something about the matter, to my hon. friend the Minister of National Defence.

In our present dilemma, which is indeed grave—and we await news that may be yet more so—my word to this house, and a word which I believe can govern the attitude of any man who wants us to give an all-out effort to win this war, is this—I use the language of Mr. Churchill.

We have great reason for vigilance and concern, but no room for despair.

Mr. CHARLES PARENT (Quebec West and South) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, since the opening of this debate a considerable degree of unrest has been noticeable on all sides. The intemperate language used by some hon. members shows that the war of nerves started by the Toronto committee of 200 has reached us.

Be assured, Mr. Speaker, that in submitting my reasons for voting against the address and the proposed plebiscite I shall be brief and moderate.

The discussion so far has revealed the existence in this house of four distinct schools of thought. This shows how difficult it is to appraise the government's attitude and to make it acceptable to the various groups.

The first school of thought endorses the government's war policy such as it was originally, that is, free, voluntary and moderate, the result of a compromise due to the firm attitude of the Quebec leaders. This school, by its support of the proposed plebiscite, is taking an alarming turn towards what may become to-morrow a coercive, non-voluntary and immoderate war policy.

Many hon. members, I know, are supporting the plebiscite while reserving the right to vote against the conscription bill when it comes before the house. It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that once freed from its pledges the government will not have to bring in a conscription bill, as it already has all the power required to achieve this end. I do not object to the principle of a plebiscite, but I maintain that the government has no right to use such a measure for the purpose of allowing the majority to repudiate sacred pledges given to a minority.

The second school of thought is that of the Tory element. After hearing the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), one can say with Abraham: "It is the hand of Esau, but the voice of Jacob." The Toronto committee of 200 has voiced its demand for a total effort with conscription, but not conscription of wealth, for that would too seriously affect their bank accounts.

It is scarcely necessary to say that I intend to vote against the amendment proposed by the leader of the opposition.

The third school of thought is led by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). I must admit that the hon. gentleman has shown a praiseworthy consistency, since he preaches in 1942 what he preached in 1939. He advocates a total war effort with conscription of man-power, of industry, of resources and of wealth. I must regretfully say, however, that I do not share his views and that I shall vote against the amendment to the amendment.

The fourth school has no leader, but it has an ideal—a Canadian ideal. We acknowledge that we have certain duties and certain obligations towards England, but within reasonable limits and in proportion to our means. We recognize that our only country is Canada and that it is Canada that we must defend and that we are ready to defend. This school of thought has endorsed without recrimination Canada's war effort which was to be free, voluntary and moderate. It has accepted every compromise for the sake of national unity, but to-day it refuses to go a step farther, for fear of prejudicing this same national unity. Solemn pledges were given to the electors at the 1940 general election. Whatever the cost, we insist on respecting these pledges.

That school of thought is of the opinion that the government can no more release themselves of their undertaking through a plebiscite than could ten endorsers relieve themselves from any obligation to pay a note through voting one and all against their creditor. Let us remember that this compromise was agreed upon by the province of Quebec on the one hand and by all the provinces of Canada on the other. Quebec alone could renounce its vested rights.

If I now take the responsibility of voting against the address and the proposed plebiscite, it is that I am determined to honour my undertaking and because I believe this plebiscite will constitute a dangerous precedent, for, by this measure the government is taking a great step towards conscription for overseas service.

Lapointe possessed great parliamentary experience, a deep understanding of law and a knowledge of the meaning and implications of words. Never did he leave any door open, however, in his statements on conscription. He had been in the house with Laurier in 1917. He had approved Laurier on the referendum. But the experience of 1917 had taught him a lesson. He was acquainted with all

democratic methods of consulting the people. Nevertheless, in making his statement on conscription Lapointe always burnt his bridges behind him. He consented every sacrifice, but would not leave the weapon of the plebiscite in the hands of the majority to overcome the minority.

Lapointe never said: "I will never agree to conscription until it has been voted by the people through a plebiscite or referendum". He quite positively and definitely stated: "I shall never accept conscription nor will I remain a member of a government which would enforce it". As the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Lacroix) so aptly recalled, Lapointe said: "Never".

Mr. POULIOT: Hear, hear.

Mr. PARENT: On June 18th, 1940, he stated before the whole country that the province of Quebec opposed compulsory service for overseas, that he would oppose such a measure and that were it suggested by the government he would cease to be a member of such government. Lapointe's undertakings as regards conscription for overseas service constitute his political will. Let us respect it.

Mr. POULIOT: Hear, hear.

Mr. PARENT: It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that Quebec is opposed to conscription for overseas service. That is true. We have a great many reasons for opposing it. In order to understand such an attitude one must be acquainted with Quebec's soul. Its state of mind, its character and its education are the result of three centuries of struggle, resolute labour, steadfastness and faith in its mission.

How truly has the author of "Maria Chapdelaine" said:

> We came here three centuries ago and we have remained. Those who brought us here could return among us without bitterness or sorrow, for while it is true that we have not learned much, we have certainly forgotten nothing. We brought from overseas our prayers and our songs; they have remained ever the same. We have brought within our breasts our countrymen's hearts, valiant and vivacious, as open to pity as to mirth, the most human of all human hearts. Our creed, our language, our virtues and even our failings become sacred, intangible things, and will remain so to the end.

The province of Quebec does not forget that it has nearly 2,700,000 French Canadians as compared with about 650,000 people of all other extractions. Nor does it forget that the average Quebec family has four children against less than two in the other provinces. Owing to that very fact, conscription would mean to Quebec a sacrifice proportionately far greater than to the other provinces.

The province of Quebec does not forget either that taxes fall more heavily upon its families, that in the economic, financial and administrative fields, it has had to overcome formidable handicaps in order to survive, and that conscription would mean the upsetting of its entire economy.

It would be a mistake to believe that our national life draws its sole inspiration from France. Most French Canadian families can trace back their ancestors over a period of one, two or three centuries, and I do not think there are to-day one hundred French Canadian families with relatives in France. Such a fact makes it clear that Canada is the French Canadians' home land and that Quebec especially represents for them the result of labour accomplished by many generations, that they are determined to live and die there but, above all, they are ready to defend the Canadian soil against anyone who might attempt to conquer it.

I can conceive that such a state of mind is hard to understand for some of our English-speaking fellow citizens who live in Canada but whose minds and hearts are in England. We do not have among our people a Lord Beaverbrook, a Viscount Bennett, a Beverley Baxter or a George W. Weston. Those men after acquiring wealth in Canada have left our shores to spend their declining years in England.

The province of Quebec does not forget either that it enjoys a certain measure of freedom, but it is well enough acquainted with history to know that whatever it enjoys was only obtained after hard struggles and that, besides, it is not the debtor but rather the creditor of Britain.

It is all too frequently forgotten how generous and loyal Quebec was in 1775, 1812 and 1914. Vimy, Courcelette, Ypres, Passchendaele give striking evidence that after the lapse of one hundred years, we have fully preserved the virtues and gallantry of our fathers.

The province of Quebec also remembers the days of 1917 and better propaganda than is now going on will have to be used if our young men are to be brought to believe that Canada's first defence line is in England.

I represent a constituency in the city of Quebec where decent and peaceful citizens were killed during the 1917 troubles, and my electors knew when they gave me their confidence in 1940, that I would honour my pledges and protect their interests.

Mr. Speaker, these are a few of the reasons why Quebec is opposed to conscription for overseas service; many others could be enu-

merated but there is no point in taking up the time of the house. I have mentioned enough to justify my vote against the address and the plebiscite.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the province of Quebec is opposed to conscription for overseas service, but it is not opposed to the war effort through voluntary enlistment. Religious and civil authorities have been generous in their support of the Canadian war effort, but the Government have enlisted this loyal support by committing themselves not to resort to conscription for overseas service. Let us keep our word.

From certain quarters, we hear that these pledges were made by the leaders and the members under circumstances different from those which presently obtain. In 1939, 1940 and 1941, the Rome-Berlin-Tokio axis was already in existence and our leaders knew full well that Great Britain could not rely on her allies of 1914.

Furthermore, Germany had exhibited the might of its military machine to the world, by cutting to pieces, in a few weeks, the gallant Polish armies. The Canadian leaders were conversant or should have been with the deficiencies of the allied armies and it was easy to gauge the situation in comparing the events of 1917 with those of 1940. However, in spite of all this, while Hitler was marching through Europe, we were told time and again that conscription for overseas service would never be resorted to. We even denounced as evil-minded citizens those who questioned the word of our leaders, the word of honest citizens, by their reminder that other leaders, Borden, in Canada, Chamberlain in England, had to go back on their word against conscription.

For the last thirty years, we have campaigned against conscription for overseas service and the Quebec population had good reason to believe that their attitude in this matter was just as reasonable as that of Australia where there are no French Canadians.

All this goes to prove that Quebec is now influenced by its education, its formation and its sense of duty toward threatened Canada.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, allow me to render homage to the heroes of Hong Kong and especially to the Royal Rifles of Canada, of Quebec City, and offer the tribute of my sincerest admiration and deepest sympathy to their bereaved families. Though unfortunate, this expedition has been glorious. Those sons of Canada have given living testimony to the gallantry and courage of the Canadian soldier. It has been suggested that Hong Kong should be forgotten. For my part, I say, in the words of Gambetta: "Let us always think, but never talk, about it."

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland): Mr. Speaker, before I proceed with the remarks I have to make with respect to the subject matter of this debate, may I be permitted to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) who had the honour of moving the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Both in manner of delivery and in thoughts expressed his speech was worthy of the highest praise. It warmed my heart, as I know it did the hearts of all hon. members listening to his words of commendation, inspired by his association with the men and women of Great Britain. I wish also to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) who, like the hon. member for Hull, had an opportunity to visit the old country quite recently and see first hand the effects of the blitz from the centre of our empire, and had the privilege of mingling and talking with those who had suffered so severely, and who are still carrying on so magnificently.

While perhaps some may consider that the present debate has gone far enough, and are impatient to get on with the job of pushing forward the war effort, I believe I owe it to the people of my constituency of Westmorland to say a few words, as their representative in the House of Commons. Westmorland is a large constituency, and has the second largest population among the constituencies of New Brunswick. I am proud of my county because of what it has done in peace time, and prouder still because of what it is doing in the present war. We are a truly Canadian section of the dominion, with a mixture of English, Irish, Scotch and French. Approximately two-thirds of the citizens are English-speaking, and the remaining third are French-speaking. There is no more loyal part of our country than Westmorland, whose chief centre is the city of Moncton, often called the hub of the maritimes. Westmorland is the core of the maritimes, and what more loyal part of the dominion is there than the maritime provinces?

If we may judge loyalty by enlistments, then Moncton, Westmorland county and all the maritimes will certainly not take second place to any other part of Canada. We have

had our share of losses, too, on land, on sea and in the air. May I be pardoned for calling attention to the fact that the glorious role played by the Royal Irish Rifles of Quebec at Hong Kong fills us with pride; for on the nominal roll of that great battalion were the names of over 450 men from the maritime provinces, French, English, Irish and Scotch.

I desire now to pay my tribute to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), my honoured leader, for the way in which he has guided the war effort so far. I do not intend to recite the innumerable measures which have been taken by him and the members of his cabinet, but we can judge their wisdom by the results thus far, results which have called for unstinted praise from that grand man, Winston Churchill, and many leading men of the empire, as well as of the great republic to the south of us.

I want to thank my leader for the stand he has taken with respect to the future war effort. I must admit that for several weeks prior to my coming here I was somewhat disturbed as to the action the government might take, in view of the vociferous call for conscription for overseas service in the army, which has come from various sections of the dominion, but more particularly centred in certain interests in Toronto and Montreal. While I realize that the greatest energy is emanating from those interests who are trying to get rid of my leader and get control of the purse-strings of the government, I also realize there are a large number of loyal citizens who conscientiously believe that to carry on our maximum war effort we must put into effect conscription of men for the fighting forces. There are, on the other hand, many people who are opposed to this idea and are not of the opinion that this is necessary at the present time, some who feel that total war effort does not require the forcible calling up of men and placing them in combatant units and sending them overseas. I believe, too, that these people are just as loyal as any Canadians and are conscientious in their beliefs. On both sides of the controversy we have extremists, and I was worried as to what action the government might take. I was greatly relieved when I listened to the speech from the throne and found that members of parliament supporting the government were not going to be forced to break their promises to their constituents, if they wished to support the government and maintain a stable administration in control.

I am supporting the plebiscite. I want the government of the day to be relieved of their past commitments. I want the people of my constituency to tell this government, by their vote, to go ahead and do what they think advisable at any time, when in the light of their knowledge and judgment they decide upon a course they deem necessary in the best interests of the whole of Canada and the empire. I have faith in the loyalty and the judgment of the Canadians in my constituency of Westmorland and in all the other constituencies in the other provinces of Canada. I do not want to face the people of my constituency and have them say I am supporting a government that so flagrantly will ignore pledges. I have faith in Canada; I have faith in our people; I have faith in the love and loyalty of the mothers and fathers, even though some speakers who have preceded me may not. I am certain that true Canadians will sacrifice themselves, their sons and their daughters, if and when they believe those sacrifices are necessary to preserve our country and maintain our freedom and liberty for future Canadians. Personally, I do not believe in conscripting men for fighting units unless it is absolutely impossible to get men by any other means. During the last war we raised and maintained, as an effective fighting force in France, four grand infantry divisions, each one of which was classed as a first-line division and could be relied upon as first-line storm troops. Lloyd George once said:

> The Canadians played a part of such distinction in the Somme battle of 1916 that thenceforward they were marked out as storm troops.

Was that because Canadians are superior beings to those of the motherland? Was it not because these divisions were made up of men who went over there voluntarily and were kept to their purpose by their own eagerness to do their part in destroying those forces that would destroy us? They did not go because they were forced; they went because they elected to do so of their own free will. The troops we have sent across the sea during this war are made up of just that kind of men, and there are many yet ready to go to support them. Do hon. members think it advisable to reinforce those troops from the ranks formed by men pressed into service against their will. I do not wish to belittle those who will not volunteer to fight overseas, but I do not consider that it is to the best interests of the Canadian army to dilute it with men so constituted that they have not the heart and spirit to fight, and who must be driven on by compulsion. Let the farmers go on the land, the machinists work in the shops, and by all means send only those into the combatant units who have the intestinal fortitude to go.

In spite of the flagrant statements made in this house, and outside this house, I do not

believe that our voluntary system has fallen down. I am still of the opinion that we can raise, by voluntary means, all the troops we should. From the beginning of this war till the end of 1941 our voluntary enlistments for all branches of the service have been over 422,000, and apparently it is keeping up, for over 182,000 were attested during the calendar year of 1941. The first month of this year, January, has given us, by voluntary enlistment for overseas, over 11,000 men for the army alone, and I am confident that there will be a continuous flow answering Canada's call. These men, together with the "R" recruits that are being called up under the National War Services Act, will tax the resources of our training facilities, and it will keep this country on its toes to supply and equip them, in the light of the tremendous demands for all the guns, tanks, rifles, et cetera, that are so urgently needed by the empire and our allies where they are actually struggling with our vicious enemies.

The government has announced in parliament that the Canadian corps overseas is to be expanded to an army of two corps; one to be a corps of three infantry divisions and two army tank brigades; the other to consist of two armoured divisions. The navy is to take all the ships Canada can produce, and man them just as soon as they can be put into commission. There is to be an increase in the home war establishment of the air force as well. With that extension of the army, there are all the corps and army ancillary troops, which, with the reserves to be sent forward this year, will require around 95,000 men to be enlisted, trained, and equipped up to March, 1943. There is every reason to believe that this can and will be done by voluntary enlistment.

I think Canadians are prepared and eager to enlist, equip and maintain as large a fighting force as we are physically able to do. But there is a limit beyond which Canada cannot go and make our forces effective. Do not let us forget that at the present time we have about 550,000 men and 75,000 women working in our factories on war production, and remember also that during the last war there were less than half that number of men engaged in war production. Let us also keep in mind the very large number of men in the air force, at least 100,000 enlisted men, besides the civilian personnel in the empire training scheme, and upwards of 27,000 in the Royal Canadian Navy, which has done such heroic work in guarding our shores and convoying the ships carrying food and munitions to Great Britain and our allies, who are so much in need of them. All these tremendous efforts of our country require men, but they require machines even more, in this type of war. Those of us who made up the Canadian corps of 1914-18 have still vivid memories of the trenches and the holes in the ground to and through which we foot-slogged it, but our army of to-day moves on wheels or treads, with engines, transmissions, and drives, that need specially trained men to operate and maintain them. I do not think I am very far out of the way in saying that the striking power of one of our divisions to-day is equal to that of two of the divisions of the last great war, and that the modern division requires far more men behind the lines and at home to equip and maintain it in the field.

Mr. Speaker, I have faith in our government, and I have every reason to have that faith when I know the type of men who make up our government. We are fortunate, especially at this time, in having such men, so many of whom know by experience as soldiers what it is to fight a war, and know what it is to hear the thud of a shell and the whine of a bullet too unpleasantly near. No one can doubt their loyalty, and no one should question their determination to make a full and total war effort. I shall support the government in this plebiscite, and I shall support this government should circumstances so develop that they feel it necessary to enact total conscription for the army for action in any part of the world where it is necessary to fight the enemy.

The other night I had the privilege of listening to a lecture in the theatre of the National Museum in Ottawa on the subject of "Canada's Army—Man-Power Plus Machines". The speaker was Lieutenant-Colonel Goforth of the headquarters staff, Department of National Defence. I have confidence in our military leaders and our military staff, even though one of the speakers the other evening said a great deal that might cause the people of this country to doubt their ability. Among other things, Colonel Goforth told his audience that a comprehensive study had been made by our military authorities some time prior to the present war, and it was concluded that the maximum force that could be raised in Canada and maintained in action was six infantry divisions and one cavalry division. At that time, so far as one could gather from the speaker, there was no idea of any British empire air training scheme, nor could there have been at that time any comprehension of the huge proportions to which the production of arms and implements of war in Canada would be expanded, not to mention the growth and expansion of the Royal Canadian Navy.

Have we not already accomplished more than it was ever hoped we could? Can there be any justice in claiming that this government has not gone all-out under the inspiration of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King)? Could there be anything more unfair than the accusation or the insinuation that William Lyon Mackenzie King has had any other idea than an all-out war effort? One thing certain is that a maximum war effort can be accomplished only by making it a united effort. Up to the present time no one can say that there has not been evidence of a unity of purpose in this country such as has never before prevailed in Canada. What a sabotaging of the war effort it would be if those who are so eager to upset the government or destroy its leader should for this or any other reason succeed in setting one section of Canada against the other.

There is actually just one point on which the opposition differs from the government, and that is as to the method of securing men for the army overseas. Surely there is only one way to decide what Canada wants. Let us ask the people whose servant we are. Let me ask those who oppose the plebiscite, are we to be hypocrites preaching democracy and practising totalitarianism? We must not be stampeded into Hitler's methods by catch-phrases and extreme statements. Let us get down to calm thinking. The cost of the plebiscite in dollars will not be too high a price to pay for our democratic ideals of government. When we know that our implements of war and equipment are being given to those who so urgently need them right now in battle, and that men are being trained by Canada as rapidly as our facilities will permit, what delay will there be in our war effort by holding a plebiscite? What right have you or I on either side of this house to say that the people should not be given a chance to speak their mind in the only way in which they can effectively do so, and why should opposition members on the other side fear the sound of that voice? Who are we to feel that the people of Canada are not every bit as loyal to Canada as members of this chamber and as eager to go the limit in defeating the enemy at every point we can?

Our duty is clear. Winston Churchill has made it clear to us. He said:

> Each to our part, each to our station. Fill the armies, rule the air, pour out the munitions, strangle the U-boats, sweep the mines, plough the land, build the ships, guard the streets, succour the wounded, uplift the downcast and honour the brave.
>
> Let us go forward together in all parts of the empire, in all parts of this island. There is not a week, not a day, nor an hour to be lost.

[Mr. Emmerson.]

Do not let us becloud the issue; and if each gets busy and makes it clear to our constituents, I am sure Canadians will tell the world they absolve the government of the day from any commitment that might interfere in a full, all-out conduct of the war effort.

Mr. J. E. S. EMMANUEL D'ANJOU (Rimouski) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, realizing my responsibility as a member for the constituency of Rimouski, at this time, and with all possible frankness, I wish to state my opinion concerning the plebiscite mentioned in the speech from the throne. Having always been a Liberal, I have, for the last thirty years, campaigned for my party, not only in my own constituency, but in a large part of the provinces of Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick. Follower of Laurier and Lapointe and, I may add, follower of the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), I have always believed in their political creed for, to me, the word Liberal has always meant freedom of thought and speech on all political matters.

Therefore, on the strength of this very freedom, I shall, in all frankness and without reservation, state my reasons for opposing the plebiscite alluded to in the speech from the throne. In my estimation, the proposed plebiscite may have but one outcome, that is conscription for overseas service purely and simply. It is nothing but a screen through which the hideous outline of conscription is plainly visible. I have always been opposed to conscription for service outside of Canada and to-day, more than ever, I am against this iniquitous system of military enlistment.

Furthermore, no power on earth could cause me to repudiate the solemn pledges that I gave to my faithful constituents on this matter of conscription. I have stated time and again in each parish of my constituency, that I should oppose whoever in this house attempted to enforce compulsory military service for overseas. I even specified that I would not hesitate to vote against my party if it ever took that initiative. I shall therefore keep my word and vote against the address and the plebiscite. I repeat that, to my mind, the plebiscite is the forerunner of conscription, for the government, unless they intend to enact a measure of this nature, would not ask to be relieved of past commitments in this connection. The risk is too great and the most elementary discretion commands that I remain on the alert and watch my step.

However, I must say that I rely entirely on the right hon. Prime Minister. But how am I

to know how long he will remain at the head of the government. He does not enjoy immortality any more than we do. And death may come suddenly. We have experienced the truth of this statement, some time ago, on the occasion of the decease of the late Minister of Justice, Mr. Lapointe.

It is, however, my honest hope, for the greatest good of the country, that the right hon. Prime Minister may long remain at the head of the government. But, I repeat that, for any one of many reasons, he may disappear from the political arena, and I am not prepared, in advance, to trust his successor in the matter of conscription for overseas service.

Our political opponents, Mr. Speaker, have often stated that the province of Quebec stood alone in its opposition to conscription. The verdict rendered on March 26, 1940, however, has shown this statement to be false. Both political parties made known their opposition to conscription and the present government was returned to power by the greatest majority ever obtained at any previous general election in Canada. It can be proven, if need be, that French-Canadians from the province of Quebec and from Rimouski constituency in particular are neither poltroons nor cowards. During the last war, a regiment from Rimouski went overseas and counted among its brave men, Jean Brillant and Joseph Keable. Both received the highest military honour within the gift of Great Britain, the Victoria Cross. A constituency boasting such heroes does not deserve to see its population be referred to as people who refuse to fight and flinch in the accomplishment of duty.

In company with several of my colleagues who have spoken before me, I stand wholeheartedly for the defence of Canada, but of Canada only and on Canadian soil. Since Japan came into the war, our country is in greater danger than ever before. Why not keep our men here, then, in case the country should be attacked? Australia has had her own sorrowful experience. Australia sent many of her best troops to foreign lands. She is calling for help to-day, because she is insufficiently defended and lacks the number of men required to cope with the situation.

In so far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, may I say that when the time comes to answer the plebiscite my answer will be no, and I will advise my electors to give the same reply. I do not wish the government to be released from their undertaking nor do I wish to be released myself. The members of the government were not alone in their pledge against conscription. All hon. members of this house gave the same undertaking. I intend to vote against the subamendment, against the amendment itself and against the main motion.

I do believe, Mr. Speaker, it would be political wisdom on the part of the government were they to change the Mobilization Act so as to exempt farmers' sons and farm hands from its application. I have had occasion quite often in my constituency, which is essentially agricultural, to ask for postponements on behalf of farmers' sons. I might quote, among other instances, two really sad cases. An excellent old man, a farmer, seventy-six years of age and sick, had three sons. Two of them were already undergoing training and he came to me in the hope that I might obtain a postponement for the remaining son. Would you believe it, Mr. Speaker, I was unable to obtain this, and notwithstanding the fact that his other two sons were already in training they took the last one from him. Such a course does not seem reasonable, for wars are not won by soldiers alone, especially by soldiers who have nothing to eat. Soldiers have to be fed if they are to fight. In order to provide them with food, the farms have to be operated.

Here is another case. A widow with a large farm asked me to obtain a postponement for her only son. I have been unable to obtain it. The exemption boards should show more consideration, especially in the case of farmers' sons.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of defending Canada and Canada alone, for I am first of all a Canadian. Mine is the motto of Sir Wilfrid Laurier: Canada first, Canada always, Canada only. May I quote the following words uttered by Lord Tweedsmuir, a former governor general of Canada:

> Canada is a sovereign nation and cannot take her attitude 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 Canada's king, and those who deny this are doing, to my mind, a great disservice to the commonwealth.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by stating once again my intention to vote against the address in reply to the speech from the throne, that is, against the plebiscite mentioned therein.

Mr. W. R. AYLESWORTH (Frontenac-Addington): Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice to those who are asking for a better deal for the farmer. We are hoping that the government will see fit to recognize the extreme value of an organized farm effort in relation to our war effort. The farmer has been hit harder by the war than those in any other vocation.

He has been hit from all sides—by the shortage of farm labour, by the low prices of his products, by the high prices of his necessities and now by the price ceiling, which was applied before the prices of his products reached parity with the prices of the goods he must buy. In the old days the farmer, when he had to give his best days to working on the soil, retired to the city or town and left the farm to the young people. They did the hard work after that. Now the young people leave the farm long before the old people are ready to retire. In the city the young people can make a living without much effort, and there is no inducement to them to return to the farm where they can barely make a living, and that only with a good deal of effort. As a result, the old people are left to struggle along, and when they can no longer carry the burden alone they must hire help.

With the beginning of the war the demand from industry for all kinds of workers at good wages resulted in hired men being weaned away from the farm to industry. Unless the farmer can compete with industry in the matter of wages—and very few of them can—a very serious situation will have to be faced. We should have a war plan for the farmer. No one can rise in his place in this house and say that the farmer has been receiving fair prices for his products in the past; that is, prices that are fair in relation to the prices the farmer has to pay for the commodities he has to buy.

Unfortunately, most city people do not know the farmer. They think that all he has to do is to plant seeds, wait for the product to grow and then harvest it and sell it. They do not realize the backaching work that goes into his job, the heartaches from wind, hail, drought and floods, to say nothing of insect pests. Certainly he has had his good years, but even in those times his profits have not been large, and in the bad years his optimism has kept him going. On the whole the farmer has done little complaining to the government about his plight. Perhaps if he had done more complaining, he would not be in the position he is in to-day. The prices he receives at present barely assure him his existence, and there is no relief in sight.

This ties up with the labour problem. If the food production industry gets a parity of prices, it will be able to pay wages comparable with those paid by industry. With the rise in price of most farm products owing to the war, it looked as if the farmer might soon have an adequate return for his efforts and be put in a position where he would be able to compete with industry for help. But then came the price ceiling. The farmer does not object to the government's action in this regard provided a fair balance of prices is maintained. There is injustice to the farmer in freezing the unbalanced economy that exists, and I suggest to the government that the price ceiling should be let off certain products. The farmer should have a fair return for the products he sells.

So little consideration is being given the farmer that it looks as if the government does not realize the importance of keeping the farmer in production, and more production. Canada has been struggling along with a hand-to-mouth policy, and it is evident that if the country is to hold its own in the task of sending food to war-torn Britain and feed its own population, including the army, the navy and air force, some plan must be advised to bring farms into full production.

Some people say, "What if we bring the farms into full production and the war ends?" That would be good. Just think of the enormous market there would be in starving Europe, for food, as well as the huge market that would exist to replenish the herds of live stock in European countries. We have been in this war considerably longer than the United States, and already they have a plan for agriculture, while our plan, if we have any, is piecemeal and has no definite goal. If we do not plan now for agricultural production, there is grave danger of a food shortage in the country.

At the last session of parliament the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe) put forward a plan for agricultural production, and a very good plan it was. In fact, it might bear repeating. But has the government taken any note of it? Let me repeat some of his suggestions. First of all, there is the suggestion to appoint a national food board. I know that the wartime prices and trade board and the agricultural supply board are operating, but they are not planning to any extent for future production. They are interested in controlling prevailing production. This board would estimate the production required for 1942, and each year to the end of the war, to feed Canada and meet the requirements of our allies. Canada would be divided into production zones according to the things best produced in the different areas. Give this board power to put into operation any scheme whereby the maximum production for the zone would be reached, and assure adequate supplies of labour, with machinery and fertilizers made available for agricultural purposes. There should be nothing difficult about this.

National registration has shown that there are sufficient men to work the farms if they

are placed at this work. We could even recruit a farm army at military pay and place them in the different zones as needed. As for machinery, the government could arrange transportation to any point where needed, or make it part of the equipment of the farm army.

Another suggestion was a women's farm army. The Ontario government is going to and may now be training women to take their places on the farm. Could not the federal government follow their lead and recruit women for farm work? I would earnestly urge upon the government that farmers' sons and farm help working on the farms and producing food be allowed to continue this work.

With regard to parity for farm prices with war production, I mentioned before when I suggested withholding the price ceiling to allow farm products to catch up and gain parity.

The board would provide that the owner of the land would have these objectives and would be adequately reimbursed for his investment and his effort. That is only fair, because all other industries receive a fair return. Give the farmers fair markets and sufficient help and they will keep our farms producing. The board would plan to build up stocks of finished foods like canned pork and beef, canned vegetables, evaporated milk, dried eggs, and so on. I would make only one addition to the plan of the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe, that is that a special section of the national food board deal with and promote a greatly increased production of cattle and hogs. The demand for bacon from our allies is ever increasing. Someone slipped so badly in their estimate of the requirements of our allies that for a time we were asked not to buy pork, with the result that the price of other meats climbed so high it was cheaper to buy pork. I admit that the situation in this regard has improved, but we could have an even greater production in hogs. For instance, we have a huge surplus of wheat that could be purchased from the western farmer at a fair price and sold to the hog raisers of Ontario. The government could arrange this. With the feed problem solved, the farmer could raise twice as many hogs. We should also increase the number of cattle raised, not only for food but in order to be ready at the end of the war to send many shiploads to Europe for food and for stock.

Cattle demand for the past year has been 115,247 head greater than for 1940. The main reasons for this increase were: curtailment of supplies of pork for home consumption; increased industrial activity resulting in improved consumer purchasing power; and the fact that military camp estimated requirements were 40,211,767 pounds, compared with 18,214,421 pounds in 1940, an increase of 21,997,346 pounds. At an average of 500 pounds to the carcase the increase is equal to 44,000 head of cattle. This makes a total camp consumption of 80,000 cattle. The number of cattle on feed is below that for the past five years. Incidentally I am sure our producers are looking for higher prices, to offset the higher prices paid for feeding cattle, the increased cost of feed and higher wages of farm help.

An improved demand for beef in both Canada and the United States could easily bring about a period when marketings of cattle would fall short of supplying our full requirements of beef. It is important that our producers be encouraged to increase their production, so I ask that the ceiling price on beef be lifted for a time. I ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to see that producers of beef, lamb and hogs are allowed to make a reasonable profit.

I would also ask the government to allow the price of cheese to advance. The lifting of the ceiling, allowing the price of cheese made during the winter to advance, was a good thing, but many farmers were not able to produce milk during the winter months and, therefore, could not take advantage of this.

I should like to place before the house the necessity of encouraging an increase in lamb production. We are facing a shortage of wool in this country, and that at a time when woollen mills are coming to Canada from England. Also last year we imported nearly 3,000,000 pounds of lamb. I should like to place on record these figures showing our imports of lamb from Australia and New Zealand from 1934 to 1941:

Year	Imports pounds
1934	37,764
1935	83,162
1936	19,079
1937	40,245
1938	402,332
1939	1,565,747
1940	920,870
1941 (11 months)	2,494,796

Up to 1937 the duty was three cents a pound, but from October 1 of that year it was reduced to half a cent.

There was a very healthy demand for lamb in 1941. This demand was doubtless due to increased purchasing power of consumers, and also to curtailment in pork supplies. The above figures show the effect of the reduction in import duties. The ceiling price on lamb has recently been lifted. This is in accord with my view, and I would ask

that it be left off in order to encourage production. If we could produce the 3,000,000 pounds of lamb imported last year, it would equal 70,000 lambs, which would produce 500,000 pounds of wool.

The farmers also have to face the restriction of electric power, and I would ask the government to give every consideration through their power controller to applications for electric power in order to help in the production of the necessary foodstuffs.

This country, Mr. Speaker, is facing a grave situation. What happened in France should be a lesson to us. Party politics and shades of political opinion so divided that country and created such dissension that it was impossible to obtain any cooperation or continuity of effort toward the prosecution of a war. At this time when we are facing such an emergency party politics should be forgotten. Anything said at this time should be aimed toward unity rather than tending to create dissension among the Canadian people. What has happened to Australia may happen any day to Canada, and it is important that we do the right thing now. I appreciate the effort the government has already put forth but I would earnestly urge a still greater effort. Russia is calling for more equipment; China is calling for more equipment; General McNaughton asks for more and better equipment; so let us see that every man or woman who can work is put to work, and let us produce to the very limit of our resources. Surely it is time we became alive to the fact that we stand in a very precarious position, from which we can extricate ourselves only by a determined effort on the part of all the people.

Mr. G. T. PURDY (Colchester-Hants): With very much of what the hon. member for Frontenac-Addington (Mr. Aylesworth) has just said I am in hearty agreement. Probably that is no wonder, because we both represent constituencies very much interested in the agricultural life of this country. I congratulate the hon. member upon what he has said.

This debate is now in its third week. Such being the situation I shall not cover all the ground I had intended to, because much of what I expected to say has been well expressed by other hon. members.

The hun is at our gates; the Jap is at our gates, our gates both east and west; Canada's gates both east and west. If there ever was a time in the history of our country when clear thinking without political or personal bias was required from members of parliament, this is the time. Having regard to this, I was sorry to see so many members of the opposition resort to making political speeches for seven-

eighths of their time and then in the remaining one-eighth trying to fool the house and the country by striking a patriotic note.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): What about the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght) this afternoon?

Mr. PURDY: The hon. gentleman made his speech, so please let me make mine. Surely it has been demonstrated again that the Tory party, shorn of power, is like a she bear robbed of her cubs. I am free to admit that certain members of the Liberal party have dealt somewhat with politics in part of their remarks, but I am sure that an unbiased perusal of the record will show that such statements were provoked by opposition speeches. Occupying as I do one of the buffer seats in this parliament, as I also did in the last parliament, with opposition members to the left and opposition members to the front, I can truthfully say that for the most part I have found them splendid fellows. I believe many of them are gradually coming to the Liberal viewpoint. I urge them to continue to seek the light, because I feel that without leaders they will have to wind up as a party. During the few years I have been in parliament I have endeavoured to follow the motto: "If you have nothing to say, say nothing." May I suggest to those groups sitting to the far left that if democracy is to function as intended, they should pay more attention to this motto. I have on my desk the following verse:

> What one approves, another scorns,
> And thus each his nature shows.
> You find the rose bush full of thorns;
> I find the thorn bush full of roses.

I often turn to this for comfort when I hear or read of some move that does not appeal to me.

The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Black) is a friend of long standing, whom I admire in both a business and personal way. I cannot, however, follow his political thought. On Monday, while speaking of the accomplishments of his constituency in munition manufacturing, it seemed to me that he was not at ease, that he cast his eyes down, and I hope he bowed his head. He must have recalled that but two short years ago he was touring his county far and wide and in effect saying that the statement made by the late Norman Rogers, a fellow-townsman, on behalf of the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe), that a large aeroplane programme was under way for Amherst was nothing but election talk, and that if Amherst was to have a revival of industry it would be necessary to elect the Manion National government. The Manion government was not elected, and the

hon. gentleman sits condemned by his own words and discredited in the eyes of many of his electors by the statements he made at that time.

The constituency I have the honour to represent, Colchester-Hants, has its roots far back in the days of colonization in Nova Scotia, and stretches from Northumberland strait to the bay of Fundy, across the central part of the province. Truro, the shire town of Colchester, was the Cobequid of the Acadians, and Windsor, the shire town of Hants county, the Pisquid. Our people are mostly of British origin, the forefathers of many of them being New England planters or pre-loyalists, who took up the lands from which the Acadians were expelled prior to the American revolution. They were followed by their Loyalist friends and relatives, and the ties with the British isles were strengthened by direct emigration from England, Scotland and Ireland. We have a small percentage of other European stock, and a considerable overflow from the original German or Dutch settlements in Lunenburg county. Our population is roughly one-third urban and two-thirds rural. The chief industries of the towns are textiles, lumber products, wood pulp, dairy products and fertilizers. The principal activities in the country are mixed farming and lumbering. Large quantities of gypsum are produced round the famous Minas basin, where the tides rise as high as sixty feet; and the western end of the constituency is the eastern end of the famous Annapolis valley, so that we produce about one-tenth of the commercial apple crop of the province.

With this background and these surroundings, Mr. Speaker, we have maintained a reasonably well balanced economy and have produced a race of people loyal to the British crown and British traditions, proud to call the union jack our flag. When the call for duty came, our boys and girls were no less willing to enlist than in the past, and are now serving wherever Canadians are found on the far-flung battle front. They are standing firm on British shores, flying over the low countries and in the middle east, and their names appear on the service rolls with the Hong Kong heroes. One company of the forestry corps now serving overseas was largely recruited in our district. We are represented in the prison camps of Germany, and our casualty lists are mounting. Enlistments keep up. To those who do not return I pay my homage. While not regarded as a marine constituency compared with others in the province, our boys have enlisted freely in the Royal Canadian Navy, and their names can be found in large numbers among the unsung heroes of the war, the merchant marine. One of my constituents, Mr. Dick Harvie, of Noel Road, Hants county, has seven sons serving with the forces, volunteers for service anywhere. That is a truly magnificent contribution from any one home.

Let me say here to these men and women of the forces, to many of whom I am tied by the bonds of friendship, and to others by the ties of blood, and to their relations and friends, that as their representative in the parliament of Canada I hope and pray they will feel that in the decisions we have made or are required to make I have not and will not let them down. I voted for the Union government in 1917 because I felt then, as I feel to-day, that selective service is the fair way of raising an army. But, Mr. Speaker, war as practised to-day by our enemies is not fair war, and we must meet them by the most efficient methods at which the best brains of this country can arrive.

In case I may be misunderstood I will say here and now that if it develops that the voluntary method of raising men does not produce sufficient recruits to maintain overseas the maximum force we are capable of sending, having regard to the demands on our man-power for munitions and supplies and adequate home defence, I will support the government in extending the provisions of the National Resources Mobilization Act to cover man-power for overseas. Churchill, in his famous speech to the empire after Dunkirk, called us to our stations—not necessarily in the firing line, but wherever we were most useful. Since munitions, food and ships are now required rather than man-power, Canada must, on account of her location, be expected to take a larger share of the load in this regard than otherwise would be the case. This is not nearly as spectacular as the million marching feet asked for by some of the opposition, but it is far more effective in an all-out, balanced effort. It was German machines, not man-power, that drove through the low countries, raced up the French lines and drove the British expeditionary force into the sea at Dunkirk. We must equip our army and the armies of our allies with the very latest in fighting equipment before we lessen the flow of these vital articles overseas by drawing men from the production lines. Have we the man-power to keep up the maximum supply of munitions and food and at the same time materially increase our overseas force? I do not know. We look to the government to inform us and to lead us in an all-out war effort, with a complete mobilization of all resources, material and human. I urge that

in such an effort our natural resources must be further developed and more advantage taken of the productive capacity of our smaller concerns than has been the case to date.

As yet, Mr. Speaker, I fear that our manpower and productive capacity are a long way from being fully mobilized, and that a great deal of our effort is still devoted to non-essentials. The people of Canada are just now beginning to feel the pinch of regulations which are necessary for the carrying out of the war. This being the situation, they look to the government not only to regulate and advise, but also to set an example. It is therefore difficult to understand how certain departments can continue to use up manpower and materials along certain lines in duplication and non-essential services, while other departments are crying for the people to salvage and save, and our allies are looking to us to produce more munitions.

For instance, our Post Office Department has a considerable programme of expensive advertising. Their service should be their best advertiser. If they are advocating less use of the telegraph, one department of government is in effect working against another. Again, we have recently been favoured with a series of advertisements issued by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. These were very well done, but, I would assume, very expensive. Surely present radio listeners do not have to be told what the corporation is doing, and we are supposed to discourage the purchase of more radios. Could not the materials and man-power used in these activities be placed to better advantage elsewhere?

Again, we have one department of the government sending out forms all across the country, asking from business certain information which has already been furnished to another department, or continuing to send out the inquiries when the party to whom they are addressed has advised that he does not deal in the article or articles inquired about.

I have before me an inquiry which has been widely circulated, asking for the price of bread on certain recent dates, while the price has been pegged throughout Canada since the outbreak of war. Is this efficiency or economy? Is it any wonder that the maritime boards of trade, at a recent meeting, asked that business be released from the work of furnishing so many government returns?

In my constituency are located the Debert military camp, the Debert airport and the Stanley elementary training school. At these various centres in the course of their training, or sailing for overseas, we are privileged to have a large number of the picked manhood of Canada, not only of Canada but of all parts of the British commonwealth, and also of the United States. Our citizens have welcomed these strangers with open arms, and while, having regard to the numbers of men as compared with our population, we have not been able to do all we would wish, yet I consider that most of our temporary military guests will take away with them very warm feelings toward the people of this banner constituency. Surely this contact will, in the years to come, bear fruit, and people from other provinces and other lands will be better able to understand our problems and we theirs.

In passing, it might be well to point out to the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) that from reliable sources I am informed that the Stanley school was the only one in eastern Canada able to carry on continual flying operations last spring during the break-up, and suggest that our location is most suitable for further extensions if required.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel I should refer to a matter which has to some extent caused me to lose my faith in mankind. I am told on good authority that in the officers' mess at Debert and at other military camps the story is being circulated that the reason why a large military camp was established at Debert is because the site of it was the old Ralston homestead and was owned by our present Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston). A return filed on February 9 to an order of this house of February 2 shows that the land occupied at this point was acquired from more than 120 individual owners and that none was owned by the hon. minister. In fact I can obtain no information that either he or his near relatives ever owned property in this district. The hon. minister, who in 1914 and again in 1939 answered the call of his country, is too big a man to pay attention to such lies as the one I have mentioned, apparently circulated in order to discredit the government, but I feel that this statement of the true situation should be posted in every mess of the Canadian army so that he who runs may read. Officers who are gentlemen should know how to deal with the likes of those who start stories such as the one to which I have referred.

Coming now to the plebiscite, I propose to support it, and urge my constituents to vote, "Yes". Why do I do this? I do this because I feel that our ministry should have a free hand, subject only to the control of parliament, in the troublesome days to come.

Do I feel that the government is bound by a pledge of "no conscription for overseas service" given in 1940? My answer is "yes". Furthermore, I consider, having accepted the Liberal platform and having been elected on same, that I am also bound by the pledge. It may be hard for our opponents to get over the idea that election promises are made to be elected on and then to be forgotten, but my leader, the Prime Minister, stands for something higher than that, and I feel that the people of Canada will honour him for the stand he has taken, in spite of the clamour of the old Tories for him to forget promises. Surely, had he done so, he would have to-day been held up to the Canadian people as a man whose promise could not be relied upon, and this by the same people who are now condemning him for holding the plebiscite.

Mr. Speaker, may I take a few moments to refer to my part of the country. I referred previously to a full use of the productive capacity of our smaller plants, of which we have a number capable of doing something to help along the war effort, but so far they have been given very little opportunity. In fact one has had to close entirely owing to the lack of raw materials, and others to curtail. When the Minister of Munitions and Supply announced the bits-and-pieces programme last fall, I felt that it was a splendid move, and I strongly urge that it be developed until every shop and every bit of machinery capable of producing a needed article for our war effort are at work. I have asked on many occasions that small concerns in my constituency as well as our contractors be given consideration on war and defence projects. To date, for the most part, we have had to be content with the crumbs which fall from the rich man's table. Centralization is efficient to a certain point but, if carried beyond that point, creates inefficiency.

I would suggest that the time is now ripe for the government to take industry to where the labour and facilities are available rather than make it necessary for the people from the maritimes to move to central Canada to work, with the consequential housing and transportation problems, to say nothing of post-war situations and the disarrangement of our local economy.

Our contractors are efficient and should have been given an equal chance on local defence works rather than being overlooked until the best contracts in the district were given to central Canadian firms, some without our contractors knowing that the project was open. Even on tenders advertised in the public press, maritime contracts are at times advertised in the central Canada media, while I have yet to see central Canada projects of a similar nature advertised in our local papers.

Equal sacrifice should mean equal opportunity, and I would urge that we be given this oportunity. To my mind this can be brought about only by a better geographical distribution of the various appointments in key positions in the departments charged mainly with our war effort.

In the past the maritime provinces have not been found lacking in producing men of a high calibre, nor are they to-day, and I believe that if the course I have suggested is followed, we shall have made a further step toward a balanced and all-out war effort.

Not so long ago the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services (Mr. Macdonald), our then premier, was called to Ottawa by the Prime Minister. Our people felt honoured by this action. I recall hearing the present Minister of National Defence for Naval Services say at one time that a happy and contented peasantry was the back-bone of a country.

As stated previously, approximately two-thirds of my constituency is rural, many of these being engaged in mixed farming. May I, therefore, for a moment be permitted to deal with some of their problems. It will be recalled that prior to the price-ceiling policy being announced, the position of our eastern farmers had been receiving attention and that it was decided that, in the face of the low prices they were receiving for their products, some assistance was in order. The federal government agreed to pay one-third of the freight on feed grains, and the local government the same. Then we come to the price-ceiling policy when, to bring farm products somewhere in line with other ceiling prices, the western farmers were given further assistance and the eastern farmers the full freight on feed grain. As stated a moment ago, our farmers had previously been given, based on their need of assistance, two-thirds of the freight, so the assistance they in fact received was but one-third. It therefore seems to me that in order to carry out the intention of the price-ceiling policy our farmers should receive additional assistance to the equivalent of two-thirds freight on western feed grains. This can be arranged by way of a rebate or discount on feed purchased, and I would ask the government to consider this matter.

Some of our farmers and poultrymen were surprised to find that western corn was not included for freight assistance, although it had been included in the original discussions. It

was included in the British Columbia agreements. Apparently the Ontario corn growers had to be protected at the expense of the maritimes. The matter was taken up with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), and hopes were held out for its inclusion by special arrangement. We are now advised after two months' delay that nothing can be done. I ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) to remove the duty on water-borne corn brought to the maritimes and suggest that we now have reason to expect this. Our farmers are not organized, nor can they afford to send large delegations to Ottawa as their western cousins have recently done. If they had the money they would, under present conditions, buy war bonds or certificates and not spend it in taking long trips. If they took the trip, who would look after their work? Therefore, as a member from Nova Scotia, interested in the welfare of our farming population, as all our members are, I am speaking on their behalf.

I am not in accord with the system of bonuses built up for western agriculture and, if I understand the Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture correctly, about to be extended by new legislation; yet having regard to the price-ceiling policy, I see no other way of equalizing farm income with that of other industries.

If the end of the war is not to see the number of vacant farms in Nova Scotia largely increased, with resulting relief problems, something more must be done for agriculture.

I have shown what we are entitled to under the "some assistance" but not "equalization" price-ceiling policy. A series of abattoirs and cold storage warehouses might be erected in the province at places convenient to the mixed farming population, such as at Antigonish, Pictou, Truro, Windsor and Lunenburg. With such an arrangement our farmers could receive a proper inspection and price for their products locally, instead of shipping them out of the province or equally long distances to provincial points, only at times to have them returned for consumption within a few miles of where they were produced. I shall not further labour this matter, but suggest that it should be carefully considered.

In view of the labour situation on our farms brought about by enlistments, and higher wages being paid in war industries, assistance could be given in certain sections by way of extension of rural mail routes and assistance in extending rural electrification into districts not now eligible under provincial legislation. This latter would, of course, only be possible if the equipment were available.

[Mr. Purdy.]

Both these suggestions, if put into effect, would increase the number of man-hours available for work on the land.

Mr. Speaker, we have a wheat committee of the cabinet. I would suggest the appointment of an eastern agricultural committee also, and I call upon the Prime Minister and the ministers representing the maritime provinces, as well as the Minister of Agriculture, to take the maritime agricultural situation in hand before it is too late and submit any necessary legislation for the maritimes along with that proposed for the assistance of western agriculture. Only in this way can we have a happy and contented peasantry stretching across Canada and our rural population united in this our hour of greatest need.

Mr. PAUL EMILE COTE (Verdun) (Translation): Mr. Speaker,, it is a great honour and a heavy responsibility to rise amidst the elected representatives of the nation to speak on behalf of one of the constituencies of my province, the constituency where I was born and brought up, whose people, kindly witnesses of my first experiences in business life, have given me signal evidence of their confidence in choosing me to present their thoughts, their feelings and their aspirations to parliament and to the government.

Verdun and Lasalle, the two highly cosmopolitan municipalities making up my electoral division, are, with their citizens of various extractions and traditions, languages and religions, veritable miniatures of Canada. Faced by the same problems of life and inspired by a common ideal, my fellow-citizens have built up two great cities which have impressed all the people of Canada and have more than once been cited as examples to all communities seeking progress in union, understanding and tolerance.

The city of Verdun, by far the more populous of the two, proudly stands third in my province and twelfth in all Canada. Among the responsibilities which this honour has imposed upon it, there is one which it has discharged in a particularly glorious fashion. I refer to the part it played in this country's effort during the last war. The Prince of Wales himself, during his trip to Canada in 1919, stated that Verdun was the city of the British empire which had, in proportion to population, placed the largest number of men under arms.

Twenty-five years have passed, and these years may have effected a considerable change in the proportions and the appearance of the constituency which I represent. However, the sense of solidarity and of unity in the presence of great causes, the love of country and of liberty, have in no way diminished, and

it is with rightful pride that I can say in this house that Verdun has accepted wholeheartedly and generously its large share of the burden of the present war. Thus it is that every war service, every patriotic organization, of whatever nature, is represented in the constituency of Verdun and receives all the cooperation and the results expected. In addition, according to the statistics available, Verdun is once again in the very first rank of the Dominion's municipalities as regards the proportion of its sons in our three fighting services.

In this community, so highly representative of the various ethnical elements of our country, I have imperceptibly gathered a fairly accurate conception of the patriotic sense of Canada. I find myself to-day in the presence of my fellow-members of this house, all charged, though in different degrees, with the leadership of our beloved country in this most critical period of her history.

Allied of her own free will with the great democracies, Canada has constituted herself the champion of the liberties of our Christian civilization and has bravely opposed the conquering march of the armies of German paganism. The conflict which began by the devastation and enslaving of far-away countries has drawn closer to our shores, and our national life is now seriously threatened.

During the two years and a half which this world-wide conflict has lasted, Canada has not betrayed the cause she undertook to champion. Quite the contrary. With the ardour and patriotism which distinguishes her sons and the incalculable richness of her resources, this Dominion has, for the defence of her territory and of civilization, contributed to the heroes of the democracies which have retained their freedom a magnificent effort which has excited the admiration, nay the astonishment, of the civilized world.

I am a Canadian by birth and by inclination. Never before, however, have I felt such love, such pride for my country as when I had an opportunity to appreciate, at the beginning of the present session, the progress made in the last two and a half years and to visualize what our young nation has accomplished for the defence of our most sacred liberties, for the safeguard of our christian civilization. And the sentiment thus entertained toward my country was equalled only by my admiration for him who, on that date of January 26, rendered an account of the manner in which his administration has carried on the war, and by my pride in sharing the political convictions of the greatest of Canadian statesmen and the most Canadian of our great statesmen.

The Right Hon. Mackenzie King, our Prime Minister, has made a clear, comprehensive and eloquent statement on a well balanced and most efficient war effort. It would be presumption on my part, therefore, being only a novice in public affairs, to attempt under such circumstances to describe our contribution in the present conflict. I would rather leave the people under the charm of that enlightening speech which old parliamentarians claim to have been one of the best ever made in the house by the Right Hon. Prime Minister.

May I be permitted, nevertheless, to bring out into bolder relief how that outstanding speech offers a fundamental explanation for the success of the gigantic task undertaken and a guarantee of its successful and really efficient accomplishment. Addressing myself in all sincerity to my fellow countrymen of every province and of every class of society, to all those who in these hours of trial pride themselves on being Canadians, I would state that we would never have accomplished one-half of what the country has contributed in two years to the successful prosecution of the war had we not had, as a foundation for our economic and military activities, both peace and unity in the land and the possibility of utilizing fully the energies which inevitably develop under such favourable conditions.

Had we been a divided country, in the throes of internal strife, far from withstanding the burden of a military effort which one might be tempted to call out of proportion with our development and population, our country might well have become but another instrument of those infernal machinations so ably devised under Hitlerian diplomacy.

Quite the contrary, in the security of internal peace, Canada has achieved a splendid contribution, particularly during the year about to close.

Our country has been able to produce all the food required for domestic consumption and to meet the needs of an ally having a population five times our own number.

We have succesfully developed our armament production and are in a position to-day to arm and equip by our own means a modern division in a relatively short time.

We have built a navy capable of serving as escort and of protecting convoys going overseas and of giving chase to enemy submarines over the seven seas.

An all-Canadian and powerful air force patrols our coasts, guards over our convoys and patrols enemy skies in search of new targets.

Compulsory military training prepares our young men for the defence of our country on

Canadian soil, while voluntary recruiting enlists all who are willing to carry the fight to the enemy wherever he may be encountered.

In short, the economic and military policy of the country has been managed with such wisdom, that the government would hear nothing but a chorus of praise and gratitude, if it were not for the uproar fostered through a certain section of the press by a handful of heirs to the Union cabinet of 1917 and to the disturbances bred by that administration.

Faced with facts, these agitators are forced to admit, occasionally, the efficiency of our war effort, in all fields. Some of the newspapers, the Ottawa *Journal* and the *Financial Post,* among others, engaged in that contemptible campaign of disparagement against the government, but in reality against our Prime Minister, have published whole supplements admitting the efficiency of our country's contribution to the allied cause. I shall mention only their issues of January 30th and 31st respectively, where 32- and 15-page supplements are devoted to a review of the accomplishments of our industries and armed forces.

However, it seems that these people are not satisfied with the complete harmony that obtains all through our war effort. They must always recall the causes of the 1917 misunderstanding and, to this end, they have revived the old battle cry: "Canada cannot realize a total war effort without conscription of its youth for military service overseas."

The Prime Minister has answered their clamour with faultless logic supported by the most irrefutable statistics.

I need not quote again the figures that have already been given in this house to show how successful the voluntary system has been. Yet, notwithstanding the fact that in the seven last months voluntary enlistment in the three services of our armed forces has given an average monthly yield of over 20,000 men, whereas in the month that has just ended, 11,000 recruits were obtained for the army only, the same clamour is being raised about the so-called failure of the voluntary system and the necessity of immediate conscription for overseas service.

Fortunately, such is not the view of right-minded and sincere people, nor I think of the great majority of Canadian citizens. The constituency which I have the honour to represent, and where there are people of various races and creeds, strongly supports maintenance of the voluntary system of enlistment for overseas military service. So far as I am concerned, I am all the more willing to express the views of my constituents on that subject as I am and will remain a supporter of the anticonscriptionist doctrine.

[Mr. Côté.]

I shall not repeat the arguments advanced by my colleagues in this house whose views on that matter are similar to mine. I shall only add that conscription has been an utter failure during the last war, that from October, 1917, to November, 1918, a period of thirteen months, it yielded 83,355 men 22,000 of whom were granted temporary postponement for agricultural or other purposes. Consequently, during the above mentioned period, that system only yielded a monthly average of 4,720 men, most of whom could be called soldiers only because they wore a uniform and were subject to military discipline, as compared with the average number of 8,000 men who have enlisted every month since September last, and all of whom are proud soldiers conscious of the part they have to play in the army and determined to uphold the honour of their country. There are over 250,000 such volunteers in our active army, besides over 125,000 men in the air force and over 25,000 in the navy, making up, as at the 1st of January last, a total of well over 400,000 men who have voluntarily enlisted in our armed forces for service anywhere in the world. In order to appreciate better the importance of those figures, we must remember that our munitions and arms factories are now employing over 500,000 men and over 70,000 women, or twice the number of workers that were required by the same class of munitions factories during the last war. Yet, our country has only 11,500,000 inhabitants.

I am against conscription because I am in the first place opposed to any cause of disunion and misunderstanding in this country. Besides, I believe that it will not be necessary in so far as the constituency which I represent is concerned. The voluntary system has hitherto been highly successful and the same success can be maintained through the sincere and enlightened cooperation of all those who are called upon to exert some influence over their fellow citizens and public opinion in general.

Let the newspapers who have hitherto furthered the cause of disunion in this country stop their purely political and personal controversies and launch a campaign for voluntary enlistment, or at the very least, occasionally publish earnest appeals to young Canadians, a thing which they have hitherto carefully refrained from doing.

Let certain military men, probably well intentioned but ill advised, abandon the coercive means they have brought to bear upon the young men under compulsory military

training, for the questionable purpose of hastening their enlistment in the active army; the signing up of a recruit through such means has not the character of a free decision and more often as not it hurts the cause, in discouraging a relative or a friend of the recruit, who otherwise would probably be earnestly willing to enlist.

Let the government consider whatever measures may be necessary to give better treatment to privates and non-commissioned officers in the active army, or to increase their dependents' allowances, keeping in mind that the pecuniary remuneration offered to them must meet the competition of the salaries that are attracting them to munitions factories.

Thus, the deficiencies and imperfections of our voluntary system having been remedied, enlistments will reach a higher level and bring into our active army as many if not more young men than during the last months, when conditions were not always quite favourable. At that rate, it would be possible, within a year, to obtain at least 100,000 additional men, without prejudice to the needs of the air force or the navy. I have every reason to believe that conscription for service in the active army would not produce as good results in the same period, and I need not emphasize the dire consequences it would undoubtedly have upon the morale of our people.

Unity within our ranks is a prime condition of success for our arms. By uniting our hearts, our minds and our energies we will succeed, under the guidance of an enlightened and wise government, in putting to really good use all our material resources and man-power, in a way that will ensure victory for the democracies over the forces of evil. Without such unity, whatever those in authority may do, we cannot expect anything but half-measures and quite unsatisfactory results.

Mr. Speaker, let us make the most of what is likely to unite us in this war; let us make use of it fully in the best interests of the great cause which we must defend until victory. As to what is liable to divide the country and, mind you, it is only a very small part of our total war effort, let us examine it calmly, without prejudice or passion. Let us see if, by adopting a one-sided and inflexible solution, we are not jeopardizing the ever growing successes which have crowned our efforts in this domain as well as in all the others.

The Prime Minister and his government have succeeded in preserving peace and harmony in our country since the beginning of the war. Unity has been preserved in the country by a responsible and strong government, in which the nation had placed full confidence. Conditions have arisen which have been considered to necessitate an appeal to the people on the question of compulsory military service. I need not question the motives which governed this decision. I have too much confidence in the Prime Minister and his advisers to doubt, even for a single moment, that this measure was not absolutely necessary to maintain unity and solidarity in the government ranks and preserve the peace of the country, threatened by the unavowed ambitions of the group of agitators whom we all know. A plebiscite will thus be held in a few months. I am convinced that the people will welcome it as a truly democratic measure and answer it conscientiously and in the best interest of the nation.

For my part, I approve the principle of this appeal to the people because of the special circumstances which necessitate it, and I understand that the government will submit, after the conclusion of the present debate, a bill which will permit us to examine and determine the details of this plebiscite.

The main motion before the house asks the members for a vote of confidence in this government.

An adverse vote, on whatever ground, would be a condemnation of the policy generally followed by our leaders and an indication of want of confidence in the authority of the Prime Minister.

I congratulate the government on having maintained as the first principle of their war policy that the might of our country and the efficiency of its cooperation with the allied powers must be based on the unity and common action of all sections of her population, for the one purpose dear to all Canadians, namely, the ultimate victory of our forces.

I note with pleasure the wonderful balance given to our war effort, which has been kept free from passions and injustices which were rampant during the last conflict and which it is sought in certain quarters to revive.

I say to the Prime Minister without hesitation that we admire the mastery with which he is guiding the ship of state through the difficulties of all kinds constantly being raised. I wish to assure him of our unswerving confidence and to say that as representative of the constituency of Verdun, I will vote against both amendments and in favour of the main motion.

Mr. AZELLUS DENIS (St. Denis) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I will take just a few minutes of the time of the house to state the reasons why I shall vote for the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

Why should I betray the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), when I am convinced that he is the only man who is able, for the present, to administer the country according to the wishes, not only of the electors of the constituency of St. Denis, but of the whole population of Canada? Why should I lack confidence in him when he has protected us since the beginning of the war against disunion, against those who were thirsting for profit and power, against the financiers and the ultra-imperialists? Why should I deny him my support when he thinks the same as we do as regards conscription for overseas service? It would be silly and inconsistent to say: I have so much confidence in King that I am going to vote against him; he has administered the country so well since 1940 that I am going to vote to put somebody else in his place.

Mr. Speaker, it may be interesting to set oneself as the saviour of one's race, as the protector of one's province and constituency, and at the same time to have one's colleagues considered as "followers." But one must beware not to cut off one's nose to spite one's face.

If I vote against the address in reply to the speech from the throne, I will be voting with and for the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), and if a sufficient number of members from the province of Quebec do the same thing, the government may be defeated, and in all probability the leader of the opposition would be called upon to form a government. With the combined help of the Conservatives, the C.C.F., the Social Crediters, and the few Liberal members who do not see eye to eye with us on the subject of conscription for overseas service, that might well happen and immediately afterwards the house would pass a conscription bill with "blitzkrieg" speed. What a nice gift it would be for my electors of St. Denis and for the country were I to vote along with certain people I know.

Mr. Speaker, it is always wise to ponder the consequences of an act before making the decisive move. It is also advisable not to hurt ourselves when we want to help ourselves.

For the present we must show our confidence in the government by approving in bulk the measures announced in the speech from the throne. Then each one will be examined separately by the house, including the plebiscite. That will be the proper occasion to discuss them.

[Mr. Denis.]

Therefore I will consider it a pleasure and a duty to support the government by voting for the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I shall vote against all the amendments moved to date, which if adopted would undoubtedly and unfortunately result in a Conservative government, or a national government, or a government directed by the 200 of Toronto, plus a conscription act for service overseas. If I am wrong, I pray God to enlighten me.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to read one of de la Fontaine's fables which is chock-full of good sense and seems to befit the occasion.

THE BEAR AND THE GARDEN-LOVER

A certain Bear, whose dam had licked him ill,
Dwelt in a lonely forest on a hill.
A new Bellerphon, he shunned his kind,
Till the seclusion, telling on his mind,
Went near to drive him melancholy-mad.
Though speech be good, and silence better still,
And sense consorts not long with solitude.
The other animals tabooed;
His unattractive domicile;
And he, for all his bearishness,
Relished isolation less and less.

Meanwhile, in the same neighborhood,
There lived a Greybeard, who was likewise bored.
He had a taste for gardening, and adored
Both Flora and Pomona, whose employ,
Though always pleasant, yields a fuller joy
If shared with some congenial friend;
For gardens rarely talk—(except in Fable).

At length, dissatisfied to spend
His life in circles purely vegetable,
On day he gave his silent loves the slip
In search of livelier companionship.
The Bear, impelled by a like yearning,
Had left his cheerless eminence,
And by an odd coincidence
They met each other at a turning.
The Man took fright, but what was to be done?
'Twas not the feaintest use to run;
And feeling that on such a case
'Twas well to put one's boldest face,
He managed to dissemble his alarm.
The Bear, whose manner failed in courtly charm,
Muttered a grumpy invitation.
'Nay,' said the other, won't Your Lordship grace
My humble cot, which you can see from here,
And condescend to cheer
Of milk and fruit? no doubt a strange collation
For one of your distinguished race,
But 'tis the best I have.' the Bear agreed.
They were good friends before they reached the door;
And though 'tis better, by the wise man's creed,
To live alone with a bore,
Once there, they got on very well indeed.
The Man could garden undisturbed all day,
For Bruin had barely two words to say.
He went a-hunting to supply their need;
But his great line was shooing flies away

From his friend's forehead as a-drowse he lay.
Once while the Oldster snored in deep repose,
A bluebottle assailed his nose
With such persistence that the Bear
At last was driven to despair.
'I'll swat you, ma'am, for this,' he growled—'here goes!'
Therewith he hurled a brickbat through the air,
Which squashed the fly—but broke the sleep- head.
His aim was better than his reasoning,
And the result of all his pains
Was that his chum lay doornail dead.

MORAL

An idiot's friend's a dangerous thing:
I'd sooner have a foe with brains.

Mr. THOMAS FARQUHAR (Algoma East): I had not intended to take part in this debate, but after listening to some statements made by some hon. members and reading certain articles in the press which to my mind are misleading and far from the facts, I feel I should say a few words to present the situation as I see it.

It is true, as some hon. members have said, that we are indeed passing through a most serious time. There never was a time in the history of the world when we had so much at stake as we have to-day; never a time when it was more important that Canada should be united, never a time when it was so necessary that all democratic countries should be united in order that we may put forward our maximum war effort. I am sure that the people will never forget the dark days of Dunkirk, the fall of France, the narrow escape we had from losing our Canadian army. As Lord Halifax said, what a blessing it was that if France was going to fall, she fell as soon as she did! Had she held out a little longer, our Canadian army would have been so far inland that they would have had no possible chance of escape. What a disaster that would have been!

Then came the long year when Britain had to stand alone; not a country in Europe to look to for help, her own manufacturing industry in danger of being destroyed. Therefore she had to look to Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United States, none of which were in a position to give her very much help. At the beginning of 1941, Britain had not an army worth calling an army, her air force was no match for the German air force; she was losing the battle of the Atlantic; the enemy were sinking her ships much faster than they could be built. Notwithstanding all this, notwithstanding the tremendous setback we had in the far east and the great sacrifices we shall yet have to make before we get control of the far eastern situation—notwithstanding all this the past year has been a very successful year for Britain and her allies.

Britain won the battle of the air over Britain in the fall of 1940, and this gave her an opportunity to prepare for the expected invasion in the spring of 1941. Britain was all set for the attack, which would have meant tremendous sacrifices of life and property, but she was not called upon to go through that ordeal. Hitler went east to attack Russia, thinking, of course, it would be a short job and then, when he had nothing to fear from Russia, he would return and destroy Britain. But in doing so, as Mr. Churchill said, he made the greatest blunder of his life. The resistance of Greece, Yugoslavia, with the help of Britain, delayed Hitler's plans for six weeks, just long enough to bring winter upon the German armies before they could knock out the Russian army and get possession of the great Russian oilfields last autumn. Russia is putting up a great fight, winning a great victory. She has destroyed much of the German manpower and equipment. She has more trained reserves than Germany, and if she can get the tanks, heavy guns and aeroplanes, she will drive every German out of Russia and defeat Germany on her own soil. The great question is how soon and in what quantities can we get the tanks, heavy guns and aeroplanes across to her. This is the important question to-day.

To hear some hon. members speaking in this house, and to read some of the articles appearing in the press, one would think that there was only one really loyal class in Canada, only one class really interested in the winning of the war, and that this class consisted of the Conservative members of this house and their friends. I should like to tell hon. gentlemen to my left that many Liberals have boys in this war, too. I believe we think just as much of our boys as they do of theirs. I think we are just as much interested in our neighbours' boys as they are. I think we are just as loyal to the principles for which we are fighting as they are, and certainly we have just as much at stake. I like to feel that all men are sincere. I should like to feel that all members of this house are sincere. I should like to feel that the entire press of Canada is sincere. I should like to feel that the Premier of Ontario is sincere; for when we feel that men are sincere we can respect them for their sincerity even though we may disagree with them. But when men have the facts and withhold those facts; when they make statements which they know are not according to the facts, then I must question their sincerity.

What are the facts? First, let me say that as far as the Premier of Ontario is concerned, we all know his problem. It is a long-drawn out desire for revenge, without just cause, upon the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King), a man who is big enough just to ignore him. By his continued insults, the Premier of Ontario has so belittled himself that he has lost the confidence not only of many of his close friends but of the Liberals of the province of Ontario, and he has lost the respect and confidence of all good thinking men and women throughout the Dominion of Canada. I am sure that all members of this house, I care not to what party they belong, if they are sincere, fair and reasonable will agree that the all important question to-day is not more men for overseas, however important that may be. The important question to-day is more equipment for the men whom we have overseas at the present time. So far in this war there has not been a battle lost because of shortage of men. Every battle that has been lost so far in this war has been lost because of a shortage of equipment, a shortage of heavy guns, heavy tanks and aeroplanes. Every member of this house knows this statement to be true.

Russia said recently that she had an unlimited number of men, but that her great problem was to equip them with heavy tanks, heavy guns and aeroplanes. China has made the statement that she, too, has an unlimited number of men whom she cannot equip, and that her army in the field is not even yet equipped. Her cry is for more tanks, more heavy guns and more aeroplanes. India now has a million men in her army. She recently stated that she could put eight million men into the fight if only she could get equipment for them. The United States has 130,000,000 people and could put millions of men into her army, but she cannot get equipment for them quickly enough. Canada has over a hundred thousand men in her air force. Our great problem is to get bombing and fighting planes fast enough for them to fight with. Britain's army is not yet fully equipped, because Britain has been doing what Canada has been doing, sending all the equipment she could to Russia, China, Libya and every battle front where it could be used. I have here a clipping from a Port Arthur newspaper, written by Judge McKay under date of February 2, 1942, right along the line of what I have been saying. It reads:

> Japan has a large navy and merchant marine and a very large number of aircraft carriers, bombers and aircraft and will probably attack British Columbia instead of Australia with a view of destroying industries and plants on the Pacific coast both in the United States and Canada.
>
> During 1942, and until the United States can get into maximum production, practically every man should be retained in Canada to defend the Pacific coast and produce as many ships, aircraft, tanks and other mechanized war equipment as possible.
>
> There are apparently over 1,500,000 Polish officers and trained soldiers who were prisoners of war in Russia who are now free and desperately anxious to carry the war into the very heart of Germany as soon as Canada and the United States can furnish them with the necessary clothing, bombers, tanks and necessary equipment. These officers and soldiers have already had experience in this war.
>
> There are millions of men in China and India and elsewhere who are crying out for more mechanized military equipment.
>
> For the sake of all that is precious and priceless the agitation for conscription should be dropped, and as far as possible the capacity to produce agricultural products and mechanized war equipment should be doubled.

In the face of these facts will any reasonable man tell me that the all-important question is the conscription of men, to send all we can overseas, when we cannot equip the men whom we already have over there? Our Canadian soldiers are brave, but is that a reason for sending them to the battle front to face the enemy without the proper equipment? Is it fair to ask the Russians, the Chinese or those brave soldiers from India to go into battle without all the necessary war equipment? These countries are calling to Canada, not for men but for tanks, heavy guns, aeroplanes, ships and all kinds of war equipment. We have the manufacturing industry; we have the raw materials; we have the farm lands to grow the foodstuffs. Before this war is ended, there is a distinct possibility that the industries of Britain may be destroyed. Britain may have to look to Canada even more than she looks to-day to supply her with war equipment. There is no question but that there will be a greatly increased demand for foodstuffs, and we shall make a serious mistake if we rob our farmers of experienced farm help. Too many men have been taken from some sections already, and production cannot be kept up if this continues. Our big job, then, at the present time is to equip and feed the millions of trained men who are ready and willing to fight, if they can get the equipment to fight with.

Do not misunderstand me; I am not opposed to conscription if it is necessary. When the time comes when we can equip the men we now have at the battle front, and the voluntary recruiting system to supply a sufficient number of men for reinforcements has

failed, I shall be in favour of conscription. And when that day does come, I trust that the conscription of wealth will come also. But I do not think anyone can say that voluntary recruiting has failed, when there are over 400,000 men enlisted for overseas service, and when during the last seven months there was an average of 20,000 a month, including enlistments in all branches of the army. So far as conscription is concerned, the government could do no more than they are now doing, because every training camp in Canada is filled to capacity, and will be for months to come.

So much has been said in the house with regard to the plebiscite that I wish to add only a word. Every hon. member knows both parties gave their promise that conscription would not be brought in for overseas service during this war. That promise was made not before, but some time after war was declared. Whether or not we individually made the promise, the fact that we supported our leaders who did make the promise commits us just as much as though we made the promise ourselves. Had the government gone ahead and brought in conscription for overseas service, without asking to be released from their promise, there would have been nothing left for me to do but to resign my seat. To my mind that is the only course any hon. member could take. How an hon. member could take any other view, I cannot understand.

Some men who know better are trying to make us believe that the government is attempting to evade responsibility by the taking of the plebiscite. That, of course, is not true. The government is asking to be released from the promise made, in order that it may be able to take on the additional responsibility of bringing in conscription, should it become necessary to do so.

There is one thing more I wish to say before resuming my seat. When this war is won, as it will be, and when great sacrifices have been made, do not let us forget what we are fighting for. During the last war some of us who could not go over encouraged the boys by telling them that they were fighting a war to end war; that they would return to a better world, a world in which there would be more equalities of opportunity, a world where men would not have to spend their days living in fear of unemployment; that men with families would not have to live in fear of losing their jobs; that they would not have to live in fear of sickness, or of impoverished old age. Such worry and fear have brought many men and women to early graves.

Yes, during the last war we saw the vision of a better world, and we held that vision up before the boys as they left Canada, and left behind them all they held dear in life. We won the war, but we lost the vision. We settled back in our old ways of living. We passed through a depression, the like of which I trust the people of Canada will never be called upon again to experience.

Of late I have been reading a good deal about Russia; and while I am not a communist and believe in the democratic form of government, still I am convinced we could learn many lessons from the Russian people. I believe the inequality of our system is wrong, and must be changed. The day of special privileges for certain classes in Canada must come to an end. Again we see many of our leaders holding up before us a vision of a better world to live in after this war is over. May we this time make the vision a reality; for land and possessions won, enemies subdued, will count for nothing to the rising generation unless there is a more lasting effect upon the lives and characters of the nation's individuals.

Mr. MAURICE BOURGET (Lévis) (Translation): Since the opening of the present session, Mr. Speaker, we have heard, in this house, hon. members from all parties, representing the various parts of Canada, express their views on the momentous problems which we have to solve at the present time. I would like now to give you a sincere statement of my opinion on the matter. I will endeavour to do it in a frank and honest manner without stirring up sentiment or prejudice.

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I must admit that I had a disagreeable surprise on reading in the speech from the throne that the government intended to ask our population, by means of a plebiscite, to be released from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service. I sincerely thought that this question asked of our population during the electoral campaign of 1940, had been answered for the duration of the present parliament and that, consequently, there was no earthly use in putting it again. It is hard to believe that the government will disregard the mandate entrusted to them and that a great majority of the hon. members have already forgotten their solemn pledge to the electors. I cannot believe it, for the answer was too clear-cut, too unanimous, too eloquent. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I have not forgotten those pledges and that I feel just as honestly bound by them as I did on the evening of March 26, 1940.

I feel that, in a democracy, where the electors of each constituency give to a person the right to represent them and speak on their behalf, they are entitled at least to the sincerity of their representative as their sole guarantee against deception. For anyone to entertain the contrary opinion would be to deny the elementary principles of democracy. Mr. Speaker, I have faith in democracy and its principles and because of this faith, I would be the last to attempt to destroy it.

I wonder whether the members of the official opposition in this house asking with such eagerness that the government break their pledge are really sincere when they parade their readiness to every sacrifice in order to safeguard democracy. One is entitled to doubt their statement when recalling the actions of their party in past circumstances of a similar nature and when considering the kind of supporters their campaigns draw from outside.

I am not a prophesier of evil, but let me say that they might be the first to lament over the results of their present campaign.

The candidates of their party, following in the footsteps of their leaders, took, before the electors of the whole country, the solemn pledge if they were set in power of never enacting conscription for overseas service. Queer pledge indeed, Mr. Speaker, for during the very first session of this parliament we have witnessed in this house an extremely energetic campaign against the government for the purpose of compelling them to set aside their pledge and enact conscription for overseas service.

They did not ask if our country was well prepared to defend itself; they did not ask how many men were needed for the defence of our coasts and the protection of our civilian population in the hinterland. They did not ask how many men our farmers, our war industries and our shipyards would need for maximum production.

No, for certain people, our first duty was not to defend our own country, but to be at the side of Great Britain.

That is not the way I understand my duty as a Canadian citizen, because I consider that each country's foremost responsibility is, first of all, to assure it own security. Unable to persuade the majority in this house, duly elected by the people, to change their views on the subject, our opponents do not accept defeat so easily; they go outside to the press and the high priests of finance for support. A campaign soon follows, in a certain section of the country particularly; these people try cunningly and dishonestly to impose their views, under the cloak of patriotism. All means are fair for them; racial prejudice, religious differences, they stop at nothing, as long as they reach their goal; they do not even stop to think that they are in great danger of defeating their own purpose.

You will admit that it is not by seeking the destruction of the present national unity that our war effort will be increased. The citizens of all parts of the country are heartily desirous of contributing to the full measure of their capacity towards the victory of our allies. I would deem it a crime to seek to destroy this noble enthusiasm by undermining national unity for petty purposes.

It has been stated repeatedly by many persons in this house and outside, even last year, that the military act of 1917, enacted by the government of the day, had in fact disrupted national unity. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, is it logical to believe that what was true in 1941 is no longer true in 1942?

For my part, I sincerely believe that the adoption of conscription for overseas service would certainly destroy what all true Canadians have striven to build up since confederation. Are those who now strive to disrupt that national unity and use every means to bring about the enactment of conscription so blind as not to see that this government has put forth a maximum effort to help our allies? Let us look around us, let us travel in the various provinces, and we will witness with admiration the exuberant activity that prevails in all our industries producing war material to help our allies.

Is not the speech delivered in this house by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), at the beginning of this session, an accurate summary of the wonderful effort we are putting forth?

Early in January I happened to read in one of the great newspapers of the American metropolis about Canada's share in the present war, and, I frankly admit that, as a Canadian, I was not ashamed of the story told to our neighbours.

Why then, Mr. Speaker, should we abandon the policy we have followed up to the present? Is it not the best one? Have the results not clearly shown that it is? The statements made by some people show a total lack of sense of proportion. How can it reasonably be claimed that with a population of eleven million it is possible to: (1) Supply industry with all the labour it actually needs and may need in greater proportion later on. In the province of Quebec alone there is at present

a shortage of more than 30,000 bushmen; and everybody knows that our boat-building industry is seeking thousands of experienced workers. (2) To leave to agriculture all the hands essential to its survival.

Already complaints are being heard in the rural centres about the shortage of labour, and many agricultural associations and county councils have sent resolutions to their federal members and to the government asking that farmers' sons be exempted from military service. (3) Supply the country with all the soldiers necessary for its own defence and at the same time send hundreds of thousands of men overseas.

I dare hope, Mr. Speaker, that such a thing shall never occur and that most members of this house agree with me on that point. I respect the opinions of other people. In the present circumstances, everyone should assume his own responsibilities. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I do not fear to assume mine, and I sincerely regret that the government does not continue the policy they have followed since the last election.

The campaign conducted by our opponents here and outside matters little. Personally, I am convinced that the majority of right-minded citizens approve our conduct. Everything was not perfect, I admit, but no one, I think, can logically expect a human organization to be perfect.

That is why I cannot support the policy of the government on the plebiscite. I consider moreover that such a policy is fraught with danger, especially under the present circumstances, when it is so easy to appeal to prejudice and revive old political rancour. In some places, attempts will be made to convince the people that they should vote "yes" under the pretext that the sacrifice will not be equal, and elsewhere a similar vote will be given for the sole purpose of embarrassing the government.

Moreover, should the Tories succeed in bringing the people to accept conscription, will any one believe, Mr. Speaker, that they would not press their campaign for a union government. I find at page 151 of the debates of this session, a statement showing that our opponents are already preparing a campaign along those lines. Let me quote the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce):

> If the Prime Minister is committed on conscription he is equally committed against a national government; consequently, if he is bound to proceed with a plebiscite, he should also ask to be relieved from a commitment against a national government.

May we not believe, under the circumstances, that we are treading on dangerous ground in proposing such a measure? Are we not going to play into the hands of our opponents? I am inclined to believe it, for if we give way on one point of our programme, we may later have to give way on another.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I have told my electors that I would fulfill the promises I made at the last election and under the circumstances I do not see why I should alter my course.

The very essence of liberalism compels the Liberal party to let its members be free to express their views, even within the party, and notwithstanding my respect and admiration for my leaders, I regret very much to have to disagree with them about the plebiscite. Consequently, I shall vote against both amendments as well as against the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

Mr. F. P. WHITMAN (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, at this late hour of the debate I should like to express my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I was greatly impressed by both the subject matter and the splendid delivery of both addresses.

This debate has seemed to me to be both interesting and educational. As a new member, and one not yet well educated in political strategy or intrigue, I have been impressed by the arguments advanced by the opposition to the government.

In the general election of 1940 I found myself elected as a supporter of this government. My political opponent, the late Mr. W. Allan Walsh, was one of Montreal's most public-spirited men and one of her finest gentlemen. In many ways it was unfortunate that he had to be defeated.

As a follower of this government I expect still to be able to arrive at decisions dictated by my own conscience. Not being a politician or a strong party man, I felt that I could vote conscientiously and honestly. This has been my aim in the past and shall continue to be my aim in the future.

The debate so far has brought out two important points: one, the government is making a real war effort according to plan; two, even greater efforts must be made in the future.

The effort so far made by Canada has been well made. That is nothing to be smugly satisfied with; but, like all sincere efforts, it is gaining in momentum as it goes along. I

was particularly impressed by the report of the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) when, last November, he delivered his report to this parliament. He described the result then as the result of the planning of the year before, and promised that, as time went on, a further development would take place and industrial evolution would unfold which would astonish us. I remember well when tanks were not even on order by this department, and now we find this complicated piece of war machinery coming along at several per day. The manufacture of guns, aeroplanes, vehicles of war, et cetera, that we have never tried to manufacture before, has astonished the world, and has proved to us that this government has made and is making a very material contribution according to plan and with the cooperation of both labour and capital, towards winning this war.

Agriculture, lumbering, transportation, mining and fishing are other phases of industry which deserve special mention. Our mines are producing minerals and coal which will eventually bring us victory. Our agriculture will in the future be taxed to the utmost but will produce whatever is necessary to feed civilization. Transportation in Canada is doing a splendid job; and right here I should like to pay tribute to those shop workers of our railways who are keeping the equipment in shape. When new equipment is not available, the old is kept in service, and developments take place of which the public never hears. But the wheels roll, freight and humans are transported, and, except for some fault-finding when trains are late we pay little attention to details and difficulties. We expect efficiency, and I think we are getting it pretty well all along the line. Each department seems a cog in the wheel of a successful war effort. If one of those cogs should break down, we would, in a short time, be aware of a serious situation in all departments. If our fishermen caught no fish, or if our lumbering industry were stopped, our entire effort would be slowed down or would become out of step. We have confidence in these phases of our national life, and feel certain they will not fail us. Sometimes little irritations arise that cause inconvenience—a strike here, or a lock-out there—but on the whole the wheels roll on without let-up, and will continue to do so until victory is ours. As long as the cogs of Canadian effort fit, we shall have a wheel that turns efficiently. And this whole Canadian effort, Mr. Speaker, is just another cog in a larger wheel—the wheel of the twenty-six nations now signed to a pact to save Christian civilization as we know it. If we as Canadians fall down in our effort, the whole cause suffers and is slowed up. We must not fail in our duty.

This brings me to the most contentious point yet discussed in this parliament—the plebiscite. I am not going to justify the causes leading to the undertaking of this plebiscite or the promises made that are being discussed. In fact, I will not attempt at this time to discuss the taking of the plebiscite, but I want to make this definite statement. If this plebiscite carries—and I know it will—I shall expect this government this session to adopt whatever powers are necessary so that our war effort will be the most effective possible. Conscription? Yes, if our war effort demands it, then let us pass it. Conscription is not a Liberal or a Conservative issue; it is bigger than any party or any section of our country. I should like to see our man-power and our woman-power detailed to a position of trust for the duration of the war and know they would be compelled to remain there till victory is won. Our farmers should have detailed to them the help needed to farm efficiently. Our industries should also have the man-power or woman-power required. Conscription—or should I call it compulsory national service?—should be a measure to ensure that our war effort is as effective as it can be with due regard to the desires and demands of the other twenty-five signatory nations of the Washington pact.

Is any political party qualified to tell this government when conscription is necessary? Is there a newspaper in this whole country that can intelligently state that to-day is the day to bring in such a measure, or am I, a member of this house, in a position to demand or insist that the government enact such a law to-day? Surely it would be sheer effrontery for any of us, with the limited knowledge we have at our disposal, even to suggest what is the most desirable course at this time. Even our experts, with all the knowledge they have at their disposal, are puzzled as to what might be the correct course. I believe, however, if we trust those experts and have faith in ourselves and our institutions and work to assist to the maximum the effort being made by Canada, that effort will be one which historians will record as worthy of this generation. Never will it be said that we failed in a time of stress to be effective and loyal both to our traditions and to those other twenty-five nations that are now our allies in this fight for survival.

Much is being said to-day about conscription for overseas service. This really is only one phase of our war effort, and it is my considered opinion that when men are required

for overseas service they will be obtained. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) is not going to take no for an answer when the need is there. Up to the present we have recruited men for our army voluntarily. We have also raised money voluntarily. We have built tanks, guns, aeroplanes voluntarily. We have raised farm products voluntarily. But if any of these or any other phases of our war effort fail, conscription will be enforced so quickly that even the opposition will be surprised; and as Mr. Menzies told us last year when he addressed the Canadian club here, let us at times say to the government, "Well done; we did not know you had it in you."

I have yet to hear one word of praise from the opposition as to any of our accomplishments. This is unfortunate since the people of Canada are aware of some of our successes and are certain to discount largely the statements of those who depreciate or belittle the results so far obtained. If Sir Robert Borden, Sir Sam Hughes, Sir Joseph Flavelle or the other leaders of the last war effort could see what we have done in this war, I think they would be astounded at the expansion of industry and our success in raising an army. And if we could see what the future holds, if we could visualize how many casualties we might have in the next year, how easy it would be to plan our efforts. But this we do not know; therefore our effort must be elastic. Our leaders and our government must take whatever steps are considered necessary as time elapses to coordinate our effort with our twenty-five allies, so that the entire allied effort will be efficient and successful. For this reason no promises should be made as to what will be done in the future, and promises made in the past must not tie the hands of our government to do Canada's share in the future.

When this plebiscite is taken, as my hon. friend the member for Danforth (Mr. Harris) has said, we must all vote "Ja" overwhelmingly; and after the vote is taken, we must not stop there. As the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) told us, in his excellent address, the government will be free to act and will act in the best interests of the country. Our duty will be to see that such statements are carried into effect, not by threats but by cooperation and by just such debates as are taking place here to-day. In the meantime, trust and confidence in our government is the order. Have confidence in our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), who has been Prime Minister so well and so long. Even my hon. friend the member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) went to some length to tell us, on May 28, 1940, what a good peace-time Prime Minister he was. I should like to quote what the hon. member for Parkdale says, as reported in *Hansard* at page 305, May 28, 1940:

> I have been a friend of the Prime Minister of Canada for many years and have admired his many excellent qualities. He was prepared, as few in this country have ever been, by long years of education and training in statecraft for public life. He is a man of high character, a man of peace.

Let us also have confidence in our Minister of National Defence, who in my estimation is giving all that he has to fill his position. The evolution of our munitions and supply make it easier to have confidence in our minister of that department. The Minister of Finance must also command our confidence and our cooperation. If any one in Canada talks about boycotting the war loan of 1942 because of some fancied wrong or of a political injustice, then I say that person is doing an immoral act and should be punished. This loan must be oversubscribed, and the Minister of Finance must use any means he deems necessary to ensure its success.

I should also like to say a word on the conscription of wealth and industry. To a limited extent we are having conscription of our wealth to-day. Wages and salaries are paying a defence tax; small, I admit, but still a tax.

I was impressed by the suggestion put forward by my hon. friend the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe) when he suggested a compulsory saving plan. That is, if this national defence tax is not producing sufficient revenue, then let us take a larger percentage of the wages. But let a portion of this collection be returned within five or seven years after the war is finished. Possibly a graduated scale of such saving could be adopted, and we could see the smaller incomes taxed a little less and the larger ones a little more. As I remember one speech made in this house, our Minister of Finance was told that his first war loan was a flop even though the amount of money required was received by extending the time of contribution. I suggest to the Minister of Finance that if he considers it necessary, he should do whatever his judgment tells him should be done to conscript accumulated capital or bank balances or money not being used. If our war effort demands it, I know he will not hesitate.

Now as to industry. I was in a plant a short time ago and talked with the superintendent. In the course of our conversation he told me he had been called to the main office that day and instructed to prepare for the production of a complicated piece of war machinery. He replied that he could not

produce it conveniently owing to labour involved, space required, et cetera. His directors told him to overcome all obstacles, for if he did not, the government would take over the plant and operate it themselves. This, I think, is all that is necessary at present. Rather than conscription we have cooperation detailed by the government. If a greater degree of cooperation becomes necessary, then I feel certain we shall have it.

I remember a few years ago about a contract for Bren guns. I remember the unrest, suspicion and lack of trust in our public men than were created by statements of a politician and of certain papers. An investigation was held, and I remember the result. Hitler must have smiled to see the slowing up of the production of Bren guns due to that investigation. I met Major-General Lafleche at the station at Montreal West last year and congratulated him upon the splendid results that this contract had produced. I told him he must feel satisfied and almost exultant at this success. His reply was that he knew what the result must be eventually and that the people of Canada would appreciate the situation. Why should we tolerate such tactics? I do not suggest control of the press, but I do believe control should be exercised if a paper stirs up unrest, suspicion and lack of confidence merely for political gain. I think the government could very well appoint a controller to insist that the freedom of the press is guaranteed to papers which print only facts and not propaganda that undermines our war effort.

I am not one of those who expect a depression after the war. I do not believe Canadians will ever tolerate a depression such as we had from 1929 to 1938. If we had kept our young men gainfully employed during those years, they would not have become demoralized. Imagine men twenty-five to thirty-five years of age being gainfully employed for the first time in their lives!

Our economy has been wrong. Possibly out of these new price controls now in force in Canada we may be able to work out a basic price so that farmers, lumbermen, fishermen and other primary producers will be able to enjoy a standard of living which will make their callings attractive. This must be done if democracy is to survive. Depressions such as we have known must not again be tolerated. We expect and must receive from our elected representatives great solutions to great problems. Our present-day war effort shows that nothing is impossible if the will to accomplish is there. We must have faith and confidence in ourselves and produce results in peace time similar to those we are producing now.

[Mr. Whitman.]

One other matter I should like to touch on is that of national government. The term "national" seems to be used incorrectly. All elected governments here in Ottawa are national governments. What I expect my Conservative friends wish to have is a union government. To this I cannot subscribe. The government of Britain since the last war has been mainly a union government, and its accomplishments are well known. Surely no one can point with pride to all the results of the union activities of the British government since 1923. Even the talents of the present Prime Minister of Great Britain were not used, in fact they seemed to be discovered only when an emergency appeared. The government of Britain is still union, but I believe democracy such as we enjoy in Canada can be stronger and more efficient if we have a loyal, intelligent and effective opposition. Because this is my belief, I believe we should not now consider union government. If all parties and representatives who have been elected to this house will cooperate, our system will continue to give satisfaction.

In closing, I wish to state my position clearly. I will vote for and exert my greatest effort to have this plebiscite give the government the authority it requires. This, however, will be only one step towards the ultimate goal. I want to see action taken this session, or as soon as possible after the authority asked for has been obtained, and if it is necessary to act before the results of the plebiscite are known, then I want this government to act first and obtain permission afterwards.

On motion of Mr. Lapointe (Lotbinière) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

Friday, February 13, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

HONG KONG

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE—APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSION OF INQUIRY

On the order for motions:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wish to lay on the table of the house copy of order in council P.C. 1160, February 12, 1942, passed under the authority of the Inquiries Act, chapter 99, revised statutes of Canada, 1927, appointing the Right Hon. Sir Lyman Poore Duff a commissioner to inquire into and report upon the organization, authorization and dispatch of a Canadian expeditionary force to the crown colony of Hong Kong.

PLEBISCITE ACT

PROVISION FOR TAKING OF VOTE ON ANY QUESTION SUBMITTED BY WAY OF PLEBISCITE

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure respecting the taking of the votes of the qualified voters on any question submitted by way of plebiscite and for such purposes to make provision for the printing and publication of a Plebiscite Act and instructions issued thereunder, the preparation of voters' lists and other plebiscite documents, including forms and ballot papers, to provide for the fees, allowances, expenses or other remuneration of certain officials and employees.

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): This is just a pro forma motion, I take it?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

SS. "LADY HAWKINS"

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF LOSS IN ATLANTIC BY TORPEDO ATTACK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, on February 4, I forwarded notice of a question to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Cardin), who asked me to hold it in order that he might consult his colleague the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services (Mr. Macdonald). I wish to ask that question now. I may say that the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services spoke to me about it yesterday. Will the minister make a statement regarding the torpedoing of the Canadian National steamship *Lady Hawkins,* and particularly as to whether this ship was convoyed on any part of the journey, and if so, why no assistance was near at hand to safeguard the lives of passengers and crew, which included women, children and highly-qualified engineers and technicians? Will the minister cause a searching investigation of this disaster to be undertaken and a report presented to this parliament?

Hon. ANGUS L. MACDONALD (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): Is my hon. friend addressing the question to me?

Mr. COLDWELL: To the Minister of Transport.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I shall discuss it with the minister and see that an answer is brought down as soon as possible.

TAXATION

PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Minister of Finance if any further agreements have been reached with the provinces, particularly Ontario, with respect to the vacation of the taxation field?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker.

PLEBISCITE

RESOLUTION OF TORONTO CITY COUNCIL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): I should like to ask the Prime Minister a question based on a letter I received to-day from Mr. James W. Somers, O.B.E., city clerk of the city of Toronto, containing a resolution passed by the city council on February 9th, requesting the government to reconsider the question of taking a plebiscite. May I ask the Prime Minister if this resolution has been received, and if so, has it been considered by the government?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I think I can assure my hon. friend that the resolution has been received, and I think I may say that it has received such consideration as was expected would be given to it. I can assure my hon. friend that the plebiscite will be proceeded with.

AGRICULTURAL SUPPLIES

ENCOURAGEMENT OF WIDER USE OF CHEMICAL FERTILIZERS BY EASTERN FARMERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. L. DOUGLAS (Queens): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the announcement made some time ago to the effect that the government had under consideration the granting of fertilizer assistance to eastern farmers, has the minister anything further to announce with regard to the proposed assistance?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member informed me of his intention to ask the question, and I have prepared the following reply.

For the purpose of encouraging farmers in the five provinces of eastern Canada to

increase the yields of pastures—clover, alfalfa, and grass meadows; field corn; spring wheat, oats, barley, spring mixed grains for grain production; mangels and turnips for feeding live stock, an order in council has just been passed providing for $1,000,000 to be spent by the agricultural supplies board by July 1, 1942, to encourage the wider use of chemical fertilizers for the production of the crops mentioned. Greater production of pastures, hay, ensilage, grain and root crops in eastern Canada is necessary if the demand from Britain for more Canadian dairy products, poultry and live stock products is to be met and at the same time supply the domestic requirements for these products.

Payments to farmers are to be based on 40 cents per unit of nitrogen and 20 cents per unit each of phosphoric acid and potash in a ton of fertilizer. For example on a ton of chemical fertilizer containing two per cent of nitrogen, 12 per cent of phosphoric acid and 6 per cent of potash, the farmer would have $4.40 deducted from the net cash price of the fertilizer by the vendor, who will be reimbursed accordingly. Purchases are to be limited to a minimum of one-quarter of a ton of any one kind or analysis of fertilizer and a total of five tons to any one farmer, and a farmer must buy only for his own use and not for resale.

The policy will be administered by Grant S. Peart, fertilizer administrator, under the agricultural supplies board. By arrangement with the provincial governments supervision of the operation of the policy will be carried out by the provincial fertilizer boards and councils, which have been established for several years.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Why are potatoes not included in that category? That is the most important thing of all.

Mr. GARDINER: The reason is that this is provision for increasing the production of feed to be fed to live stock in order to increase the supply of meats and dairy products.

Mr. SENN: With further reference to the question of the bonus on fertilizers, is there any price ceiling on fertilizer to prevent the price going up in the meantime and the farmer being robbed of that bonus?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes; there is a price ceiling on fertilizer.

Mr. WRIGHT: In view of the statement made by the minister with regard to the assistance to be given in the purchase of fertilizer for the purpose of producing more feed for live stock, why are the western provinces excluded from the grants for fertilizer for the production of more coarse grains for that purpose?

Mr. GARDINER: There are two reasons. The first is that fertilizer is not generally used nor as much needed in the three western provinces as it is in the older provinces of the east, partly because of the nature of the soil itself and partly because of the length of time farming has been carried on in eastern Canada. The other reason is that we did last year encourage the production of coarse grains in the west and this year we are paying a very considerable amount in freight on the shipment of coarse grains from west to east. It is thought preferable to have as much coarse grain as possible produced on the farms where it will be fed.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

PRICES OF CHEESE AND BUTTER—AGREEMENTS WITH GREAT BRITAIN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. LECLERC (Shefford): May I ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) whether the pegged prices of dairy products in 1941 will be continued during the present year?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): The only peg there was to the prices of cheese and milk products last year, forming a floor for prices, was the agreement made with Great Britain. New agreements are being negotiated with Great Britain and will come into operation on the 1st of April. The terms of the agreements have not yet been determined. So far as butter is concerned, last year we had a minimum price beginning in May and extending until October. I am not in a position to make a definite statement as to how the matter will be handled this year, but it is under consideration at the moment and an announcement will be made later.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

EXCLUSION OF "GAZETTE" AND "GLOBE AND MAIL" FROM SALE IN LOBBY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, may I ask your honour if it is a fact that the Montreal *Gazette* and the *Globe and Mail* have been excluded from sale in the

lobby of the house? If so, on whose authority, and is there any reason why that should be so?

Mr. SPEAKER: The question which the hon. member asks can hardly be discussed while I am in the chair. There are some matters under consideration now, and I should prefer to have the hon. member see me personally, when I will give him an explanation.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

KIRKLAND LAKE MINERS—QUESTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PRESERVATION OF SENIORITY RIGHTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I wish to ask a question of the acting Minister of Labour (Mr. McLarty). About a week ago, I understand, a delegation representing the miners of Kirkland Lake interviewed the minister to see if the government could use their good offices with the mine operators so that when the men went back to work there would be no discrimination and that their seniority rights would be respected. Did the government take this matter up with the operators, and was there any assurance on that point?

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Acting Minister of Labour): What the hon. member states about the delegation meeting in Ottawa is correct. At the time the matter, I believe, was taken up with the operators, who were asked to be magnanimous in taking back the men. No formal undertaking was given by the operators as to discrimination or seniority, but the men are returning to work and I have heard no complaint in connection with the matter up to this time.

Mr. COLDWELL: The minister says he believes the matter of victimization and discrimination has been taken up. Does he know whether it was taken up or not?

Mr. McLARTY: It might probably be as well if this question were allowed to stand, so that I can confirm what I stated and possibly I may be able to give a little further information. The point is that so far as I am aware, no complaint has been received. I understand that the men are going back to work, but no discrimination has, I believe, so far been shown.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Thursday, February 12, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. HUGUES LAPOINTE (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, it is not without emotion that I rise to-day, having in mind the tributes paid to the memory of my father by his friend and leader, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), and by other members of this house. Their words of appreciation for the services rendered by him to his race and to his country have become part of an inheritance most valuable to me, an inheritance composed of examples of his persistent work, of his loyalty to leader and party and of his devotion to public duty. I wish, Mr. Speaker, in the name of my family as well as in my own, to take this occasion to thank you, sir, and to thank the Prime Minister and the other hon. members who spoke, as well as all members of this house, for the sympathy extended to us in our sad bereavement.

When I last attended a session of this parliament prior to my departure for overseas, it did not enter my mind that an occasion would be given to me to participate in a debate of this kind. At that time the introduction of conscription of man-power for service overseas appeared to anyone with an unbiased mind as a totally unnecessary issue, in view of the success with which the voluntary system had been attended throughout the country. Of course there were, even then, small isolated groups in different parts of Canada who were clamouring for a measure of this sort, but, generally speaking, the people of Canada had to admit that enlistment in the Canadian forces had been plentiful, and that the appeal made to the young men of this country had received an adequate answer.

Unfortunately, since that time the small isolated group of conscriptionists to whom I have just referred have acquired adherents and have succeeded in making some people believe that representations and requests, if made loudly enough, constituted public opinion. They have succeeded in convincing some well-meaning but ill-informed citizens that the war effort of Canada as prosecuted

by the present government is not satisfactory, and that conscription of man-power alone is the remedy for all the ills from which our effort is suffering.

Since circumstances with which hon. members are acquainted have provided me with an opportunity of being in the house during the present debate, I would feel that I was failing in my duty towards the constituency which I have the honour to represent if I allowed myself to keep silent while this controversy was going on. My contribution at this stage may, I fear, be a mere repetition of some of the views which have already been expressed. As, however, I doubt very much whether an opportunity will again be given to me to be present if ever this question is discussed again, I ask the indulgence of the house, and I will endeavour to be as brief as possible in my remarks.

A few days ago I heard someone state that during the last general election of 1940 he had campaigned in his riding, repeating no less than sixty-four times the pledge made to the people by the leader of the present government and his ministers, and also by the leaders of other groups in this house, that there should or there would be no conscription of man-power for overseas service. I cannot claim to cope with this hon. gentleman's record; I can state, however, that I also pledged myself in the same way in over forty municipalities of the riding which I represent. I made that pledge not only because the leaders of my party had done so, but because I honestly and sincerely believed that the voluntary system was the only adequate and practical method of recruiting men for the services.

I must say that I still hold these views, and am still against conscription of man-power for overseas service. I am against it because I honestly believe that under present circumstances existing in Canada conscription would not increase, but would rather hinder Canada's war effort. I believe it would defeat its own purpose.

As was so eloquently said by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), conscription is not a fundamental; it is not a principle without which the war cannot be prosecuted efficiently; it is merely a method, a means, a device for getting men into the ranks of the different services. Some people may think it is the best method, and they are entitled to such views if they honestly and sincerely entertain them. But they have no right to attack as disloyal, defeatist, complacent or lacking in courage those who, on the other side, believe honestly that it is not the best method and that it could be, under our present national circumstances, disastrous to what has been up to now a united war effort.

May I pause to state immediately that to my mind conscriptionists in this country may be divided into two classes: first, those who honestly and sincerely believe that conscription is the only patriotic procedure in war time; and, second, those who exploit the patriotism of the first group and who use the word "conscription" merely to give voice to their political frustration. I wish to say that the remarks I intend to make, for the next few minutes anyway, are directed towards the second group. It has been said and repeated in many instances that this war should be run in the light of the experience of the last war, and that the many errors and blunders which took place between 1914 and 1919 should not be repeated. Up to now the government has been most careful in its handling of our war effort. In fact, had this government not been so careful; had it permitted the speculation which took place during the last war; had it let the many hoarders and financial sharks who existed during the last war, run amok in this country, I doubt whether the Tory outcry against the government would be as loud as it is, and this well-financed, underhand campaign against the Prime Minister, which has grown in intensity every time big business has been brought to order, might have lost much of its vitality and died a natural death. The clamour for conscription of man-power which has originated from certain quarters might well have been quenched, had more leniency been shown by the different controlling organizations set up by the government.

As I have already said, there are some well-intentioned citizens who sincerely believe conscription to be the only patriotic procedure in war time. But I honestly believe that the conscription issue has been and will again be used by the self-appointed powers of the Tory party to stir up agitation against the government in the hope of precipitating a crisis which might permit them to overthrow it. To put it in another way, it is hoped that the word "conscription" may be a pass-word which will let a certain group through the back door of power after the Canadian people have barred them from the front door. For these people I feel no sympathy whatever. In their view, the end justifies the means, and they will not hesitate to destroy the unity of this country; they will not hesitate to destroy forever the faith which the Canadian people may have in their public men; they will not hesitate to halt the advance of Canada at war, to obtain the

control of this government against the will of the people. They demonstrate their patriotism by clamouring for a step which would tear this country to pieces. Ever since the outbreak of this conflict, they have been asking for compulsory service, at a time when there were more volunteers for the army, the navy and the air force than it was possible to train and equip.

In a certain element of the press over which they seem to have an almighty power, they have been damning the voluntary system, which had been endorsed by the Canadian people and to which this parliament is pledged. Instead of cooperating in the voluntary recruiting which was the war policy of the country, these self-styled leaders of the nation have been publishing cock-and-bull stories about the methods of recruiting officers. They want compulsion; they advocate coercion, but they are scandalized at the idea that young men should be asked to enlist voluntarily.

All this has been done, sir, on the pretext of an all-out war effort. An all-out war effort? Yes, but it was an "all-in" war effort during the recruiting campaign last summer, when they were denouncing the voluntary method and throwing ridicule on the men who were doing their duty. One newspaper published that after the demonstration on parliament hill after the last recruiting campaign, only one man came forward and offered to enlist. What an absurdity! What lack of good faith! Who comes forward and subscribes immediately after a speech on the victory loan? It would have been better for the editor of that paper to inquire from the recruiting office of this district whether many young men did not enlist as a result of that meeting and whether this district, which had been lagging in its quota, did not exceed it as a result of the meeting. But no, Mr. Speaker; this type of person and these newspapers refuse to give encouragement to the voluntary system, which nevertheless has succeeded in spite of them. They have preferred to accuse the government of being weak, cowardly, and complacent. Cowardice, weakness and complacency; these are the choice words of the critics; they are also the choice words of all our war demagogues.

Who is complacent in Canada to-day? Who does not feel the pinch of the war? Who has not been submitted to the increased taxation? Who has not felt the many restrictions imposed by the government? I have no complacency for these abusers of the Canadian war effort. I have no complacency for the calumniators of the men who have been entrusted by the nation with the task of directing our war effort. I especially have no complacency for these highly financed agitators who, from the warmth of their aristocratic clubs and from the comfort of their editorial rooms, advocate conscription on the principle of equality of sacrifice.

An all-out war effort? Yes; everybody in Canada is for an all-out war effort. Everybody wants to finish the war; but an all-out war effort means a whole nation united in heart, soul and spirit, all friends and brothers in sacrifice in a great national union, having the same goal and willing to do their utmost to attain it, but not one group of the nation trying to coerce another group and sowing seeds of discord.

We have before us days of hardship and sorrow, when sacrifices of all sorts will have to be endured. We shall have to face the complex problems of after-war. This country needs, and will need even more, the spiritual unity of all its citizens. We must adopt policies which will keep us bound together, because any division now would be national suicide.

I believe that the national circumstances of each country should determine its method of dealing with war, as they should determine the limits of its effort. Our policies must be realistic, adjusted to the facts of our national life. So must the policies of Australia and south Africa; so they are, and so they should continue to be. Many hon. members have given us the example of our sister dominion, Australia. There is no one in this house who will not praise Australia's loyalty to the crown and the important part which her forces have been taking in the defence of the empire. But this splendid effort has not been accomplished through conscription; it has been accomplished through the voluntary system. In fact, hon. members know that during the last war an attempt was made to introduce conscription in Australia, and this measure was defeated by the people in a referendum. This did not stop the Australian people from earning more than their share of honours during the last war. In south Africa it has always been deemed that conscription, due to national circumstances, would defeat its own purpose. Yet south Africans are defending the empire at this very moment, as they did nobly during the last war. It is strange, Mr. Speaker, how some of our public men, in their well-intended attempts to defend British institutions, British liberties and British ideals, fail completely when they try to imitate the good judgment, common sense and political wisdom of some British statesmen. When the advisability of

conscription for northern Ireland was discussed in the British House of Commons it was immediately dropped and Mr. Churchill, commenting on this measure, said:

> We have made a number of inquiries in various directions with the result that we have come to the conclusion that at the present time, although there would be no dispute about our rights and merits, it would be more trouble than it is worth to enforce such a policy.

That statement was very highly praised in the British House of Commons, and the Manchester *Guardian* published the following editorial:

> If we force conscription on the people of Northern Ireland we do so in defiance of the strongly expressed wishes of a third of the population and against the entreaties of Ulster Labour and of those Ulster Unionists who are not tied to the Unionist machine. We have to consider whether it is in accordance with our professed war aims to coerce a large minority and rouse bitter resistance in a neighbouring state. And for what? Sixty thousand men, many of whom will be disaffected, and an estranged Ireland more ripe for Hitler to attack.
>
> If we destroy the hope of Irish unity, do we not, which is equally serious, bring disharmony into our own ranks? It is necessary to warn the Conservatives in the government that this step will be strongly resented by the Liberal and Labour parties that are now serving under and supporting a Conservative Prime Minister. They will make many sacrifices for the sake of national unity, but they should not be asked to make and they ought not to endure a sacrifice to unreasoning prejudices which stand condemned on every ground of political and strategic common sense.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended at this stage through figures to show how the Military Service Act of 1917 had been a complete failure. Be it sufficient to say that everybody admits the result should have been foreseen even before its enforcement, because no such legislation can meet with success without a thoroughly prepared public opinion.

It has been suggested that conditions have changed, and that public opinion would now be more prepared than in 1917 to accept similar legislation. I beg to differ. Conscription would again cause serious disunity. It would meet serious opposition not only in Quebec but in many other sections of the country.

Again I urge hon. members: let us be realistic and practical. The whole problem, it seems to me, can be summed up in three short questions:

(a) Can conscription for service overseas be enforced without causing disunity in the country, thereby endangering our war effort?

(b) How many men can it produce for the forces, after exemptions and discharges on medical grounds have been granted?

(c) Can the same number or a sufficient number of men be obtained by the voluntary method which, it is admitted, would not destroy Canadian unity?

That is what the whole question amounts to, once it has been shorn of all emotionalism and sentimentalism. As to the answers to these questions enough has already been said in the house to make the answers obvious. I shall not repeat the figures already quoted, but they make clear the case for voluntary enlistment. Conscription was disastrous in 1917. From the point of view of national unity it was a complete failure and proved to be totally inefficient in bringing men into the army. Everything leads us to believe that similar legislation now would bring about a similar situation.

The Prime Minister, in his speech the other day, mentioned the changes to be made in the Canadian corps overseas. I imagine these changes are being made at the suggestion of our military authorities, who realize the need of efficiency in the army.

I believe it is generally admitted that the men drafted for overseas service would be for the army alone. Conscription would not apply to the navy or to the air force. Recruits for these two services are plentiful and furthermore, as I understand it, the very nature of the duties which the men in these services are called upon to perform makes it necessary that they should be volunteers. You cannot make a pilot through compulsion, and you cannot force a man into a submarine and obtain good results.

I submit that what is true of both the air force and the navy is also true of the army. I heard the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) state that, with his experience as a man who went through the ranks and was promoted to the rank of company commander during the last war, he would still prefer to have one volunteer rather than ten conscripts. Other members who have had the experience of the last war have made similar statements. In fact, I doubt whether there is one of the many members of this house who served during the last war, and had occasion to deal with conscripts, who would claim that these men were up to the standard of the volunteers. If this was true of the last war, it is even truer now. With modern methods of warfare, the soldier of the modern army must be a highly trained man, possessed of great initiative and a keen sense of duty. He must be a master at handling the different weapons which are put at his disposal and should be a specialist able to act alone. He is not just a cog in the wheel, but a perfect warrior by himself. For this, a man must have qualities of courage, skill and discipline. In

this war quality coupled with high training and proper equipment is far more important than quantity. France had millions of men but fell before the well-trained, high-powered panzer divisions of Hitler. For these reasons I do not believe that through compulsion you will obtain the type of men needed for the modern army.

It has been to the glory of our Canadian forces overseas that they are serving there voluntarily. Every Canadian on British soil or elsewhere, whether he belongs to the air force, the army or the navy, is there because he chose to be there, not because he has been drafted or conscripted, not because an act of parliament has forced him into service, not because he has been sent there against his will or desire, but because he has elected of his own free will to fight Canada's war at the foremost outpost, on the foremost front line. He has acted as a free citizen in a free country, and he is justly proud of his status as a volunteer before the whole world. He is proud of belonging to a unit totally formed of free volunteers, like himself, and this pride in himself, in the formation to which he belongs, contributes to develop his keenness and to make him a better fighting man. It would be a gross mistake to deprive the men in the army of this justified pride. Surely hon. members will not lower the pride of the Canadian army; surely they will not give the army the occasion of having a feeling of inferiority before the other services by forcing them to take into their ranks men who have refused to come forward of their own free will. Surely the hon. members will not give Hitler's hordes occasion to rejoice in saying that Canada which had entered this war under the voluntary system has had to use compulsion to get men into the army.

It has been argued that it is our duty toward the men already serving overseas to impose conscription in order to supply them with necessary reinforcements. Everybody in this country agrees that the men overseas must receive the backing of the nation. But, Mr. Speaker, let us not be swayed by our emotions. If this support can be given voluntarily, as it has been given voluntarily—and there is no reason to believe that it should stop—why should we cease to continue with the present methods?

Since the opinion of the men already overseas is to be considered, it is only reasonable that we should ask ourselves what that opinion is. Canadian troops overseas have two different attitudes of mind as regards the sending of conscripts to join them. A great number of men, and I should say probably the majority, feel that, if they have volunteered for service overseas, the other fellow who has not followed their example should be forced to serve whenever it may be deemed necessary. They resent very strongly his absence from the service. Another group, which is by no means small, has a totally different attitude of mind. These men have no use for conscripts. They feel, and rightly too, that their status as Canadian citizens, who have come freely to fight Canada's war in Britain, is highly enhanced by the fact that they are volunteers. I have no comment to make about either of these views, but I think the house will admit that neither of them is conducive to the right spirit of cooperation which must exist among men in the army. Our army, like our country, must have unity to be an efficient fighting machine, and I am convinced that this unity, this efficiency, cannot exist if you have on your right flank volunteers and on your left flank conscripts who have been sent there against their wishes. I do not believe that the results will be any better if you have them mixed up together.

I have tried to give a few of the reasons why I am against conscription for overseas service. As I said previously, there are to my mind two different groups of conscriptionists in this country. There are those who are patriotic and there are those who exploit the other fellow's patriotism. As regards this last group, no argument can be of any use against them. I think the results of the four by-elections at the beginning of this week constitute the best answer that we could give. As regards the first group, I submit humbly to them the few arguments which I have just expounded to this house. To that I can only add the words that Cromwell used in a letter to the members of the Church of Scotland, "I beseech you; think it possible that you may be wrong."

Translation): Mr. Speaker, having given some of the reasons for my opposition to compulsory recruiting for overseas service, I wish to explain my position as regards the plebiscite announced in the speech from the throne.

Canada entered into this war voluntarily and freely, because it believed that its most vital interests were seriously threatened. The conflict in which our country finds itself engaged has taken such a scope and assumed such proportions that victory cannot be expected save at the cost of the greatest sacrifices. The prosecution of the war requires an unremitting and ever-increasing effort on the part of everyone. For us in Canada such an effort should aim at building up and maintaining an army, an air force and a navy sufficient for the defence of our own territory. It should also aim in no less a degree at the production

of foodstuffs, munitions and war material of all kinds which our allies so urgently need, which they cannot produce themselves or which they are unable to buy.

If it be true that the defence of our own territory entails the necessity of sending troops overseas as advance guards, it seems to me that the number of such troops is of somewhat secondary importance, considering the many other fields where our efforts are required. To maintain that Canada cannot make an all-out war effort without resorting to coercive measures for overseas service is to show a lack of sense of proportion. Certainly it is important and necessary to maintain our front-line troops and to make sure that they will get the reinforcements they may eventually need; but if it is permitted to look at the past and the present in order to judge of the future, I am firmly convinced that voluntary enlistment, intelligently encouraged and pursued, will suffice to provide such reinforcements.

We all know the gigantic effort put forth by the people of Canada since the outbreak of the war. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and some of his colleagues have already set forth the magnificent results which this effort has produced and is expected to produce in the future. Well, Mr. Speaker, this achievement was made possible by the unity which has existed among Canadians and by a concentrated effort directed to a common end. This unity, this concentrated effort, have been made possible by the assurance, given to the people of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, that there would be no conscription for overseas service, thereby removing all danger of national disunity. The disquiet stirred up by the noisy agitation of shortsighted politicians who would like to have the government break its plighted word gives reason to believe that recourse to conscription for overseas service would injure Canada's war effort.

Such a measure would destroy the confidence of the Canadian people in their government; it would sow the seeds of distrust and reopen recent wounds. No, Mr. Speaker, in this extremely grave crisis, there should be no disunion among Canadians. We must close our ranks and work together. Our efforts must not be spared and we must take care lest they should prove fruitless. Obviously, the Canadian people are masters of their fate. They alone can relieve the government from its pledges. To-day, in view of the attempts that are made to persuade the government that public opinion has changed to the point of being ready to accept a measure it has hitherto so forcibly rejected, the administration is justified in consulting the people themselves in order to find out whether such is the case. To my mind, that is the best way for the government to ascertain not whether conscription for overseas service must be applied, but solely whether the Canadian people would consent to relieve the government from its pledge not to resort to conscription, in case it should feel that such a measure has become necessary. So far as I am concerned, I praise the government for honouring their pledge and I commend their decision to consult the people rather than listen to those public agitators who would have them disregard the promises that were made to the electorate and in which they themselves were a party. For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for concurrence in the address in reply to the speech from the throne, so that the electors of the constituency which I represent may have an opportunity to express their views freely, according to the dictates of their conscience and in the light of facts which I am sure they will be able to appreciate properly.

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate we have listened to a number of speakers emphasizing the seriousness of the foreign situation, and we have listened also to a number of Liberal members who have endeavoured to make us believe that the war effort is everything that it should be. I am sure that we will all agree that the statement made by Mr. Herbert Lash, director of the bureau of public information, last November that we are not winning the war, that our not having lost it is due to luck, that unless we mend our ways and mend them soon we are in dreadful danger of losing this war, should be driven home to every individual in this country, and more especially to the members of this government.

As I said, we have listened to a number of speeches by Liberal members praising the government's war effort, but the thing to remember is that we have been suffering reverse after reverse at the hands of the Germans and the Japanese. No matter how good our war effort has been in the past, it must be considerably better in the future. Otherwise time will not be on our side; time will be on the side that makes the best use of it. I think we can all agree that from September, 1939, to the middle of 1940 the

enemy were making considerably better use of time than we were, and therefore time was not on our side. Speaking in the house the other day in reference to our war effort, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) stated that our direct expenditures for war this year will be three billion dollars. Then he asked these three questions: "Will anyone in this house say that that programme is not worthy? Will anyone say that it will not tax our resources this very year? Will anyone say that the commitment is not enough?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say the only basis on which we can analyse these three questions is this. Are all the people of Canada to-day working? Are our industries to-day working to their full capacity? Are they working twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, three hundred and sixty-five days a year? Have we reduced non-essential services down to the very minimum? The minister knows very well that the answer to all these three questions must be in the negative. As to the question whether or not our effort to-day is a worthy one, the answer must also be in the negative. It is not a question whether we are spending three billion dollars a year. The question is whether or not that represents the maximum effort which we are capable of making.

I am satisfied that we will never make that maximum effort until we mobilize the total resources of the country—financial, industrial and man-power. It is not necessary for me to deal with it any further, except to say that it must be the total of all resources. We advocated that back in 1939, in September, upon the declaration of war, but unfortunately at that time the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was too busily engaged in playing politics, too busy trying to make political capital out of the war. We knew very well that, with an election pending, our stand was politically speaking a dangerous one, but we also knew, and everyone familiar with foreign affairs knew or should have known, that that was the only sound stand to take at that period. Nevertheless, unfortunately for this country, all parties in the house were more interested in the political situation than they were in the foreign one, and during the election campaign attacked our stand for an all-out war effort and in its place advocated a modified one. The Prime Minister, having lulled the people into a false sense of security, won the election on that basis, and to-day we are still reaping the tragic consequences of that policy. It took Dunkirk, in 1940, to awaken the government from its state of lethargy; and to-day it is taking the tragic reverses that we are suffering in the east to make the government realize the folly of its preelection promises.

And so now we are to have a plebiscite, in order that the government may be released from the promise which it made during the last election. It is strange that in spite of that fact one minister after another rises in his place in this house and says that we do not need conscription. I am receiving letters from many people across the country who are very much puzzled that we are to have a plebiscite in order to release the government from its promises regarding conscription, while at the same time it is telling people that we do not need conscription. Naturally the people are bewildered. The other day the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) stated in this chamber that he believed in the voluntary system; he was very much opposed to the idea of conscription. He said, "You cannot conscript men and put them on ships." Well, the minister must have a very short memory, because in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the British used to employ the press-gang in order to get men.

Mr. GARDINER: I did not say that. I said, "corvettes".

Mr. QUELCH: Well, corvettes are ships. I will accept the minister's explanation. He may think they are prairie schooners, but they are ships, and I am referring to ships.

Mr. SLAGHT: Would you go back to the press-gang?

Mr. QUELCH: If the minister had not interrupted me I would have gone on to say that I am not advocating the press-gang. But will the minister say that the prestige of the British navy was not as high when they utilized that method as it has ever been since?

Mr. SLAGHT: Certainly not.

Mr. QUELCH: When he says, "We can't use conscription, we can't force people on ships," I am merely pointing out that in the past we forced men to go on ships, and they were the finest sailors the world has ever seen.

Again, is the Minister of Agriculture right when he says that the present system is a voluntary system? I maintain that the present system is one of the most undesirable forms of compulsion you can possibly have; it is not voluntary at all.

When the four months' training plan was brought into operation, I happened to meet a recruiting officer one day, and I asked him this question: "Do you believe we can get enough men for overseas service?" He replied, "Well, under the one-month training

plan we could not do it, but now we have those men for four months we shall be able to bring enough pressure to bear upon them to bring them into the active service." Of course, that "pressure" is compulsion. Let me give an example. A mechanized convoy comes to a small village. In the evening a dance is put on, and while the boys and girls are dancing a spotlight is turned upon different couples, and a man from the stage calls out to the girls dancing with these men, "Are you not ashamed to be seen dancing with a man who is not in uniform?" I say that if the government cannot get the men they need on a straight voluntary system, without adopting despicable methods of that kind, it would be far better to have conscription. In the olden days we persuaded men to make statements by putting them in a torture chamber. To-day we are persuading men to go into the army by means of a form of mental torture.

Again, let us remember this—I know some hon. members may object to the statement, but they cannot deny it is perfectly true—that in the early days of the war many men were forced into the army not through a sense of patriotism but because of the economic condition in which they found themselves. Let us keep that well in mind. Where that happens it is not going to help to improve the morale or esprit de corps of the army.

I am not criticizing the government for holding a plebiscite. Definite commitments were made, and when they are made they should be honoured. But it is rather strange that suddenly, at this point, the conscience of the Prime Minister should prick him. It has not done so in the past. The promises which he made in 1935 never worried him, although they were never kept; but to-day all of a sudden he has decided that promises should be kept. While I say that I am not over-critical of the government for taking a plebiscite, on the other hand I am very critical of the government for having placed itself in a position where it requires a plebiscite to extricate it. If the Prime Minister had shown during the last election a little more interest in the welfare of the people and a little less interest in the welfare of the Liberal party, that promise need never have been given.

Most people will agree that to-day our most urgent need is machines and more machines. Military men admit that frankly. We were told last year by the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) that we were rapidly approaching peak production due to the fact that we had a shortage of skilled labour.

Again I say that if we had instituted, upon the declaration of war, complete mobilization of the resources of this nation we would not have been faced with that critical situation.

I want now to refer to a statement which was made by a witness before the members of the special committee on pensions. When we sat last year we had Mr. A. W. Crawford, member of the interdepartmental committee on youth training, as a witness, and in his evidence he admitted quite frankly that there were a large number of men trying to get in the training schools for whom they had not the capacity. When he was asked why we could not increase the capacity of these schools in order to train men more rapidly, his answer was that even if they were trained we could not find jobs for them. When he was reminded of the statement made by the Minister of Munitions and Supply that we were reaching maximum production because we had not the skilled labour, he explained that the type of training given to these men does not sufficiently equip them to take their places in skilled industry. Then it was drawn to the attention of Mr. Crawford that in the United States there are a number of advanced training schools which make it possible for men, when they are through with their course, immediately to take their places in industry. Mr. Crawford admitted that we had no schools of that kind in this country, and that they were very costly to install. In view of the fact that we have been told by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of National Defence that no financial restrictions shall be allowed to impede our war effort, it is hard to understand why schools of that sort have not been put into operation long ago, if the main objection is the cost of installing them.

There is something else that is impeding our war effort, and it is this. A large number of men in Canada to-day are engaged in non-essential industries. Perhaps the most flagrant example is to be found in the gold mining industry. According to the bureau of statistics there are engaged in that industry in Canada at the present time between 32,000 and 33,000 men. These men are largely skilled mechanics and miners, but to-day they are not making any contribution whatsoever to the war effort of the British empire and the United States. They are not helping in one single degree. The point may be made that this gold is used for the purpose of bringing supplies from the United States to Canada; but of how much use is that gold to the United States when they get it? Here we have 32,000 men busily engaged in digging gold out of a hole in the ground and transporting it across the line where it is buried in a

hole on the other side. How much is the war effort either of the United States or of the British empire advanced by that process? How much greater would the war effort be, both of the United States and of this country, if these men were engaged in war industries? If the United States desired this gold, we could come to an agreement with them to turn over to them, to hypothecate to the United States the total production of the gold of Canada after the war for so many years. Surely gold is just as safe in the ground on this side of the line as it is in the ground on the other side.

It is unfortunate perhaps that we have in this country at the head of affairs a number of men who still worship at the shrine of gold. Let me quote what Lord Sempill said in the House of Lords on November 18, 1941:

> Ten years ago we regarded it as axiomatic that gold gave value to money, and that money would immediately become worthless if it had not got an adequate gold backing. Yet within the space of these ten years the roles have been reversed, and if anyone is suspected of cherishing a theory now, which has been so comprehensively and thoroughly disproved by fact, he is labelled a "museum piece" or a "gold bug."

Commenting on that statement, I suggest it is unfortunate that we have had in the past and still have a number of these museum pieces on the treasury benches—a number of people with the gold-bug mentality, who are willing to sacrifice the work of thousands of men in the production of gold when these men are needed in our war effort. I would again point out to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) that so long as such things are going on in this country it is useless for him to get up and try to persuade us that we have an all-out war effort.

I might refer to the question of agriculture and the chaotic condition of the industry in western Canada as it relates to the grain grower. There are many boys enlisting who are needed on the farms. In my opinion if we had proper mobilization of man-power we would keep these boys on the farms; they would not go into the army. There are men in non-essential industries that should not be working at their present jobs but somewhere else; they should be doing work which is necessary in our war effort. That would be a form of selective service. I know of many boys who were supposed to be able to get a postponement but were not granted it and were called up. Now they are in the service and cannot obtain leave of absence. Their parents are too old to carry on the work themselves and the result is that they have to sell their stock, which is valuable and is needed in the country. They have to sell valuable breeding stock and that is a loss to the country. This stock is being sold to the packing plants.

Another aspect of the war effort which I have not heard mentioned very much up to the present time is the question of morale. I have heard a number of people in Canada criticizing Canadians in different parts of the country for not being enthusiastically behind the war effort—at any rate, not as enthusiastically as they should be. I think we can all agree that, unfortunately, in many parts of Canada there is not a very great amount of enthusiasm behind the war effort to-day. But where these people generally make their mistake is in criticizing the wrong people, instead of placing the blame where it rightfully belongs, on the shoulders of the government. Let me explain what I mean.

In the period from 1935 to 1939 we continually urged upon the government the fact that people throughout the country deserved and should be given a better and a higher standard of living. We emphasized the fact that the people were not able to find work because there was not enough money being put into circulation. We urged time and again that everything possible should be done to make the people throughout Canada happy and contented, because when you have a happy, contented people, they are willing to fight for the maintenance of the conditions that make for that happiness and contentment. We know, however, that during that period the government refused to spend the amount of money necessary to put Canadians to work, and therefore conditions from 1935 to 1939 were very unsatisfactory. We allowed the productive resources of the country to be systematically sabotaged. There were half a million people unemployed, a million people on relief, and many industries running at only a part of their capacity. What a contrast, one may say, between that condition and the conditions in Russia to-day. There you have a united nation fighting for what they believe to be a real democracy. They do not have to depend upon promises with regard to the future. They can look back on the past twenty years and go forward reassured that everything possible will be done to improve the conditions of the masses. If the people in charge of our policies had been paid servants of Germany during the period from 1935 to 1939 they could not very well have put into operation a policy that would have been of greater advantage to the German nation.

What has been the consequence? To what extent has the health of the soldiers and of the people of Canada been undermined? Let me quote from *The Soldier* magazine of

November, on page 10. There is an article headed, "Fat in war, thin in peace." It reads in part:

A prominent Canadian, General Leo Lafleche, tells how thousands of young Canadians are unfit to fight. They cannot pass the army doctors. Medical authorities point to depression years and the hordes of these transients herded from province to province in the ten years before 1929. Enforced bumming and near starvation was rampant in this great new land of peace, promise and plenty. Youth took to rod-riding and it is to their everlasting credit that they behaved themselves. Mr. Bennett built concentration camps for Canada's young manhood. Mr. King said, "Re-elect me and I'll abolish Bennett's camps." It was an election promise kept by Mr. King, but it took another world war to absorb the population of the now empty camps. Nazi forces of evil and destruction loomed up. Another world war. Canada's youthful transients were fattened for the fight.

Fat in war: thin in peace.

I ask, will that type of policy build up the morale of the Canadian people?

Last year I read in a Canadian magazine an account of how a young man had evaded a draft. He was called up before the judge and asked if he had anything to say, and he replied that he did not think Canada was worth fighting for. Then the writer of the article went on to say what a wonderful and wealthy country Canada was—surely a country well worth fighting for. The point that writer entirely missed was that that boy was probably one of those who came out of college in 1930 and for nine or ten years was not able to find a place in the industrial life of this country. Probably his parents were on relief, his brothers and sisters unable to get proper medical attention or nourishment. Could you expect that boy to be enthusiastic about fighting for the continuation of such a condition? I have spoken to men of the armed forces on the train and I find a similar strain running through the conversation of these men. Invariably the comment was this: We have a dirty job to do and we are going to do it, but when the war is over we are going to demand something better than we have had in the past. I believe that if these men do not get a chance of something better in the future than they have had in the past, there will be serious trouble in this country.

I remember when I was in France during the last war listening to a speech by a prime minister of this country. He told us Canada was grateful for what her men were doing, and he promised that nothing would be too good for us; our dependents would be looked after and every man guaranteed a job. Was that promise kept?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

[Mr. Quelch.]

Mr. QUELCH: Reference was made to that question by the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power) the other day. Let me read what he said, as reported at page 4143 of *Hansard* of November 6, 1941:

Therefore it behooves us, or any government that takes its duties seriously, to see to it that these men do not return from overseas with the same sense of disappointment, disillusionment and discontent as did the men who returned from the last war.

Well, we are now hearing statements by the Prime Minister to the effect that after this war there will be a new heaven and a new earth. I am satisfied that if in the future we continue the same type of policies that we have had in this country in the past, instead of there being a new heaven and a new earth for these men there will be a new hell. If the Prime Minister is really sincere in his talk about a new heaven and a new earth, why does he not take steps now to let the people have a glimpse of this new heaven? I think it was the Prime Minister himself who stated that unless this new order is well on its way before the end of the war we may look for it in vain. Now is the time to try to set up this new order, instead of waiting until the end of the war.

Let me give a few examples of what could be done in order to help regain the confidence of the people of this country. For instance, old age pensions have been mentioned in this debate. The amount of the old age pension could be increased from $20 to $30 a month so that any province wishing to increase their contribution could take advantage of it. Also, the age should be reduced from seventy to sixty-five.

Then we have the question of pensions for widows of disability pensioners. The parliamentary special committee on the Pension Act last year spent a great deal of time considering that question, and in our fourth report we made this recommendation: that after further and more complete exploration of the problems involved, consideration be given to the advisability of extending the provisions of the War Veterans' Act to (a) widows of disability pensioners not now provided for; (b) widows of deceased recipients of war veterans' allowance.

The Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) has stated that no legislation will be introduced this session to take care of these people. But surely we realize that these people are a direct responsibility of the department of pensions. The minister has tried to say that these people should be dealt with under social legislation. But let us remember that when a soldier

marries, the amount of his pension is increased; by increasing the amount of the pension we recognize a very direct responsibility for that woman. Again when a soldier marries and later is given a war veterans' allowance, the amount of the allowance is increased from $20 to $40 a month. Thereby we recognize responsibility for that woman. Yet strangely enough, if that man dies we automatically cut off the allowance to the woman.

Another point is regarding the dependents' allowance regulations. In March, 1941, order in council 138/1936 was passed which destroyed one of the principles of the regulations regarding dependents' allowances. A department of government, the soldier settlement board, is allowed to attach or seize a certain portion of the dependents' allowance to pay off a soldier settler's debt. This action has been criticized by various soldier organizations. This order in council should be rescinded.

Another thing I want to refer to is the question of the subamendment. If it were possible to move an amendment to the subamendment I would do so, owing to the fact that it is open to misinterpretation. But under the rules of the house this may not be done; therefore the subamendment will have to be either accepted in its present form or rejected. The subamendment requests that—

> the forthcoming plebiscite should seek the support of the people of Canada for the complete and effective conscription of war industries, accumulated wealth and financial institutions, at the same time and on the same basis of sacrifice as the suggested extension of the conscription of man-power.

Various interpretations, or perhaps I should say misinterpretations, have been offered in this house regarding that subamendment. But on page 55 of *Hansard* of January 26 last the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group explained exactly what the group means by that subamendment. On behalf of this group I will say that we will support the subamendment on the basis of the explanation given by the acting leader of the C.C.F., with the exception of paragraph 1 and paragraph 6 of his explanation, in respect to which we will take the alternatives presented by the C.C.F. group.

Before commenting upon this explanation I have one or two observations to make. First I should like to compliment the C.C.F. upon their present stand. I might point out that it is very similar to the stand we took in September, 1939, and have maintained consistently ever since. On the other hand it is quite a broadening out of the stand they took at that time. To show the consistency of this group as between 1939 and the present day I want to quote what I said on the appropriation bill on behalf of the group as reported on page 99 of *Hansard:*

> When a country engages in war it becomes engaged in a life and death struggle, and it therefore becomes essential that it organize on as effective a basis as possible. Otherwise unnecessary loss of life and great hardship are bound to result. That is why the group to which I belong has taken a stand in favour of the conscription of finance, industry and man-power. By such means we believe we can avoid the injustices and inequalities which existed during the last war. By such means we believe we may develop the resources of this nation to their full capacities, so that we may be enabled to make a maximum contribution, without increasing the debt of the nation by a single dollar. In other words we advocate a policy of pay-as-you-go. . . .
>
> We believe in utilizing the Bank of Canada so that we may create the necessary financial credits and currency, combined with definite price regulation so as to obviate any serious rise in prices. We would advocate, further, steeply graded income and profits taxes. We maintain, further, that the only possible justification for borrowing is when our need for goods is greater than our ability to produce them. That condition of course requires external borrowing. We see absolutely no justification for internal borrowing.

An hon. MEMBER: What date was that?

Mr. QUELCH: That was on September 11, 1939, during the discussion of the war appropriation bill.

Now I come to the C.C.F. subamendment, and the explanation of that amendment as given by the leader of that group, appearing at pages 56 and 57 of *Hansard* for this session:

> 1. The national ownership or, at least, control of all our war industries to produce everything we require to maintain civilian health and morale and to provide our fighting forces with adequate equipment.

We are completely in accord with those last words, referring to control. With regard to the question of national ownership, I would say that wherever the government puts up the money to build an industry, we believe that industry should be owned and operated by the government. On the other hand, where you have industries already set up using only a small portion of their plants for the purpose of manufacturing war supplies, we do not think it would be advisable to have nationalization and in such cases would advocate control.

> 2. An integrated production plan which utilizes every plant and facility in its proper place without regard to the demands of big corporations and trusts.

We agree with that.

> 3. A complete reversal of the present dollar-a-year-men control policy and the substitution of proportionate representatives of organized

farmer and labour bodies on all control agencies, so that the pressure of big business could be effectively curbed and democratic direction of the war effort achieved.

We agree to that.

4. Direct national control of all our financial institutions so that without inflation and without unnecessary future burdens of debt, we can finance our national effort.

We are altogether in accord with that. I like the way it is worded, but perhaps I might add a word of explanation. We realize that you cannot tax the total income away from an individual, that you must leave him enough in the first place to maintain a fair standard of living and at the same time put aside a little for a rainy day. This has been emphasized time and again by the Minister of Finance. So we say that to the extent that taxation and the sale of interest-free war savings certificates fail to meet government expenditures, the services of the Bank of Canada should be utilized.

5. There must be, at least, a one hundred per cent excess profits tax and, indeed, on all profits a low maximum rate should be set and the excess taken by the government for our war effort.

We agree to that.

6. The present loan policy should be replaced by one of compulsory, interest free loans imposed on the accumulated wealth of rich individuals and corporations, and based on ability to contribute. Indeed, the fairest method would be to establish a fair maximum income for all and to tax back to the country every dollar above that maximum.

So far as this paragraph is concerned, we are heartily in accord with the portion commencing with the words, "Indeed, the fairest method." Perhaps I might quote from what I said on the appropriation bill of 1939, to show the similarity of our stand then, as it appears at page 99 of *Hansard* for September 11, 1939:

In time of war it becomes necessary to call upon certain people to make that supreme sacrifice. It is necessary for others to suffer mutilation of the body. Is it asking too much to ask people remaining in Canada, in comparative safety, to be willing to sacrifice the major portions of their incomes? Is that asking too much, at a time when we are asking other people to sacrifice their lives? I say we have every right to demand that those who remain in safety be prepared to sacrifice the major portion of their incomes, that they be permitted to retain only that portion which is necessary for the maintenance of a moderate standard of living.

That is why I say we are heartily in accord with the latter part of this paragraph. No doubt some people will say that our policy to-day shows a considerable change from our policy before the war. Of course it does, because in war time we do not advocate business as usual. We have always held that in peace time the production of the country should be maintained at a level sufficiently high to satisfy the requirements of the Canadian people and to make that production available to the people throughout the country. But in war time, on the other hand, we maintain that the production of the country must be kept at its maximum level in order to make the greatest possible contribution to our war effort. Therefore the people should be satisfied with a moderate standard of living, a standard that will ensure their health and efficiency. And in order that the people shall not have a higher standard of living than that, we have consistently advocated increased taxation during time of war.

Coming back to agriculture, we feel that the government should give every consideration to the just demands of agriculture. We feel it is high time for the government to introduce an agricultural policy based upon the recommendations of the various farm organizations, instead of showing, as they have in the past, a contemptuous disregard for those bodies. When we compare the treatment of the farmers in the United States under the AAA with the treatment which has been accorded the farmers of this country, we must agree that any such comparison is odious so far as this country is concerned.

There will be plenty of time later on to discuss agricultural policies, so I can leave this question, only mentioning that we in this group have urged, as to-day we are urging by resolutions on the order paper, that $1 per bushel should be paid the farmer at point of shipment, on a quota designated by the wheat board, and that the Prairie Farm Assistance Act should be amended so that it might constitute a sound crop insurance scheme.

By their actions now the government should do everything in their power to convince the people that when victory has been won there will be no danger of a return to the deplorable conditions that existed prior to the declaration of war. Only in this way can we inspire in the people the will to win. Only by such means can we hope to build up the morale of the people, so that they will be glad to endure any and every sacrifice required of them, whether it be in Canada or beyond the seas.

Mr. W. C. MACDONALD (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to join with other speakers who have preceded me in this debate in extending congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the motion for the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

To-day Singapore is in the news. None of us can be unmindful of the critical situation

now facing that great British naval base, nor can one fail to feel admiration for the gallant defence that is being maintained by its defenders. I have the honour to be one of the representatives of the city and county of Halifax, and to-day I cannot help recalling that Halifax itself was established long ago as an outpost of Britain's expanding colonial empire. Someone has said that in the history of every nation there are certain decisive moments which determine the destiny of that nation for centuries to come. One of those moments in the history of Canada undoubtedly was the founding of Halifax in 1749, and the establishment there of a British naval base and army garrison. The British government of the day had come to realize that possession of Nova Scotia was essential, if British connections in north America were to be maintained. In Halifax was built up a naval and military base, which was undoubtedly one of the decisive factors in preserving this country for the British crown, not only during the wars with France, but also during the American revolutionary war and the war of 1812. It was realized in those early days, just as it is to-day, that Nova Scotia was one of the new world's strategic areas. One need only glance at the map to appreciate to the full the strategic importance of Nova Scotia in relation to the defence of the northern part of this continent.

Halifax is practically in direct line between the New England states and the British isles, and is itself important in the defence of this dominion, because of its position in relation to the travel lanes of the Atlantic. Many soldiers have gone out from Halifax during past wars, and during the existing one, to take part in the empire's battles.

The record of the city and county of Halifax in the present war is a proud one. On land, on sea and in the air, in all parts of the world, her sons are to be found fighting for their country and for the freedom of mankind. To the great port of Halifax, of which it has been written—

> Into the mist my guardian prows put forth;
> Behind the mist my virgin ramparts lie;
> The Warden of the Honour of the North,
> Sleepless and veiled am I.

—come ships from all quarters of the world. Unhappily in recent weeks some have brought victims of the ruthless nazi submarine war, or of shipwrecks, heroic members of our great Canadian merchant marine, the royal merchant marine, and the merchant marines of our Norwegian and Russian allies, men who have suffered hardships as trying as can be endured by men.

It is not any wonder, therefore, that the people in a constituency of this kind should be deeply concerned with the prosecution of Canada's war effort, and the proposals of the government as contained in the speech from the throne. Hon. members from the west coast have discussed in the house the problems which concern the people of British Columbia, in consequence of Japan's entry into the war and her unprovoked attack on Great Britain and the United States.

I do not know what the situation is on the Pacific coast, but as a representative in the house from the Atlantic coast I am happy to say that early in the war the government recognized the importance of Nova Scotia in our country's defence, commanding as it does the southern approach to the gulf of St. Lawrence. Of great strategic importance in the defence of the northern Atlantic also is the island of Newfoundland, and it was a matter of deep satisfaction to all Nova Scotians and to all Canadians, I am sure when the United States acquired naval bases in Newfoundland.

I know I express the thoughts of my colleague from Halifax, as well as my own, and I am sure I express the thoughts of the people in my province when I say that the people of Nova Scotia have faith in our Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston). In his most admirable speech in the house a few nights ago he spoke of our Canadian defence. I am sure he and his associate defence ministers will take all necessary measures for local defence of our Atlantic coast.

Before entering into a discussion of the proposal, contained in the speech from the throne, there are one or two matters affecting my own constituency, but which are of more than local interest, to which I wish to refer. I have already made reference to the importance of the port of Halifax in this war, because of its strategic position, and because of its position in relation to the sea lanes of the north Atlantic. Halifax is the principal Atlantic winter port of this country. It is an all-year-round port. Tremendous sums, running into astronomical figures, are being and will be voted in the house for the prosecution of our war effort. The larger part of these moneys will be devoted to the manufacture of munitions and war supplies. To accomplish the purpose for which they are intended, those munitions and supplies must be transported out of the country. It is inevitable that a great part of these will have to be shipped through the port of Halifax. It is essential that there be no bottle-neck.

I am pleased to say the Canadian National Railways have greatly improved railway facilities between Moncton and Halifax. The

railway system has inaugurated a lighterage system in Halifax. Scows have been built and are now engaged in transporting cargoes from the railway to the ships. It is necessary, however, that the railways should improve their facilities for local transportation. Many of those engaged in war work of the most essential kind in the city of Halifax live outside its boundaries. Housing conditions in Halifax are bad, and they will become very much worse unless much better local transportation facilities are provided by the Canadian National Railways.

There is a matter of greater importance affecting the port of Halifax. There is urgent need for the erection of a large graving dock in Halifax harbour. Ships that have been travelling the high seas since the outbreak of war are showing increasing signs of wear and tear. Many of the ships, that should have long since gone into dry dock for overhauling and repair, have been kept afloat owing to the exigencies of warfare. Present facilities in Halifax for the repair of ships are inadequate, and the need for improved facilities will be intensified as the war goes on. I do not think the new floating dry dock under construction and the floating machine repair shop are going to meet the situation. The new dock will not be able to accommodate ships of the greatest size. Facilities for the speedy repair of ships, it seems to me, are of the first importance in the successful prosecution of our war effort. Dry docks should be close to the sea lanes. Ships damaged at sea should not have to run the risk of proceeding to distant dry docks. Convoys must not be held up.

I have always held the view that great as is the striking power of an air force and an army, the decisive influence in the winning of this war will be the naval and shipping strength of our empire and our allies. I have become more convinced than ever as to the soundness of this view since the entrance of Japan into the war. Landings of Japanese troops have been made on stretches of land in the Pacific ocean distant hundreds, yes thousands, of miles apart. They will be wiped out when we have complete naval control of the Pacific ocean. Our Canadian navy is expanding; so is the British navy. Our Canadian merchant shipping fleet is expanding at an amazing rate. The programme of production of merchant ships in Canada for 1942 is practically as large as the programme for Great Britain. The available dry docks throughout the empire may become fewer. Those in the United States will be fully taken up in looking after their own ships. One does not require much imagination to realize that our war effort may be seriously impaired through lack of ship-repairing facilities. Ships great or small that are waiting in port to go to dry docks are not of much use in maintaining the life-line to Britain and Russia, upon which all depends. I mentioned Singapore a few moments ago. How much use are the large docks in Singapore now for the repair of ships? What about dry docks in Malta and in other ports of the empire? Have we any assurance that the nazi bombing of British ports will not soon be resumed? There should be facilities at Halifax for repairing the largest ship afloat. We should not be behind the cities of Australia and other parts of our empire in this respect.

I now come to the proposal for a plebiscite. The question which the government proposes to the people is a simple one:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligations arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

The question may in form be made even more simple, because there is no doubt at all in my mind that the government did commit itself before, during and after the last general elections not to impose conscription for military service overseas.

I need only point out what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) declared on September 8, 1939, as reported on page 36 of *Hansard:*

> I wish now to repeat the undertaking I gave in parliament on behalf of the government on March 30 last. The present government believe that conscription of men for overseas service will not be a necessary or an effective step. No such measure will be introduced by the present administration.

That pledge was renewed on public platforms on many occasions during the election campaign. I cannot say that in my own constituency there was very much, if anything, said about conscription. Speaking for myself, I do not think I once referred to it. The main issue in Halifax was that of national government.

I must say, however, that I was aware of the fact that the Prime Minister had given a pledge that there would be no conscription for overseas service and that as one of the Liberal candidates standing in support of his administration I was bound by the pledge. The question now arises whether, notwithstanding its pledges, the present administration is justified in imposing conscription for overseas service. I am not myself prepared to subscribe to the proposition that a government that sought the support of the people of this dominion on the faith of its pledge not to impose conscription for overseas service is

justified, after success at the polls, in pursuing a directly opposite course. Our form of government is based upon the principle that promises were made to be kept and not broken. Our very way of life is dependent upon the sanctity of promises. In my own lifetime I have seen a decline in the value of the pledges of nations.

I can recall the horror with which the whole world received the news in 1914 that the armed forces of Germany had invaded Belgium in violation of Germany's pledge to preserve the neutrality of that small country. To a greater extent than even during the great war we have seen solemn pledges made by governments treated as scraps of paper. If there is one thing that undermines the confidence of a people in their government, it is the calculated breach of pledges upon which that government had sought and was given power. The very fabric of democracy becomes a sham and a farce if the pledges of those who are elected to govern a country are to be treated as scraps of paper. What possible faith or confidence would the people have in the members of such a government? Those who advocate that our government impose conscription without first getting a release from its commitments are unconsciously playing into the hands of Hitler. What has been the policy of Hitler, both before and since the outbreak of war, but to work to make the people of countries which he wished to destroy lose confidence in their governments? Divide the people, divide and conquer, that has been the policy of Hitler.

There is a further consideration. It is well known that in this country people from all sections do not see eye to eye on the question of conscription for overseas service. We know that the question was one that split the country in two during the great war. Anyone who has any doubts upon that subject need only examine the debates of this house that took place during the years 1917 and 1918. I have no desire to enter into a discussion of the merits or demerits of the action taken by the government in power during the years 1917 and 1918. It is useful to recall, however, some of the events that led up to the imposition of conscription in Canada at that time.

At the outbreak of the last war there was in power in this country a Conservative administration under the leadership of Sir Robert Borden. It came into power in 1911. The administration of Sir Robert Borden was still in power in 1917, no elections having been held in the meantime. The Military Service Act, the conscription act of the last war, was passed in August of that year. During the year recruiting had fallen short of replacing casualties in our divisions overseas, and reinforcements were needed for overseas service but were not forthcoming. The act was passed and it recited the need for such reinforcements. As I said, it was passed in August, 1917, but Sir Robert Borden would not assume the responsibility of calling up men under the provisions of that act until the policy of conscription had been approved by the votes of the people of this dominion. It was not until January, 1918, that any attempt was made to raise men for military service overseas under the Military Service Act.

Is it surprising that our Prime Minister has decided to take the course he proposes to take at this time—a time when voluntary enlistment is satisfactory and a time when there is no call for any substantial number of reinforcements to replace casualties? Should anyone wonder that members of the government of this country would want a release from their commitments before introducing legislation for the conscription of men for overseas service? What are those sections of the dominion that supported the government by overwhelming vote at the general elections two years ago on the faith of the specific pledge that there should be no conscription to think if parliament were to impose conscription before the government secures the release it seeks?

It would be a profitless undertaking to debate now the question of whether those pledges should or should not have been given. The hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch), who preceded me, stated that he saw no objection to the government pursuing the course it proposes to take now. But he did criticize the giving of pledges by the leaders of all parties in 1939 and during the general election in 1940. As I have said, it would accomplish nothing at this time to debate this question. I would say to the hon. member for Acadia that Canada would not have put forth the war effort it did in the autumn of 1939 and during the early part of 1940 if this government had not given the pledges it did. We all know what the situation was at that time in the province of Quebec. The Duplessis government was not defeated until the autumn of 1939. It might be all right to say now that these pledges should not have been given, but we should consider conditions in the light of circumstances that existed at that time. I suggest to those who are bawling now for conscription that they should remember that one formidable obstacle in the way of conscription will be removed should the government get the release it seeks in the forthcoming plebiscite.

Like many other members of this house, I am a veteran of the great war, having seen service in France and Belgium. I am not one of those who believe that there is anything inherently bad or unfair about the policy of conscription. It is a policy consistent with sound democratic views. The great democracies of Great Britain and the United States have seen fit to impose upon their man-power compulsory military service for all parts of the world. I see nothing objectionable in the principle of conscription. I am bound to say that I disagree with some of the suggestions I have heard in this house to the effect that conscripts do not necessarily make as good soldiers as those who volunteer, or that they are necessarily inferior in fighting qualities. The armies of Great Britain and the United States have been raised by compulsory service.

It may be necessary for us to have conscription for overseas service. It will become necessary, if sufficient numbers do not continue to come forward voluntarily to provide necessary reinforcements or to permit us to put forth our most effective war effort. In any event, the hands of the government should be freed from all past commitments respecting the method of raising men for military service. We have entered into a joint defence pact with the United States, and it is not in keeping with the spirit of that pact that we should not have the right to send our armed forces wherever they are needed for the defence of north America. I go further. I agree with some other speakers who have preceded me that we must defend Canada outside the borders of this dominion and in any part of the world. The fate of many European countries has shown the folly of any one nation believing that standing alone it has the means to defend itself. It is even more incredible folly to believe that the nazi war lord would be satisfied with the conquest of Europe and Africa. No conqueror in the flush of victory is ever satisfied. Alexander the Great, who conquered the known world, wept that there were no more worlds to conquer. Our armed forces must be prepared to fight the enemy wherever necessary to defeat him. We were the first of the American nations to take up arms against German aggression, and we shall continue in our efforts until nazism is stamped out forever.

I have suggested that I thought those who are in favour of conscription should work to see that the question submitted to the people in the coming plebiscite is answered affirmatively. It does seem to me, too, that they should do everything possible to hurry the reference to the people and devote their energies to the end that the government may be given, without undue delay, the release which it seeks. In Nova Scotia this would appear to be the attitude generally taken by our people. When the government decided to hold a plebiscite, the two leading newspapers in the maritime provinces, one or both of which had previously been somewhat critical of such a step, took the position that the patriotic thing to do was to accept the fact and see that an affirmative answer was given by an overwhelming majority to the question submitted by the government for decision. I quote from the editorial columns of the Halifax *Herald* of January 24, 1942:

> Since this government decision has been taken and announced, since a plebiscite in these terms is to be held, the public must recognize the accomplished fact.

And again in the same editorial:

> The immediate and inescapable fact is that a plebiscite has been decided upon in the terms outlined, and the only effective course now open is to see to it that the government gets the answer it seeks and that decisively.

The Halifax *Chronicle* in its issue of January 23, 1942, had an editorial which in part read as follows:

> Let us get the plebiscite out of the way, behind us and forgotten at the earliest possible moment. Then let us "to the task."
>
> The present is no time to stand on ceremony on matters of purely political significance.

I commend the attitude taken by both these newspapers to hon. members opposite. Unfortunately a section of the Canadian press has adopted an entirely different stand. Part of the press has attempted to use the government's proposals for a plebiscite as a means to undermine the confidence of the people in their leaders and to belittle the war effort of this country.

The campaign of vituperation and abuse that has been launched against the leader of our Canadian people is not in many ways unlike those that the President of the United States has had to face for some years. The president and our Prime Minister have this in common. They have trusted the common people, and in turn they have been given and have retained the confidence of the common people in their respective countries. Both have been attacked at different times by large sections of the press and by powerful financial interests. Neither, however, has been deflected from the path of duty by these attacks. Even to-day, at a critical stage of the war, the venom poured upon the two leaders is extraordinary. In the United States President Roosevelt is abused in some quarters for sending American troops to Ireland instead of to the Philippines and for allowing American

warships to patrol the sea lanes of the Atlantic rather than those of the Pacific. Our own Prime Minister is abused by certain groups in this country for not imposing conscription immediately. One of the worst offenders that has come to my notice is a newspaper published in Toronto that has been mentioned several times in this debate. It never loses an opportunity to belittle the leadership of the Prime Minister and the war effort of his administration. It is not backward either in imputing motives to members of this house who support the government. It got its answer in the Welland and York South elections, and I would not waste the time of the house by referring to it now, but for the fact that for upwards of a year it has been preaching a doctrine that, if accepted by the majority of our people, would break this dominion in pieces. Canada is a federal union. The Toronto *Globe and Mail* wants a legislative union. It has called upon the premier of Ontario to lead the way to the abolition of our provincial legislatures. In its issue of January 17 last, there appears an editorial dealing with the negotiations now under way between the dominion and the provinces with a view to having the provinces vacate the income and corporation tax fields in exchange for fixed subsidies. In this editorial the provincial legislatures are termed "white elephants" and declared to be wholly unnecessary. I quote the concluding words:

> As we have observed before, the greatest service which Mr. Hepburn may render would be for him to state publicly what everybody knows: that the provincial legislatures and the provincial governments are a fifth wheel to the national coach.

It is not a coincidence that in its issue of January 31 the premier of Ontario is reported as declaring:

> The overriding authority of the War Measures Act and federal invasion of our provincial revenue sources had made a "farce" of the provincial governments, and that he was prepared "if the thing goes any further" to recommend the abolition of provincial administrations.

That the leader of the opposition in the province of Ontario holds similar views is clear. He spoke to members of the Commercial club in Halifax last year and is reported in the Halifax *Herald* of April 25, 1941, as declaring that, while he was conscious of local rights of provincial legislatures, the preservation of such traditions did not justify the maintenance of ten separate governments in the nation. Colonel Drew said:

> What we need greatly is to look at government from a business viewpoint, paralleling methods that a private business head office and nine branch plants would employ to promote more efficiency.

I wonder what particular good those people think will come out of the preaching of such a doctrine. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that this dominion cannot be run as one would run a large banking, industrial or other private business undertaking having branches throughout the country and with rules such as: "If one branch is not paying, close it out. Let the people move away to some other part of Canada or to the United States. Disregard sectional rights and interests. Those in control are at the head office and they must have the say."

I have always thought that the fathers of confederation intended that in the federal union of the provinces the parliament of Canada should have wide powers commensurate with its responsibilities. I agree with many students of constitutional law who think that the powers given to parliament by the British North America Act have been at times unduly limited by judicial decision, but I am surprised that in this day and age there are to be found people who have so little understanding of the spirit of the pact of confederation and of the temper of the people of this dominion as to preach such utter nonsense as the abolition of our provincial legislatures. I agree with the view expressed by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) during this debate that no country so great in extent as Canada can be governed in a democratic way for any considerable period of time under a system other than a federated form of government, and that if we did not have such a form of govenrment we should have not less than four or five dominions instead of one. The *Globe and Mail* is the self-styled "national" newspaper of Canada. Anything less likely to preserve this dominion as a nation than the doctrine it has been preaching would be difficult to imagine.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my time is about up. I wish to say in conclusion that I shall ask the electors of Halifax to vote affirmatively in answer to the question that will be submitted to them for decision, and I am confident that they will do so by an overwhelming vote.

We shall have our plebiscite and the government will get the release it seeks. The even wider total war effort with our military forces, contemplated by the speech from the throne, will be made. We shall go on with the war. We are a free people and we shall remain free no matter what the cost. And we shall remain united. Fighting as a free and united nation with other members of the British commonwealth, reinforced and strengthened by our alliance with the great republic of the United States and with our other allies, we shall go on to victory.

Mr. HARRY LEADER (Portage la Prairie): My first word will be one of congratulation to you, Mr. Speaker, upon the magnificent fortitude you have exhibited in sitting in the chair with so much dignity for so many weeks listening to the different orations and observing this house of democracy in action. It has occurred to me in recent days that the thought must have been running through your head, "O Lord, how long"? Nevertheless I am sure that you would expect me to have something to say in a debate of this nature. I feel that it is my duty as representative of my constituency to offer my contribution. I know that my constituents will expect it, and therefore I am going to express my viewpoint as I see it.

Now, the vital question, stripped of all the fancy words and phrases and camouflage, is simply conscription. Do you want conscription in Canada, and for overseas service? So I am using the word conscription, the old-fashioned word which to me is plain English. Our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) tells us, and many others in the house, that a solemn pledge was given, before, during and subsequent to the last election, that this government would never impose conscription for overseas service without submitting the question to the electorate. They regard that as a solemn promise, and I respect it.

Speaking for myself, I want to say that conscription was not an issue in my constituency. I believe I was asked once during the campaign what I thought of conscription, and my answer was that it was not an issue in the campaign but that personally I believed it was the only fair way to conduct a total war. I believe that conscription should mean equality of sacrifice and that each of us must be put in his proper place for the work which he is best fitted to do. I believe there are in Canada men in industry, key men, if you will, who could render far better service here in Canada than they ever could on the battlefield; and speaking of my own occupation or profession, I know there are many good farmers leaving Canada who could serve their country better if they remained on the farm and produced the food that will be required before the war is over.

I too must be careful of my promises. I spoke in this house in 1937—and I wonder how many hon. members had mentioned conscription as far back as that. The occasion was when the defence estimates were going through the house, and I took the opportunity then, in supporting the increase in the defence estimates, to submit to the house a resolution that had been passed by the United Farmers of Manitoba about a month before the house convened. I attended the convention and the resolution was passed unanimously, calling attention to the fact that a war was in the offing and that if this country was going to war it should conscript man-power, wealth and all resources we have in Canada, for the successful prosecution of the war and for victory. I submitted to the house that resolution, which I supported. I wish to quote the words I used on that occasion. I do this for the simple reason that I made a statement in this house and I have not changed my viewpoint. I said, at page 994 of *Hansard* of February 18, 1937:

> The Canadian people expect that if we must go to war all the resources of the country will be employed in the prosecution of that war. I believe that in the nation's interest we should conscript . . . the resources of the fields, of the forests, and of the mines and all the accumulated wealth.

I had hoped that this question would be settled differently. We do not take conscription so seriously out on the plains in western Canada as they do for instance in the province of Quebec, and I respect their opinions. I felt that if we were to have conscription—I believed it was coming and I think we should have had it immediately after Hong Kong—the Prime Minister should have asked the house, if he wished to be released from his promise. He should have asked the representatives of the people to release him. I for my part am willing to take my medicine and I would have spoken for my constituency of Portage la Prairie. Instead of that we have what we call a political football. I had hoped that the question of conscription would escape the turmoil of party politics. I believed that the Prime Minister, with his knowledge of the situation, and the need for vigorous and aggressive action, would have accepted the responsibility or else allowed the house to decide the issue. Now the initiative has been taken by the politicians, with results, I fear, detrimental to Canada.

The word "appeasement" has been used in this house. Mr. Speaker, it is a horrible word when applied to our dealings with the axis powers; but appeasement for the sake of harmony at home is a beautiful word. Nothing should concern us more than to have unity in this country of ours, and I say that a prime necessity of our war effort is to maintain unity at home. That should not be a difficult task, when all that is best in our national life is threatened from without. Let me testify, in the name of my French-Canadian constituents, that I regard them as among my very best friends, loyal to the core. I have found the French-Canadians in my riding just as kind, just as industrious,

just as intelligent and law-abiding as my English-speaking friends. But there is prejudice on both sides, that we all must admit; and it is founded upon suspicion and imaginary grievances exploited to the full by unscrupulous politicians and their backers. It is my opinion that these barriers that have separated the French- and the English-speaking people in Canada could all be removed by tolerance and cooperation founded upon mutual trust. I wonder when we are going to learn that lesson.

Mr. MacNICOL: As soon as we drop politics.

Mr. LEADER: I believe that is true. When our leading public men in all parts of the dominion, when our religious bodies, both Protestant and Catholic, learn this fundamental truth, these leaders of public opinion will earn a nation's respect and gratitude.

Now I want to say something about our Prime Minister. I have often quoted him in this house, and am always glad to pay him a tribute of the respect in which I believe he is held by the people of this dominion. I do not believe there is a man in Canada, perhaps never has been in the public life of this country, who has striven more for unity than our present Prime Minister. In 1936, when I supported the trade treaty which he had made with the United States, I stated that it was more than a commercial treaty, that it was the extending of the hand of fellowship to a neighbour who is our kin. In 1939, when that treaty was renewed and we brought Great Britain into the picture, I said that when the history of our time was written no one would stand higher than our own Prime Minister. I appreciated those trade treaties, and let me say from my own experience that when I deal with my customers I hope to make them my friends; if you make a friend of your customer you are going to have a better deal every time.

During the last election I did not base my campaign very much on the government's policy and what they had done, but I told the people this, that in Mr. Mackenzie King and Mr. Lapointe we had two of Canada's greatest statesmen, two men who had done more to bring unity to Canada than any others that I could think of; I am satisfied that that statement is true. In unity there is strength. Great Britain and the United States are working in cooperation—by the way, they have conscription in both countries—and Canada cannot fail them.

It is my opinion that if we must have conscription—and I think it is coming if this war continues—we should have conscription wherever our interests are threatened. Are they not threatened in the motherland, that has nurtured this nation and is guarding its future? Are our interests not threatened in Africa, where a sister nation battles for her freedom; in Australia, where a sister nation battles for the livelihood—yes, the very life—of the white race? Are they not threatened in Hong Kong? Did not 2,000 gallant Canadians go to Hong Kong and offer the sacrifice of their lives, troops from the east and troops from the west, English-speaking and French-speaking? We should never forget Hong Kong, and I believe we are bound to go and avenge the sacrifice that these grand soldiers made for us.

And what about the United States, the most powerful ally of all, whose president declared that if Canada was attacked they would not stand idly by? That promise was made two or three years ago at Ivy Lea. Are we going to fall down in any particular in standing beside the mother country and the United States of America? We should not, and I do not think we shall. What an inspiration it should be to us when we think of that great British statesman Winston Churchill in his challenge to the nazis when he said: "If this country is invaded we shall fight in the air, we shall fight on the ocean, we shall fight on the beaches and in the streets and in the fields, and if we must we will fight from the dominions overseas." Are we worthy of that glorious ancestry? I say, let us unite with the forces of freedom everywhere and let us forget domestic discord. If we lose this war we lose everything.

I have heard it said in this house that this war is a result of broken promises. I presume there is truth in that statement, but I think that the cause of this war is commercial and industrial rivalry, greed for power and search for the almighty dollar. When you have men in high places imbued with that spirit, and when they are running this country or any other country, what can you expect?

I have a clipping here which I found in my desk the other day. It refers to ex-prime minister Baldwin of Great Britain, and I should like to quote it. It is from a speech by Stanley Baldwin on November 12, 1936. The heading is "A Famous Confession." It says:

> My position as leader of a great party was not altogether a comfortable one. I asked myself what chance was there that in the next year or two the country would give a mandate for rearmament? Supposing I had gone to the country and said that Germany was rearming and we must rearm, does anyone think this pacific democracy would have rallied to that at the moment? I cannot think of anything that would have made the loss of the election from my point of view more certain.

Mr. HANSELL: Where did he make that speech?

Mr. LEADER: I am not sure.

Mr. HANSELL: I think it was in the British House of Commons.

Mr. LEADER: Now, without casting any aspersions on ex-prime minister Baldwin—

An hon. MEMBER: Lord Baldwin.

Mr. LEADER: Whatever his title, I want to say he was the head of one of the greatest munition factories in Great Britain at the time, the Baldwin locomotive works—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. MacNICOL: The Baldwin Steel company.

Mr. LEADER: Well, he was engaged at the time in supplying munitions to Germany and any other country that would buy them.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What authority has the hon. member for that statement?

Mr. LEADER: This statement right here.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I cannot believe it. It is not true.

Mr. LEADER: Therefore can you expect from men in high places, wealthy men, rich men, running a country, that they will give equality to all and special privilege to none? You cannot.

I want to quote something said by Ernest Bevin, a man from the ranks, who knows what it is to toil and who has a feeling in his heart for his fellow workmen. When he was taken into the Churchill cabinet he made this statement:

> Ernest Bevin declares system based on monopoly and big business failed to deliver the goods in hour of trial and that social effort must take place of chaos that followed last war.
>
> This report is dated from London, June 6, 1940.
>
> Labour Minister Bevin told a building trades workers' meeting to-day that "in whatever I am doing I am keeping an eye on its possible value when the war is over," and added, "I know that a new country has got to be planned."
>
> "One thing we are producing—order out of chaos, and chaos it was when we went in," said Mr. Bevin, who before entering the government under Winston Churchill last month was secretary general of the transport and general workers' union.
>
> "The system based on monopoly and big business failed to deliver the goods in our hour of trial," the labour minister said.
>
> He added that there would be no boom at the end of the war.
>
> "The only way of absorbing these millions (of fighting men) back into industry and the national life is by way of public works and enterprise," Mr. Bevin said. "Social effort is bound to take the place of the kind of thing that occurred at the end of the last war. There is no alternative.
>
> "We cannot afford at the end of this struggle —when we have won—to leave men standing in queues at the labour exchanges without direction as to where to go or what to do."

I agree with what Mr. Bevin has said. I want to say here, Mr. Speaker, that I would take the responsibility of advising every soldier who is wearing a uniform that when this war is over he should not surrender that uniform until he is secure in some permanent job, with a chance to build a home and raise his family. That is how I feel about it.

I see my time is slipping by, so that I should like to come to the question of how I am going to vote. I have tried to look at this question from every angle. I have no particular fault to find with the government's war effort. Everything that has been done has been done in close cooperation with Britain and the United States, and in the words of Churchill, "Canada's war effort has been magnificent." However, the job is not completed; the victory is not won. There remains one step to take in order to convince our enemies that we mean business and to assure the closest cooperation with our allies. That final step is total conscription for overseas service, or wherever Canada's interests are threatened.

I said I was not so much concerned about the word "conscription" or the actual fact of conscription, as some people seem to be; but I realize that there is a disunity in this country and that some people, particularly my French speaking friends, do object very strenuously to conscription and its effects. I have urged tolerance, and I wish to practise what I preach. I intend to vote for the address in reply to the speech from the throne, for the government's policy of a plebiscite, if you will. The question being asked is:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

As a final word I want to add that my action will be justified as a gesture of tolerance, in order to preserve unity in our beloved land. The plebiscite is a delaying action, I admit. Perhaps it is the appropriate action at this time. Future events will test its wisdom. At any rate I am giving the government the benefit of the doubt. If the government, or the opposition, or any individual member of this house has served any interests other than the welfare of his country, may God forgive him; the nation dare not, and in my opinion never will.

Mr. A. D. LEGER (Kent, N.B.): Mr. Speaker, I have listened very attentively to the various speeches that have been delivered in this house, in regard to the plebiscite mentioned in the speech from the throne, by hon. members belonging to different political groups. The most surprising thing to me was the attitude taken by those who now call themselves Conservatives, but who during the election campaign chose to call themselves the National party. Their leader, then Doctor Manion, and his colleagues, preached high and low that if they were returned to power they would not enforce conscription. Shortly after the election, however, those of the National party, or Conservatives, who were elected began to attack the government because conscription was not put into force. They had behind them a certain section of the press, controlled by a certain financial group in Ontario, which said that Canada could not have an all-out war effort without conscription; that it was absurd for the government to ask the people of Canada to be released from the promises made during the campaign of 1940. Imagine what they would have done if they had been returned to power! According to them, election promises mean nothing. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is not of that calibre. He regards his promises as sacred, and now is asking the people who elected him to relieve him of those promises. Could there be a better gesture, coming from a leader? He is a man who remains true to his promise; he is a man on whom the electorate depend; he is the man whom the people of Canada need as a leader.

In passing, I believe it my duty to mention that the Prime Minister has shown his leadership in bringing about the good entente that now exists between Great Britain and our great neighbour to the south, the United States, and also in the defence agreement he made with the United States, in case of any attack. These incidents show his great foresight. I am asking myself whether it would not have been better for the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) to follow the example of Mr. Wendell Willkie who, after his party was defeated, campaigned the country in support of the president's war effort. To my mind this is the way an opposition leader should act, but what a contrast we have in this parliament!

The census returns tell us that we have a population of only about eleven and a half million people, so in our war effort we must not be compared with nations such as the United States, with a population of 130,000,000 people or more; but if a comparison is made, it must be on a per capita basis. Perhaps I may be permitted to review the war effort of this government and compare it with that of other nations. We have over 110,000 voluntary enlistments in the air force. We have over 27,000 voluntary enlistments in the navy. We have over 260,000 enlisted in the army to serve anywhere, on any front, overseas or elsewhere. I have not included those called up for training for home defence. We must realize that we have well over 500,000 men in the armed forces, to defend Canada on our shores or elsewhere. In order to compare with us, the United States should have over five million men under arms. It is admitted by military authorities everywhere that from twelve to fourteen men are required at home to maintain one man in the front line. At that rate we would require six million men and women to produce in our factories, if we are to provide for our men in uniform. If that were so, we would be left with about five million people. In this group would be included all the children up to the age of sixteen, all invalids and old people past working age, and married women who have to stay at home.

In all fairness to the nation, could we ask the Canadian people to furnish much more? The air force and the navy have a reserve list, and the army is recruiting all it can handle. Can we furnish any more than 150,000 to 200,000 men, if we want to back them up with ammunition, and instruments of war such as aeroplanes, trucks, tanks, guns of all kinds, bombs and so on, all manufactured in Canada? Our industry had to be transformed from a peace-time to a war-time basis, and I say that our war effort compares favourably with that of any allied nation in the world. We are giving out contracts at the rate of $4,000,000 a day. Still we hear the complaint that our war effort is not a total one. Admitting that we have not reached our limit, I say that to get the men it will not be necessary to resort to conscription. Each Canadian knows where his duty lies. He will answer the call. After the war it will be more honourable to say, "All our men fought in the war without having to be conscripted."

Present reports indicate that we have all the recruits that can be handled. That being so, why do we hear this cry for conscription if, indeed, it is not for a certain motive, namely, that of disuniting the two major races in Canada? These people know that French-speaking people in general are, and always have been, and always will be against conscription. Why is that so? It is not because they do not want to share the responsibility; no, it is because they believe it is more honourable to do their part freely. The French in Quebec and the French Acadian

in the maritimes have volunteered freely in this war, despite the fact that men with the degree of Bachelor of Arts could obtain ranking no higher than that of private, in some units.

My answer will be that French-speaking Canadians have contributed as much as any others toward Canada's war effort. Let us turn to the facts. We learn that the maritime provinces rank first in enlistments. In the army they have furnished one man in every twenty-eight recruited. New Brunswick has furnished one man in every twenty-six. I am proud to say that the French in New Brunswick have thus far contributed more than their quota. They represent about a third of the population in that province, and have contributed forty to forty-five per cent of total enlistments.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Would the hon. member oblige me by giving me the source of that information?—because I have been trying to get it and have not succeeded. I am not questioning his statement, but I should like to know the basis for it.

Mr. LEGER: It was given to me by an official in the army.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): They will not give it to me; I am rather surprised at that.

Mr. LEGER: I am told that Quebec has furnished its share, as well as Ontario. It must be understood that these two provinces have shouldered most of the war effort, the large industries being centred in those two metropolitan provinces. I believe better distribution should be made among the other provinces, and particularly in New Brunswick, where very few contracts have been let. This matter should be attended to by the ministers.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words in my native tongue.

(Translation) Mr. Speaker, I have just pointed out to our friends who speak the other official language that the French Canadians, like the French Acadians, are doing their part in our war effort as fully as any other race in Canada. No reference is made to conscription in the speech from the throne. Why then all the excitement? The government ask to be released from their pledges. I feel that we, as the representatives of our constituents, are in duty bound to support that request. I believe that we must do so if we want to keep our country united.

I represent the constituency of Kent, New Brunswick, whose population is very largely —about four-fifths—of French extraction, and they do not want conscription. I am proud to say that my constituency has given its large share of New Brunswick recruits and I hope it will continue to do so. No heed should be paid to the capitalist-controlled press which is endeavouring to cause disunion within the ranks of this government, in order to defeat them and permit the financial interests to assume power. That is their fondest hope; they have no other ambition. Their actions are not prompted by patriotism but by their ambition to control war contracts in order to make money as they did during the last war.

Our leader, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is asking us for a vote of confidence. We shall give it to him, shall we not? Or had we better place our confidence in Mr. Meighen and his crowd? To the same Mr. Meighen who, during the last war, drafted the conscription act, one of the darkest pages in our history? His views have certainly not changed.

I mentioned Mr. Meighen. I should not have done so, because he is dead. Whom will the Conservatives choose as his successor? Mr. Hanson is filling the post quite creditably. Why should they not keep him?

Mr. King's record shows him to be worthy of our confidence. Whom do we want? Mr. King? If so, let us support him: he will not betray us. If not, let us vote against him and support our friends of the opposition who, should they get into power, will most certainly bring in the same measure as during the war of 1914-1918—conscription.

(Text) I have been trying to show why we, supporting the government party, and every fair-minded hon. member should vote in favour of the speech from the throne. In reference to the plebiscite, let me point out that hon. members on both government and opposition sides of the house have pledged themselves against conscription for overseas service.

I am proud to announce that in my district there is one French family with seven brothers, another with six brothers, and several others with two or three who are now serving overseas. All Canadian people are anxious to see this war won because it is a war of faith, Christianity against paganism. None of us want to go back that far. We have come a long way from Christian concepts, and that is why the world is involved in such a war. We have failed to live true Christian lives. There is no more brotherly love, there is no more true Christianity, there is no more true charity. We must come back to it. There is no equality.

I have listened to western members asking for better prices for their wheat. I believe

that their problems are the same as that facing the farmers and fishermen of the maritimes. It is not so much dollar wheat or potatoes at $1 a bushel. What do they care if we have 25 cent wheat? What is important is to ensure to the farmer that no matter where he is, after he has paid the cost of his production, he will have enough left to provide himself and family with the living he deserves. The same thing applies to the fisherman. We have heard many times that these two classes are the backbone of the country. They are in reality, but our governments have not treated them as such.

If the farmer of the west gets a dollar for his wheat, or the fisherman gets more for his fish, then the prices of the necessities they have to buy will go up, and they will remain at the same level. That is where the trouble is. The farmers throughout the length and breadth of this country are discontented, and they are not to be blamed. This is one reason why so many farmers' sons have enlisted. I would strongly suggest that a committee be appointed to study seriously these problems in their true light. Each province has its own problem. Committees should be appointed also to study the reestablishment of our soldiers and excess factory hands after the war. That must be done if we do not want to go back to the bread-lines and relief we had from 1930 to 1935.

Mr. MacINNIS: Why stop at 1935?

Mr. LEGER: We do not want that. If we are not to have it, we must prepare now. I can remember seeing children crying for bread when people in the west were burning their wheat. What terrible distribution! Let us plan for what is ahead of us. Let us all set our minds to winning this war. Let us all help as much as we can with the war loan, the Red Cross, the salvage campaign, and even recruiting. If we all set our minds to do our best, our war effort will be complete.

On motion of Mr. Graham the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre) the house adjourned at 5.58 p.m.

Monday, February 16, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—HON. MR. HANSON

CENSORSHIP OF MAIL ADDRESSED TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to a question of privilege, affecting not only myself but every member of this house. On January 21 the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) raised a similar question. No answer, so far as I know, has been forthcoming from the government and I desire to demonstrate that the practice of which he complained is still continuing and to register my firmest and most emphatic protest against it.

I hold in my hand an air mail envelope postmarked "Wolfville, N.S."—which is in the constituency of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley)—"February 12, 1942." The end of this envelope has a label pasted over it, upon which appear the following words: "Examined by DB/C 106." This label obscures any initials which may have appeared on the envelope, but the following appears very clearly, "Hanson, Esq., M.P., Leader of the Opposition, Parliament Buildings, Ottawa, Ont." There could have been no doubt in the mind of the censor that this letter was addressed to me as a member of parliament and as leader of the opposition. The censor none the less took upon himself to open and examine this letter.

I protest, first of all, against that. In this connection I should like to draw the attention of the house to the reply made by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) to the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) on January 21 last, *Hansard,* page 4463, in which the hon. member asked this question:

> If any criticism of a department of government has been found, has such criticism been extracted from letters and sent with the name of the writer to the department involved?

The answer of the Postmaster General was:

> Such extracts are referred in confidence to the head of the department concerned, when it is considered in the public interest to do so.

In other words, if this letter from the constituency of the Minister of Finance, addressed to me as a member of parliament and as leader of the opposition, had contained critical reference to the minister's conduct of his department, shall I say, it might have been referred to the minister.

Mr. Speaker, this is an intolerable situation and one which the members of this house cannot permit to continue. This practice converts a censorship, which exists solely for the purpose of securing the safety of the state in wartime, into a petty Gestapo spying upon members of parliament and others.

May I make it very clear that my protest is not based upon any objection to the contents of this particular letter being made known to anyone. I hold it in my hand and anybody who wants to do so can read it. The letter is merely a general condemnation of the plebiscite and I would have no hesitation in reading it to the house if anybody wants to hear it. My protest is based upon a principle and that principle I enunciate

as follows: Mail addressed to any member of parliament or dispatched by any member of parliament must be considered inviolate and free from interference by any servant of the crown. Unless this principle is firmly established, I do not believe it is possible for members of parliament adequately to perform their duties. If it is possible, as it is, for a letter addressed by me to, shall I say, the leader of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia, or by such leader to me, to be examined by a censor and the contents thereof communicated to the Postmaster General or even to the Prime Minister himself, I do not see how anyone can continue to carry on the duties of leader of the opposition. I do not say that this has occurred, but, under the procedure followed, it may occur.

I propose to lay on the table of the house the envelope to which I have referred. I protest against this practice with all the vigour and emphasis at my command and I ask the house to deal with this violation of privilege. Unless I have an unequivocal assurance that this practice will be stopped immediately I shall take the earliest opportunity to assert by way of a motion the rights and privileges of members of this parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to carry on one of the functions of government—perhaps in an inadequate manner but nevertheless with all the loyalty and power at my command—but if I am to be subject to this sort of espionage, I shall protest to the utmost and if I get no redress I shall carry the matter to the court of public opinion.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): May I say first, with respect to the underlying principles that are vital in the matter to which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has just referred, that I am in entire agreement with him. May I also say that if what I have been told is correct, some of my own mail has been similarly opened by censors, against which I wish to protest just as strongly as he has done.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am in good company.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It could not be better for either of us. May I say further something with which I am sure my hon. friend will be the first to agree. It is that great difficulties present themselves to some of the officials who are discharging public duties, in the matter of carrying out the instructions given to them. The letter to which my hon. friend has referred, as well as that referred to the other day, were air-mail letters, if I am not mistaken?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And there is the further fact, I believe, that they came from areas known for certain military reasons as prohibited defence areas. I think there is a part of the district represented by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) which is a prohibited area.

Mr. ILSLEY: Halifax is, but I did not think any part of my constituency is.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understand that part of Halifax is. I cannot say just how far the area extends, but there are certain prohibited defence areas and certain restrictions in regard to air mail coming from those areas. I should not be surpised if that and that alone is the reason for the opening of the letter of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition.

I can assure him that the last thing any member of the administration would wish is to have his mail or the mail of any hon. member opened for purposes of espionage or anything of the kind. I shall take up at once with the ministers concerned with censorship the representations which have been made, and see if it is not possible to have any occurrence of this kind prevented in the future. Hon. members will realize that in a time of war of necessity there are occasions when with the utmost desire to give the fullest discretion to officials they may err on what they regard as the side of strict compliance with instructions. I am sure the present instance is one of that kind only.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I should like to add this: I realize that from a proclaimed defence area such as Halifax a good deal more care has to be taken than from an area which is not a defence area. But Wolfville is not a defence area. An air mail letter is mailed at Wolfville; I assume it goes to Halifax and takes the plane there. But it does not originate in Halifax. I think we ought to know what instructions are given to the censors. A letter directed by a citizen of this country to a member of parliament should not be opened even if it does take the plane at Halifax. I should like to know what the rules are.

In the early part of the war I was in Florida, and my family was living at Halifax, and all our mail was censored. I expected that; there was the element, an important one, of possible contravention of the regulations of the foreign exchange control board. Such mail was international in character. People have sought to send securities out of the country by mail, and the foreign exchange control board exercise some control over that through the censorship. That is quite proper. But mail from Wolfville to Ottawa surely should

never be opened. I cannot see on what principle they are opened. I suppose it is charitable to think that probably it is due to some too officious official. But that is not enough; we ought to know what the rules are.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall try to get for my hon. friend the information he has requested. I would only wish to substitute the word "conscientious" for "officious".

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, I think it is officious.

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): May I add a word in this connection, as I happened to bring this subject to the attention of the Postmaster General? The Prime Minister has said that he thought this opening of letters by the censors would apply only to air mail letters. In one case a letter was opened, an ordinary letter, mailed to my wife from Montreal. It happened to contain a Christmas card. It seems extraordinary that that should happen. I have been informed that on other occasions photostatic copies have been made of extracts from letters and these have been sent to the departments of government concerned when there has been criticism.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the last statement of my hon. friend is one on which the government should have a little more information. If he can advise me of any instance in which photostatic prints have been made from letters and sent to the government, I should like to have particulars.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Postmaster General said it was done.

THE WAR IN THE FAR EAST

FALL OF SINGAPORE—TRIBUTE TO HEROIC RESISTANCE OF ITS DEFENDERS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Hon. members will I assume be anxious to know whether the government has received any information with regard to the critical situation in the far east which it is in a position to impart, beyond the momentous announcement made yesterday by the prime minister of Great Britain (Mr. Churchill) in the course of his world-wide broadcast that Singapore has fallen. Hon. members will I am sure appreciate the fact that such information as our government receives with respect to matters in the far east comes to us for the most part from London. There are very few connections between Canada and the far east if we except the direct communications we have with Australia and New Zealand. So far as London itself is concerned the sources that may be regarded as reliable with respect to events and happenings in the far east are becoming increasingly limited, and in Britain the government itself is obliged to take additional precautions by way of investigating the reliability of information before sending it out.

We have thus far received no information that would throw additional light upon the situation in the far east, beyond the announcement that was made by the Prime Minister yesterday.

I am sure, however, that hon. members would not wish this fateful hour to pass without some recognition on the part of the parliament and the people of Canada of the heroic resistance of the defenders of Singapore, a resistance which will be recalled throughout time as comparable to any recorded chapter of valour and endurance. The position of the defenders of Singapore has deeply stirred the hearts of the Canadian people. It has made us more determined than ever to resist with all our might onslaughts of the enemy wherever we can assist to that end, and to devote the utmost of our strength to the defence of freedom. This major reverse should not be allowed to become an excuse for undue pessimism, or undue recriminations. I should like to re-echo the words of the Prime Minister of Great Britain that as a people we must steel ourselves against "many misfortunes, severe and torturing losses, remorseless and gnawing anxieties." At the same time we must, with a faith that is stronger than ever, believe, again to quote Mr. Churchill, that the same qualities which brought the British people through the awful jeopardy of the summer of 1940 will bring all through this new ordeal.

Let me add, too, that with the Prime Minister of Great Britain I believe nothing could be more harmful at the present or any time than a lack of unity within our nation, or between the nations that to-day are united in seeking to preserve the liberties of mankind. We must stand together as never before in preserving our national unity and the unity of the united nations. For Canada the fall of Singapore should emphasize the gravity of the whole world situation. Coming, on the eve of the victory loan campaign, it should serve to bring forth from the people of Canada a full and immediate response to the loan as an essential factor in the war effort of our country.

SECRET SESSION OF THE HOUSE

REQUEST FOR OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS DEFENCE MEASURES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): I should like to ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) whether any decision has been reached by the government concerning the suggestion that there should be a secret session of the house to consider the question of the defence of the Pacific coast, or of both coasts. The fall of Singapore may mean that Canada has only a limited time in which to prepare.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The government has had in mind the suggestion advanced that a secret session of the house should be held. Thus far we have had the intention of holding that session at a date which, all factors considered, we believed would be most advisable. We had felt that the debate on the address should be concluded before a secret session was held, unless there were some special reason to the contrary. We have also felt that if the plebiscite bill could be passed and sent to the other house as speedily as possible, that would be desirable. We would then make the plebiscite the next measure to be considered, and immediately thereafter have the secret session which has been requested. If, however, there should be a general feeling that it would be desirable to have a secret session earlier than that, the government will seek to meet that desire. I am inclined to believe that if the secret session could be held at about the time I have indicated it would perhaps serve the purpose my hon. friends have in view.

Mr. GREEN: May I suggest to the Prime Minister that time is precious these days, and that he consider whether or not the secret session should be held before the plebiscite bill is under discussion, because that discussion may last for some time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Of course it is the emphasis that has been placed upon time being precious that makes us wish to get the plebiscite bill through as soon as possible. My colleague the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) mentions to me that members of the staff of his department have certain steps in view which might obviate the necessity of having an immediate discussion on the Pacific situation. He feels that matters might be put in such shape that the house might be more fully informed if the steps that are now being taken could be taken before the secret session is held.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I rose to say something similar, except that I think the secret session should be held immediately, and that even this debate should be suspended in view of the general situation which is developing. And I do not believe any secret session should be concerned only with Pacific coast defences. It should deal with the whole of our defence effort and with our production; that is to say, there should be a complete inquiry into the situation as it now exists. Members of this house know very little more than the general public. It is about time we assumed our responsibilities and went into this thing very thoroughly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend, the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party, that if the feeling is as he has expressed it, namely that the secret session should be held immediately, then we might agree at once to have the session held as soon as the debate on the address has been concluded. I believe there is a general understanding that this may take place to-morrow night.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I think we should get this debate concluded, and then we might get together and decide on a date for a secret session and what should be discussed. I am afraid that if we undertook in secret session to cover the whole gamut of government operations and responsibilities we would have a debate lasting as long as this debate on the address. I think it is a matter on which we might get together and perhaps evolve a programme; I believe that would be a fair suggestion to make.

Mr. V. J. POTTIER (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare): May I say that the remarks made by the hon. member for Vancouver South Mr. Green) with respect to a secret session to discuss defence on the Pacific coast might lead one to think that we on the Atlantic coast have not the same feelings about our defence as the people on the Pacific coast. I urge that at any secret session of the house where the question of defence on the Pacific coast is taken up, the government be prepared to discuss as of equal importance and equal urgency the question of defence on the Atlantic coast.

SECOND VICTORY LOAN

INQUIRY AS TO STEPS TAKEN TO REDUCE COSTS OF FLOTATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): In view of the fact that the cost of raising the last victory loan was reported to be over

$8,000,000, will the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) inform the house what measures he has taken to curtail the expense of raising the present victory loan?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The proposed expenditures have been carefully budgeted for. Preparations for the loan have been made over a long period of time, covering several weeks and months. Naturally we wish to keep expenditures down to the absolute minimum, but apart from that I do not know that there is anything that I can say to my hon. friend.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I believe there is a question on the order paper by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) having to do with the cost of the last victory loan. I have heard a good deal of criticism of the cost of that loan. I do not know whether or not that criticism is justified, but I do think the Canadian people are entitled to a breakdown of the cost of the last loan. If that would prejudice the success of the present loan I would put it in the waste paper basket at once, because nothing must be allowed to prejudice this loan. I am going to have something more to say about that, perhaps tomorrow; but there is a feeling that the cost of the last loan was pretty high.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

PRESS REPORT OF STATEMENT OF PREMIER OF ONTARIO AS TO DISCHARGES BECAUSE OF LACK OF PROPER CLOTHING

On the orders of the day:

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): My attention has deen directed to a dispatch appearing in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of Friday, February 13, containing a statement attributed to the premier of Ontario, as follows:

"He said 45,000 men had been discharged from the armed forces mostly because they developed colds and tuberculosis from lack of proper clothing."

Every implication of this grossly alarmist statement is totally unjustified. Out of more than 400,000 enlistments up to the end of December the total number discharged as medically unfit was only 27,153. The number 45,000 represents the number struck off the strength for all reasons, including among others the following: misconduct; false attestation; over and under age; compassionate grounds; unlikely to become efficient soldiers; returned to civil employment in which they had special skill. The number discharged as medically unfit, I repeat, was 27,153, which is approximately 6·75 per cent of enlistments.

A statistical analysis of the conditions leading to discharge is complete with respect to 21,000 cases dealt with prior to November 1. To suggest that tuberculosis is a major condition is utterly and entirely untrue. Up to the first of the year the number of the members of the forces discharged for physical unfitness, including wounds, was less than 7 per cent of total enlistments. For more detailed statistics, I have to go back to November 1.

Since the outbreak of war it has been an automatic procedure that the file of every member of the forces discharged as medically unfit shall be referred immediately to the Canadian pension commission for a ruling. The number of cases upon which rulings had been given on November 1 amounted to 20,982. The number of cases of tuberculosis among these were 1,320. At that time the number of enlistments in all three services was around 360,000.

The total number of cases of tuberculosis was, therefore, only one-third of one per cent of the whole of our Canadian forces in the present war. This figure includes a very large number of non-active cases—that is, of men who were found to have spots on their lungs, which made it unwise for them to continue in military service for fear of some later breakdown, but who at the time were quite well and able to carry on in ordinary civil life.

Every man enlisting in the Canadian forces in this war is given a careful X-ray examination for the purpose of detecting chest conditions which may escape attention at the ordinary clinical examination.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): When did that practice begin?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I am just going to refer to that. In the early months of the war this X-ray was not taken until perhaps three or four months after enlistment.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Right.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Now, in most cases, it is taken at the time of enlistment, often before attestation has been completed. The Canadian Tuberculosis Association has kept a careful record of the results of these X-ray examinations and I am advised that of all the cases of tuberculosis detected in these examinations only 40 per cent were active. The remainder were inactive or quiescent.

The vast majority of these non-active cases were detected within a very short time after enlistment, indicating (1) that the condition had arisen prior to enlistment, (2) that it had

not been aggravated by the man's short experience in the army, and (3) that the precautions taken by the government have probably saved young men's lives; since a man with this weakness, if subjected to the rigours of military life for a prolonged period, would undoubtedly break down.

The foregoing figures clearly indicate that of the small number of cases of tuberculosis detected in the armed forces, the vast majority existed before enlistment. Our law provides that if a condition such as tuberculosis is found to have been caused by service, or to have been aggravated by service, the man is pensionable. I have already shown that among the 21,000 men discharged as physically unfit prior to November 1, the Canadian Pension commission had found 1,320 cases of tuberculosis. These cases include the men who have been attested for only a few days, and then discharged. The extent to which tuberculosis has been caused by or aggravated by military service is reflected in the number of pension awards made. That number, up to November 1, was 39—for tuberculosis, in all our forces. That is, out of 360,000 men enlisted by November 1, we have the following facts:

Fewer than 7 per cent were discharged as physically unfit, and this 7 per cent includes a large number in whom weaknesses of pre-enlistment origin were detected by X-ray within a few days or weeks of enlistment. It includes only 1,320 cases of tuberculosis, the vast majority of which were non-active. The total number of cases of tuberculosis found in the armed forces represents only one-third of one per cent of the men enlisted. The number of tuberculosis cases due to, or aggravated by service, was 39, all told—a number too small to be expressed in any percentage figures.

The fact that we have 1,320 cases of tuberculosis recorded indicates not that the provision for the health of the troops is inadequate, but that the efficiency of our medical services has saved a large number of men with lung weaknesses from undergoing the rigours of military training.

Instead of conditions in the armed services having brought about large numbers of cases of tuberculosis, as so recklessly implied by the premier of Ontario, the efficiency of our medical examinations has actually saved hundreds of lives, and revealed to many young civilians the existence of unsuspected lung weaknesses, which they can now intelligently protect.

The irresponsible and unfounded statement by the premier of Ontario may have several consequences. First, it may needlessly alarm tens of thousands of mothers and wives as to the care their boys are receiving in the armed services of Canada. Such a statement is therefore entirely improper and thoroughly indefensible. Second, it may give comfort to the enemy by belittling the efficiency of our fighting forces. There is only one word in the English language to describe such conduct—and I shall not use it here. In the third place it may shake public confidence in the government of our country. That, of course, the premier of Ontario regards as fair game in these grim, dark days of war, as well as in the more pleasant days of peace.

I leave this whole unhappy affair to two tribunals, one being indefinite and uncertain, the elastic conscience of the man who pronounced the libel, the other very definite and certain and purposeful, the free and unfettered judgment of hon. members of this house. In my own opinion the statement was thoroughly contemptible.

Mr. COLDWELL: Will the minister consider using paragraph 39 (b) of the defence of Canada regulations empowering the government to intern any person making statements likely to interfere with recruiting?

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, following what my colleague has said, I should like to place on record the figures for the Canadian army. It will be remembered that Premier Hepburn's statement was that 45,000 men had been discharged from the armed forces, mostly because they had developed colds and tuberculosis because of lack of proper clothing.

As I understand it, the 45,000 is a rough figure arrived at for all discharges from all causes. The number found medically unfit after they enlisted in the army was 29,476. That is the number for two and a third years, stretching from September 1, 1939 to December 31, 1941. That is, 29,476 of those who had enlisted were subsequently found medically unfit.

Premier Hepburn's statement is that the discharges were "mostly because they developed colds and tuberculosis from lack of proper clothing". Of the 29,476 found unfit, only 1,499, or 5·1 per cent, were found unfit on account of tuberculosis. And only 55 of these men who were found unfit from this cause were so found after they had gone overseas. That is to say, there were 55 cases of discharge for tuberculosis, out of over 130,000 men overseas. It should be remembered also that the total of 1,499 men who were found unfit on account of tuberculosis is out of an aggregate enlistment in the Canadian army for this same period of nearly 300,000 men.

Premier Hepburn also includes colds as reasons for discharge. I think it ought to be known that ordinary colds are not a cause for discharge. Discharges are made where there is a chronic or serious cause of affection of the respiratory system, such as in the case of asthma, bronchitis and things of that kind. I have had these looked up as well. The total number of men who have enlisted in the army and who have later been found unfit on account of an affection of the respiratory system is 3,015 out of total found unfit of 29,476, or 10·2 per cent. Again, this number of 3,015 is out of a total enlistment of nearly 300,000.

To sum up, Premier Hepburn says that "45,000 men had been discharged from the armed forces mostly because they developed colds and tuberculosis from lack of proper clothing." The facts are that out of 29,476 found medically unfit after enlistment, only 5·1 per cent were found medically unfit on account of tuberculosis—as a matter of fact, about 40 per cent of those were non-active. And about ten per cent of those found medically unfit were cases of affection of the respiratory system. In other words, taking the total number discharged for tuberculosis, asthma, bronchitis or any other disease of the respiratory system, which might include chronic or serious colds, the total discharges were 4,514 out of 29,476, or a little over 15 per cent of those actually found unfit, and that 4,514 was out of a total number actually enlisted of nearly 300,000.

I think these facts speak for themselves without any embellishment from me.

Hon. C. G. POWER (Minister of National Defence for Air): With respect to the Royal Canadian Air Force, I have before me an itemized list of discharges and retirements for medical reasons, September, 1939, to January 31, 1942. I would point out that discharges for medical reasons only total 2,270. Discharges for tuberculosis total 136, and for respiratory diseases, as explained by my hon. friend the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), 141.

Hon. ANGUS L. MACDONALD (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): Mr. Speaker, to complete the story with regard to discharges from the armed forces, I should like to say that so far as the Royal Canadian Navy is concerned the total number of discharges for medical reasons from the beginning of the war up to January 31, 1942, was 954. Of that number 53 discharges were because of tuberculosis and 56 were for other diseases of the respiratory system.

HONG KONG

PRESS REPORTS AS TO ATROCITIES UPON CAPTURED CANADIAN TROOPS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister based upon two news items, one of which appeared on page 3 of the Ottawa *Citizen* of February 13 and the other on the front page of the Ottawa *Citizen* of this morning. These articles describe barbarities and atrocities that are alleged to have been perpetrated upon Canadian troops captured in Hong Kong. The latter dispatch carried a footnote to the effect that the Department of External Affairs is taking immediate action to check the truthfulness of these reports. In view of the harrowing effects which news of this nature is bound to have upon the relatives and loved ones of these men, will the government consider withholding news items of this sort until their contents have been verified?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would say to my hon. friend that the government of Great Britain has informed us that they have received certain information. It is from sources the reliability of which they wish to investigate before making a definite statement. As soon as reliable information is available it will be furnished to our government. I make that preliminary statement, as the only statement that I think can be taken at its face value with reference to certain rumours appearing in the press or circulated from other sources as to conditions in Hong Kong and indeed in other parts of the far east. I have not before me the communications to which my hon. friend has referred, but I gather that they are dispatches that have come from abroad, either from Chungking or London. As news dispatches they are in no sense of the word to be regarded as communications from the British government. My hon. friend referred to certain atrocities which are alleged to have been perpetrated upon Canadian troops captured at Hong Kong. I do not think that there has been any communication which referred particularly to Canadian troops.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The one this morning did.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have not seen it. At any rate such communications as the government has had from the British government have made no specific reference to any atrocities committed upon Canadians as distinguished from troops generally that might be at Hong Kong. I wish to assure my hon. friend at once that the British government are themselves investigating the rumours to which

he has referred and that up to the present they should not be regarded as belonging to any category other than the one in which I have placed them.

As to my hon. friend's suggestion that the government should seek to censor communications of the kind, I must say that personally I share his views and feelings on the matter. There is an element of unnecessary pain caused to many by rumours that occasion alarm and distress, particularly where rumours may be without foundation or are without verification. But the government is in this very difficult position. The moment we take steps to censor any rumours as to the condition of our troops in any part of the world, we may be accused of withholding information which the Canadian public would wish to have at the earliest moment. I know that such is the criticism that would arise if the government withheld any information that was reliable and which would throw light upon existing conditions. In so far as we receive information that we have reason to believe is authentic and reliable, if it is in the public interest that it should be given out, it will be given out. In the meantime I hope that the public of Canada will not assume as reliable, communications that are not authenticated by the government itself.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): If I may be permitted, I should like to make an appeal to the Prime Minister. The statement with respect to Canadian troops which appears in this morning's press was broadcast over CBC last night. I am not asking the Prime Minister to indulge in censorship, but I would ask that he consider making an appeal both to the press and to the radio not to announce and repeat such heart-rending stories about these men until the government itself has been able to verify their authenticity.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understand in connection with this particular matter that the officials of the Department of External Affairs believed that the communication to which my hon. friend has referred would come to Canada from the United States. If it were censored in the press, it might be heard over the radio nevertheless. However, what I have said stands. In so far as the government may feel justified in seeking to circumvent unverified rumours, I take it the house will be agreeable to our so doing.

PACIFIC COUNCIL

REPRESENTATION OF CANADA ON COUNCIL TO CONCERT COMMON DEFENCE IN SOUTH PACIFIC

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should like to reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) with respect to Canadian representation on the Pacific council. This question was asked on February 10 and the hon. member's remarks will be found on pages 444 and 445 of *Hansard:*

The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, in a speech in the House of Commons at Westminster on January 27, which was quoted in this house in reply to a question from the member from Vancouver South (Mr. Green) on the following day, announced that it was proposed to set up in London a Pacific council, comprising Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand and the Netherlands, which would be able to transmit their united views to the combined chiefs of staff committee sitting at Washington. Definite arrangements had not at that time been made for the establishment and location of the council and, as members of the house will be aware, suggestions were put forward in certain quarters that it should meet in Washington rather than in London. It has now been settled that it will meet in London, and the following official announcement of its constitution has been made public:

> A Pacific council has been set up on a ministerial plane. Australia, Great Britain, the Netherlands and New Zealand will have representation on the council. Other ministers and advisers will attend as necessary.

At the first meeting of the council, held on February 10, the government of India was represented in addition to the governments named in the official announcement.

Since the question of Canadian representation in the Pacific council was raised in this house I have been again in communication with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom on the matter. The council's functions and responsibility are not quite as wide as its name might suggest. The Prime Minister has stressed the fact that as present constituted its duties are directly related to questions of regional defence of the areas in the southwest Pacific and southeastern Asia against which Japanese offensive action is now directed. The countries participating in it are those actually in the zone of hostilities.

It may be, however, that future strategic requirements will make it desirable to enlarge the scope of the Pacific council to include the whole Pacific area, in which case Canada will certainly be represented on the council.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

USE OF MOBILE UNITS AND IMPROVEMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, as a private Liberal member of this hon. house, may I ask the

government if the Canadian people, following the deplorable fall of Singapore and the notorious escape of a German naval squadron from Brest, can secure a definite guarantee that this country will not be invaded before the end of the war; and if so, what is it? If not, is it the policy of the government to create a large number of mobile units and to improve at once all means and ways of communication throughout this country?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on these questions of strategy and war policy, questions that affect other parts of the world as well as Canada and other nations as well as our own, I do not think any question should either be asked in a form which is likely to cause embarrassment, or answered, or attempted to be answered, if there is the slightest possibility of either the question or the answer being misunderstood in any part of the world. I am afraid that my hon. friend's question has been asked on the spur of the moment, and I for one would certainly not wish to reply without due consideration.

TAXATION CONFERENCE

AVAILABILITY OF REPORT—CANADIANS AT SINGAPORE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) asked on the orders of the day whether it was the intention of the government to make the report of the last interprovincial conference available to all members of parliament and "if so, will it be an unrevised copy".

The hon. member is apparently referring to the meeting with representatives of the provincial governments which took place on December 18 and 19 to discuss the proposed draft agreements to implement the offer made to provinces in the last dominion budget. This was not a formal interprovincial conference in the ordinary sense. For the convenience of representatives of the various governments, a shorthand record of the discussions was kept. The meeting, however, agreed that the record should be confidential, and I think hon. members will understand that in a meeting of this sort between governments in which certain aspects of the financial affairs and position of the various governments were discussed, freedom of discussion would have been seriously impeded if any other decision had been reached. It is, therefore, not the intention of the government to table the "report" of the meeting or make it public in any other way, although as the house is aware, I have already tabled copies of the tentative draft agreements which were, if I may put it this way, the basis and the result of our discussions.

The hon. member also asked whether any member of the government informed the provincial representatives attending this conference that there were Canadian soldiers, sailors and airmen at Singapore as well as at Hong Kong. As I have already explained, the meeting was for the purpose of discussing tax matters arising out of the offer made to the provinces in the last dominion budget and no reference was made by myself or, to my knowledge, by any other member of the government to members of the Canadian armed forces serving at Singapore or anywhere else.

My colleague the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) has already replied to a third question asked on the same occasion by the hon. member for Temiscouata.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex East): Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken very often in this house but as an old soldier I should like to say a word with regard to the present situation. We do not have to worry. We know that everything is going to come out all right. We know that—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Is the hon. member asking a question of the government?

PRIVILEGE—MR. BRUCE

REFERENCE TO STATEMENT IN DEBATE AS TO "COUNTRY OF ADOPTION"

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I should like to draw attention to page 527 of *Hansard,* where the hon. member for Nicolet-Yamaska (Mr. Dubois) is reported to have said, amongst other complimentary remarks he made about me, that Canada was "my country of adoption." As I happen to have been born in Canada I assume he would wish to have these words expunged from the records of the house.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Friday, February 13, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. R. T. GRAHAM (Swift Current): Mr. Speaker, the debate on which we are now engaged has chiefly centred around that portion

of the speech from the throne which dealt with the proposed plebiscite. If that were the sole matter I proposed to discuss I doubt very much if I would have taken part in this debate to-day. The very excellent contributions to the debate made by the mover (Mr. Fournier) and the seconder (Mr. Macdonald) of the address in reply, the statements made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and by other ministers and the many able contributions made by other members of the house, seem to me to have reasonably served the purpose of the debate and there is very little of value left for me to say. However, having in mind that I propose to speak on another phase of the speech from the throne, I decided that if I remained silent my attitude might be misinterpreted as in opposition or at least lukewarmness to the policy of the government. Such a supposition would be wholly incorrect. I can say, as one member said, that both my mind and my conscience are in agreement in supporting the government in the matter of the plebiscite. I consider that the Prime Minister could do no other than he has done in observing the pledge he gave the people of Canada in the election of 1940. Once you accept that premise, it seems to me there is only one alternative to the plebiscite, and that would be a general election. I believe we would all be in agreement, both in this house and outside, that in the present crisis that course is one that no one would wisely or properly consider. Moreover, ever since this government has been elected, and since I have had the privilege of being a member of this house, I have followed with all the attention I could the policies adopted, and I think that the war leadership displayed by the Prime Minister and his colleagues has been magnificent, to borrow a word used by a much more eminent person than myself, Mr. Churchill. I am assisted in coming to that conclusion by the statement that was made to the Canadian troops in England by General McNaughton, the commander of our Canadian forces, a man who possesses the confidence of every section of the Canadian people, and, may I suggest, of every party in this house. It is true that General McNaughton in the position he holds might not comment at all upon the war programme of this country; but I think the fact that he did not remain silent but saw fit to give expression to his own views on the men, munitions and food that were going from Canada to England, is indeed, coming from one who is in the best position to know and to pass judgment on our war effort, a very warm recommendation for the Prime Minister and the cabinet.

[Mr. Graham.]

Personally, after listening to the statement given by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) as to the success of the voluntary recruiting method, and having the assurance that neither at present nor in the near forseeable future will the system of voluntary recruiting occasion any shortcomings in our war effort, I think it would be unwise and inadvisable at this moment to attempt to put into operation the conscription of man-power for overseas service. I realize of course that it is wise for this government, while there is yet time, and in the light of the terrible events elsewhere, to secure from the people to whom they gave the pledge a complete release, so that under any circumstances and in any event their freedom of action to advise this parliament of the course that should be pursued shall be untrammelled and unfettered.

In my opinion, therefore, not only was it right for the Prime Minister to keep his pledge, but the method adopted of submitting to the people by way of a plebiscite the question which it is proposed to submit to them, is the wisest and best under all the circumstances. So far as the plebiscite is concerned, as the Prime Minister has pointed out, the conscription of man-power for overseas service is not an issue. I propose therefore to reserve to myself the right to discuss when the time comes, if it ever does come, the question of conscription for overseas service, and only when that question is properly before the house and becomes a matter which parliament is called upon to decide.

The subject that prompted me to take part in this debate arises out of a much more important section of the speech from the throne than that dealing with the plebiscite, because after all the plebiscite is merely a method of procedure. The part of the speech from the throne which I propose to read to the house is a part which actually deals with the attitude of the government to our war effort. Let me read that paragraph:

> In accordance with the government's policy of a total national effort for total war, you will be asked to approve a balanced programme for further increases in the armed forces and in the production of munitions of war and of foodstuffs.

I wish to call the attention of the house particularly to that word "balanced". I think it is most essential to apply it to our war effort. I should like also in that connection to call the attention of the house to a sentence from the speech made by the Minister of National Defence the other day in the house, in which he said at page 448.

> Total war requires a country to plan its pattern for war according to its resources, and,

more than that, according to the needs and abilities of other countries with which it is allied.

That, too, is a statement of significance, indicating the duty we have to discharge in the direction of the war effort of Canada. We should never let it escape our attention. The portion of that particular section of the speech from the throne which I wish to discuss to-day is that dealing with our programme in the production and supply of foodstuffs. I am convinced that the events of the last few weeks make it necessary for this government and for us all to completely resurvey and reappraise the position of Canada in its relationship with the United States, particularly in this matter of the production and supply of foodstuffs.

What is the situation? I think I can briefly review it, and this may be of some value to the house. It will be recalled that soon after the outbreak of war the part of Europe that had supplied great quantities of foodstuffs to Great Britain was closed to her. I need only point to Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, the Danube basin, and other Eurpoean countries, which had all played their part in supplying Great Britain with the foodstuffs that were so solely needed. It is true that even after that disaster, after these sources of supply had been cut off, there was still a considerable portion of the world available to supply that vital war necessity—food. But the events of the last few weeks have completely changed that picture. Singapore has fallen, the Malay peninsula is gone, and no one in this house can be blind to the possibilities that may flow from the victories of Japan in the far east.

What does it mean in actual terms of foodstuffs? For example, the hon. member for Danforth (Mr. Harris) has often informed this house of the great quantities of edible oil that had been furnished to Canada from that area. The United States, too, commensurately with its population, imported large quantities of that commodity; and because of her peculiar position, England, in proportion to her population, imported from that source quantities out of all ratio to those imported by the United States and Canada. Is it not clear also, now that Singapore has fallen, that the sea routes to and from Australia, New Zealand and even India, may be denied to the ships of Britain and her allies? What effect must that have in the necessity of taking care of the food problem of Britain? It seems to me it can have only one effect, that is, to place upon Canada and the United States and the other American nations which are able and willing to assume it the task of making up this tremendous deficiency in food supply resulting from the events of the last few weeks. We would be blind indeed if we did not recognize the immediate necessity of reshaping our food policy to take care of the additional needs of our allies arising out of the situation in the far east.

It seems to me that despite the difficulty of keeping the Atlantic sea lanes open, Canada and the United States are the only countries that can possibly take up the slack caused by Britain being cut off from those countries as sources of supply. Keeping that route open will be a most difficult task, but it would appear to be the only continuous sea lane that we can hope to maintain. Australia and New Zealand, as everyone knows, have supplied great quantities of wheat, beef, mutton, butter, cheese and, as a by-product of the food supply, wool, to Great Britain, Canada and the United States.

I would point out that not only must we make up the deficiency in the supply to Britain and our own armed forces and the armed forces of our allies there, but it will be necessary to make up the deficiency that we ourselves shall feel as a result of the cutting off of those things that formerly came from the far east.

We should also have in mind that not only may it be necessary for us to take care of Britain's needs, but it may be our task to get great quantities of food to Russia and China. Both those nations are vital partners with us in this war, and if they for a moment fail through lack of food and any share of the responsibility of that were upon the shoulders of the Canadian people, we should deeply regret our failure to take due steps in due time. It is also necessary to keep in mind that in the production of either cereals or food in the shape of live stock it takes considerable time to produce a greatly increased supply. A crop of cereals cannot be grown in less than a season, and the same applies still more in regard to live stock. The growing in Canada of soya beans, which would immediately come to our mind to replace some of the edible oils, is not very feasible. But we know that in the United States there are considerable areas where that commodity has been successfully grown. It seems to me there must be further cooperation between the United States and Canada, after consultation and consideration of the joint problem, to see to it that those areas are used for that purpose. Canada can also assist indirectly by encouraging a great increase in the growth of flax. Flax produces linseed oil. We are using considerable quantities of edible oils for non-edible purposes, and we could make up that deficiency to some extent at least by producing more linseed oil.

I have already pointed out that as I see the problem it requires the closest cooperation between United States and Canada. That

cooperation exists in many fields and it should immediately be taken into account in this very vital section of our war effort. The policy adopted by this government at the present time will of necessity have to encourage the production of the foodstuffs that we most need. In the policy to be adopted this year any suggestion of encouraging the keeping of suitable agricultural land out of production should be completely eliminated.

The situation is so serious that any land properly capable of producing any form of food should be utilized to the full, in the face of the great danger that confronts us. I used the words "suitable agricultural land". I know the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) through his long experience will have in mind the history of the last war and the difficulties that arose through encouraging the bringing into production of vast areas of western lands that were not suited to agricultural use. We should not repeat that mistake, except under the urge of dire necessity. This year certainly the policy should be to encourage the full use for production of all land that is in shape to be used. I would point out that sooner than I or probably any hon. member of this house expected the Minister of Agriculture has been proven right in two statements he made to this house. It will be recalled that he said that what we thought to be a huge surplus of wheat would in the end prove to be not a liability but a great asset. And in 1941 he told us, in introducing the wheat policy of that year, that the wheat policy would necessarily have to be a temporary one. The events to which I have referred make it quite clear that he was correct in both those statements.

I propose to deal with the question of the wheat policy, not because I believe it is not now once more in its proper alignment with the production of other foodstuffs as a national necessity, but simply because up until now wheat, it might be said, has been treated as the orphan in the storm. I think that attitude of mind on the part of the government and ourselves must cease; we must recognize that if there are areas in this country suited only to the production of wheat, they should be used for that production. It would be far better that either our allies or ourselves should have ample food supplies in the form of wheat plus a reasonable amount of fat than to find ourselves and our allies with only a little wheat and a little fat. Every acre of suitable and properly cultivated agricultural land should now be devoted to building up reserves of foodstuffs for the inevitable day when they will be needed.

[Mr. Graham.]

Every hon. member will recall the recent visit of the four hundred farmers and others to Ottawa from Saskatchewan. I think I can safely say that they made an excellent impression on this house and, in the presentation of their submissions, on the government. Despite the criticism that was directed at the expense involved in that delegation coming to Ottawa, it is my considered opinion that they did a good job and any expenditure involved was well justified. I should also like to point out that the presentation they made to the government was most reasonable and moderate; it was made with dignity and was supported by sound arguments.

Let me give briefly the main points in that submission. They urged upon the government:

1. That an initial payment of one dollar a bushel basis No. 1 northern at Fort William be made.

2. Deferred payment of the balance of what they described as a parity price to be made later, this price to be determined by the bureau of statistics.

3. The continuation of the quota system of marketing, and the taking of only the amount of wheat required for domestic consumption and export during the coming crop year.

4. The continuation and necessary amendment of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

5. Soil conservation and the encouragement of the production of grasses to aid in that policy.

It seems to me that this submission, in the light of the events that have taken place, merits the most favourable consideration by the government in determining the wheat policy which at present is under review. Personally I want to say that in 1941 I had no hesitation in supporting the wheat policy brought down in this house by the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Trade and Commerce. It served an unusually good purpose last year in my constituency, which was visited by drought conditions almost unprecedented in our history. But I am convinced that circumstances have so changed that there is no path open to us except to recognize the needs occasioned by these events and circumstances. I believe therefore we should see to it that our policy realistically appreciates the change that has taken place. I feel that for once—and I say this to every member of this house—the interests of the nation and of our war programme are fully in keeping with the encouragement of those now producing the foodstuffs that are or will be so badly needed in connection with our war effort. Therefore, not because we are in a generous mood but

because it is right and proper and because the policy is wise and sound in the light of present circumstances, I would urge the government to see to it that for once in the history of this country, the farmer, the man whom we often proclaim to be an important element in our population, should be given that measure of justice which his situation demands and deserves.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that in connection with the policy that should be pursued by this government there has been an honest difference of opinion as to the methods by which the funds taken out of the dominion treasury should be distributed among the farming class, speaking particularly of western Canada. In view of the fact that last year we had a huge surplus of wheat which apparently we did not immediately need, the course followed then was more or less justified; but in view of the circumstances that now exist I do not believe that course should be followed any longer. I do not think it would be fair to the wheat grower, or for that matter to any other producer of foodstuffs, to say at this time, "It is vital in the interests of our war effort for you to grow all the wheat you can grow, but, because of priorities in the matter of various foodstuffs, we are going to depress the price of your commodity below what would be fair and equitable, everything being considered." I think the basis of the policy should be the establishment of fair and equitable prices to all producers of foodstuffs. Then if we wish to encourage the increased production of certain most needed agricultural commodities, we should attain that objective by paying a premium on the commodities that we desire our farmers to raise.

It seems to me this is the only reasonable attitude to assume. I further submit, Mr. Speaker, that we should encourage the greater production of coarse grains and grasses, and, as I have said already, of flax; but none of these policies should be put into operation at the expense of the wheat grower. I realize that we cannot hope to have government by delegation; I would not urge upon this house that because four hundred farmers from my own province came here and submitted their views as to the agricultural policy that should be pursued this year, that in itself should be sufficient to cause this government to follow the recommendations made by this delegation. I do feel, however, that when we examine the situation as it now exists; when we find that the policy advocated by that delegation is completely in conformity with our war needs and possible future needs, then, because it is right, proper, fair and equitable, we should give effect to that submission in its entirety. I turn particularly to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who has direction over the framing of the wheat policy of this government. I address the Minister of Agriculture who, with his great experience in the production of foodstuffs, must be a close adviser of the government in connection with the adoption of any wheat policy. I hope also that my words may reach the ears of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), because I realize that in any policy affecting any part of our national life, the Minister of Finance plays an important part.

I believe the two ministers from the west will be fully aware of the necessity of taking into account the matters I have mentioned in drawing up the wheat policy for the coming year. We all know the Minister of Finance has undertaken a task unequalled in our previous history; I am sure he must sometimes consider that there is no ceiling whatever to the amount of money he must raise in order to take care of our war needs. But in all seriousness I do suggest to him that he should not forget what the Prime Minister has already told us, that the war effort of Canada will not be restricted by financial limitations but only by the physical capacity of this country to produce. If ever there was a time when that statement should be kept in mind, it is the present. That statement should be applied in all its vigour in regard to the production of foodstuffs in this country. I suggest to the Minister of Finance that posterity will forgive him, I am sure, if we should produce a surplus of foodstuffs and find ourselves left with that surplus on our hands; but I doubt whether posterity or the members of this house or the minister himself would forgive him if in the near future we should find ourselves and our allies faced with a serious shortage of the very staff of life itself.

It is for these reasons that I urge upon the government consideration of the new conditions with which we are faced in this world struggle; the awful potentialities that present themselves and the part Canada must play, particularly in connection with the production of foodstuffs and materials of war, in close harmony and cooperation with our great neighbour to the south. I leave this with the government in the hope that appreciation of the situation now facing us, together with the need for a new survey and appraisal of the position of Canada in connection with supplying foodstuffs, will have its effect in the policy that will be announced for this year.

Mr. M. E. McGARRY (Inverness-Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I had decided that I would not take up any of the time of the house by participating in this debate. How-

ever, having been exposed to what might be called the infection of intermittent fever, generated by the very heated debates that have been carried on as to conscription versus the plebiscite, my powers of resistance weakened and I fell for a slight attack of the contagion. The few remarks I shall make will reflect the symptons of that mild seizure.

Before directing my attention to the subject matter of the debate I wish to associate myself with the eloquent and complimentary tributes paid the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Sound in substance, logical, factual, devoid of partisan colouring, they were veritable masterpieces, reflecting credit alike upon the hon. members who delivered them and the constituencies they represent.

Of all the items dealt with in the speech from the throne, the one which most agitated the minds of the public, the press and hon. members, was the plebiscite. Were I to presume to give a dictionary definition of the term "plebiscite", as applied generally, I would provoke the scorn of every hon. member, because I realize full well each hon. member is capable of giving that definition himself. But concerning the word plebiscite as applied in this specific instance there seems to be some difference of meaning. One would understand from some hon. members that the plebiscite as applied in this instance is a harmful thing, and that some ulterior purposes have been concealed. I fail to see why those hon. members should take that stand. My own view is that it is the most honourable, courageous and democratic means our leader could take to ask the electorate to release him from commitments made not only by himself but, with very few exceptions, by almost every other hon. member in the house.

Those who have spoken in opposition to the plebiscite have argued that it will delay our war effort. They urge that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) should peremptorily bring in a measure of conscription, and they would fain make the house and public believe that that is the only manoeuvre essential to bringing about an all-out war effort. Canada's organization for this all-out effort was well explained to the house when the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) made his very excellent speech here about a week ago. I was interested to learn that Colonel O. M. Biggar, who certainly should be recognized as an authority, agreed entirely with the order of requirements set out by the minister.

Those requirements were set out in five classes. The first was to ensure enough service and enough supplies to maintain the physical and mental health of our population. The second was to provide troops to protect Canada from invasion. The third was to build as many ships and manufacture as much war equipment as our materials and facilities permit. The fourth was to send across the seas as much food and war equipment as would be required to supply the needs of our home forces, part of the British forces and part of the civilian population. The fifth, and last, was to send overseas, out of Canada, troops who would be prepared to meet and to defeat the enemy wherever found.

As Colonel Biggar pointed out, compulsory overseas service was relevant to the attainment of only one of these requirements, namely that of providing troops for overseas service. It was indicated, in fact, only for a part of one of the requirements, because, as is known, there is no lack of recruiting in our naval and air forces. All hon. members know that only a small fraction of our overseas forces have contacted the enemy. We know, too, that if troops are recruited in Canada for Canada's protection those troops can be trained here, and if the time comes when there is a change of circumstances in the process of the war, their responsibility can be altered by the voice of the Canadian people.

We must bear in mind that man-power and woman-power in Canada is limited. Nobody knows to-day how far that power can be extended, any more than do we know which of these five requirements will be the most essential. Compulsory service for overseas is applied to only one of those requirements, and that only in a limited degree. Only a small fraction of the troops mustered to-day have been utilized. In my view the delay now obtaining is a proper one; it permits the people to concentrate on the question whether or not it is proper to extend the full power to our government. For that hesitation and concentration the government is taking full responsibility.

Listening to the speeches of some hon. members opposite, and reading some press comments, one might be led to believe that the government's war effort was away below what it should be. If I may be permitted for a few moments I should like to turn over a few pages of the history of this war, and hurriedly give a brief synopsis of what the government has already done.

First of all, in this fiscal year Canada is spending more than she spent during the whole of the duration of the last war. In other words 40 per cent of our national income is being spent to-day in the war effort. Or, if we may put it in another way, we are spending at the rate of $4,000,000 a day. Five times as many people in Canada are paying

to-day five times as much taxes, through all means of taxation. Men and women with incomes of from $3,000 to $10,000 are paying taxes increased from 4 per cent to 11 per cent. Then, 130,000 of our young men have been taught in the art of war and, since the beginning of the war, 750,000 men have been employed in connection therewith.

The British commonwealth air training plan in three years of operation has cost Canada an amount equivalent to the whole of Canada's taxation in one fiscal year. Fifteen times as many men are employed to-day in shipbuilding as were employed before the war, and thirty-five times as many are employed in aircraft work. The total production of explosives this year in Canada will be greater than the total production during the last war. Canadian-made army vehicles are serving in every arena of war where British empire troops are participating. To-day Canada is paying more per capita to provide foodstuffs for the British empire than the British government itself is paying for the same purpose. Canada's navy has increased from 15 ships at the beginning of the war to 350 at the present time. We have an army of 265,000; our air force numbers 100,000, and we have 150,000 men serving overseas. Some of our ships are separated by 10,000 miles. They have been engaged not only in protecting our shores but in convoy duty. They have convoyed 7,000 ships overseas, carrying a total of 43,000,000 tons of cargo. The Canadian active force comprises 393,000 men, almost half of whom are serving throughout the British empire, some in England, some in the British West Indies, some in Newfoundland, and some in Gibraltar. The air training plan now has 92 schools. Canada has built about 200,000 automotive vehicles, an average of one every three minutes. Up to date there have been manufactured in this country 9,000,000 shells, 10,000,000 cases and 150,000,000 pounds of explosives. Canada is producing every type of gun, armament or equipment used to-day in modern war.

This is a synopsis of Canada's achievement since the war began. But it may not be immune to criticism. It may be said that we were slow in building tanks and ships, but anyone who realizes the transpositions that were necessary to convert this country from a peaceful nation into a belligerent country will be ready to credit Canada with a wonderful achievement. Canada has a comparatively small population. Our recruiting has been satisfactory and we have a waiting list for the navy and air force. Only a small portion of our forces has been utilized, but the danger to our own shores is becoming more menacing and imminent.

I fail to see why this matter of conscription should be considered so essential to our having a balanced all-out war effort. This bogy of conscription is being urged by the press and by other people. Sometimes I am inclined to think that people who urge conscription are more concerned with bringing about disunion in this country than they are in effecting a more unified effort. God forbid that this will result in an advantage to our financial barons of Baronfield.

I consider that our leader and his government are doing a good job. They are doing first things first. They have laid particular stress upon those things which have the greatest significance. So far they have been allowed to pursue their war effort one hundred per cent, but with the passage of time it may be necessary to have their power extended. They are asking the people in an honourable, courageous and democratic way to relieve them from the restrictions of their commitments so that when the time comes they will have a free hand to act.

I should like to make a suggestion to the government. If and when the time comes that the need for conscription is indicated, if we are to maintain the balanced effort that has been achieved so successfully up to the present time regard must be given to the producers of foodstuffs. The production of foodstuffs is one of the most essential requirements of this war. These men should be afforded all possible advantages; they should be given every facility and provided with every stimulus necessary to enable them to produce the surplus which is needed for the successful prosecution of this war. I think this government should see to it that there is no disproportion between the prices that the farmer receives for his products and what he must pay for his domestic wants and implements of production.

When the government is considering the conscripting of man-power it should be careful not to bring about a condition which will have an unbalancing effect upon our war effort. I should like to cite one case. I have a number of fishermen and farmers in my constituency who operate on a small scale. The man I have in mind was most provident. He had one son and he operated a small fishing industry. But he is now past his age of labour and his son is in the army. He has a boat and the necessary equipment to do a small amount of fishing, and now that the fishing season is coming on he has tried to have his son released from the army, but he has not been successful. This is only one of a number of cases in my constituency. This man cannot operate without the assistance of his son, and his operations are not large enough to warrant his hir-

ing another man. Here is a man who should be a producer, but if his son is not released from the army he will probably be on relief. When this matter of conscription comes up for consideration I ask the government to see that the producers' man-power is not reduced to such a degree that they will not be able to produce the required surplus as well as their own domestic needs.

Mr. HOMUTH: Why do they not do it under the present act?

Mr. McGARRY: I could not tell you that. I was interested in hearing what the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Macdonald) had to say the other day about the necessity of the government being vigilant in preparing facilities for ship repairs. In the light of what is happening off the Pacific coast it looks as though the day may come when the facilities he has in mind will be in great demand. In the historic town of Louisburg in my constituency there is a wonderful site for a dry dock. Nature herself laid out the site and has done most of the construction. Experts in the Department of Naval Services and the Department of Transport have visited that site, admired it, and reported back to the government. I do not know what has happened since, but in view of what is happening in the Pacific I would urge the government to look carefully into the possibility of constructing a ship repair plant at that site because there are strong indications that such a plant may be required on the Atlantic coast.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to say just one word more with regard to Canada's achievements in this war. I do not think this has been mentioned by any other speaker, and I shall take only a few minutes.

At the beginning of the war the government did not lose sight of the fact that some planning should be done for the day when the war is over. Some people disagree with that view. They say that we should not consider postwar problems when we are in the midst of the conflict. I do not agree with this opinion. I agree, of course, that it should be the thought and purpose of every Canadian to prosecute this war vigorously to the very best of our ability. Nevertheless I think it is our duty to give consideration to and do some planning for the day when our soldiers come back to their civilian employment and when the work of manufacturing implements of destruction ceases—the day also when prices of commodities, which in wartime are bound to reach a higher level, recede once more to the economic levels of peacetime. I think some planning should be done to meet these events. The wartime prices and trade board has prevented the profiteering and hoarding which obtained in the last war when we witnessed the disgraceful spectacle of individuals and corporations waxing fat on the sacrifices of the men who stood in arms against the foe. The ceiling which the board and the government have imposed upon commodity prices is a guard against inflation, and I think it will protect us in a great measure at least from a depression such as followed after the last war, and which brought suffering and privation almost equal to the horrors of war itself.

While in a democracy we have the right to engage in controversy and argue whether a certain way is right or wrong, our united purpose should now be to consider first our national responsibilities and to protect our democratic rights which are being attacked by the enemy who would, if possible, take them away from us. This is no time for bickering or carping criticism. Constructive criticism is helpful to the government and we should welcome it. While we may have our controversies and arguments as to the right or wrong way of doing things, we should never forget that this is no ordinary war between nation and nation but a conflict between ideologies. On the one side we have democracy, which gives us all the rights and privileges that make life worth living. On the other side we have the totalitarian tyrants who would take away from us those rights and privileges, and who seek to destroy everything that is spiritual in man. That is the crisis we are facing and we might as well face it, realizing that we are witnessing the greatest tragedy of carnage which this world has ever seen. The ghost of that carnage is almost at our very doorstep. This is a time for us to coordinate our national efforts. Let us preserve our unity and go forward with a united purpose and the single determination to win. If we do that, and if every Canadian will do his duty, we shall overthrow these tyrants who have gone absolutely mad in their desire for world domination.

I shall vote for the plebiscite. My constituency will give an affirmative answer. I trust my leader. He will not abuse the power he asks for. The people of my constituency have faith in his leadership, in war or in peace.

Mr. D. A. McNIVEN (Regina City): Long before this, Mr. Acting Speaker, you will have concluded that every subject that can properly be debated on this motion so ably introduced by yourself as the member for Hull (Mr. Fournier), has long since been exhausted by the eloquence and logic of the members who have preceded me. Notwithstanding that, I am going to venture a few

remarks at this time, and in case I should omit to do so at a later stage I state now that I intend to support the motion as introduced by yourself and seconded by the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald). I intend to vote against both amendments now before the house, notwithstanding that both of them may have some merit, but because undoubtedly they are a want of confidence motion in this government. Since I am fully persuaded that this government during its term of office has handled efficiently and well every situation that has arisen, I could not under the circumstances support anything that savoured of a vote of want of confidence.

Every candidate for an election, upon the acceptance of a party nomination thereby accepts the party's policy and the declarations of its leader. The policy and the declarations of the Liberal party and the declarations of our leader were well known and widely publicized throughout this country. For that reason, sir, I intend to support the plebiscite and to use every endeavour within my power to bring about a practically unanimous vote in the constituency which I represent—and I mean every section of that constituency. I am supported in the view that such will be the fact, for among the various resolutions that I have recently received was one from the German-Canadian club of our city supporting an all-out Canada war effort. I am further persuaded in that connection because of the declaration of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and various other ministers, that the taking of this plebiscite would not mean a single day or hour of delay in the furthering and development of Canada's war effort.

The Prime Minister and the members of the government are capable men, sincere, honest, straightforward and loyal to both king and country; and they are the ones who, from the responsibility of their positions, are best equipped to know what is needed, what is essential in promoting a balanced, continuous war effort—balanced and continuous to the very end, no matter how long that may be. I am further convinced that the Prime Minister will sponsor and enact any and every measure that is essential to bring about ultimate victory.

In a recent issue of the magazine *Liberty* there appeared a biographical sketch of the Prime Minister written by Mr. Grattan O'Leary. After reviewing the events of what must be described as a colourful life, the distinguished author comments that the Prime Minister is possessed of something, a trait, a characteristic, subtle and impossible to put into words, but which has had a genuine appeal to hundreds of thousands of people in this country over a long period of years and which his critics have been totally unable to understand or appreciate.

With deference to the distinguished author may I suggest that that subtle something in the Prime Minister's character, which the author found so elusive, was very aptly expressed by Lord Tennyson when he penned these lines:

> And, because right is right, to follow right
> Were wisdom in the scorn of consequence.

This couplet expresses a whole political philosophy; it is a chart for personal guidance; and the Prime Minister's adherence to and his courage in the expression of its truth has inspired confidence in him in the minds of the Canadian people and has brought confusion to his critics and those whose standards of political life do not reach the pinnacle which he has achieved.

The publication of the census returns a few weeks ago brought some startling results in so far as we who reside in Saskatchewan are concerned, because by an alleged reduction in population that province will lose four of its representation in this house. The representation is now twenty-one, and with the realignment in Saskatchewan the membership will be reduced to seventeen. Our population in 1931 was 922,000, and for those hon. members who live in eastern Canada, may I say that our constitution provides for a quinquennial census. Because of that provision a census of the prairie provinces was taken in 1936, and in 1936 our population had shown an increase—930,893. But by June, 1941, our population had been reduced to 887,747, or a loss of approximately 43,000. Conditions following 1936, notwithstanding the catastrophe of 1937, improved from year to year. They were better in 1938; they were better again in 1939; and they showed a substantial improvement in 1940. Where and why, then, the loss? What is the answer? There can be only one answer and that is, the exigencies of war. Enlistments from our province approximate 35,000 in all the armed forces. Geography, our own economy, and the necessity of making large shipments of war materials to Britain and the European front precluded the development of war industries in Saskatchewan. But, patriotic to the core, our people have come east where war work was to be had; and I can say, from conversations with eastern industrialists, that they are glad to have the prairie dweller in their factories because of his resourcefulness and initiative.

I protest most vigorously at any reduction in the membership of this house from the province of Saskatchewan, particularly at this time, and owing to the causes which I have already indicated. Prior to 1930 Saskatchewan was the third province in the dominion, and for the following five or six years that province experienced every kind of agricultural disaster that was ever conceived by the mind of man. Saskatchewan, however, is emerging from the effects and consequences of that disaster. While it is true that in that period the accumulated savings of bygone years have been swept away, two things stand out like a neon light in a black-out, that the fertility of our soil is unimpaired, and that the courage and spirit of our people remain unbroken. Our people look forward with confidence, faith and hope to the day when Saskatchewan will again occupy the proud position she once occupied in the galaxy of Canadian provinces. Saskatchewan will play a prominent part in the settlement of post-war problems; our wide open spaces, our resources, offer ample scope and opportunity for the industry of many millions. I appeal to hon. members, with their genius, their initiative, to find some means of avoiding the infliction of this penalty to which I have referred, upon a patriotic people at this time. What has been done before can be done again. In 1915, on the petition of this parliament, the British parliament amended the British North America Act in these terms:

51A. Notwithstanding anything in this act a province shall always be entitled to a number of members in the House of Commons not less than the number of senators representing such province.

I am not familiar with all the reasons which occasioned that amendment, but I would point out that it was made in war time and it had the effect of stabilizing the membership of this house in so far as certain provinces are concerned. I will not develop the point further at this time except to urge that, if our constitution as it stands at present makes imperative an adjustment or realignment of the membership of this house, we immediately initiate proceedings to amend our constitution so that we can postpone this until after the war when conditions have again become settled, and that the membership of this house remain as it now is.

By that same amendment the senatorial representation of Canada was fixed. Canada was divided into four divisions, the maritimes, Quebec, Ontario and the west, each with a senatorial representation of twenty-four. I am not going to suggest that the senatorial representation of any area should be cut down, but I do say that the prairie provinces and British Columbia now have a population of nearly 3,300,000, almost equal to that of Ontario, and three times as great as that of the maritime provinces. Notwithstanding this, there has been no demand from the west for increased senatorial representation; that is due to our characteristic modesty. But I can say, sir, that the demand will become vocal and more and more insistent should this reduction of membership be forced upon us at this time. I think all will agree that that august body would be invigorated by the infusion of a little prairie vim, a little more prairie vigour, versatility and resourcefulness.

I would repeat now a statement which I made in the presence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) at Regina; there are far too many people in Ottawa occupying reponsible positions who think that nothing good can be done outside this city. While this statement has particular reference to the Minister of Finance, it is not a criticism of one for whom I have a very high regard, and who has steadily grown in the estimation of the people of this country. But, sir, a constant appeal is being made for the purchase of war savings certificates and stamps. The individual who purchases these certificates must send to Ottawa and submit to weeks of delay before his certificate comes along. Why should these certificates not be sold in our banks and post offices, under such limitations as you will, so that the purchaser may have immediate concrete evidence of his patriotic impulse? Shortly afterwards, I heard over the radio an announcement by the United States authorities that war savings certificates could be purchased from the banks, from the post offices, and even from the letter carriers as they go from door to door. I therefore suggest that a similar practice be adopted in this country to encourage the sale of war savings certificates.

When the price ceiling was introduced, licences were required, and over 300,000 licences were issued to wholesalers and retailers. They were all issued from Ottawa. The regional directors sat idly in their offices, impotent, unable to give information to the merchants who besieged them for it. When the army called for women recruits, it was announced in the press that applications would be received at military district headquarters. Later that was cancelled, and then it was to be at national registration headquarters. That was cancelled, and every woman in this country who desired to enlist in the army was required to send her application to Ottawa.

These are just a few examples of what I mean by centralization of everything in Ottawa. I do not blame the ministers; they cannot know everything that goes on. But these are

examples of the conduct, the intention and the desire of bureaucrats in responsible positions to extend their authority and expand their position, irrespective of the inconvenience caused to the general public. Washington is rapidly becoming the nerve centre of the war, and almost every day we hear announced in the press that non-war departments and those having to do with civilian life are being moved to New York, Philadelphia, Chicago and other centres in the United States. May I suggest to the government that a similar practice be followed here, that civilian departments be moved out from Ottawa to centres in other parts of Canada. This would obviate the necessity for continued temporary office construction in the capital and at the same time greatly relieve the Ottawa housing situation.

I mentioned a moment ago that certain facts, our geography, our economy and the necessities of war, had precluded our participation in the war industries up to the present time. However, the outbreak of war in the Pacific and the presence of U-boats on the Atlantic, in American waters, have substantially changed this picture. The Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) is efficiently energetic and is surrounded by capable men who doubtless have a full appreciation of this problem. They will have realized that of all Canada, the prairies are least vulnerable; and that of the prairies, Saskatchewan is in a favoured position in this regard. Our anxiety over the Pacific coast extends to the industries that have been established there, and immediately suggests that any additions or extensions or new industries should be established where they will be safe from possible attack; and that place, I submit, is on the prairies. In adopting such a policy we would be following what has been done in the United States, where already they have established many of their key industries in the middle west, in that part of their territory which corresponds to the province of Saskatchewan. The westward flow of materials made necesssary by the outbreak of war in the Pacific again suggests the necessity and advisability of establishing industries on the prairies.

I make this suggestion, not from a monetary point of view, but from the innate desire of our people to have a larger place in the war picture and to use their experience, energy, inclination and training in order that they may be of assistance at this time. Just here I want to thank the Minister of Munitions and Supply for establishing Regina Industries for the manufacture of gun carriages for anti-tank guns. That plant is not yet in production, but I fully understand why that is so. They advertised for labour and received over five hundred applications from men on the prairies who had machine-shop experience. Many of them, it is true, were rusty, but they soon acquired skill and speed. Industry in the east has drawn heavily upon our population, but I submit that as a principle it is still preferable to move industry to labour rather than to take labour to industry.

The big industrialist who has been favoured with large war contracts has not farmed out the manufacture of component parts as he was expected and instructed to do. As a result, there is still a wealth of equipment and skill in the prairie regions which have not been used. A similar condition obtains in the United States, and only recently I heard over the radio that the small munition plants and small machine-shops were making a united, vigorous protest to the United States congress, urging that the policy of centralizing industry had brought them to the point of bankruptcy and was militating against the American war effort. Industrial development in Canada has reached astronomical proportions, running into billions of dollars. Notwithstanding that, I fear hon. members will doubt my word when I say that the only contracts awarded in the province of Saskatchewan have been as follows: John East, of Saskatoon, $65,000, being a sub-contract from Manitoba Bridge; Richardson Road Machinery, $150,000 for trailers; Northwest Iron Works, $70,000 for steel rollers; Northwest Iron Works, $4,800, being a sub-contract from the Ogden Shops, Calgary; and G. and G. of Prince Albert, who have had a few small contracts from Canada Car and Foundry at Fort William. I do not include in this list Regina Industries, but I do say that full use is not being made of the inclination, the training, the ability and the resources of our province.

About two weeks ago parliament played host to a representative group of Saskatchewan citizens who made a submission to the government with regard to agriculture. It was one of the largest delegations to visit Ottawa in recent years. The presentation was carefully prepared, logically arranged, and cogently presented. It was an unfolding of the democratic system; and in this time of stress and strain it is good to know that there are still countries where the people can approach their government without personal danger. The representations of this delegation were courteously received by the government, and from conversations I had with delegates I would judge that they departed for their homes with a new conception of the many problems confronting a government in a rapidly changing

world. This is characteristic of that sweet sense of reasonableness which always actuates the western mind.

Prairie dwellers know that western wheat is the best food product in the world. They know, too, that the time will come when that food product will be needed by our allies, as it will be needed in the post-war period. We know the important part played by wheat in the last war. Sir George Paish, the eminent British economist, told a number of us here in 1938 that if it had not been for the productivity of the western plains and the ability of the British navy to transport our wheat to England, that country would have been starved into submission in 1916 and again in 1917. Wheat was the only commodity that was commandeered in the last war. The United States farmer received from $1 to $1.50 a bushel more for his wheat than the western agriculturist received, but the prairie farmer smilingly accepted that reduction in price as his opportunity to render national service. Wheat is temporarily a drug on the market, and that being so, the farmer does not ask for that parity of price which is enjoyed by Canadian labour and industry. He asks merely for a price that will enable him to continue as a productive unit until such time as his commodity is again in universal demand. Such a plea, presented on national grounds and from patriotic motives, must not remain unanswered, and I am sure the Canadian people generally will approve the granting of the request presented by this delegation.

Ours is a peculiar situation. We are still subject to recurring periods of drought over wide areas. Every farmer, every farm, is a national asset. He produces what is required to maintain the body and fertilize the mind, and for that reason must be maintained as a national resource.

For this reason, sir, the Prairie Farm Assistance Act has become the magna charta of western agriculture, serving and fulfilling a long-felt want. The loss of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act would create consternation and dismay on the prairie farm. Of all the innovations and policies developed by the dynamic Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) to stabilize agriculture, the Prairie Farm Assistance Act still holds the spotlight as accomplishing the greatest good for the greatest number.

Mr. MacNICOL: That is something for which Mr. Bennett can take credit.

Mr. McNIVEN: The Prairie Farm Assistance Act was passed in 1939. I know the hon. member would not wish Mr. Bennett to receive any credit for something entirely due to the Minister of Agriculture.

[Mr. McNiven.]

The government is to be commended for the construction of the chain of airports between Edmonton and Alaska. The purpose is obvious, and that purpose was confirmed by what happened on December 7. Supplies will be needed in the far north, and the integrated purpose of the Canadian and United States governments make imperative the immediate construction of a highway connecting the centres of production in the middle western states with Canada's and America's vulnerable hinterland. That construction is a mammoth undertaking and, in the light of existing events, has become an imperative necessity.

May I suggest to the government that, in the choice of a route, scenic and tourist possibilities be overlooked. This is no tourist expedition, and the ambitions and animosities of local areas should not be considered. The route to be constructed should be the one which is capable of quick, easy, speedy construction, and will demand the smallest part of the taxpayers' dollar. As fulfilling all those specifications, I suggest to the government the prairie route as being best calculated to serve the demand.

As residents of the prairies, we share the anxieties of the people in British Columbia with regard to their Japanese problem. The revelations respecting Pearl Harbour have justified that anxiety, an anxiety which I may say to you, sir, is most real, and not imaginary.

I would urge the government that it ought not to hesitate to remove the Japanese from points of danger in British Columbia, and, if necessary, a safe place can and will be found for them on the prairies. Consequences of delay are hard to visualize. I can best repeat the words used on one occasion by Mr. Churchill—"There is not a week, nor a day nor an hour to be lost."

A cloud no bigger than a man's hand has recently appeared on the political horizon, a cloud reminiscent of the most sinister political alliance that ever darkened the pages of Canadian history. The hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght) scented its presence the other afternoon, and with his keen analytical mind depicted some of its possibilities. In 1911, in Quebec the Nationalist cry was anti-imperialism, and in Ontario the Tory slogan was, "No truck or trade with the Yankees." Following 1911, these antagonistic doctrines found common ground. Messrs. Bourassa and LaVergne refused appointment in Sir Robert Borden's cabinet. They were allowed to select and they chose Pelletier, Nantel and Blondin, all Nationalists, and later, in 1916, Mr. Albert Sevigny, an outstanding Nationalist, was named Speaker of the house.

In September, 1914, after the outbreak of the last war, Mr. Bourassa said in his paper, *Le Devoir*, that it was—

—Canada's national duty to contribute according to her resources, and by fitting means of action to the triumph and especially to the endurance of the combined efforts of France and England. I have not written and will not write one line, one word to condemn the sending of Canadian troops to Europe.

Estimable, indeed! His conversion, however, was short-lived, for from 1915 on, both in the press and on the platform we find him in unmeasured terms condemning Canada's participation in any of Britain's wars. His shafts of criticism were levelled at Sir Wilfrid, and reached their climax in September, 1916, when he declared:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier is the most nefarious man in the province of Quebec, yes, in the whole of Canada.

On Wednesday last this same Mr. Bourassa emerged from retirement, rose from a sickbed, and with something of his old time vigour, combined in a single address both the arguments which in 1911 were used to undermine Sir Wilfrid in Ontario, and again in Quebec. What did Bourassa say on this occasion? As reported in a boxed position on the centre of the front page of the Montreal *Gazette*, he said:

Canada will be annexed by the United States within ten years.

The present policy of the Canadian government is not dictated by London, but by Washington.

Borden and Meighen were both more honest than the present government leaders.

Mr. MacNICOL: Hear, hear.

Mr. McNIVEN: "Hear, hear", someone says. He is just a little too early; I shall deal with that later.

Living in the past, this crafty old campaigner made a double-barrelled appeal to the anti-imperialists of Quebec, and to the British whose roots are deep in British traditions, by sowing seeds of distrust of our American neighbour. He likewise endeavoured to undermine the confidence of the Canadian people in the honesty of members of the administration, and his thought in that direction was similar to the invective he employed against Sir Wilfrid in 1916.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why was such prominence given to these thoughts in the Montreal *Gazette*? Did that newspaper have an objective similar to that which brought Bourassa out into the limelight once again? In its editorial page, on the following day, it is true that they acclaimed those portions in which he tendered sage advice to some of his compatriots. But it is equally true that they registered only mild disagreement with the more insidious part of the address.

Commenting on the same speech, the *Globe and Mail* said editorially:

What will cause special anguish at Ottawa was the declaration of his belief that Sir Robert Borden and Arthur Meighen were more honest in their attitudes than our present ministers.

I wonder what standard Bourassa had in mind when he used that language? I wonder what was passing through the mind of the editor of the *Globe and Mail* when he quoted it with such gleeful approval? I ask you, Mr. Speaker, was it the War-time Elections Act of 1917? On the other hand, was it the famous Hamilton speech, or was it the speech delivered by the Right Hon. Mr. Meighen in the Quebec by-election in 1926? Perchance was it the famous "last gasp" speech delivered by the right hon. gentleman on January 27, 1942? Or possibly it was that amazing contradiction of past performances and past utterances delivered by the right hon. gentleman on February 3, 1942. Mr. Speaker, I leave the answer and the comparison of standards to you and to other members of this house. Again I ask you: What is the purpose and objective of this mentality which has in the past created so much trouble for this government and indirectly hindered the war effort?

I shall call another witness who has been motivated by similar ideas. Premier Hepburn must have known or should have known that his declarations against the United States navy would cause anxiety and distrust in the minds of Canadians with regard to our great ally and would create antagonisms on the other side of the line. The Winnipeg *Free Press*, commenting upon his action in that connection, made the following statement:

The harm done by Mr. Hepburn will outlive and outlast any amends offered by Canada.

On page 2 of the Montreal *Gazette* of this morning I find the following in "Lights and Shadows" by L. S. B. Shapiro:

Mr. Hepburn's feat: It would be nice if Mr. Hepburn's bright little escapade of last week could be laughed off and dismissed merely as part of the price we have to pay for having an aggressive prankster in a responsible position. In trying to be as lively as possible on all occasions, Mr. Hepburn has provided the dominion with a few guffaws and not a few headaches, the most violent of which is his current criticism of the United States navy.

I fear, however, that this one is not to be laughed off so easily. A lot of people I know in New York and Washington are laughing very bitterly and they show no sign of stopping.

And again:

More important than these examples of ruffled feeling is the comment of Fletcher Pratt, the

noted American military expert. Mr. Pratt observes the U.S. navy has not attacked the main Japanese fleet for precisely the same reason that the Canadian army in Britain has not attacked the Germans who are only fifty miles distant from some of the Canadian encampments.

Thus we begin to find ourselves in a battle of recrimination over our beautiful, undefended border while we are still losing the war to the axis. A Hitler agent couldn't have done as well in a year of trying.

I mentioned a moment ago that a cloud no bigger than a man's hand had appeared on the political horizon. Knowing that the friendly relations between Canada and the United States is primarily the accomplishment of the Prime Minister, as was abundantly attested to last evening by the President of the United States, I ask you, Mr. Speaker: Are the critics of the Prime Minister developing a new line of attack regardless of its effect upon our war effort and our friendly relations with our greatest ally, the United States? I cannot believe that the retention of the Right Hon. Mr. Meighen as leader, the reappearance of Bourassa in the limelight and Hepburn's recent outbursts are mere coincidence. Rather would I believe that the opponents of this government, having failed to stampede the people on the plebiscite and conscription issues, are now trying the old game of 1911 by bringing about the unity of the Nationalist group in Quebec and the narrow-minded persons who always look askance at the United States because of the fact that a close association with that country might infringe upon the monopolies which they enjoy. Truly it is a strange alliance—the imperialistic Mr. Meighen—the anti-war Mr. Bourassa!

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What nonsense!

Mr. McNIVEN: Not quite so nonsensical as the house leader of the Conservatives seems to think.

Mr. MacNICOL: Is the hon. member reading a quotation or what?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is just innuendo.

Mr. McNIVEN: We have heard Bourassa praise Mr. Meighen. What has Mr. Meighen to say about Mr. Bourassa and his summary of United States designs upon this country? Do Mr. Meighen and the Conservative party expect Bourassa's support, and with it the Nationalist party of Quebec, whose campaign has been entirely anti-war, as it was in 1911? I find it hard to believe in this grave hour, accentuated as it was yesterday afternoon by Mr. Churchill in the most sombre tones, that the great Conservative party will countenance such a move. Unless, however, Mr. Meighen denounces it, dissociates his party from the statements that have been made by Mr. Bourassa and condemns his latest friend and ally, Premier Hepburn, for his recent utterances reflecting upon the navy of the United States, I for one feel justified in concluding that the group of men who are using the Meighen-Hepburn-Drew combination as a means to power will go to any length. I am quite certain that the house leader of the Conservative party will be glad to use the earliest opportunity to make such an avowal.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The hon. member is simply putting up a straw-man to knock down.

Mr. McNIVEN: I see that my time is up, so I will conclude with the statement that such a declaration from the present leader of the Conservative party is now overdue.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. R. W. GLADSTONE (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say at the very outset of my speech that if Canada is not one hundred per cent in the war to-day, it is the duty of this parliament to remove impediments and close the gaps immediately, for in the words of Prime Minister Churchill there is not a week nor a day nor an hour to be lost. If we hesitate, if we delay, if we try to conserve our resources, and if likewise our allies should employ less than their maximum in this struggle, who is to say that we shall not be driven out of the Orient, out of Africa, yea, even out of Europe? Contemplating now such a situation, is it not imperative for our survival that we throw the entire strength of the nation immediately into this struggle? In war there is no second heat, no return game, no second chance.

The hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght), speaking in this debate on February 12, referred to the speech from the throne in 1936 in which was forecast a bill to create parliamentary secretaryships. I have pressed for this enlarged representation and participation by members on so many occasions in this parliament and elsewhere that I do not propose at this time to repeat what I have said. But the reference calls to mind the statement that I made in the auditorium of the city hall in Guelph when I was a candidate in the 1925 election. I was advocating the return of the Liberal government on a platform of which one plank was senate reform. During the course of preparing my speech to-day I was

seeking for confirmation of that plank, and I found it in *Hansard* of January 12, 1926, at page 105, in a speech delivered by Mr. C. W. Bell, then member for Hamilton West. Mr. Bell referred to a speech that had been made by the then Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in a hockey arena in London, Ontario, on October 16, 1925, during the election campaign. The words of the Prime Minister, as quoted by Mr. Bell, were as follows:

> Only a few days ago a number of senators were appointed. Every one has given me his pledged word he will be prepared, once a measure passes the Commons, to give it his support. Subsequent senators will be appointed with that understanding, and as Providence takes away a few of the older members, you will have a Senate pledged to bring about the reforms for which the administration stands.

I have the utmost confidence that this is a matter which will be receiving the attention of the Prime Minister in due time.

I sometimes wonder whether it is an evidence of strength or of weakness in our cabinet make-up that we do not have family rows and resignations. Shake-ups are common in the British cabinet. I sometimes wonder whether we are not too hesitant about creating occasions for by-elections. Who will say that the recent by-elections were not without profit right across Canada in bringing all the diversified factors of our war effort into the open for discussion and decision? Boldness of policy in this respect should strengthen any government. Our democracy will be more secure as we trust the people more. Therefore I would suggest to the Prime Minister, as a humble supporter of his, that the undoubted confidence in which he is presently held by the electors will be heightened if he will more often furnish occasions on which the electors can pass judgment on the record of his government.

There is opportunity now for the rejuvenation of the cabinet, with so many senate vacancies inviting it. Whose move is it? Don't too many speak at once—make it easy for the Prime Minister. Seriously, however, these days call for forceful and resourceful men, the type that, unflinching before Hitler and his gang, would spring at them and smash them a black-out.

The two great instruments for moulding public opinion and maintaining and uplifting the morale of the nation in this time of stress and during occasional dark days of near panic are the press and the radio. Canada has been blessed over the years in having finely conducted newspapers. Readers have been able to place reliance on the news reports of events, local, national and world-wide. But one wonders sometimes whether the merging of ownerships for exclusiveness of newspaper field has not given rise to some catering to interests and the use of the newspaper columns to promote interests and to promote the views of powerful and influential groups.

More explicitly what I have in mind is the colouring of news, over-emphasizing certain features and suppressing or merging other features, depending upon some possible objective to be attained. Perhaps I should give some instances of what I have in mind.

Take (1) the speech by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Fraser). One paper refers to his speech as a burlesque, accompanied by prolonged applause and desk-thumping. As a matter of fact, the desk-thumping coincided with a statement which was not mentioned at all in the editorial, namely, that some persons would conscript youth to fight for their dollars.

(2) A most capable member, of undoubted sincerity, in his speech dealt with a tendency of some papers to belittle members of parliament. His was a considered and reasoned argument. One paper has an isolated comment, quoting only the following of his words: "We may be a mediocre lot. God help us, I know we are."

(3) Two morning newspapers reporting the speeches in parliament of the preceding day, used the following front page headlines respectively: (a) "More Liberals from Quebec tell Commons they oppose conscription for overseas"; (b) "Five Quebec members back plebiscite plan—three others express opposition in Commons debate."

It is to be regretted if there is any trend towards colouring the news in Canada, even in isolated places; and should the colouring of news be employed to the extent of possibly undermining the nation during war time, it ought to become a matter for government attention, looking, for instance, to an amendment to the libel section of the criminal code. Not being a lawyer, I would not assume any competence to pass on legal questions, but as a layman I simply suggest that persistent colouring of news in a way that is detrimental to the morale of the nation in time of war ought not to be permitted regardless of the long-accepted principle of the freedom of the press. Defamatory libel is defined in section 317 of the criminal code in these words:

> A defamatory libel is matter published, without legal justification or excuse, likely to injure the reputation of any person by exposing him to hatred, contempt or ridicule, or designed to insult the person of or concerning whom it is published.

Provided that the scope of this definition could be and were enlarged to include the national safety, then the colouring of the reports of the proceedings of parliament would

be an offence under section 322 of the criminal code which reads:

No one commits an offence by publishing in good faith, for the information of the public, a fair report of the proceedings of the Senate or House of Commons, or any committee thereof, or of any council or assembly aforesaid, or any committee thereof, or of the public proceedings, preliminary or final, heard before any court exercising judicial authority, nor by publishing, in good faith, any fair comment upon any such proceedings.

I would wish this allusion to the press to be regarded as of a more or less hypothetical nature and most certainly as in no way critical of those men and women who are in the press gallery of parliament, but nevertheless as a warning to their editors that theirs is the high mission of maintaining and upbuilding the morale of the nation during the war years.

Mr. Speaker, the true implication of certain portions of the speech of the hon. member for Northumberland, as reported at page 331 of *Hansard* were not grasped, or were ignored in some press reports. I wish to quote one paragraph of this speech; but before doing so, let me explain, for any one who may not know, the meaning or significance of two of the terms he used. "Who's Who" contains a list of directors, industrialists and financiers in Canada, showing the company or companies with which each is associated; and where he used the word "empire" he referred to investments or dollars, if you will. He said:

Let me go further and say to them, that if I owned an empire such as "Who's Who" says they own, I would want to conscript everybody in Canada to defend it. And, Mr. Speaker, if I had their mentality not only would I wish to conscript—insist upon conscripting—every man in Canada to defend that empire, but I would go farther and spend every dollar I could to create in this country in the minds of the people a situation which would delude and deceive them into conscripting people to defend my empire.

My purpose in referring to the speech of the hon. member for Northumberland is to lay the groundwork for my wholehearted support of any sound proposal for higher pay for the men who go forth to risk their lives for us all. Such a proposal was so splendidly set out in a speech by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver), as reported in *Hansard* at page 387, that I cannot do better than quote what he said:

Right here I should like to make a suggestion in regard to the armed forces. Many of those who have stayed at home have earned good wages. Some have spent them; others—many—have accumulated savings. I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that a savings fund should be set up for the armed forces. I would urge that every member of our armed forces while serving in Canada, should receive an additional $1 per day, and, while in active service overseas, an additional $2 per day. These savings should not be paid now, but at the end of the war. When the boys return, some will want to complete their education. Many of them will marry. Certainly all of them will find it difficult to get back into civilian life. None of the money would have to be paid now. This would not detract from the war effort. It would be no hardship to continue war-time taxation for a few years after the war. There is another feature about this. The proposed payments would establish a tremendous reservoir of consumer demand for goods at a time when this country will badly need a consumer demand for goods to start its industries going again in peace-time operations, turning over from war-time operations.

We have a study underway. It will be a progressive study of means of assisting men, both of the armed forces and of those who have been diverted to war activities, back to a normal civilian life. Here is the place to apply the suggestion of the hon. member for Parry Sound as to the creation of parliamentary secretaryships. The study is being made under the direction of the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie), in whose ability we have the utmost confidence, and he is supported by an able committee of civil servant experts. There might, however, be some worth-while advantage in bringing to the assistance of this committee a few of the elected representatives of the people, men who at the next election will have to go back and account to the people for what they have done in the direction of providing for a speedy and decent rehabilitation of our returned men.

To turn next to agriculture, the condition of our great industry of agriculture is one which demands tackling by methods which so far have not been employed. Speaking of Ontario agriculture, I would say that prices being realized to-day are at a fairly reasonable level having regard to what the working man supporting a family can afford to pay. But where is the margin to the farmer to erect a new barn or even to reroof the old barn, or to replace worn-out implements, or to instal modern equipment, or to do the many things that would be profitable to our industries in supplying needed materials? Men are leaving the farms for the one and only reason that it is not possible for them to maintain those farms as their fathers and their grandfathers were able to maintain them, progressively, making farming in reality a way of life. I submit, therefore, that in relation to agriculture we must face the perplexing situation where the working man can hardly afford to pay more and the farmer cannot make ends meet at present prices for the food products of Ontario mixed farming.

Seemingly the experts in economics have not yet arrived at a solution of this problem,

unless perhaps they are unwilling to do so. Here, again, I see an opportunity for the application of the suggestion made by the hon. member for Parry Sound as to the creation of parliamentary secretaryships looking to representation in the administration for eastern agriculture. We have a most capable Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), but I think he will admit that the problem of the western wheat surplus, coupled with the destitution of western farmers in drought areas, has made very heavy demands upon his time. I am not informed as to what use is being made of the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph, the most outstanding college of its kind in the world, towards meeting the economic situation of the eastern agriculturists; but I will say that if the services of the president and staff, who are all trained in agricultural economics, are not being used to the fullest extent possible, they should be.

For the sake of the farmer, some means must be found to make his dollar go further. For the sake of the working man in our factory, the farmer must be put in a position to buy more freely the implements, the equipment and the materials the making of which gives employment in our towns and cities. We ought never to forget the old saying that whenever the farmer prospers, everyone prospers.

The leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), speaking in this debate on January 26, as reported at page 25 of *Hansard* used these words:

> When the Union army of volunteers was in desperate condition, President Lincoln is reported to have said:
>
> Voluntarism is the unprincipled dodge of cowardly politicians. It has ground up the choicest seed of the nation. It has consumed the young, the generous, the patriotic, the intelligent, and the brave, and it has wasted the best moral, social, and political elements of the republic, and left the cowards, the shirkers, and the money makers to stay at home and procreate their kind.

A rather extensive search has been made in the library of parliament at Ottawa, in the library of congress at Washington and by noted authorities on Lincoln such as Mr. Grant Dexter of the Winnipeg *Free Press* and Mr. Dave Elman of the Hobby Lobby programme, Radio City, New York, but without success so far in confirming that these words were used in a speech by Lincoln. Be that as it may, however, I am sure that many of my electors of Wellington South would feel that there is more truth than fiction in these words as applicable to the present war.

The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), speaking here on February 10, gave a most comprehensive review of Canada's contribution to date in all our fields of service. It is to be hoped that his speech has been read by very many Canadians. It reveals a marvellous undertaking and accomplishment to date by Canada, and gives proof of greater momentum for growing achievement in the future in all spheres of our planned service. Every hon. member has, I am sure, been impressed by the sincerity, strength and determination of our Minister of National Defence. Following a most thorough review of the results of voluntary enlistment, and after urging support of the plebiscite to give the government a free hand for whatever changes may become necessary, the minister said, as reported at page 455 of *Hansard:*

> I prefer the voluntary method if it works, and I shall do all I can to make it work. At the same time, we cannot know what is ahead and I feel impelled to say—here I can speak only for myself—that if the voluntary system does not meet the needs of the fateful days before us, then I shall feel it my duty as part of my responsibility to advocate the adoption of the other method.

For myself, I wish to subscribe to the view stated and the position taken by the Minister of National Defence. I hold a decided preference for the system of draft followed in the United States, where some of more mature years are called to the service before exhausting entirely the cream of the youth. We are suffering to-day from discouraging methods of recruiting followed during the earlier days of the war. Many fine young men were turned back for reasons which appeared unjustifiable, and having gone to some other war service or to preparation where still higher skill is involved, they are loath to offer themselves again immediately. Some badge of recognition is certainly due to them to lift from them the stigma attaching to slackers. Many such are waiting to be told where they can best serve. Pushing men around is something more easily said than done on a national scale. Something more definite and intensive is required in the way of system in directing them where their duty lies, whether on the farm, in the factory or in some branch of the armed services.

I come now to a phase of the discussion which carries a risk of misunderstanding, but inasmuch as some of my electors have not the opportunity I have of knowing the situation, I feel that I owe it to them to be frank for the good of all Canada. Preliminary to a discussion of our Canadian partnership let

me repeat in effect the words of a great Canadian of the present day of French ancestry: "Your attitude towards the war outside of Canada is motivated partly by sentiment whereas our attitude comes more through judgment." While no doubt he is largely correct, I would say that there are strong evidences of a good deal of sentiment for the old land in the French-speaking parts of Canada since the king and queen visited Quebec and the queen spoke to the cheering crowds in French. Yes, I stand for a one hundred per cent participation by Canada in this world struggle. We must trust our government and our high military officials as to methods and progressive development, for they alone can know the secret plans of allied strategy. Decisions cannot be based alone on the view of the member for Wellington South, or the views of the electors of Wellington county, or of the province of Ontario, or of the province of Quebec, or of any other province. Total war requires total harmonization of objective and effort within Canada, plus careful coordination with the plans of the supreme command of the allies. Total war cannot be achieved amidst discord, passive resistance or indifference. War to be efficient can give no place for appeasement, because appeasement lulls, quiets and reduces striking force. I am certain that the electors I have the honour to represent have no use for any policy or attitude of appeasement. I am equally certain that they will approve all reasonable means to bring every province and all persons of whatever race into cooperation for the fullest possible use of Canada's entire resources of wealth, materials, man-power and woman-power. Firm believers in democracy and democractic government are fond of saying, "Trust the people." But in war time when so much relating to military preparations and operations must be kept secret, it is equally true that the people must more than at other times trust the government. For this very reason of secrecy many facts concerning the war programme cannot be made known, even to private members of parliament. We as members have trusted the Prime Minister and his cabinet, and in turn we are grateful that our constituents have trusted us.

I have spoken of the need for cooperation. There cannot and must not be any varying degrees of cooperation by the provinces. Canada must be a unit in this struggle to preserve freedom, liberty and justice as these have been vouchsafed wherever the British flag has flown. This war must be won. Canada must do her full part, and we hope and pray that she will do so with the fullest cooperation of all her people.

[Mr. Gladstone.]

The plebiscite is designed surely to achieve that united effort. Count not the expense if Canadians everywhere, English-speaking and French-speaking alike, will by their votes remove any hindrance to total war. And total war demands total participation of all Canadians, whether in Guelph, Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, Vancouver or elsewhere. There are, I fear, those in Ontario who misjudge Quebec because they do not understand Quebec. They have not the opportunity that members of parliament have of mingling in a social way and in conference on affairs of state with many of the altogether likable, fine and most capable members from that province, whose mother tongue is French but who for the most part speak English almost as fluently as we of Anglo-Saxon ancestry. It would seem appropriate here to quote from the British North America Act, section 133:

> Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the houses of the parliament of Canada and of the houses of the legislature of Quebec. . . .

The memories of the War-time Elections Act of 1917, and of the methods employed by the Union government in 1917 and 1918 to enforce the Military Service Act still rankle the French-Canadians. Knowing of the unhealed wounds from those days the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe felt compelled to define and limit Quebec's participation when war was declared on Germany in 1939. As recorded on September 9 at page 68 of *Hansard* of the second session of that year, he said:

> The whole province of Quebec—and I speak with all the responsibility and all the solemnity I can give to my words—will never agree to accept compulsory service or conscription outside Canada. I will go farther than that: when I say the whole province of Quebec, I mean that I personally agree with them. I am authorized by my colleagues in the cabinet from the province of Quebec—the veteran leader of the Senate, my good friend and colleague, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin), my friend and fellow townsman and colleague, the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Power)—to say that we will never agree to conscription and will never be members or supporters of a government that will try to enforce it. Is that clear enough?

A few months later, in March, 1940, a general election was held. I have before me now two important pieces of advertising used in the constituency of Wellington South during that campaign. One was issued in my behalf, as Liberal candidate, while the other was issued in behalf of my opponent, the National Government candidate. Each carries in bold type the words "Without conscription." It is a truism, I believe, that the giving of this pledge by the two national leaders was due entirely to the fact that

Canada is a partnership of the two great races. More accurately, perhaps, the pledge was due directly to the ill-feeling engendered by the roughshod methods employed to enforce conscription in Quebec during the last great war. I realize that many electors in Wellington South are of the opinion that the government should not be bound by its "no conscription" pledge at a time when the very existence of freedom is at stake. Other electors hold strongly to the opposite opinion. The cabinet is unanimous that nothing should limit Canada's part in the war, and accordingly they are asking the electors, by means of a plebiscite, to cancel the election pledge of "no conscription" and thereby give them a free hand in whatever direction may become necessary in future to maintain a total war effort. After all, does not total war for Canada resolve itself down to a means of enlisting, not compelling, the cooperation of the two great races of this nation?

I have spoken of the lasting resentment in Quebec against the methods employed to enforce conscription in the last war. I have quoted from the speech of the late Minister of Justice, made at the outbreak of the present war, in which he declared most emphatically, "We will never agree to conscription." To-day we who are in intimate contact with hon. members from Quebec are heartened by evidence of a changed attitude in Quebec. We have growing confidence that if we employ methods acceptable to her people, Quebec will stand shoulder to shoulder with English-speaking Canada for whatever service and wherever Canadians are called in this grim struggle. This changed attitude is reflected in the speech recently made in the house by a French-speaking member, the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Veniot), who, as reported at page 512 of *Hansard* said:

> We do recognize that the best way to defeat our enemy is to fight him outside of Canada and to prevent him from reaching our shores. To this end we are prepared to give freely of our lives and to the limit of our man-power and of our meagre means. But we want no more guns and no more bayonets hacking down our youth like wild beasts in our hills and our forests. We have open minds, but the way to convince us is not by making us guzzle it, by ramming conscription down our throats.

I cannot leave this section of my speech, Mr. Speaker, without paying the highest possible tribute to the memory of a great Canadian who is with us no more, the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. The quotation I have read from his speech on the declaration of war ought, in all fairness, not to be read apart from the whole argument of that speech. Knowing the people of his province better than any other person in or out of parliament; knowing the discord that had been aroused by the endeavour to force conscription upon Quebec in 1917 and 1918, he stood adamant against a revival of such circumstances. His very soul spoke in a plea for methods in this war that would line up his compatriots with English-speaking Canada unitedly in this struggle. So I wish to leave with you some other words of this great Canadian, as they appear at page 69 of *Hansard* for 1939, second session:

> God give Canadians the light which will indicate to them where their duty lies in this hour of trial so that our children and our children's children may inherit a land where freedom and peace shall prevail, where our social, political and religious institutions may be secure and from which the tyrannical doctrines of nazism and communism are forever banished. Yes, God bless Canada. God bless our queen. God bless our king.

I notice that my allotted time in this debate has almost elapsed, but if the house will bear with me for a few minutes I shall mention, without much elaboration, some other relevant factors in this debate on total war.

The word "communism" appears in a quotation I used a few moments ago. That reference, no doubt, has to do with the insidious propaganda that was waged over the world a few years back. All that can be and is forgotten to-day in our acclaim for the marvellous defence of Russian soil against the German war machine. That defence surely demonstrates to the world that Russia was not lying dormant. It is irrefutable evidence of what was taking place within her own borders, scientifically, industrially and in a disciplinary way.

In wars of other days a $20 suit, a $30 gun and a little "forming fours" made a man a soldier. To-day it is entirely different. War to-day requires a man of high intelligence to operate a Bren gun or a 50-ton tank, or to pilot a $100,000 bomber. I ask the armchair critics to contemplate just what modern warfare means in ships, guns, tanks, explosives, bombers, fighters; in training, and in all the organization and facilities for production. I ask them to inform themselves reliably of what Canada has done to date and what we are committed to do in the programme mapped out now for the period ending March, 1943, as to both men and materials. I ask them to remember that all our reverses to date in this war have been due to a shortage of munitions, not to a shortage of man-power. I ask them not to overlook the fact that Canada has been supplying munitions in huge quantities to the British isles, Russia, Africa, and the far east, even to the extent of leaving ourselves short. I ask them to note that there has been an upsurge in recruiting during recent

weeks, in excess of our facilities to train men. The winter-fair building at Guelph has had to be reopened during recent weeks as a training centre to accommodate the overflow from the Chatham and Kitchener camps.

This week every person who has means will enter the war in the victory loan campaign. At Guelph the whole strength of my riding is being organized under the able leadership of an outstanding citizen, Mr. W. P. Gamble, and they will by hard work go over the top. Here I would give the highest praise to the *Globe and Mail* for the tremendous boost it has given the campaign to-day in the striking display occupying the entire front page of its paper. The press is powerful, so powerful that, if so inclined, it can in a week lift the morale of the people one hundred per cent. That would go a long way toward maintaining a one hundred per cent war effort in Canada. Our hearts are saddened when we know that many fine young Canadians already have made the supreme sacrifice. Their places must and will be filled over there, and additional units to Canada's maximum will be sent. We must and will have reinforcements for every emergency. May God guide us and keep us faithful through the dark days, as we struggle on toward victory and the preservation of our right to live as free people.

Mr. D. F. McCUAIG (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, it is almost four weeks since this debate began, and I hesitate to take the time of the house to speak, particularly when I realize that a great deal of important legislation is pending. I have, however, been asked from time to time why there is such delay in taking the vote on the plebiscite. Probably few people realize that it is first necessary to dispose of the motion we are now discussing before the government is in a position to introduce legislation making provision for the vote.

My observations with reference to the plebiscite itself will be very brief. When it was first mentioned there was a great deal of discussion and opposition, but I feel that as the weeks and days pass, that opposition diminishes, and I am sure when the vote comes it will be accepted by a heavy affirmative vote. I know I shall do all in my power toward that end.

I do not believe conscription was mentioned during the last campaign in my constituency. I know I did not mention it, and I believe I can say the same for my opponent. Therefore conscription was not an issue, except as it was made one by the platforms of both parties. Each member is bound by the pledges made by his party, irrespective of whether he raises the question or not.

We are also told that the vote on the plebiscite will cost a large amount of money. It is true that the vote will cost about fifteen cents or twenty cents per person. Will any of those people who have been so provocative in their language respecting the cost of the plebiscite say that it is not worth twenty cents to them to know that a pledge given by a public man, not on a minor but on a major issue involving life itself, will not be broken without first appealing to the people to whom that pledge was given? Anyone who has studied the life of our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) will agree with me that he has always been prepared to trust the people. I believe this is a question where we should not be guided in our decision by the request of others; it is a question where our consciences should be our guide. If we permit our consciences to be our guide in respect of this question, I am sure none of us will look back and regret any action he has taken.

The following words from Shakespeare's "Hamlet" are a good guide to all of us in deciding questions of this kind:

> This above all: to thine own self be true,
> And it must follow, as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man.

The people I represent are satisfied with nothing less than a total effort. I believe there may be some difference of opinion as to how that objective is to be attained. A demand is raised in many parts, particularly in the urban area, that we should have a greater effort, including the conscription of man-power. If we listened to those who volunteer information, and those who tell us what they think we should do, we might consider that that is the predominant opinion. But when we make personal inquiries and investigate for ourselves we find quite often that that feeling is not so intense.

In fact, after making a survey of my constituency, I am doubtful if a vote on conscription, without including the conscription of wealth, would receive a favourable reply. It is interesting to study the response in the various parts of the province with respect to the advertisement carried in the *Globe and Mail*. This advertisement was carried in five local papers in my constituency of Simcoe North. My estimation is that in my constituency the advertisement in question went into approximately 6,000 homes. Hon. members will probably be surprised to learn that while those 6,000 homes were asked to write their federal member requesting him to do certain things, I received only thirty-four newspaper clippings. In addition, I received about twelve letters, but some of those were opposed to the advertisement, and others

agreed with it only if conscription of wealth were included.

I believe it is the duty of every hon. member as best he can to ascertain the wishes of his constituents. But he should also be guided by the information he receives from those charged with the responsibility of carrying on our war effort. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) has made it clear that up to the present time we are obtaining by the voluntary system all the men we require. He has added that he prefers the voluntary system, if it works, and that he will do all he can to see that it does work. Although acknowledging the need for men, he emphasized the need for the production of food and weapons of war, as our contribution as one of the members of a team of united nations.

The message that General McNaughton gave to the soldiers at Christmas has already been put on *Hansard*. In that message he praised the Canadian soldier and stated that new units and formations and reserves would arrive as quickly as ships could be found to bring them. I should like to place upon *Hansard* an editorial which appeared in the Windsor *Daily Star* of February 10 as follows:

> If anyone knows what is needed to win this war, it is Lieutenant-General A. G. L. McNaughton, general officer commanding the Canadian corps. The fact that one of his first acts after returning to Canada on furlough was to visit industrial plants turning out military equipment, coupled with his comments on this phase of our war effort, indicate the important place in his mind which armaments occupy. He has borne out what those closely in touch with the war situation have been saying all along. What our men need is equipment and more equipment. He does not suggest, of course, that there is not a need for more men but the machines come first.

There is also the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) with reference to the voluntary system, which appears on page 310 of *Hansard:*

> I wish to say that neither as a member of the government nor as a member of the war committee of the cabinet, nor otherwise, have I been able to find any evidence that the abandonment of the voluntary system and the substitution of the compulsory system in respect to that part of our war effort represented by overseas army service would help at this moment in our war effort.

It is my opinion that we should be guided by our desire to serve, not only the people in our own ridings but the people of Canada as a whole. We are not being true to our duty if we sponsor legislation which might lead to disunity in this country even though such legislation might meet with the approval of our own people. Lord Tweedsmuir, speaking at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island in September, 1937, and referring to the loyalty of the Scottish people, not only to the land of their adoption but also to the land of their origin, said:

> That is as it should be, for a man can never have too many loyalties. Therefore I want to see in the citizens of Canada strong and continuing love of the district to which they belong, but at the same time a strong and continuing interest in the dominion of which they are a part, the whole Canadian nation.

It is important that we should not become hysterical at a time such as this when we are faced with reverses. Reverses are inevitable in a war which is being fought on many fronts. I should like to quote from an editorial in the *Globe and Mail* of to-day. This refers to Prime Minister Churchill's reference to the difficulties we are facing and might expect to face in the future, and it says:

> But these blows need not be mortal blows if we keep our heads and pursue our purpose relentlessly and with grim determination. That purpose is to convert our enormous potential power into an actual fighting force as rapidly as possible. We must build ships; produce aircraft; make guns; send the tanks rolling off the end of the production lines; and train men to operate these deadly engines.

Although we may be satisfied with our voluntary system as it is at the present time, and we have reason to be if we listen to those who are in charge, this attitude may change. I think it will change if the present system does not meet the emergencies that may arise. Should the system change, I am afraid there will be many difficulties in administration. We provide for compulsory service under the National Resources Mobilization Act, and even though this is confined to service in Canada, we have experienced many difficulties.

I believe hon. members who represent rural ridings will agree with me when I say that the majority of the requests received when we go home for week-ends are received from farmers' sons who are urging postponement of their military service. It is true that farmers have the privilege of asking for postponement, but I know of many cases where men have been taken away from large farms and no one left to operate them. I do not think postponement is sufficient. A farmer must plan, not only for months ahead but for years ahead. He must not be uncertain as to what he can do. He cannot plan if he knows that at any time he may be called into service and have to sell his farm and his stock. As I say, I think they should have more than postponement; they should have exemption in order that they can go ahead and plan for future operations.

There is some dissatisfaction with the procedure. If this is so in my constituency where the greatest distance from the district registrar

is only 100 miles, how much more is it so in areas where men are as far as 1,000 miles away from the divisional registrar? This is so in northern Ontario where the nearest registrar is in Toronto. There has been a demand that agriculture should be represented on these boards. Up to a short time ago the boards were made up of representatives of the Department of National Defence and the national labour supply council. This condition has been improved by the order in council passed on the seventh instant which provides that at the hearing of applications made to the board there shall also be a representative of agriculture in order that the interests of agriculture may be represented.

There also has been a demand for local boards which would be more familiar with the needs of the locality concerned. The argument against such boards is that there would be a danger that they might be influenced by representations made by people in the locality. If that argument is sound, then I suggest to the government that local committees be formed. These would not have administrative powers but would act merely as fact-finding bodies. These committees could be set up in each county or district, and they could forward the facts to the central board which would administer and deal with the application. In that way a committee need not be influenced because it could be said that they were merely a fact-finding body and were forwarding the facts to the board which was in charge of administration.

It is urged also that selective service should be extended to all branches of our war effort, including the factory, the farm, as well as military service. I know the government is dealing with this problem, but we can readily see the difficulties in the way. This was brought out quite vividly on the tenth instant when the Minister of National Defence was speaking. He was referring to the policy of the government, and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) interrupted, as reported on page 452 of *Hansard:*

> . . . is it anticipated that the government intends to say to a man: "You shall work here and not there"? The Prime Minister has not made that clear. I do not think you can say to a man: "You must work here and not there". You might not get results.

Then, when the minister stated that this is receiving a great deal of examination and consideration in England as well as here, the leader of the opposition replied:

> I am not sure that you can make a man work.

I would ask the government to give this policy their best consideration in the hope that some satisfactory arrangement may be made in order to assure adequate help on the farm as well as in the factory. This might be accomplished by doing it indirectly, as is being done to a certain extent in the civil service, by refusing to hire a man in any industry if he is eligible for service or is better fitted for some other employment. In this regard some consideration must be given to the farmer as well as to those employed on the farm. A farmer under present market conditions cannot afford to pay the wages received by those employed in industry and, on the other hand, it is not fair to the farm labourer to be compelled to work on the farm for wages much lower than he could receive were he allowed to work in industry. This problem, I am afraid, cannot be met in any way except by allowing the farmer to receive a higher reward for the commodities he produces.

Although there may be a difference of opinion as to the method by which the war is to be waged, I can assure the members of this house that my people are insistent that we should continue to prosecute the war to our utmost ability. I know the Minister of National Defence was speaking one hundred per cent for the people I represent when he said, as reported at page 448 of *Hansard:*

> No person can doubt that Canada is committed to total war. We are committed to it not only for the survival of freedom generally but for our own survival and for the survival of this nation, and for the security of our own homes and families. To wage total war is the stated policy of the government and I believe, indeed I am sure, that it is the determined purpose of the Canadian people.

I will do all I can to urge the government to use every means at their disposal, including the conscription of wealth, if necessary, in order to wage total war, and I assure them that the people I represent are prepared to undergo any sacrifice requested of them. Let us all get behind the government in any move to increase the war effort, prod them on, if necessary, and show them the way by doing all we can to assist in the war loan, recruiting, the salvage campaign and the advancement of all organizations connected with our war effort; and, above all, let us remain united that we may hold this nation together in our struggle against the common foe.

Let me conclude with a quotation from the speech given by Prime Minister Churchill yesterday, when he said:

> In the English-speaking world we rejoice in free institutions. We have free parliaments and a free press. This is the way of life we have been used to. This is the way of life we are fighting to defend.

Mr. ARMAND CLOUTIER (Drummond-Arthabaska) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceal the emotion I feel on rising for the first time in this chamber to speak on behalf of the electors of Drummond-Arthabaska whom I have the honour to represent in the House of Commons since 1940. Though this emotion proceeds from various causes, I attribute it in great measure to the fact that Drummond-Arthabaska has been represented in the past by men of the first rank, and I wish I possessed the eloquence of Laurier, of Lavergne, of Dorion, or of Girouard, in order to give to the voice of my constituency the authority and competence it formerly had. Only a poet could do justice to my constituency, for Drummond-Arthabaska is certainly not an ordinary district. It is privileged in many respects. The soul of our national life is daily in evidence there, harmony reigns between the two races as among the various classes of society. Our farmers are performing real miracles on the land, and our workmen have not known even the shadow of the depression which has so seriously affected most urban centres.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Drummond-Arthabaska has always been famous. This section of the country which is so dear to me has given great men to the nation, in the arts as well as in public life. Filled with national pride, my county has played a large part in the national war effort. At this moment my thoughts go to the brave defenders of Hong Kong, among whom many young heroes represent the contribution of Drummond-Arthabaska to the glorious Canadian army. Their sacrifice, like that of Dollard des Ormeaux and his valiant companions, will not have been in vain, and their glorious defeat is already worth more than a mere aureole of victory. They have displayed the tenacity of the Canadian soldier, his will to victory, his heroism. They are the symbol of a people which prizes freedom above all else and is ready to give everything, even life itself, to defend freedom until final victory.

I have every reason to be proud of my district, Mr. Speaker. It is admired by those who visit it and loved by those who live in it. With its vast plains recalling the western prairies, its delightful valleys, its poetic streams, its mountains characterized by beauty rather than loftiness, it is a miniature of Canada. Adolphe Poisson, whom Drummond-Arthabaska gave to French-Canadian literature, has sung the praises of this section of Canada in his immortal works, "Les heures perdues" and "Sous les pins." Inspired by the natural beauties of his native district, he expressed sublime thoughts in harmonious verse.

And when admiring the illustrious works of the great sculptors Alfred Laliberté and Suzor Côté, we understand the scruples their chisels must have felt at hewing out masterpieces worthy of the grandeur and beauty of this bit of homeland.

And who is unaware of the renown of the enfant terrible of Drummond-Arthabaska, Erick Dorion, who brought to the politics of his time a note so ardent that even the enfant terrible of Temiscouata can hardly equal him to-day. I hope the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) will not mind this presumption on my part, for I shall tell him frankly, that, just as my electors, the men and women of Drummond-Arthabaska, I hold him in high admiration and consider him a great Canadian and an ardent patriot.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay a tribute to the memory of a man the centenary of whose birth was celebrated just a few months ago, the great statesman who was the pride of French Canada and the glory of the entire country, the man whom gracious Queen Victoria called "silver-tongued", Sir Wilfrid Laurier. We cherish with veneration numerous mementos of this great statesman who spent several of his finest years in the pleasant little town of Arthabaska and the village of l'Avenir, the home of Dorion, where he published a small newspaper which had considerable fame in its day. Drummond-Arthabaska will ever be proud of having had in its midst this great Canadian and illustrious patriot, a symbol of unity and an example of straightforwardness and justice towards all the races and classes making up our beautiful country.

May I also, Mr. Speaker, associate myself with my fellow-members in paying a tender tribute to the memory of another great French Canadian, too early taken from our midst.

The people of Drummond-Arthabaska desire to pay a respectful tribute of admiration to the memory of the great patriot Ernest Lapointe. I feel that we shall miss him more and more in these troubled times. He was a man to whom we could turn in any emergency, and especially in time of peril. I hope that the policies of Laurier and of his successor Ernest Lapointe will ever be preserved by the Liberal party and that the life of those great statesmen will be an inspiration to all young Canadians. They embodied Canadian loyalty and patriotism.

I wish to tender my sincere congratulations to the proposer (Mr. Fournier, Hull) and the seconder (Mr. Macdonald, Brantford City) of

the address in reply to the speech from the throne. They have discharged their task with dignity and expressed their views with courage. I listened to their speeches with great interest and I admired the sincerity of their language.

I shall now discuss the six main points of the speech from the throne, considering them as much as possible from various angles. The first point is the proposed plebiscite concerning the use of our man-power. Mr. Speaker, I understand that through such a plebiscite the government will request the people to release them from their past commitments as regards overseas military service. In my opinion it would have been preferable for the government to put directly to the electors the following question: "Are you for or against conscription for overseas service?" But since the government is asking the people whether they are in favour of releasing it from its pledge, I take both questions as being synonymous, even though the one that was selected may seem more ambiguous. I believe that such is the view of the people about the question of the plebiscite and they know that the future stand of the government will be either a wise one, in acordance with the policy they have followed so far, or a desperate, dangerous and useless course, according as the people reply in the negative or the affirmative to the question of the plebiscite.

The government was no doubt prompted by very grave reasons in deciding to consult the people. Besides, they promised, as I did myself in my constituency, that no momentous decision would be taken with regard to conscription without a plebiscite. For those reasons, I shall vote for the holding of a plebiscite, because I am a fervent Liberal and have the utmost confidence in my leaders.

But upholding as I do the policy inspired by Laurier and Lapointe as well as by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin) whom I greatly admire, I say once again that I am strongly opposed to conscription, and that I shall ever oppose with all my strength any compulsion for overseas service.

Nothing can justify such a policy, Mr. Speaker; of this I am convinced more than I could ever say. The voluntary system has given results of which Canada can be proud. We have already supplied more troops than are needed by our allies. What is expected from us is first and above all material assistance. Ever since the beginning of the war, Canada has many times been referred to as the empire's arsenal. Our factories are working full time and they are supplying this country and our allies with weapons and munitions which may be a great contribution to final victory. Besides, we cannot as we did in 1914-18, be solely concerned with the defence of England and her possessions. Our shores are directly menaced by enemies who are drawing closer and closer to them. We are threatened with invasion from two directions. Our duty to Canada compels us to direct our energies, over and above all toward the defence of our own territory.

It would be the height of folly for us to carry our friendship—undoubtedly quite legitimate—for England to the point of giving up too considerable a part of our armed forces. If we are to be attacked, a contingency which is considered possible and even probable, the assault will come as part of a general onslaught by our enemies, and on the same occasion England and the United States will have to oppose a fierce resistance against perfectly equipped enemies. We can only expect a rather weak support from those allies, and to my mind it would be a mistake to believe that we can put all our strength into the defence of the empire while relying on help from our neighbours in a crisis. The most elementary prudence makes it imperative for us to attend first and above all to the defence of our own territory.

The tragic example of Australia should open our eyes. The Australians are now facing the terrible threat of an invasion by the Japanese and their army is no longer strong enough to withstand the attack easily.

The expected help is not forthcoming and not without emotion have we read their government's appeal and the words uttered by the venerable archbishop of Melbourne. Taking a leaf from such experience, I may say that if Britain, with its forty million people, cannot be everywhere at the same time and on every front, how can one expect Canada, with a population of eleven million, to set up a gigantic war production, supply large expeditionary forces and provide for its home defence at one and the same time? So that, while I support the government on the plebiscite, I intend leaving my constituents perfectly free to cast their vote as they wish, without bringing any pressure to bear whatsoever, and as their conscience dictates. What result can we expect? Time will tell. If the answer is in the negative, I will ask the government not to interpret this as any lack of confidence. Quite the contrary, my constituents ardently wish to retain such a man as the Right Hon. Prime Minister at the head of affairs.

I still favour expeditionary forces raised on the basis of voluntary enlistment, but here again do I urge the wisdom of attending with greater care than ever to the maintenance of a sufficiently strong home force to meet such tragic and imminent dangers as now threaten our coasts. I am in accord with the government policy as regards the sending of arms and munitions to Britain. This constitutes the most valuable contribution we can offer and we must be generous in our aid to Great Britain that she may set up a military machine capable of ensuring the final overthrow of the axis' own machine.

I now come to the fourth outstanding feature of the speech from the throne: the extension of the government's policy of selective service and mobilization of our material and human resources to increase the national war effort. I have already stated my views on one aspect of mobilization. I must add here that the government's action in this domain should be dictated by the greatest prudence. I do wish the government would wholly share my views regarding agriculture and labour whose first duty is production to meet the nation's needs. Exemption from military service should apply to all farmers, farmers' sons and every one engaged in industrial pursuits related to agriculture, so as to provide our army and our population with all the necessary food. Exemption from military service should also be applied to those who are employed in munition plants and factories producing war supplies.

I agree that the largest possible number of Canadian citizens should be in a position to take up arms for the defence of the country in case of attack. Could we not, Mr. Speaker, organize in our towns and villages courses of preliminary training which farm and factory workers could attend without interfering with their productive tasks? By that I mean elementary military training given to farmers and factory workers after their working hours and in each locality. Uniforms would not be needed. It would simply be a matter of giving the elements of military training with a view to accustoming our people to handling arms, and to forming reserve battalions or guerilla troops for use in case of attack or invasion of the country.

Our worthy people would no doubt willingly devote a few hours a week to receiving an elementary training which might prove useful in the dark days this country may yet see.

I now come to the last point of the speech from the throne—the financing of the war. I am happy to note that Drummond-Arthabaska has done more than was asked of it in that domain. It is all to the credit of my electors, and I am sure that Drummond-Arthabaska will continue in that patriotic path until the end of the conflict. My people want to purchase victory and I am sure such is the desire of all the citizens of Canada. In the face of the present danger it would be tragic and criminal parsimoniousness to count the dollars that will bring victory. No matter how heavy the sacrifice, the people will respond generously to the call. Of that I am certain.

I shall be glad to vote with the government in favour of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, because it reflects above all the government's ardent desire to collaborate in a large way to the final victory of our arms.

In joyfully accepting all these sacrifices in a true spirit of national cooperation, we shall contribute to cementing the union of the two great races which compose our fair land and to make of Canada a country of two languages but a single heart.

Mr. W. E. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): The address in reply to the speech from the throne has been very ably moved and seconded by the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald). Since that time there have been many very good speeches and much has been said; in fact little is left to be said. But on behalf of the riding I have the honour to represent I feel called upon to make a few remarks. It is customary, I believe, in the circumstances under which I rise also to say a few words about the riding itself.

Grey-Bruce is two-thirds rural. The urban part consists of towns and villages, none of which has a population of more than four thousand. The rural part is given over to mixed farming, particularly the raising of cattle, hogs and sheep and the production of butter. The counties of Grey and Bruce were first and third respectively in Ontario last year in the sale of butter, and they were among the first four in the sale of cattle, hogs and sheep. The urban part is mainly concerned with providing services for the farming communities and also with the manufacturing of furniture and similar wood products.

The people in the riding are almost entirely the descendants of the original settlers who came there between 1840 and 1880, and are from two main stocks, Anglo-Saxon and German. We have been very ably represented in public life; one of my predecessors from my home town distinguished himself in the chair which the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Glen) now so graciously adorns and for whom the hon. member for Hull is at present an acceptable substitute. I might also add that in this house, in addition to the hon. member for

Grey North (Mr. Telford), and the humble representative for Grey-Bruce, there are the following members who were born in the counties of Grey and Bruce: the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon), the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ward), the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Nicholson), the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. McNiven), the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), and the charming and hon. member for Edmonton East (Mrs. Casselman).

In this war the counties of Grey and Bruce are represented by three units: the 97th battery, mobilized in Walkerton in 1939, the 98th anti-tank battery mobilized July, 1940, in Port Elgin, and my own unit, the Grey and Simcoe Foresters, mobilized in June, 1940, as an infantry battalion as part of the 4th division.

All these units were raised with the minimum of delay, and enlistments have since been quite steady in the two counties. I cannot speak for the two batteries; but as far as my own unit is concerned, on those few occasions when by reason of medical discharges we went under strength there was no delay at all in getting recruits, they came almost overnight, as indeed they did on one occasion. Since that time, of course, there have been many enlistments in other branches of the army, in the navy and in the air force, and more recently there is recruiting going on for the two auxiliary women's organizations. In my unit, and in all the others, particularly perhaps the 97th battery, there is a large percentage of recruits from those areas which were settled by the original German immigrants. The young men of German racial origin in my counties have enlisted in quite as good percentage as the Anglo-Saxons.

The problems of the riding are naturally connected only with the war effort at the moment, and I should like to make a brief reference to the army, the navy and the air force.

The Canadian army which will be in existence at the end of this year, according to the plans of the government, will consist of whatever is overseas at the moment, plus the 4th division which in the meantime will have become armoured. The Canadian army will then consist of two corps: the first, of three infantry divisions with two army tank brigades attached; and the second, of two armoured divisions. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) was, I thought, rather modest when he referred to the Canadian army as it will be; he said it would be at least equal to anything in the armed forces of the empire, as I recall the phrase. But I should like to point out that Germany is popularly supposed to have invaded France with eleven armoured divisions out of sixty, and to have invaded Russia with twenty armoured divisions out of one hundred or one hundred and twenty. In neither case was the percentage of armoured units equal to the two out of five which the Canadian army will have on completion of this year's plan.

I might say that the feeling of the riding is not only commendation of the fact that the Canadian army will be self-contained and self-directed, but it is considered essential that that should be so.

With respect to the navy, we have had enlistments from our counties, and unfortunately there have been losses, which we all regret. Nevertheless the work of the navy was rather remote from the people of my riding until my battalion went east last spring, and the members of the unit began to see the navy in action and to see the difficulties with which it contends.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that the Canadian navy has grown from 15 to 350 ships and now has a personnel of 27,000 is not only commendable but laudable; yet, knowing the battle of the Atlantic and of Great Britain as we do now, and in view of the situation which has resulted from the withdrawal of at least part of the United States navy to the Pacific, in my opinion it must be the first duty of this government not only to continue the shipbuilding programme which has brought about that great increase, but to extend it and to continue to extend it for many months to come. The battle of the Atlantic has not even been won at the moment, though it has not been lost; and until our production of ships has run away ahead of our losses for some time, we cannot afford to take any risks on the danger with which we have been faced during the past two years.

With respect to the air force, of course we are familiar with that because of the large number of enlistments from my riding, and the fact that the Canadian government will spend something like $800,000,000 on the British commonwealth air training plan shows the importance of this project. But here again, in my opinion, the plan, while a great one, is not yet sufficient for the needs of the Dominion of Canada. It is heartening, of course, to learn that the number of recruits entering the training centres of the air force monthly has been quite sufficient, but that is sufficient according to the yardstick which we followed some months ago. Surely it is evident to every one in this house that in no engagement so far in this war has the side without air strength succeeded in winning. Therefore not only should the number of

recruits be increased, but the plan itself should be broadened so that in the near future planes and pilots will be available in much greater numbers than we now have them.

I suppose the house would expect me to make some reference to the munitions programme. I must confess that the figures as to contracts granted and amounts of money involved are beyond my comprehension. But the figures of production do mean something to me, and I wonder whether we are not under a misapprehension about them. I do not say that in an endeavour to reflect in any manner upon the government, but some hon. members and some speakers are prone to make reference to the percentage of our production now in comparison with what it was in our first, unprepared condition. I hope that in making its plans for this year the government will bear in mind not what we did last year, but what Hitler and his allies are doing this year. Our production should be aimed to overtake that production, and no other yardstick should be used.

When we met some twenty months ago, all hon. members were acutely aware of our shortage of war equipment, and we had a rather gloomy outlook. But I am afraid we have forgotten that, to the extent that we have overlooked not only the production which Hitler had on hand at that time, but what he has been able to accumulate since. He has had the productive capacity of Europe, with the exception of Russia and Great Britain, since that time. However, 1941 did give us one very considerable stroke of good luck, shall I say. Hitler attacked Russia, and since then he has lost a large number of men and a large amount of equipment, while on our side we have gained a large number of men and a large amount of equipment from Russia. Similarly, we have lost the manpower and the productive capacity of Japan, but we have gained those of the United States. With all this, however, it is my opinion, as I think it is the opinion of my riding, that the production of this country should be greatly expanded before we undertake any great expansion of our armed forces. I understand, from figures given the other night by the Minister of National Defence, that at present there are 600,000 people in the dominion engaged directly or indirectly in the production of munitions and war equipment, and that another 100,000 will be added this year. I must say this is a large number. Yet it is not anything like what we can have and what we should have as the facilities increase.

As I pointed out a short time ago, in my county there have been many enlistments in all branches of the armed services. This has brought about a shortage of farm labour; and while the farmer himself is as willing as anyone to suffer inconvenience and loss in the prosecution of the war, he knows that food is necessary in Great Britain to-day; he knows that it will be necessary next year, and he knows that at the end of the war we should have a surplus on hand for the purpose of feeding the millions who will be starving in Europe at that time. Having all this in mind, he finds it hard to understand, in some cases at least, the drain on labour from the farm, not only into the armed forces but into munition factories and other more gainful employment in the cities. In my opinion this situation should be corrected this year, and I was glad to see that in his speech the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) made reference to it, which reference I shall give in a few moments.

In addition to the farmers, other civilians in my riding have been under the impression that they have not yet done anything like what they could and should do in the prosecution of the war. They have engaged in successful salvage campaigns; they have participated in the war loans; they have bought war savings certificates and stamps; they have engaged in Red Cross and similar activities, but at the same time they still think they could do a great deal more. They agree that the change-over from a peaceful nation into one with a war economy cannot be done overnight. They agree also that the government, with all due respect to some hon. members opposite, has laid a very good foundation for our war effort, and they agree that the future will see an orderly and effective advance to an all-out effort. But with all that, they do feel that now, the foundation having been laid, something more could be done by them and, further, they believe it is the duty of the government to provide that opportunity. I am glad to say that the Prime Minister has been ahead of me in this also, and in his speech made some reference to it. With the permission of the house I shall read these references now, because they apply to both farmers and civilians. Those words appear at pages 45 and 46 of *Hansard* for Monday, January 26:

> The government now proposes to apply the compulsory powers of national selective service to other aspects of the war effort as well as to military service. These powers will be applied selectively and progressively to those activities where it is considered by the government that their application will contribute to the goal of a total effort. . . .
>
> I shall not attempt at this time to outline the measures which are contemplated in order to extend the scope of national selective service. I shall confine myself to saying that the extended policy of selective service will com-

prehend measures to increase the supply of man-power available for war industry and for the armed forces; also measures to safeguard and, where necessary, to assist in providing agricultural labour required to expand war production on the farm. These objects it is proposed to achieve by positive action to increase the mobility of available man-power, to add to the number of women available for employment, and to facilitate the transfer of labour from non-essential occupations to direct employment in the furtherance of the war effort.

I am naturally concerned with the present and future condition of the soldier, sailor and airman, to whom I shall refer hereafter only as soldiers. I was not satisfied that the condition of soldiers' dependents last year was what it should be, in view of the increased incomes of the civilian population, particularly in Ontario, and probably other parts of the dominion. To the soldier who went home on week-end leave it was quite evident that the civilian population were spending large sums of money on pleasures, and with respect to other matters which, at best, were luxuries. It was unfortunate for that soldier to meet the person—the young man or the young lady—who took his particular position in civilian life, because the civilian occupying the position vacated by the soldier was in all cases found to be earning considerably higher than had the soldier at the time of enlistment. In view of this I was in favour of increasing the allowance for the dependents of soldiers, and of increasing soldiers' pay, up to and including the rank of warrant officer. I hope the house will understand that neither my wife nor my children are in receipt of allowances, so that anything I may say is quite unbiased in that respect.

Nevertheless the government decided to institute trustee boards to which applications could be made by dependents, to show that they had special cases where greater allowance was required. I do not agree with this system, may I say with all respect to those who brought it about. The cost of living mounted very sharply in Ontario, at least during the twelve months of 1941, and cost of living bonuses were provided for many types of wage-earners. They were not, however, provided for soldiers. The price ceiling was placed upon nearly everything, if not everything, and the cost of living since that time has remained relatively constant. Therefore I now suggest to the government that with the cost of living well under control, the dependents' allowance might be increased by a flat rate, and that such action would not require the assistance of the trustee boards which have been set up. However competent they may be, they will make mistakes. And there will be some cost in connection with the machinery, no matter how much it is kept down by the government itself, and by those individuals who are willing to serve on it.

The disparity between the earning power of the soldier and the civilian is common to all wars, and I do not suppose it can be adjusted adequately to suit the soldier. At the same time there are benefits received by the soldier upon his return, and I believe I should place them on record. If the soldier is discharged for medical reasons, he receives free hospitalization; and if he is in a civilian hospital, he and his dependents receive some allowance while he is there. If he is discharged for other reasons at the conclusion of the war, and if he has been in the army for a period of six months, he receives, in addition to the clothing allowance, one month's pay and allowance, and he also receives free treatment in the department's hospitals for twelve months for anything which may occur during that time.

In addition to this, he receives his old job back, if he wishes to have it. I am pleased to say the government is changing this provision from the order in council which has existed for some months, into a bill already before the house. If, however, he was not employed when he enlisted, or if for any reason he does not wish his old job back, if single he receives $9 a week and, if married, $13 a week, for a limited period of time while seeking employment. He also receives training in some type of employment he may choose and, in addition, he is in receipt of the benefits of the Unemployment Insurance Act. If, as happens so often, he leaves his education uncompleted in order to join the army, he receives free tuition, and a modest living allowance while he completes his course. These are substantial benefits, and go a long way toward placing a soldier back where he started when he enlisted.

However, from my slight experience in the army—and this is a point which, I am sure, is appreciated by all hon. members who are returned men—I believe that nothing which can be done by the house can place the soldier back in the position he was in when he enlisted, whether his service in the army has been for only three or four months, or for two or three years. Therefore any consideration given by hon. members to provision for veterans of this war as well as those of the last will, I hope, be given with that point in mind. Nothing we can do will adjust those men completely to their previous civil status.

After what happened a week ago, I should not think it necessary to make any reference to the plebiscite. My silence might, how-

ever, be misconstrued, and perhaps I ought to make some brief observations. I am quite in favour of holding the plebiscite, partly because I believe it the right thing to do in any event, and partly for personal reasons. In my own riding I stated the policy of the Liberal party, as I understood it, in these words:

> The Liberal party is opposed to conscription for overseas service, but we are pledged to prosecuting the war with the utmost vigour, short of that.

Those are the words which I used, and which were reported in the local press. Under those circumstances I would find it quite impossible to come to the house and discuss the question; I would be limited to my promise made during the election campaign. Since it seems that conscription will be discussed, probably debated at length in the house in coming months, I would wish to be free so that I might take my part in that discussion.

It seems to me that there will be three classes of persons who will vote on the plebiscite. First there will be the person in favour of conscription for overseas service; he will vote in the affirmative. Then there is the person opposed under all circumstances to conscription for overseas service; he will vote in the negative. Then there will be the third person—and in my view this will be the largest group—who has no settled conviction one way or another, but who is willing to vote "yes", and leave the decision to the government which so far has guided the country successfully through two years of war. I am pleased that the plebiscite is being taken, and that the government has said that with the utmost vigour it would see that the question is fairly put to the people, and that an affirmative answer will be requested of the electorate.

In conclusion, perhaps I may be permitted to make a few observations respecting the soldiers with whom I have been associated for twenty months. I would remind hon. members that Hitler has said he is fighting against democracy. We tell our soldiers we are fighting for democracy. To a member of the armed forces democracy is not an abstract thing, nor is it necessarily the best form of government. Many of our men have no opinion on the point at all—nor could they be expected to have. But democracy to them is that form of government we have in Canada, the form we are fighting to maintain. We fight for it because it is our choice, and for no other reason. Under these circumstances, while democracy in the abstract may mean nothing to the soldier, the deliberations of this house do mean something. They are reported in the newspapers and are familiar to all ranks. The standard of our public life should be maintained with that in mind. I ask the house to remember that in this session and in all sessions until the war is over it is essential, not only that everything that happens here should be directed to winning the war, but that nothing be said in this house to detract from the symbol for which the armed forces are fighting.

Persons in and outside the house have at times made references to persons in the house and in authority, and to others who enjoy the confidence of the electorate which go a long way toward destroying the honour which is due to this house and to the members of it. We are expecting the armed forces to fight for us as an institution. They are willing to do that, but they expect that this house will conduct itself in a manner befitting the sacrifice they are making. I do not intend to say anything more along this line.

In all probability some time during this year, or next year, the Canadian army will proceed to the scene of conflict. They will be convoyed in British and Canadian ships, manned by Canadian sailors, guarded overhead by the Canadian air force. When that time comes we must see, not only that our soldier is well trained but that his equipment is adequate and superior in quality and quantity to the enemy's; we must be able to assure him that behind him there is a civilian population whose morale is as good as his, so that when he faces the greatest task he will be able to meet the Germans and their allies and defeat them.

Mr. J. A. BLANCHETTE (Compton): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I desire to add my congratulations to those expressed already to the mover (Mr. Fournier, Hull), and the seconder (Mr. Macdonald, Brantford City) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I desire also, on behalf of the county of Compton, to congratulate the Minister of Justice, Mr. St. Laurent. The minister was born in the county of Compton in the eastern townships, where, as he himself has stated, he learned to speak French to his father and English to his mother. In many respects he thus became a true exponent of the eastern townships.

At this late stage of the debate it would be imposing upon the indulgence of this hon. house were I to bring up again what has been said already by hon. members on the subjects of conscription and the plebiscite. In my remarks this evening my intention is not to go into the various details of the matter under discussion but rather to treat both these subjects in a general way, based

upon what has been advanced in this house as well as out of it. I intend to mention the Hong Kong matter and to speak briefly on social legislation.

On September 8, 1939, when I had the honour of seconding the address in reply to the speech from the throne, I stated, as reported on page 12 of *Hansard:*

> I wish to state, without the slightest hesitation and without any mental reservation, that I am fully opposed to conscription. I am completely against a system so inconsistent with our Canadian turn of mind. Experience has shown moreover that it is not effective, for, without having given the desired results, it has, in the past, fostered trouble and unsettled our national life.
>
> In order, therefore, that none may falsely construe my attitude in the matter, I repeat that I am completely opposed to conscription.

During the election in the following year, 1940, I repeated that assertion throughout the length and breadth of my constituency. The result was that the majority I received at that time was greater by one hundred per cent than the largest majority ever given any candidate in the history of the constituency of Compton. In making this statement I attribute no credit to myself. It is due rather to the present leader of the government whose programme was endorsed by the electors of my constituency. My conviction upon the subject of conscription is still the same. I feel that conscription is unnecessary, that it would undermine our national unity and that in having recourse to it we would defeat the very aim we have in view, that is, a total war effort. Since the declaration of war by this country, we have had practically at all times a sufficient number of volunteers whom we could clothe and equip and train. Recently we had figures from the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) to the effect that total voluntary enlistments in January of this year were 18,285, broken down as follows:

Navy	800
Army	11,713
Air force	5,772

I should like to quote the words of the Minister of National Defence, to be found on page 455 of *Hansard* of this year, as follows:

> You can hardly say, Mr. Speaker, that the voluntary system has failed. Let us not forget that these enlistments have come not under the patriotic fervour which casualties produces, but at a time when because of comparative inactivity it was naturally harder to convince our people that the army needed men. We at national defence headquarters are going right on, and I ask most sincerely for the active interest of the members of this house and of the citizens generally to back up our efforts.

In his address to his men General McNaughton stated that this government had done all that it possibly could do in the way of an efficient effort in the war. Prime Minister Churchill, Lord Beaverbrook and others who have visited us from Great Britain have declared that our effort is magnificent. With Great Britain attacked as she has been I feel that it would have been treason on their part to assert this if they were not convinced it was the truth. I feel that these testimonials from responsible persons who ought to know should take precedence over the wails, lamentations and deprecations of our back-seat driving, shall I say, journalistic or paper generals. I feel that if these generals would only spend as much of their time in giving an impulse to voluntary enlistments as they have done and are doing for conscription, there never would be any doubt as to the results obtained in the future with our voluntary system of enlistment. In so doing they will be logical and sincere in the aim which they assume, namely, the supplying of all the men that are needed for an all-out war effort.

Let us not lose sight of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that our population consists of only eleven and a half million people, and that up to the end of 1941 we had already in the Canadian service over 500,000 men, of whom 422,000 have volunteered. In addition, according to plans laid out by the Department of National Defence, as set out at page 450 of *Hansard,* with additional recruits this year of from 173,000 to 193,000, we shall have over 700,000 under military arms. That is more than six per cent of our total population, which would represent, according to population, armies of the following size for some of our allied countries:

Russia	10,800,000
United States	7,800,000
United Kingdom	3,000,000
Union of South Africa	600,000
Australia and New Zealand	600,000
British empire in Africa	2,700,000
British empire in Asia	24,000,000
Netherlands in East Indies	4,200,000
China	27,000,000

The New York *Times* in its issue of yesterday, February 15, states in its editorial:

> An armed force of 7,000,000 (for the United States) is within reason. There can hardly be more than that number if we take official estimates of 15 or 20 civilian workers for each man under arms.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, if the United States with its population of 130 millions and its mass production recognizes officially that not more than six per cent should be placed under arms, can we outdo and outbid the United States in our efforts to enlist manpower?

I am one of those who firmly believe that our voluntary system has worked well in the

recruiting of our man-power, and I feel that the government would be egregiously wrong in resorting to some other method.

That conscription would have a disquieting effect upon this country is plain to those who have eyes to see and ears to hear. In spite of the opinions which we might have to the contrary, the experience of the last war is there to prove it.

I know that there are some who make light of this term, "national unity," calling it a red herring, a bogy. We have heard those very terms and qualifications used in this house, and as a rule those who make the most pronounced charges in that sense show at present, as they have shown in the past, that, to say the best, their actions do not always tend toward national unity. Incidentally I might state that the Conservative party by its conscription propaganda has forced out of its ranks the only representative it had from the province of Quebec. No, Mr. Speaker, the success of our war effort, spoken of in such laudable terms by those outside Canada, but detracted from, to put it mildly, by a certain stentorian group in this country, has been possible only because of the success in maintaining national unity; and the moment that unity is scuttled, arrested or defeated, I shall fear for our total war effort in this war, as I would fear also for our peace effort after the war. Surely, if the fathers of confederation were able to adjust their differences in their day to make us a united nation, can it be thought that we, the sons of confederation, have so retrogressed in the realm of love of country and all that it means to us, have moved so far back to pre-confederation years, that we can no longer maintain united this young nation of ours? Unity is the result of adjusted differences; disunity represents uncompromised differences.

Everyone in this country has the same end in view, the winning of the war. The difference is only one of means to attain that end. I confess that the case might be hopeless if the end to be arrived at were disputed by anyone in this country, which it is not; and surely we can agree on the means to arrive at our objective. The war front is only as strong and as effective as the home front; the one is the necessary complement of the other. In war neither one of these fronts can continue alone if one is impaired in unity and efficiency.

What we have accomplished to date in finance, in the enlistment of man-power and in production has been done for the most part, be it noted, by voluntary methods. These, Mr. Speaker, are my humble views upon conscription, which I believe is unnecessary and would disunite this country and defeat our efforts to attain the very goal at which we are aiming.

But equally as contentious as conscription is the plebiscite proposal in the speech from the throne. This popular consultation, as I see it, represents, to me at least, the quintessence of democracy. I am one of those who have faith in the people. I believe they will pronounce according to the dictates of their mind and conscience in the matter; and is not the free expression of the people, according to their dictates, exactly what this country and all the other democracies are fighting for to-day—freedom of mind in the affairs of religion, freedom of expression in the affairs of state, all of which are advance posts of democracy?

The plebiscite is not a pronouncement on conscription. It is a release from the promise made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) as well as by practically seventy-five per cent of the members of this house who were elected at the last election, a promise made by both leaders of the two major parties at the last election. But there is this to be noted, that whereas the Prime Minister asked for release from his promise, and that from the whole people of Canada, the new leader of the Conservative party, in spite of the promise in the same sense that was made by his party at the last election, relegated that promise to the four winds immediately upon —I shall not say his election or choice by the Tory party—but rather upon his appointment by a certain group in the country. Is it not more democratic to follow the course our Prime Minister has taken and have recourse to the popular will rather than to decide arbitrarily of one's own accord that an engagement shall be broken and that in spite of the promises made by Mr. Meighen in 1925, which he made first in Ontario when he stated at Hamilton:

> I have myself not the slightest fear but that, if danger threatened Canada again, this country would respond as it responded in 1914; but I believe that in future it will be best for all that before a government takes a step so momentous as the dispatch of troops, the will of the people should be known.

Again, a few days later, in Acton Vale, Quebec, during the course of a by-election in the county of Bagot, the new leader of the Tory party spoke as follows:

> If a crisis should occur in which our country's peace would be threatened, I declare, so long as the reins of power are in my hands—I declare this country will not send a man out of Canada without the country being consulted.

In other words, the present leader of the Conservative party believes in popular consultation on the subject when he is in power,

but is totally against it when not in power. I feel that we can exact, and we must exact, of our public men precisely the same standard of integrity, honesty and probity in the pledged word as we expect in our common daily relations with our fellow men.

Once again, I am of opinion that the plebiscite is a democratic measure, and I do not feel that the severe criticism upon this measure is justified. I am glad to note that during the debate which has been progressing there is at least one point upon which we all seem to be unanimous, and that is the common assertion that the Department of National War Services should do all within its power, by its different boards throughout the country, to enable agriculture to carry on, in the adjournments of military training for farmers' sons. We have had instances of that this evening. Practically every member who spoke made recommendations in that sense—the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. McCuaig), the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Gladstone), the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Harris), the hon. member for Drummond-Arthabaska (Mr. Cloutier), for instance; and I am only too glad to associate myself with the sentiments which they have expressed in that regard.

In many instances the call of farmers' sons for military training puts in danger the continuation of the farm, and I would suggest that all possible consideration be accorded such demands. In expressing this view I am only conveying to the house the text of many petitions which I have received, and which all hon. members have received, in that connection. The carrying on of agriculture on a larger scale than ever is of equal importance with the making of munitions and equipment, and I am of opinion that everything should be done to exempt farmers' sons from military training.

There is, however, one point to which I would call the attention of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), and that is the case of farmers' sons who are at present doing military training in camps—this because the recruit did not make his representations in time, or for other exceptional reasons, the result being that he is called anyway. There are a number of such cases in my constituency, and I find that the procedure is unreasonably slow to get such men out of the training camps and to bring them back to the farms, where they are more useful to the country and to our allies.

I sincerely endorse the decision of the government to have an immediate inquiry into the disaster of Hong Kong, with a view to imposing the necessary sanction upon those responsible for this calamity, in order that this inquiry may serve as a lesson to anyone in high command who unnecessarily takes an unsound and unreasonable attitude toward the lives of the men. I do not believe any county in the eastern townships has furnished more men for the Hong Kong organization than did Compton, where men were recruited in large numbers from such centres as Bury, Scotstown, Cookshire, Sawyerville, Island Brook, East Angus, Lake Megantic and other localities of the riding.

Needless to say, the news of the fall of Hong Kong brought a great deal of sorrow to a very large portion of my constituents, and I know the sympathy of the country goes out to them and to their fallen heroes. With bowed heads at all times, let us always remember their deeds of valour and their supreme sacrifice.

I would not be true to the convictions which I hold did I not say a word on this occasion with regard to social legislation, too little of which we have heard for a number of years past, compared with European countries. I have already introduced in this house a measure for subsidizing large families; and although I do not believe that this measure, if put into effect, would result in an increase in the size of our families, I feel that such a step would greatly assist such families in the proper bringing up of their children from the point of view of proper nourishment and health, among many other advantages that would result. Had we had this legislation in the past, who is there that can deny that we might have to-day two or three hundred thousand more hands to turn the wheels of industry and to carry on our farms, as well as men in our training camps—a wealth of which we have been deprived by premature deaths or undernourishment among those who fill our hospitals to-day as a result of lack of assistance given this human capital?

The eminent sociologist, Doctor Eleanor F. Rathbone, has truly said that children are not simply a private luxury; they are an asset to the community, and the community can no longer afford to leave provision for their welfare solely to the accident of individual incomes. The Right Rev. Dean Williams, Archbishop of Huron, speaking on this subject said that the best way to populate the vacant spaces of Canada is to populate them with the children of Canada; and the following words are from Mr. Justice Powers, President of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court of Australia:

> Family allowances will, if adopted, remove the greatest cause of industrial discontentment and misery, namely, the inability of many

workers to feed their children properly and clothe them decently, however hard they work for their basic wage.

In a radio broadcast address the Rev. Father S. J. Lebel, S.J., the eminent sociologist, truly stated:

> All governments have a duty to make a very serious study of family allocation. It is one of the most pressing questions of the hour. Upon its solution is dependent in large measure that true social peace and the real prosperity of the dominion.

There exists a common relation between the family and the state, a relation such that whatever contributes to the welfare and strength of the family, also contributes to the welfare and strength of the state. All that is indispensable to the family is also indispensable to the state. In spite of the seriousness of the hour, with its pain and suffering, Great Britain has already been seized with the importance of this legislation and has already submitted to its parliament a study of this important question of family allocation. I cannot too strongly urge the present government to take a step in the same direction in order that the proper orientation be given to this legislation as something that will greatly help this country and add to its war strength, at the same time granting the blessings of distributive justice. We speak of a new order to follow the war; let us not believe that this new order will arrive with the break of day some fine morning; we must begin to break the shackles of the old if we wish to prepare for the new. By all means let us slave and save and sacrifice to win the war, but let us sacrifice and save and slave also to win social peace after the war.

Mr. W. H. MILLS (Elgin): In rising to add a word in this debate on the address, I am not going to repeat what has already been said by handing bouquets to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne, who both did justice to the honour assigned to them.

I have the honour to represent the pioneer county of Elgin, Ontario, noted and outstanding in many ways. The county is ideally located on the north shore of lake Erie; St. Thomas, my county town, is midway between Fort Erie and Windsor on No. 3 highway, a shortcut for United States travellers across Ontario. St. Thomas is the Canadian terminal for three great railways: the New York Central, the Wabash and the Père Marquette. The shops of the New York Central are located there, and the Père Marquette have new shops almost completed. We also have the Canadian Pacific, the Canadian National and the London and Port Stanley railways, the latter, I believe, being the last remaining electric road running across country. Therefore St. Thomas is rightly called the railway city.

St. Thomas has also the most outstanding, up-to-the-minute daily newspaper in Canada. The editor of that paper, after reading the speech from the throne, gave St. Thomas world-wide publicity by cabling to the Right Hon. Winston Churchill and telegraphing President Roosevelt and headlining on the front page the following message:

> Canadians feel humiliated and apologize for action of their premier in proposing plebiscite on military service, believing it falsely represents them as failing to realize gravity of situation and necessity of all-out effort to save themselves and empire. Believe unparalleled circumstances require that you should create precedent and advise Mackenzie King to abandon idea and take only step possible for utmost prosecution of war without delay.

I have been following the paper looking for a reply, but so far the only reply I have seen is where in the British parliament Prime Minister Churchill gave an account of the great contribution Canada has made to the war and the great applause his statement received.

Elgin is a great agricultural county, producing great quantities of hogs, beans, beef cattle, tobacco, small fruits, milk and, of course hon. members all know, the finest apples in the world.

The government, of which I am proud to be a supporter, has located in Elgin county several airports in connection with the commonwealth air training plan. Three miles south of St. Thomas was the great new Ontario mental hospital. The provincial government immediately on the outbreak of the war, turned that hospital over to the Department of National Defence. The technical training school in connection with the air training plan is now located in Elgin county, and between 5,000 and 6,000 men are stationed there all the time. Then we have the Fingal bombing and gunnery school with a personnel of 1,200 to 1,500, also Aylmer air school for pilots with about the same personnel. They have almost completed an emergency landing field five miles east of St. Thomas and needless to say, St. Thomas and Elgin county have been stimulated to great activity by reason of these training centres. We are grateful to the government for locating them there. Then we have at Port Stanley the finest harbour on the north shore of lake Erie, being the lake port for St. Thomas and London and also the home of a great fishing industry.

Last, but not least, Elgin county is the home of the best known provincial premier in Canada, in the person of Hon. Mitchell Hepburn. Mitchell is always putting Elgin county

on the map. Our friendship dates back to long before either of us entered public life. We have a standing agreement; Mitch grows my onions and I grow his apples. Mitch has always given me his loyal support, and I shall always do likewise any time he appeals to the electors of Elgin county.

As to the government, one might write a book on their accomplishments in the last seven years. I have not time to dwell at any length on them, but in passing let me say that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is the only outstanding statesman and leader in Canada to-day. He is surrounded by the best ministers it is possible to get. Where in Canada could you better our three ministers of national defence? Where in Canada could you better our Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe)? Who has any fault to find with any of them? We have the most representative national government possible, a government representing more parts of Canada than any government since confederation.

I have no time to go into the benefits and accomplishments of this government since it came into power, but let me just touch on the Prime Minister's ability. For example, immediately after he was elected he negotiated a trade treaty with the United States. I shall mention just one benefit from this trade agreement, in reference to cattle. We have in our stables a great many beef cattle, and therefore I know something about what I am saying. We are allowed a quota of about 52,000 head of cattle over 700 pounds each, entering the United States every three months, at one and a half cents a pound duty. The quota which started in January was filled in about six weeks. This makes a grand market for our cattle. What would our cattle market be like at the present time, with no export to Britain, if it were not for this agreement, which Lord Bennett, as he now is, tried three years to negotiate but without success?

A great deal is owing to our Prime Minister for the great cooperation between Great Britain, the United States and Canada to-day. My opponent, speaking in St. Thomas on February 14, 1940, at the last election, six months after war was declared, was criticizing a Liberal poster which read: "Forward with Mackenzie King". He said, "Forward; where to?" Answering his own question he said, "To closer relationships with the United States." I wonder whether he would make such a statement to-day. I doubt if our Conservative friends will ever again choose as an election slogan, "No truck or trade with the Yankees." I have always advocated close relationships with the United States. Why not? Many of our sons and daughters are permanently settled there.

Canada's war effort has been fully explained by previous speakers, so there is no need for me to repeat what has been said. But let me refer to an editorial in the New York *Times,* which said that Canada's contribution is one of the miracles of the war, according to her population.

As I see it, the situation is that, as time goes on, Canada will almost become the cupboard of the world. A few days ago I was reading an article on conditions in Europe, where thousands are cold and hungry. Will Canada soon not have to be sending food supplies to Russia as well as England? Canadian farmers are as loyal and patriotic as any people we have in Canada. They have met the demands made upon them and are willing to continue working long hours and doing their best, but they are becoming greatly handicapped by the labour situation. The calling up of men as recruits for the training centres, the employment of men by factories, shops and the railways, make it almost impossible to hire men for farm work. The only farmer who is going to get by is the small farmer, who can do the work himself.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I come to the question of calling up young farmers for war service. The procedure under the present policy is very unsatisfactory. First let me say that Mr. W. A. Martin, the divisional registrar at London, who represents the whole of western Ontario, is the finest, fairest type of man it would be possible to have in that position. He wants to be fair and impose no hardship on anyone, but he has an impossible task; no one man can act as a tribunal for all western Ontario. I should like to give my experience only a short time ago. About ten o'clock in the morning I called his office. The long-distance operator reported back that Mr. Martin could not talk to me until after two o'clock. I said to her, "I will not be sitting at this telephone at two o'clock. You tell him W. H. Mills wants to speak to him, and I think he will speak to me." I was talking to him inside of a minute. If it had been a farmer from a back concession who had called, there would have been some other alibi at two o'clock because his staff simply have to protect him. He cannot attend personally to all the demands made upon him.

I should now like to mention my experience in interceding in one or two cases, although I could refer to many. A short time before I came to Ottawa, a lady and her son came to see me one evening. I found that she was a widow, with one son and a married daughter. The son was the only help she had. They came to see me on New Year's day, and the

son had been notified to report at the Chatham training camp the following Thursday, which would leave no one to do the work. I should like to read one paragraph from the letter I wrote to Mr. Martin in this connection:

He is the only son of a widowed mother. She has one daughter who is married and away from home. They have one hundred and ninety acres of land, fourteen milch cows, sending the milk to the Corinth cheese factory, fourteen young cattle, four brood sows, turning off approximately forty to fifty hogs a year, have four horses, and do general farming. Wilford has been doing the work on this farm alone with no hired man and it is out of the question to get one. If he has to take this four-month training, there would be nothing else but a sale and quit farming. At this late date, it is even too late to have a sale in time, and they do not want to do this anyway. It is not the intention of the department that a widow's only son should have to go into training and the farm be abandoned. The Hon. James Gardiner spoke especially on this point at the London meeting a year ago.

I asked Mrs. Burwell at what time they got their mail, and she said, "About nine o'clock in the morning." So I said, "If you do not hear anything by next Tuesday as a result of the letter I will write, you telephone me and I will telephone Mr. Martin." Then I added, "You go home, go to bed, and get some sleep," because I could see that she was greatly worried. I added, "You take it from me, Wilford is not going into training next Thursday." I heard nothing more for some time, so I took it that they had received the looked-for letter. Then Mrs. Burwell sent me a copy of a letter they had received giving her son a postponement until March 31, a date not far off now. If she took that letter too much to heart, she still would not be sleeping nights because the letter said that Wilford would be expected to report at the first training camp after that date, and that he would be notified in ample time as to the place and date.

I contend that there should be some different policy from this worrying of widowed mothers. I would refer to another case, that of a young man who finished his four months' training last July, was given a postponement for six months and then was notified to return to duty on December 15. Prior to that date he and his father interviewed me to see if something could not be done, so I wrote a letter in his behalf to the commander in charge, Wolseley barracks, where he was supposed to report. This young man's father, Mr. Danbrook, has only one other son, who has been in the air force for over a year and a half. The other boy, Keith, is married and lived at home with his father, working the farm with him. They have two hundred acres—I know the farm very well—twenty-two Holstein cows and sixteen young cattle, an accredited herd. They kept hogs until some time ago, when they had an outbreak of hog cholera and their twenty-six hogs were slaughtered, but they are going back into hogs shortly, and are carrying on general farm work. This boy went to London, without result, and he was instructed to report at the barracks. I wrote the commander there, and received this reply:

This young lad has reported here for duty and is at the present moment being held in the depot for disposal.

I regret that I am unable to take any steps regarding any further postponement but would suggest that you write the district officer commanding, headquarters, M.D. No. 1, London, who will issue instructions to me as to what disposal I am to make of this young man.

I wrote as suggested, enclosing a copy of the letter I had written to the commander at Wolseley barracks, and saying I could add nothing more except that the father was confined to bed at that time with a paralysed shoulder. Then I got the following acknowledgment from him:

This man has completed his four-months training as a reserve recruit and has now automatically become a member of the Canadian army "home defence".

Had he applied to the Department of National War Services prior to 15th December it is possible that he might have secured an additional postponement, but now his status is the same as a member of the Canadian army active.

We have had this man in and suggested to him that it is thought that he might possibly secure a discharge on compassionate grounds, and further suggested that he should forward an application through his commanding officer for a discharge.

The next information I received was in a letter from his father. They had a neighbour boy helping to do the chores, and the son was sent to Camp Borden to wash dishes. He remained there for about three weeks, and then finally, on January 14, he was released on compassionate grounds and given six months leave of absence. That will take him up until around the 1st of July, when we all know he will be needed at home more even than he is now. Will this whole procedure have to be gone over again? If he does not get a postponement, there will be difficulty then.

There are several young men in training from my constituency who should be at home. Will the same procedure have to be gone through to get their release? What I recommend to the Department of National War Services is that Canada be given a more definite system, a system which will be advertised so that young men can understand

it, and know what action to take if they are key men and it is almost impossible for them to take training. It ought to be arranged so that they will not be trapped, as they are now. The policy should be widely known so that an hon. member is not called upon to intercede for every young farmer in his constituency. That responsibility should not fall upon us. We have enough to do to-day to look after the interests of our constituency, without this extra work.

I also recommend to the Department of National War Services that a board be set up for every county or constituency, whichever way it would work out best, such board to comprise either two or four men. Where possible, the appointments should be made half from each political group in the riding. In Ontario the executives would be mostly Liberal and Conservative. Such committee would have for its third or fifth member, according to the size agreed upon, a county judge. It would receive applications for postponements, make inquiries, and deal with applications on their merits. The opposition could not then say that this is a Liberal war.

As to the proposed plebiscite, may I say that I have not been favourable to the taking of a plebiscite, and I still wish it could be avoided. But our Prime Minister and cabinet ministers tell us that the matter has been given careful consideration, that the government is unanimously agreed, and that the plebiscite is going to be taken. Therefore there is nothing else to do but to go back to my constituency and advise my electors to go out and vote, making a cross opposite the word "yes", so as to release the government and many private members from pledges previously given the electors respecting the raising of recruits for overseas service. In this way the government would have a free hand to meet the situation which is changing from day to day. This war must be won at any cost or sacrifice.

From my observation during eight years as a member of the house I know that thousands upon thousands of dollars are wasted by every session being prolonged month after month by speeches made for no better reason than that of publicity, so that they may be printed in *Hansard* and reprinted back home. This is a war session. I know how busy the cabinet is, with the unlimited work connected with the prosecution of the war. Its work is greatly increased while the house is in session, and I should think it would welcome as short a session as possible. I know that help is scarce at home, and most hon. members, including myself, are needed at home.

Therefore I appeal to all private members on this side of the house as well as those in opposition groups to refrain from unnecessary, non-constructive speeches. Let us get down to the business of conducting the greatest possible war effort. Let us consider the general business of the country, and conclude this session by May 24, at the latest. This can be done just as well as by staying here until the heat drives us out in July.

Mr. ARMAND SYLVESTRE (Lake St. John-Roberval) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the great number of my French-speaking colleagues who have taken part in this debate prompts me to follow their example. Like them, I have always been and still am opposed to conscription for overseas service. I would go further and state that any government attempting to enforce this execrable measure will meet with numerous obstacles and many disappointments in every section of the country. During the last general election campaign of 1940 I made my own the statements coming from my leaders and the electors in my constituency, by casting their votes in my favour, ratified the pledges made at the time. I know beforehand that 95 per cent of the electors in my constituency will answer "no" to the question put by the plebiscite and I have no intention of asking them to release me from the solemn pledges I have taken. I therefore intend answering with them in the negative.

For all that, I have not the least objection against the holding of the plebiscite, for it is the fairest method of ascertaining whether or not public opinion has changed in the land, as some claim it has, and it is also the method most in keeping with the democratic principle of government of the people by the people. I even believe that the vast majority of the people will answer in the negative and that the effect will be to silence once and for all the voice of those fire-brands and false patriots whose only purpose is self-interest and whose ever readily borrowed cloak of patriotism only serves better to disguise their turpitude and selfishness.

I will therefore vote confidence in the King administration. I will also add a word in connection with the abnormal situation created by calling farmers' sons for military service. Mine is principally an agricultural constituency. More than ever is a greater and more extensive agricultural production being advocated. In order to increase production, cheese factories are being operated over the winter in my constituency; work on the farm is increased as a consequence and this is no time to reduce the number of available farm hands.

The exemption board for the district of Quebec sits in Quebec city, 200 miles from my district. When a farmer's son receives a call

from the registrar, he must within eight days of its receipt send a request for postponement to the latter. The registrar has no authority to decide whether the request should be granted or not, but has to transmit it to the board. The latter sits from time to time and receives hundreds of applications which it hasn't even time to read, with the result that applications for postponement are rejected when they should be granted. On account of the great distance and the consequent expense, farmers and farmers' sons cannot afford to submit their case in person. Because of the serious prejudice resulting therefrom, I would suggest that the board delegate a representative to the districts of Lake St. John and Chicoutimi to meet the applicants, examine their requests on the spot and report to the board.

Otherwise, the way things are going, we are slowly crippling agricultural production which, to my mind, is more necessary to victory than the manufacture of arms and munitions, for, as a consequence of the defeats in the Pacific, there will remain only Canada to supply foodstuffs to Great Britain in the event of the Japanese securing the mastery of the Pacific and cutting communications with New Zealand and Australia.

In addition, lumbering employs thousands of men, and in my district there was a shortage of labour this year. I know that many farmers' sons go to the lumber camps in winter. They are more useful there than in the army, for the work of the woodsman requires a degree of capacity and of physical strength which is not given to all. In calling this class of men to the colours we are crippling another essential industry.

Another serious problem calls for attention on the part of the government. I refer to the movement away from the land. My duties in the army have enabled me to grasp the extent of it for I had occasion to visit many localities, and a continuance of such a situation will spell disaster. A great number of farmers' sons leave the land to work in factories. They are attracted thereto by fairly high salaries, by comparatively short working hours and by the pleasures of city life. Most of them do not save anything, they squander all their earnings and enjoy themselves without any thought for the future. A young man who leaves the farm to work in a factory is lost forever to agriculture and the terrible lesson of the last post-war period is now quite forgotten. As every one knows, one of the main causes of the last depression was the movement away from the land. If nothing is done about this, the next post-war period will be worse than the last one, for when the factories now employing thousands of farmers' sons close their doors, those men will not go back to the land but will swell the ranks of the unemployed in our large cities, as has happened in the past. The government should make arrangements with the managements of those factories so that inquiries may be made about those who seek employment, and whenever it is found that they are from rural districts, they should not be accepted. Human nature is such that people must sometimes be protected against their own mistakes, but as I say, it is vitally important for our race that farmers' sons should remain at home.

In conclusion, I may say that I cannot understand the reasoning of those who, while claiming that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is our best safeguard, will vote against him. Such is certainly not my way of showing confidence in a man and I feel that in spite of the dark hours at hand and the clouds that are gathering over the horizon, the Prime Minister like the experienced helmsman he is, will bring the ship of state safely into port.

On motion of Mr. Eudes the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Tuesday, February 17, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. CHURCH

1941 WAR LOAN AND WAR SAVINGS CERTIFICATES—EXPENSES

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege, with reference to remarks made in the house yesterday and a return for which I moved on November 12 last regarding the victory loan and war savings certificates. A return was brought down in November. It was not satisfactory, and I have asked for particulars in question No. 39 now on the order paper, and also in a motion, No. 8, for production of papers. When these two matters are reached I suggest the question be passed as an order for return and the motion for papers carried with the understanding that the return be tabled after Easter. There was never any intention of interfering with the present loan.

SECOND VICTORY LOAN

RETURNS FROM ALBERTA—ATHABASKA ON THE HONOUR ROLL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. M. DECHENE (Athabaska): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance based upon reports appearing in the press this morning in relation to the new war loan. Has it come to the knowledge of the minister

that once again communities in the fair and loyal province of Alberta have gone over the top in subscriptions to the new loan, and that Athabaska, in the riding which I have the honour to represent, stands at the very top of the honour roll?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I saw that report in the press, and assuming it is correct I wish to congratulate the province of Alberta and the hon. gentleman's riding.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And what about Mr. Aberhart?

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

IMPOSITION OF DEATH PENALTY BY HANGING—TORONTO PRESS REPORT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. K. BLAIR (Wellington North): I should like to refer to an old question which I brought up in the house years ago. The Toronto *Evening Telegram* contains a report—the editor sent me a copy—in regard to a man who was hanged in Toronto the other day. The report states that the man was left hanging for over half an hour before he died. I bring this matter to the attention of the Minister of Justice.

SUGAR

APPLICATION OF TWENTY PER CENT REDUCTION IN COMMERCIAL USE—WINES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. P. C. BLACK (Cumberland): I wish to direct an inquiry to the Minister of Finance. It has to do with the wartime prices and trade board, which reports to his department. An inquiry comes to me from Nova Scotia as to whether sugar used in the manufacture of beers, wines and liquors is subject to the twenty per cent reduction imposed on other commercial users of sugar. If not, why not?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I had a letter inquiring about the use of sugar in the manufacture of beers and spirits. I made some inquiry and it confirmed my own impression that no sugar is used in the manufacture of beers and spirits. But with regard to wines I will make further inquiry and give my hon. friend an answer later.

APPLICATION OF TWENTY PER CENT REDUCTION IN COMMERCIAL USE—SOFT DRINKS AND ICE CREAM

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. LECLERC (Shefford): I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Finance in relation to sugar. According to the press, the manufacturers of soft drinks and ice cream will have to reduce their consumption of sugar by twenty per cent. Will they be allowed to use any substitute, or will they have to cut down their production by the twenty per cent?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I shall have to get the information for the hon. gentleman from the wartime prices and trade board and answer his question later.

REDUCTION IN EXCISE TAX—ENCOURAGEMENT OF DOMESTIC BEET SUGAR PRODUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I should like to make a statement on the subject of sugar. The increased cost of raw cane sugar, the necessity of rationing supplies of sugar both for household and industrial uses, and the desirability of encouraging the production of domestic beet sugar in the present emergency, have necessitated certain changes in the sugar situation which I would like to explain to the house.

As the house is aware, our purchases of cane sugar are made for the joint account of the United Kingdom and Canada by the British ministry of food. From the beginning of the war they have purchased for our joint account the total exportable surplus of British empire countries. The contracts are on an f.o.b. place of shipment basis and in the present calendar year the cost of such British empire sugars has been increased by 1 to 1½ shillings per hundredweight. War risk insurance costs have substantially increased and freights will no doubt average higher during the present year. Approximately one-third of imported sugars have been drawn from countries outside the empire. Last year these were purchased at an extraordinarily low price. They are mainly from Cuba and Santo Domingo, and the cost of such sugars in the present year will be $2.65 U.S. currency per one hundred pounds f.o.b. country of shipment, which is an increase of almost 1½ cents per pound as compared with last year. All imported sugars are sold by the sugar administrator at a fixed price c.i.f. refineries. This price has been held unchanged since May, 1940, at the figure of $3.30 per one hundred pounds. It is now proposed to increase this price to $3.55 and to increase the refiner's margin between his cost of raw sugar and the net selling price for refined sugar by about 21 cents per one hundred pounds. In this connection it may be noted that there has been no change in refiners' margins since control was established at the outbreak of war and the margin allowed has been below the margins obtained by refiners in the pre-war years in

spite of the substantial increases in cost that have taken place. These increases in operating costs will now be further aggravated by the reduced volume of production necessitated by the rationing of sugar.

Under existing circumstances, relating to accessible supplies and shipping difficulties, it is obviously in the country's interests that the maximum amount of domestic beet sugar should be produced, and the sugar administrator some time ago notified all beet sugar producing companies that they should do everything possible to stimulate production. The increased value of about one-half cent per pound in refined cane sugar will of course extend to beet sugar and, in addition, contributions which have been made in the past to the sugar administrator to equalize the net price with the cost of cane sugar have been discontinued. This will result in an increased gross to the beet sugar factories of 83¼ cents per one hundred pounds of refined sugar.

The proportion of this increased value which will go to the beet farmers will, of course, vary on account of different terms of contracts with different factories and also as a result of differences in yields of tonnage and sucrose of the beets, but will amount, I am advised, even under the most unfavourable circumstances, to over $1 per ton in the price of sugar beets.

The new factory in Manitoba had an unfortunate experience last year. First, harvesting was interfered with by unusual rains, and an unusually early closing in of winter resulted in about one-quarter of the crop being left in the ground. With a considerable increase in the production in Alberta and normal expectations in Manitoba, it is anticipated that the production of beet sugars in these two provinces may slightly exceed the total requirements at the reduced rate of consumption of the three prairie provinces. Soft or brown sugars and other specialties are not made by the beet sugar factories, and some manufacturing processes require cane sugar. Therefore it seems probable that a considerable quantity of beet sugar from the prairies will be marketed outside that area. Prospects of an increase in Ontario beet sugar production are somewhat obscure, due principally to a shortage of labour. The departments of agriculture and labour are, I believe, studying this question with a view to possible relief.

On the recommendation of the wartime prices and trade board, we are taking certain steps to ensure that the above adjustments may not affect the price of sugar to the public. In the budget resolutions we shall propose a reduction in the excise tax on sugar from 2 cents to 1½ cents per pound. Pending such formal action, we are providing for a remission of this tax to the extent of one-half cent per pound dating from yesterday, February 16. This remission of a part of the excise tax has, as I have said, been necessitated by the desire to avoid any increase in the cost of sugar to the public. To prevent the realization of any inventory profits, one-quarter cent per pound will be collected on all inventories in the hands of the refineries as at the close of business on February 14.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): So far as the consumer is concerned, his position will not be affected?

Mr. ILSLEY: Correct.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The retail price will be the same, the loss being taken up by the treasury?

Mr. ILSLEY: That is correct.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Those provisions with respect to the reduction of the excise tax went into effect yesterday?

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): How about prepayments on wholesalers' stocks; will they be refunded? This is an old sore in other lines of commodities of the same character, and I recommend to the minister that consideration be given the refunding of this reduction to wholesalers and other distributors. Otherwise these men are going to have to bear that loss themselves. If the principle of the loss being borne by the treasury is a good one, it ought to be carried through the piece.

Mr. ILSLEY: I shall look into that situation. I would think it would depend on when the sugar was delivered.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes.

Mr. ILSLEY: On sugar delivered after midnight last Sunday night I should think the tax would be one and a half cents, regardless of what returns were made. But I shall look into it.

WOOL

CURTAILMENT OF IMPORTS AND SHORTAGE OF STOCKS—RATIONING

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Munitions and Supply. Owing to the curtailment of wool shipments from India, Australia and New Zealand, and the shortage of wool stocks in Canada, is the government going to ration wool in Canada at once?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): To the best of my information stocks of wool in Canada are not short. I have gone into the matter thoroughly and my officers see no purpose in rationing wool at the present time.

FIRST VICTORY LOAN

PERCENTAGE OF SUBSCRIPTIONS REACHING BANKS OR LENDING INSTITUTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. N. J. M. LOCKHART (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, in view of the apparent necessity of making the present victory loan a success and in view of the numerous inquiries I have received, all indicating a certain line of thought in the minds of many who might be considering subscribing to the present loan, would the minister indicate to the house the percentage of individual subscriptions, and more particularly with respect to large amounts than to small, which were taken out at the time of the last victory loan and which, in the course of a very few months, reached the channels of lending institutions or banks? That question has been asked me over the week-end. For instance, a certain firm or individual may have taken out $10,000, $15,000 or $20,000 at the time of the last victory loan, and retained only $1,000, the rest reaching the channels of lending institutions. This is an urgent matter, and I should like to have some information concerning it.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I shall see whether the information is available and can be made public. I made inquiries not long ago about this situation, and I must say that I was surprised at the greatness of the percentage of long-term bonds which remained in the hands of the persons who bought them. The information was very satisfactory. With regard to short-term bonds, of course more left the hands of the buyers. They did find their way, I presume, into the hands of certain financial institutions. Our experience, however, with respect to the sale of long-term bonds was exceptionally good so far as the last victory loan was concerned.

Mr. LOCKHART: I suggest that a clear indication of just what the situation is would be most timely.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

EFFECT OF INCREASED ALLOWANCE BY BRITISH COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The other day the hon. member for Acadia (Mr. Quelch) asked a question about old age pensions in British Columbia. I replied in a way which I find was not as complete or precise as it should have been. The hon. member asked whether the Canadian government by order in council had amended the old age pension regulations so that the increased pension being paid by the government of British Columbia will not involve a corresponding reduction on the part of the federal government, and also whether I could tell him what was "the immediate situation in British Columbia."

In regard to the first of these questions, I said at the time that I believed we had communicated with all the provinces with regard to such an amendment of the regulations, but that I did not know what replies had been received. Actually I find that we have not communicated with all the provinces but have instead been relying upon the statement I made in the house on November 14 last, to the effect that if any of the provinces desires us to take the necessary steps to allow a province to pay a supplemental pension without such payment affecting the maximum pension now payable under the present act and regulations, "the government is prepared to amend the regulations and, if necessary, the act, to ensure such supplementary payments by a province do not entail a reduction in the pension payable under the act." I find also that when one province raised this question during the meeting with representatives of provincial governments in December last, I again stated the dominion's position directly to all the provinces in substantially the same words as I used in November last.

The situation, therefore, is that if and when we receive a formal request from any province to amend our regulations in this respect, we shall be glad to make the necessary amendment. For some time it was not clear to me whether an amendment to the regulations would be sufficient or whether the act itself had to be amended. I am now advised by the Department of Justice that an appropriate amendment to the present regulations could be made under the power given in the act itself, to provide by regulation for the manner in which the income of a pensioner is to be determined for the purpose of the act.

In regard to the second question asked by the hon. member for Acadia, I find that the Premier and Minister of Finance of the province of British Columbia made the following statement in his budget speech delivered on January 23:

> The government of the province has given careful consideration to this matter and is of the opinion that conditions in British Columbia warrant the increase of old age pensions to $30 per month, and, pending appropriate action by the dominion to that effect, it proposes to supplement the pension now paid by $5 per month. Of this amount, $2.50 is the provincial share of the increase recommended, and the other $2.50 represents a war-time cost of living bonus, which will cease if the scale of pensions is increased by the dominion before the cessation

of hostilities. The payment of this additional sum will be made on precisely the same basis as current pensions and will be subject to the maximum limitation provided in the act. Generally speaking, a British Columbia pensioner will now receive $25 instead of $20 per month. Should the supplemental payment, however, bring the total income above the maximum of $365 per annum, it will be reduced by that portion which would be in excess of the said maximum.

This statement apparently represents the present policy of the government of that province. I understand that an item was included in the estimates to provide the necessary appropriation for this supplemental pension, and as the provincial legislature has adjourned, the presumption is that the item was passed. I expect, therefore, that we will shortly be receiving a formal request from the province of British Columbia asking us to take any steps that may be necessary to make it possible for the province to implement its policy. I may add that if I understand correctly what the provincial government intends it may not be necessary for us to make any amendment even to the regulations, because you will note from the statement I have read from Mr. Hart's budget speech that the supplemental pension is only to be given in cases of pensioners who have supplemental income—that is, income above a maximum pension payable under our act of $20 per month—of less than $125 per year, and is only to be given in such cases to such an amount up to $5 per month as will bring the total income, including present pension, provincial supplemental pension and any supplemental income, to an amount not in excess of $365 per year.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO BRITAIN

OPPORTUNITY FOR DISCUSSION OF BILLION DOLLAR GIFT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the government. Because the debate on the address in reply is drawing to a close, and there is no desire on my part to prolong the debate, may I ask the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance whether any special legislation will be brought down during the discussion of which the billion dollar gift to Great Britain would be in order.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I believe there will be several opportunities for discussion of the matter to which the hon. member has referred. Certainly if the appropriation bill included that particular item, that bill would afford ample opportunity for discussion. The Minister of Finance has just intimated to me the possibility that the billion dollar measure may be made the subject of a special bill. In that event, of course, there will be ample opportunity.

PRIVILEGE—MR. POULIOT

REQUEST FOR ANSWER TO QUESTION CONCERNING BRUCE COAL COMPANY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANCOIS POULIOT (Temiscouata): Mr. Speaker, as a private Liberal member—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HOMUTH: Thank God for that.

Mr. POULIOT: —it is my painful duty to rise to a question of privilege, not for the redressing of any wrong, but to make my position clear.

Mr. McGREGOR: You should never do that.

Mr. POULIOT: I hear only intelligent remarks. I did not hear what was said.

Paragraph 297, found at page 97 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, quotes May as follows:

> The imputation of bad motives, or motives different from those acknowledged, misrepresenting the language of another, or accusing him, in his turn of misrepresentation, charging him with falsehood or deceit; or contemptuous or insulting language of any kind; all these are unparliamentary and call for prompt interference.

I did not ask for interference, and I do not now. But I was deeply sorry yesterday when my leader, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said it was his understanding that my question regarding the use of mobile units and the improvement of ways of communication had been put with the intention or purpose of embarrassing the government.

It seems to me that what I said on January 30 when speaking on the debate we are now about to resume was not said to embarrass the government. I did on a later date raise the question about the sale of the same coal three times by the Bruce Coal company. I did so just to prevent waste and theft. And now may I bring the attention of the government to the fact that although my question of February 9 respecting the Bruce Coal company has not been answered, a new government contract has been awarded the same company since that question was asked. I should like to know if that is true, and I should also like to have an answer to this question.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The last thing of which I would accuse my hon. friend is seeking to embarrass anyone.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is fine irony.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall seek to relieve the hon. member's embarrassment by securing an answer to his question as soon as possible.

JAPANESE NATIONALS

PURCHASE OF GUNPOWDER—EVACUATION TO INLAND AREAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. A. CRUICKSHANK (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, as a public Liberal member I would like to ask a question of the government. I regret not having submitted it in writing to the government beforehand, but my reason for not doing so was that I have not the faintest idea which branch of the government is handling the Japanese situation—nor has any other British Columbia member.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does anybody know?

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: The Japanese in British Columbia can still, under permit, purchase powder. That is the condition, according to a press dispatch of February 6. Is that a correct statement of the situation—that the Japanese can still purchase powder in British Columbia, under permit? My second question is whether the Japs—I do not say Japanese—near the Ruskin power dam in British Columbia have been moved, and if not, why not?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): As to the powder, that has been prohibited. As to the dam, I am not in position to say anything at the moment but I shall try to get my hon. friend the information he desires shortly.

THE WAR IN THE FAR EAST

AID TO THE EMPIRE AND ALLIED FORCES IN THE PACIFIC AND EASTERN ASIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I should like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a question which I asked last week, as reported on page 497 of *Hansard,* regarding the Pacific, Singapore and the far east. At that time the Prime Minister answered me and said that he was consulting Britain and would give me a reply later—not on a Pacific council but on Singapore. I was not in the house yesterday afternoon, but I understand that the Prime Minister has not as yet replied to my question. I gave him notice of it to-day. He has proposed a secret session which is not legal under the rules. On June 12 last I asked the Prime Minister about a secret meeting on this matter with the British Columbia members and not the whole house. In England the Singapore question was debated on a motion to adjourn the house; the Lord Privy Seal, the leader, allowed a debate on Singapore from early in the afternoon until midnight. The whole question was gone into, and Australia also spoke strongly, publicly and openly. I think it is a mistake that this matter of life and death to the empire should be dealt with in private.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CHURCH: The life of the British commonwealth is at stake and I wish to protest against any secret meeting.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I do not know that I am sure of what my hon. friend has just said. He began, as I understood him, by referring to a question which he had asked with respect to the Pacific council. That question I answered yesterday. If I understand him aright, he is asking why I have not replied. I would say that I have replied. He will find on page 598 of *Hansard* the statement I gave to the house in answer to his question. As to my having had a meeting with the British Columbia members, that would have been a pleasure for me but it is one that I have not had this session.

Mr. GREEN: He said last year.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, well, I beg the hon. member's pardon. I had a meeting last year with the British Columbia members of all parties in the house. I do not know whether my hon. friend is taking exception to that or whether he wishes me to repeat it this year. I shall be pleased to seek to meet his wishes. As to the house proceeding in secret session, my hon. friend is aware that arrangements are being made for a secret session. In connection with the proceedings of that session I shall be glad to take into account the representations he has just made about the unwisdom of pursuing certain courses in this house that have been pursued elsewhere.

Mr. CHURCH: Since the war started all meetings are in secret here. They are not reported under your press censorship, which should be abolished.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Monday, February 16, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Mr. RAYMOND EUDES (Hochelaga) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, since the opening of this session parliament has been seeking which one of two path opening out before it will lead straight to the objective, which is victory and the establishment of a better order. This pause is not a waste of time. Indeed, effective action stems from thought which directs.

By what principles should this search be guided? In the first place, this war is a conflict between two ways of life, a conflict from which no people is free. All nations, in varying degrees, are shaken by it. In such a conflict, to seek refuge in indifference is equivalent to desertion. Either our civilization will perish or hitlerism, slavery and iniquity will be vanquished.

From this principle there flows a fundamental consequence: each country is fighting for itself. England, Russia, the United States, China, Canada are waging war each one for its own preservation. Canada, therefore, is not fighting for the triumph of England or even of the British empire. It is fighting to defend its soil, its history, its past, its future, its freedom, its civilization. We are therefore fighting for a Christian ideal, for human civilization, for the liberty of the individual.

On what does victory depend? Only recently, a country's power was measured by its armed strength. To-day, in balancing the factors of strength, purely military might no longer has the absolute importance it once had. The strength of the best armed nation can only be measured in terms of its economic superiority. This is clearly shown by the methodical manner in which the enemy has used all his material and moral resources, as well as by the resistance offered by England, Czechoslovakia and Russia. The defeat of France is another evidence of that fact. Do you know how many German soldiers broke through the French line at Sedan, smashed the British and Belgian forces in Flanders, and destroyed at one fell swoop an army of five million Frenchmen? One hundred and fifty thousand men. Twelve panzer divisions with the assistance of a few thousand aeroplanes conquered France. The million German soldiers who followed had only a minor part to play: occupation.

44561—41

Since war on the one hand brings into play all the strength and resources of the belligerent nations and since on the other hand the strength and resources of the warring countries will not become exhausted at the same time or in a single day, the basic problem in this war is one that implies a total as well as a lasting effort. Victory will come to whoever has sufficient resources to achieve a lasting effort, and enough strength to wear out the enemy.

The moral factor is an important part of that strength. In fact, public opinion or the morale of the people is an integral part of a nation's potential. History shows that an army which has a high morale and is fully conscious of its objective is a victorious army. To-day because of the constant risks of life modern man has become accustomed to calculation and reasoning, to appreciation of interdependent factors and to comparison of values. Man obeys a command and accepts a sacrifice for a purpose whenever he is in a position to appreciate the necessity of it.

Under what conditions is this long-drawn total effort to be carried on? Owing to the variety and multiplicity of needs, to the wide distribution of natural resources and to the highly specialized character of production, no one territory is capable of meeting alone the exigencies of a long-drawn-out war. Control of the sources of supply is essential to success. These sources are numerous, varied and scattered. Such control therefore implies freedom and mastery of the seas. The successful outcome of the war is therefore dependent upon a rational coordination of the total war effort contributed by each allied country.

A total effort, an enduring effort and a united determination to win, such are, Mr. Speaker, the conditions essential to victory.

In making its contribution each country will seek efficiency rather than quantity. Each country will take stock of the general need, of its own means and of the potential capacity of the Allied Nations. Such contribution cannot be the same in each case, neither as to form, extent or kind.

These brief remarks may serve to determine how Canada can and should do its duty as a warring nation.

To provide for its own defence is its first duty. As a French economist once stated, Canada is a geographical paradox.

Although its boundary follows a parallel of latitude, nature has, on the contrary, by its mountain ranges, its climatic zones, its natural resource deposits divided the North American continent along meridians of longitude. Canada is the outcome of a free pact between provinces possessing each its own charac-

teristics inhabited by ethnical groups of various origins, cultures and ideals. A deeper interest has served to unite them on a broader basis.

For the sake of security, the government must maintain these ethnical groups and dissimilar elements properly balanced and united. The existing bond must be strengthened and, in public policy, every step that might be of such a nature as to endanger harmonious relations or would not entirely promote the common good should be consistently avoided. In the interest of security, the government is also bound to provide for the defence of the country and all civil needs.

It is only after these civil needs are met, after the home defence is organized, in other words, after public security is assured, that Canada will be in a position to contribute to the allies' war effort. Otherwise the Canadian war effort would fall short of its object.

In order to reach maximum efficiency, our effort must take into account both our own possibilities and the needs of the allied nations. England, Russia, China, Australia and north Africa may all become theatres of war, and it is evident that this situation hampers the development of resources and the production of equipment and food in all these countries.

The considerable proportion of their population thus released from these various activities can without inconvenience be assigned to purely military tasks.

Because of its geographical situation, our country enjoys a greater measure of security than the other allied nations. Not that Canada is entirely safe from attack, but the geographical situation of the enemy countries as compared with its own makes it more secure. Consequently, Canadian production is less likely to suffer interruptions liable to jeopardize victory. On the other hand, Canada's natural resources are vast and varied. Its soil is fertile. Its population, however, is small, and this fact is aggravated by the dispersion of this population over a narrow stretch of land extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

In order to be logical and to attain its fullest effectiveness, Canada's contribution to the joint war effort must therefore be concentrated upon the production and the supply to the allied countries of the war material and foodstuffs which they cannot produce or can produce only in insufficient quantities. Anything that interferes with the accomplishment of this task is an obstacle to the role which Canada is expected to play in the defence of freedom and civilization.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that no one can honestly deny that Canada has so far filled this role to the fullest. It must not be forgotten that when war was declared Canada had only recently emerged from a depression. Its agriculture and its manufacturing industry were just beginning to adapt themselves to the new markets they had had great difficulty in securing.

I invite those who criticize, either through inclination, interest or partisanship, to compare the quantity, quality and variety of our production, the effectives of our different armed forces, the amount of money raised by taxation and loans, in a word Canada's total contribution of to-day, with that of the last war. I ask them to think of the innumerable difficulties—the problems of transportation, to name only one of them—which this economic revolution, for that is what it really is, has involved. If they are sincere they will admit that our country has performed marvels. Our allies, the British people and their prime minister, our neighbours to the south and their president, have repeatedly praised and admired our achievement.

Yet, certain people are crying failure and demanding the head of the only man capable of carrying through the gigantic task which Canada has undertaken. Why? Because he has refused to yield to their wishes and make overseas military service compulsory.

In order to appraise it on its merits, conscription should be given its true perspective in the whole Canadian problem. This problem, I think I have shown, consists in providing collective security, in supplying our allies with foodstuffs and weapons, in maintaining an army, a navy and an air force. These four things are essential. Each one requires the same measure of attention in order that, a proper balance existing between them, the effort devoted to one of them may not injure the others. So, conscription is not an end in Canada's war effort. It is but a means of increasing the strength of the active army. Such is the only fair way of sizing up its importance.

Being a means, conscription must be judged by its results. If the latter are good, then conscription is desirable. If it impairs the efficiency of Canada's contribution to the common war effort, it must ruthlessly be rejected.

Let us now examine the effects of conscription. It will certainly be harmful to the war industry. It will take able-bodied men off the land, where they are already more and more needed. No one can deny the prime importance in this war of the navy and the air force, recruits for which are trained in this country. It is hard to see how conscrip-

tion will help either of these two services. On the contrary, it is liable to disorganize the navy and cripple the air training plan.

Moreover, the controversy that has developed about conscription shows that the latter has not the unanimous support of public opinion. Consequently, it is a serious threat to national unity. Besides, it is a coercive measure, and coercion destroys enthusiasm and heroism, without which no victory can be won.

And if Canada were attacked, does any one believe that the soldiers sent to England or Asia through conscription—a mere handful of men in the allied armies—could defend our territory?

I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, the admonishments given to the French Canadians by certain persons who urge them to desist from opposing conscription. I think I have clearly shown that conscription is not a problem restricted to Quebec. It concerns the whole Canadian people. Besides,—as has been stated by many honourable members from different provinces—the French Canadians have identified themselves with the cause defended by Canada and her allies with the devotion, the bravery and the generosity characteristic of the French soul. It follows, Mr. Speaker, that under the circumstances conscription is a nefarious theory, hardly consistent with true partiotism.

To my mind, such is the material contribution of Canada to the war. Before discussing her moral contribution, I wish to say a few words about the plebiscite.

It has been claimed that the government should have continued to administer the public affairs without resorting to a plebiscite. I sincerely confess that I would have preferred such an attitude. However, I cannot be persuaded that a member elected by the people can oppose the plebiscite. A democratic government derives its mandate from the people. The latter are governed by their elected representatives, who in turn must express the views of their constituents in so far as they do not conflict with the common weal. It is claimed that former statements by government leaders gave no indication that a plebiscite would be held and that, consequently, parliament should reject such a measure.

Does such reasoning sufficiently take into account every element of the problem? Politics must ensure the common good within the limits set by justice, charity and liberty. How can politics hope to live up to such virtues when deliberately setting aside the needs of the hour for the consideration of statements made under different circumstances and of directions designed to deal with needs which are no longer the same to-day.

Some still contend that the government cannot now break pledges taken at the time of the last general elections. Perfectly true. Does it follow that the parties to such contract are incapable of modifying its terms by common consent? Now, in a plebiscite, the government is asking the people if they believe that a clause in that contract between them should be changed. Should the people refuse, then such clause would remain in its original form. To refuse a contracting party the right of consulting the other is the very denial of liberty. To refuse the right of holding a plebiscite is to deny to the people the exercise of an inherent privilege of liberty, that of stating one's opinion, a privilege which the democratic system does essentially grant to the people.

In order that their war contribution may be thoroughly efficient, the Canadian people must be united in their ardent and enthusiastic determination to win. A lofty conception of their purpose must serve as the inspiration for the necessary sacrifices they must accept.

Why is there war? Why this tremendous sacrifice of the Canadian people? Is it simply for the joy of victory, simply to preserve pre-war conditions under which the individual certainly did not enjoy the fair share of well-being which the state should provide? No. We are not fighting for victory alone, but for peace, for real peace. And this does not mean the mere absence of conflict. It means a state wherein, under the aegis of justice, charity and liberty, human faculties may attain a full development. Post-war will be such as we shall have made it. The people have selected us to direct their destinies. A politician must not let events overtake him. He must scan the future that he may foresee and master it.

The new order which the post-war period will bring cannot easily be foreseen in every detail. It must first be born in the heart of each and every one. Then only can the state supply the appropriate setting wherein legitimate needs may obtain just satisfaction. Democracy will supply this setting. For the democratic formula is not static. It is dynamic and naturally tends towards improvement.

Our government has already taken steps in this direction. Under the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) a group of experts are studying post-war problems. On the other hand, unemployment insurance, stabilized trade and prices and other measures are due to temper the trying hours of the post-war days to come.

These measures are but the first step. Dealing with one of its aspects only is not solving the whole problem. The inauguration of a new order presupposes a general consideration of all post-war problems and a thorough knowledge of all questions relating to manpower and material.

This new order must be founded on justice and freedom. But there can be no justice unless the rights of the poor, the workers, the minorities and every other class are respected. Without equality and fraternity, justice is a vain word. However, equality and fraternity lose their beneficial character when the leaders use them as a bait for the weak and the lowly.

Liberty must be enjoyed by everyone. Enjoyment of power, privileges and fortune by a few while the majority labour under the weight of restraint cannot be considered as freedom. There is no freedom in the absence of political rights and these are a mere illusion unless accompanied by economic rights. There is no freedom for the worker whose future is unsettled. Finally no freedom is possible unless the representatives of the people govern with the greatest possible efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, this new order erected on justice and freedom is our goal. I am confident that our efforts will not be in vain, which would be the case unless we are guided by the principles for which we are fighting. In the present conflict we fight the enemy by our own methods. It were better not to fight than to use nazi methods.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I express the hope that when the struggle is ended in victory, this new order will prevail. Let us spread this ideal through the land. Let everyone's ambition be that of living in a united Canada in the enjoyment of justice and freedom. Then will our efforts and our hearts be united through the struggle ended by victory, for if it be true that men die in combat, it is equally true that nations often disappear for refusing to fight.

Mr. A. S. RENNIE (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few observations on the question now before the house, may I grasp this belated opportunity to congratulate the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I should like to compliment them upon the splendid speeches which they made in moving and seconding that motion. I venture to say, and I believe most hon. members will agree, that the material which they used in their presentations was excellent; and I believe that if we turned back over the pages of *Hansard* we should find that their speeches have been excelled by few.

The hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) had the splendid opportunity of visiting England and seeing conditions there at first hand. They naturally, therefore, speak with some authority. They have returned to Canada and have given us a vivid picture of what those stout-hearted people of Britain are enduring in this tremendous conflict.

In passing, I should like to compliment the hon. member for Northumberland, N.B. (Mr. O'Brien), who a few evenings ago gave us of this house an opportunity of seeing some of the pictures which he had taken in England, and of realizing more fully the courage and endurance of those brave people. I have personally spoken to a number of Canadians who recently returned from Britain, and have been amazed at what I have learned of the gallantry and determination of the British people, and the sacrifices which they are making to preserve freedom not only for themselves but for all the peoples of the world.

I recall a speech made in this house by the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services (Mr. Macdonald) on November 19, 1940, reported on page 208 of *Hansard*. He said:

> Some two months ago I listened to a radio commentator from London who said that one of the amazing sights in that great city, was the number of flags that could be seen flying there. Most touching of all, I thought, was his statement that in instance after instance these flags could be seen floating over ruined buildings, many of them the humble dwellings of the poor. These people, forced to see their homes destroyed, their personal possessions gone, sometimes members of their families maimed or killed, digged themselves out of the wreckage and at once they planted above it the flag of Britain. That act seems to me symbolic. They plant that great flag there, not only to defy Hitler, not only to encourage the weak and inspire the faltering among themselves, but also as an emblem of hope and of prophecy. And the hope and the prophecy are this: that just as the flag of Britain rises over the physical ruins of some of its homes, so out of the wreck and welter of this war there will arise a greater Britain, a Britain strengthened and stiffened by its heroic struggle, a Britain which will lead the world into better and fairer ways of life, not for one class or group, but for all people.
>
> So long as that spirit remains we need have no doubt as to the ultimate outcome of this war. The whole of Britain is under attack now, but in her own time she and her dominions will take the offensive. They are on the offensive even now; for our gallant airmen are carrying the war to the heart of enemy countries and to the territories which Germany has conquered,

and our incomparable fleet still commands the seas. Her soldiers at Dunkirk have proven their quality. We shall see Britain triumphant, and long after the name of Hitler will have become nothing but an unpleasant memory, the same flag which now waves over disordered heaps of crumbled brick and stone and mortar will be flying freely and proudly in the airs of heaven, sheltering liberty and justice and freedom and truth in its benevolent shade. That is the hope and the promise of the British flag flying over the ruins of British homes.

In these difficult days, when our empire is faced with the greatest crisis in its history, one cannot help but recall the words of a great Canadian, Doctor MacDonald, when he said on one occasion, "It would be indeed a calamity beyond compare were that world empire broken and its fragments scattered abroad." Yet on the other side of the picture one has the encouraging words of Burke, who said that the ties of empire are as light as air but strong as links of steel.

In the preservation of this British empire we need to-day the encouraging words of Burke. Canadians played a great part in the first world war, and when the history of that war was written the pages were bright with the matchless deeds of valour of our men. And, sir, after a quarter of a century we still think of those fine, stout-hearted men and their deeds at Ypres, Passchendaéle, the Somme and Vimy Ridge. So to-day we must show to the world that what Canada did in 1914-18, Canada can do to-day on a larger scale.

But in order that we shall do our best in this country there must be cooperation on the part of every individual citizen of this dominion. Cooperation is not merely a sentiment; it is an economic necessity. The efforts of every man and woman in this dominion I believe should be directed through the government into the avenues of service for which they find themselves best fitted. May I quote here Mr. Churchill's words spoken in this chamber on December 30, 1941, as reported at page 4480 of *Hansard*, January 21, 1942:

> In this strange, terrible world war there is a place for everyone, man and woman, old and young, hale and halt. Service in a thousand forms is open. There is no room now for the dilettante, for the weakling, for the shirker or the sluggard. The mine, the factory, the dockyard, the salt sea waves, the fields to till, the home, the hospital, the chair of the scientist, the pulpit of the preacher—from the highest to the humblest, the tasks are all of equal honour. All have their part to play.

I think it is the consensus of the Canadian people that Canada has taken a preeminent position in this great world scene. Men have their own views on politics and on political personalities; they may prefer one Canadian statesman to another. These are important matters; they are the blood and bone and muscle of democracy at work. But in a world convulsed with the mighty shock of the fiercest war of which history has record, factional, political and partisan differences should sink into their proper and proportionate place. When great forces are in action, with powerful tides and undercurrents sweeping over and through countries and peoples, the obvious has a way of being overlooked. But just because a fact is obvious it is not less significant. It is no less fraught with rich cargoes of ideas and ideals. Obviously Winston Churchill is the man of the hour of Britain; obviously President Roosevelt is the man of the hour in the United States; obviously Joseph Stalin is the man of the hour in Russia, and obviously Prime Minister Mackenzie King is the man of the hour in Canada.

While there are some who are outspoken in their condemnation of the Prime Minister's policy for Canada's war effort, these same critics are just as ready to admit that because of the happy personal relations between the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the United States, relationships which have their roots in the common understanding of the ways of life of Canada and the United States, the three thousand miles of unfortified border between the two countries are marked with the personalities of Mackenzie King and Roosevelt. Who but our Prime Minister could have appealed to the United States in forthright language for help for Great Britain? Our Prime Minister did this in a broadcast from London last year. Canada could speak to the United States as an American nation.

Did not Canada declare war on Germany of her own volition? And in the succeeding year under the good neighbour policy our Prime Minister entered into a joint north American agreement with President Roosevelt. When Pearl Harbour was attacked, Canada declared war on Japan in advance of both the United States and Great Britain. Canada could do these things because, to put it bluntly, she was a free agent. Canada is a member of the British commonwealth of nations, but she is a nation. She showed her loyalty to the crown in the brilliant reception given to Their Majesties King George and Queen Elizabeth in 1939. She again showed her loyalty in the tumultuous welcome given to Winston Churchill in Ottawa. So I say, how properly can we assay the qualities, the seemingly paradoxical qualities of Canada? With the structure of the world organization rudely, roughly shaken, Canada, through her Prime Minister, became the stabilizer and acted to maintain the equilibrium. Winston

Churchill perfectly illustrates the situation. He visits Washington; he comes to Ottawa, and then visits Washington again. Speaking in this very chamber Prime Minister Churchill said:

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

I should like to say a word on behalf of that great mass of patriotic men and women in Canada who derive their living from tilling the soil. In my own county, according to the latest available figures, we have a land area of about 489,000 acres; the number of occupied farms is about 5,000, and the farm population is something over 20,467. These fine men and women are bending every effort to help Canada fill her quotas of cheese, bacon, eggs and other farm products for Britain, and in order to do this they are toiling from early morning until late at night. There is no eight-hour day for these hard-working people. I should like to quote a few words from the very fine address of the Prime Minister on January 26, when he presented to this parliament what one might call Canada's balanced war effort. He said, at page 34 of *Hansard:*

> A vital aspect of Canada's war effort is our contribution to the food supply of Great Britain. This contribution has grown steadily in importance. Britain cannot feed herself, and her own great and growing armed forces. Still less can she feed the ever-increasing numbers of men we are sending from Canada to add to her armed strength. In the present war, unlike the last, her sources of food on the continent of Europe have all been closed off by enemy occupation. Canada is the nearest source of food left open. Without our food, the people of Britain might starve.

Then, at page 40 of *Hansard,* the Prime Minister went on to say:

> Canada has contracts with Great Britain for bacon, hams and other pork products amounting to 618,000,000 pounds. The forthcoming agreement for cheese is expected to be for at least 125,000,000 pounds. Then, 675,000 cases of evaporated milk will probably, again this year, be required by Britain. The present contract for eggs is for 30,000,000 dozen. Further large contracts for summer and fall delivery are anticipated. Canada has also undertaken to supply Britain with 4,500,000 pounds of honey; 510,000 barrels of fresh apples; 425,000 cases of processed apples; 300,000 cases of canned tomatoes, and other fruit and vegetable products in substantial quantities. Altogether, the value of the exports of the above commodities will be at least $180,000,000. Exports of the same products in the year before the war were valued at about $50,000,000.

Prosperity on the land, Mr. Speaker, means prosperity for all. I believe no calling surpasses farming from the standpoint of health and vigour, both of body and of intellect. Farmers as a class do not ask for charity; they are willing to work for what they get. Moreover, they constitute such a large proportion of our population that their welfare demands the consideration of all. This, coupled with the fact that they are engaged in our basic industry, makes the need for such consideration doubly great. Unfortunately many city people do not know the farmer. They have no appreciation of what he contributes to Canadian life as a whole, or the relationship that exists between his work and the earning of a livelihood in urban centres. So that in passing I should like to mention briefly one or two points which I believe are in the interests of the farmer, because after all I believe farming holds the key to prosperity in Canada and that this basic industry must therefore come first in legislative thought and action.

I should like to touch briefly on the mobilization act, in regard to young men being called up for training. I come from military district No. 1, which has contributed a great many fine young men both for overseas service and for the defence of Canada. But I have long since come to the conclusion that it is most unreasonable that we in Canada should take away from our farms the help that is so essential if we are to produce the food supplies which the Prime Minister stressed so much in his address a few days ago. I appreciate the fact that if a young man appeals to the registrar he is given consideration. In passing I should like to express my appreciation of the work done by Mr. Martin, registrar for military district No. 1. I do not know the gentleman very well; I have never gone to him to ask that any young man be relieved from training, but I believe he is a reasonable and fair-minded man, who gives every consideration to any request he receives, which is as it should be. The point I should like to make, however, and the point I should like to draw to the attention of the government, is this. I do not believe that in this crisis, when the farmers are finding things most difficult, they should have postponements for only perhaps six months. A young man who is on a farm, where the only other available labour is that of an old man perhaps fifty or sixty or seventy years of age, should be given an undertaking that he will not be called for military service, because I do not believe any industry requires early preparation for its annual activities more than does farming. Then, too—and this is not a new thought—we realize that the farmer

is greatly handicapped in having to pay wages more or less equivalent to those paid in factories making the munitions of war.

I have every confidence in our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), and I believe the policies which will be worked out by the government for this year will be of benefit to the farmer. But I suggest to the minister that these policies should not be left in abeyance any longer. Let us frame our programme so that the farmer will know this spring just what his position will be, so that he may put in his seed as early as possible.

There is another point in connection with farming I should like to mention in passing. I refer to the price of farm implements. I realize, too, that in war-time farm implements are bound to cost more money. Nevertheless I believe some arrangement should be made by the government under which the prices of what the farmer has to buy will be closer to parity with the prices of the commodities he offers for sale.

I come from a part of Canada in which the growing of tobacco has developed into a great industry. I would ask the government to realize that this is a seasonal occupation. The men involved have spent large sums of money in equipping their farms. Usually they have five or six kilns costing about $500 each. I am inclined to the belief that in connection with the sale of tobacco there is something radically wrong with the process of grading. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to give the matter his attention.

May I be permitted to say a few words respecting compulsory service, and the committee for total war. I shall state frankly that I have taken exception to that committee for calling men from all parts of Ontario to attend a dinner at the Royal York hotel, without first informing those men as to the matters to be discussed at the meeting. I know some men attended the meeting believing it to be called for the purpose of organizing the victory loan campaign, and they were somewhat disappointed when they learned otherwise. In my view the committee by its agitation did more harm than good. Had their method been one of cooperation rather than one of destroying and tearing down, they would have contributed much more to Canada's war effort.

Although I have not the authority for this, I am told that the cost of advertising and other activities of the committee must have been somewhere in the neighbourhood of $150,000 to $200,000. In addition to that, large quantities of gasoline were used by two hundred men who drove to Toronto from all parts of Ontario. Had the committee put that amount of money to the credit of the government to purchase a corvette or a minesweeper, or some equipment for the benefit of our soldiers, it would have been making a greater contribution.

I received letters and cards from my own constituency, some of which were in favour of a total war effort, some in favour of conscription of man-power only, and some in favour of conscription of wealth. But from a constituency with a voting population of about 35,000, in comparison the number of letters and cards received was small.

In my constituency the committee for total war, sincere in its efforts but overzealous in its patriotism and its wish to see the war ended as soon as possible, gave vent to its feelings through the medium of this organization. I have received telegrams from my constituency, some of which favoured, and others of which objected to the operations of that committee. For instance, I hold in my hand a letter from a veteran of the last war, an extract from which I shall read to the house:

> As a veteran of the last war, I suppose I might be expected to be in full support of a total war effort. This is so true that I am prepared to place my property at the disposal of the government, and serve in any capacity at the army scale of pay, if the people behind this movement, including those who signed the petition, are prepared to do the same. But I am not prepared to assist in any way to conscript my neighbor's son on any other basis. You probably know that at least some of the people whose names appeared as taking the petition, made fortunes out of the last war and hope to add to them out of this one; and I want to record my objection as strongly as possible to this conscription for the other fellow. I have no authority to speak for others, but I am sure you would find my sentiments approved by a large majority of people, irrespective of politics.

And one other clipping:

> I have three sons in the air force, and I applied for enlistment myself. I do not know about military conscription. If it were absolutely necessary, I suppose it will have to be; but I believe a good, honest, wholehearted war effort, governed by good sense as at present, is what I stand for.

I should like now to touch on the question of the bits-and-pieces programme which has been functioning under the Department of Munitions and Supply. In that connection I would register a complaint which, I believe, is worthy of consideration and is in fact receiving some consideration. I am inclined to the belief that in this great war effort, and especially in connection with the development of our industry, there has been too much centralization in the larger centres, with the result that the smaller towns have not had the opportunity to compete in connection with a variety of industrial activities.

There are many small towns in Ontario where the housing situation is not acute, and where large numbers of men could be accommodated. But we find that at least up to the present time industry has been directed toward the larger cities. I leave this thought with the government, in the hope that as time passes this condition may be remedied.

I should like to make a few brief observations concerning the plebiscite. I did not feel I could add much to the debate, but I do wish to make my position perfectly clear in regard to this important matter. When I had the honour of being elected as member for the constituency of Oxford, I believed that in all matters of public interest I should use my best judgment in respect of any action I might take. I believed that that should be my course with respect to matters such as the one I am now discussing. Having first obtained information as to the facts, I believed I should vote according to the dictates of my own conscience, and, Mr. Speaker, that is what I intend to do. I believe in the truth of the old adage that honesty is the best policy. The Prime Minister and practically every hon. member supporting the government stated clearly during the 1940 election campaign, "No conscription of men for overseas service." Doctor Manion, the then leader of the National Conservative party, also made his position clear. Some have urged that because the government has the largest number of supporters, it should disregard its pledge. My thought is that the larger numbers on the government side constitute all the more reason why they should appeal to the people and have the people make the decision.

At the moment I am not saying what stand I should take if it comes to a matter of conscription. I reserve that decision for myself. In the light of my vote on the plebiscite —and I shall vote for the plebiscite—I shall then endeavour to gather a knowledge of the facts, as I have done in this instance, and shall try to vote intelligently on the matter of conscription when it becomes an issue.

At this point I had intended to quote some authorities to support my vote on the plebiscite. I had intended to quote the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), than whom there is no more outstanding man in this great dominion. I refer hon. members to his speech. In this connection I think of the Prime Minister's speech with respect to the plebiscite. I think, too, of the fine contribution made to the debate by the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie). I think of the splendid contributions of the Minister of National Defence, (Mr. Ralston) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner). I have perfect confidence in these men who are trying to direct Canada's war effort, and while I am in this house I shall be guided considerably by them. I feel that after all they know the situation better than we do; and more than anything else I am interested in the preservation of the unity of this great dominion of Canada. National unity is no bogy. National unity is of vital importance, even beyond the present crisis. After this war we shall have to face tremendous problems of world reconstruction and nations and men of goodwill must cooperate. I believe that Kipling's "The Law of the Jungle" still holds good:

> For the strength of the pack is the wolf,
> and the strength of the wolf is the pack.

How can we play a part in the new world order if we have failed in the duties of brotherhood and cooperation here in our own country? With tolerance and goodwill at home we shall have taken a long step toward helping in an international world and toward the solution of Canada's own social and economic problems. Canadian unity, warm, effective and vital, is the key to our entire future.

During the last war I think all men in Canada had great admiration for Marshal Foch who led the allied armies. He represented to us the type of perfectly functioning mind which amid the storms and stresses of conflict found its way to victory. I recall that on one occasion when General Foch was addressing the students of the war college in France he said:

> You are to be the brains of an army, I beseech you in the name of God, think!

In so many places tolerance and friendship have been replaced by bitterness, freedom has given way to tyranny, the light of democracy has been somewhat extinguished. I can think of no more needed message to leave with the leaders of this country than words similar to those Marshal Foch uttered to the men who were to lead the armies of France:

> You are to be leaders in the nation;
> You are the builders of Canada;
> You are thinking for the people,
> I beseech you in the name of God, think!

Mr. H. A. MacKENZIE (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, the question now before the house has been under debate for over three weeks, so I appreciate fully that anything I may say will be largely repetition. But I feel that I cannot let the question pass without making a few suggestions, and I shall try to be brief in my remarks. It seems a peculiar state of affairs, and there must be something

radically wrong with world conditions, that after engaging in and winning a world war in 1914-18, and after dictating the terms of peace, in a little over twenty years we should be in a second world war which is being waged with much greater fury, more powerful armaments and equipment, and with much more disastrous results to both human life and property than the war of 1914-18. Winning this war is essential, but winning the peace that will be a lasting peace, that will give us national security, is much more important.

We are facing the greatest crisis, not only of this century but in the world's history. So much has been said about total war effort and total mobilization of all our resources that the average Canadian citizen is confused as to what total war means and what is really needed for a total war effort. Every Canadian worthy of the name wants this to be a total war. I shall not repeat in this house details of the magnificent contribution Canada has made thus far in the war with her air force, her navy, her army and the great industrial development that has taken place in providing munitions and instruments of war, when, prior to September, 1939, practically all of Canada's industries were engaged in supplying domestic needs. In the present situation the drive for total war and conscription was made by a powerful Toronto group backed by an extensive newspaper campaign. This question of total war first arose in Toronto, then in Montreal, and then it spread throughout Canada and has caused a great deal of confusion. If it can be proved or successfully argued that the previous pledge not to conscript men for overseas service without consulting the people has actually impaired the war effort thus far; if there is a serious shortage of enlistments to fill out the plans of the army chiefs; if there is any shortage of industrial man-power to turn out the instruments of war, then the issue would be much clearer. But the best sources of information in Ottawa state that none of these things are true. However, the time may come when that will not be so and, of course, we must be prepared.

One of the greatest dangers to an all-out war effort is, I believe, a shortage of labour on the farm. I am speaking now particularly of Ontario where many hired men have left the farms to work in munitions plants for wages the farmer cannot afford to pay. In many cases the farm boy was drafted for military training, and when he asked for postponement he was, in some cases, advised by the Department of National War Services to take his four months' training in the winter when farm work is slack so that he might be home for seeding and harvesting. The act was, however, changed, and these boys now find themselves in the army for the duration of the war with very little hope of getting released. I believe it would be in the national interest if all farmers who are in the armed forces and who are needed on the farms were given leave of absence for seeding and harvesting. If this is not done, I fear our farmers will not be able to supply the foodstuffs that may be required for the feeding of Britain and our allies.

I shall place the contributing forces in three categories, and one is probably just as important as the other: the armed forces, the instruments of war and munitions, and the supplying of foodstuffs. The latter could easily be the deciding factor in the ultimate conclusion of the war. I have received many postcards from residents in my riding, and no doubt many hon. members have had a similar experience, which read:

> I believe the most efficient and honourable way for Canada to prosecute total war is by compulsory selective service without restrictions. The government of Canada should introduce this measure so that men who are best on the farms will be placed on the farms; those who are most helpful in the factories will work in the factories, and those best fitted will serve in the armed forces, wherever needed. Such a plan is fair to all the people of Canada.

That would be conscription of man-power, but would it be an all-out effort? We all remember back in 1914-18 when many thousands of Canadian soldiers went to Europe to fight, many paying the supreme sacrifice. But what happened at home? At that time many industries made so much money because of the war, that they have never had to do much since—many millions were made. At the beginning of this war the government took the stand that a similar situation must not exist, and the Excess Profits Tax Act was passed. This would take by taxation over eighty per cent of all profits made in excess of the profits made in the average four years preceding 1939. There was some logic in this because of the experience of the last war, but it does not go far enough. Many industries made big dividends during the four years prior to 1939, and they should be required to make an equal contribution. War at the best is waste. What financier, what farmer, what employee, what man in the armed forces should hope to come out of this war as well off financially as when he went into it? Nevertheless, many thousands of people apparently do. We talk about equality of service and sacrifice; how much has the average man in Canada sacrificed? If total war means contribution in kind and according to ability to winning the war, then total war

must reach everyone, no matter who he or she may be. It must exempt no one. Then, if you divide the contributing forces into the three categories, the armed forces, the factories, and the farm, they should be put as nearly as possible on the same pay basis.

The income tax does take a large toll on salaries and on the revenue that is derived from our investments, but it does not go far enough. If the government is going to organize labour completely, it must also organize and regiment the capital resources of this nation. The Toronto *Globe and Mail* a few days ago in an editorial claimed that some people, when talking about conscription of wealth, meant confiscation of wealth. I do not think that is anyone's intention or is in anyone's mind. But what if some wealth had to be confiscated? What happens to the young man who gives his all, his life? Is that not confiscation? What about the soldier who comes back from the war crippled and broken in health? Is his health not confiscated? We say that the government looks after him and his dependents, and the Canadian government has done as well as or better than most other countries in looking after our war veterans; yet I know of several men who served in the last war who, because the pension board does not attribute their disabilities to war causes, are deprived of a pension or have to eke out an existence on a war veteran's allowance. We talk glibly about an all-out war effort, but let us go all the way. We live in a democracy; then let us start with the highest office in the dominion and end with the private in the army or the labouring man and be as nearly equal in service and sacrifice as possible until this war is won.

We have in Canada a fairly large population of foreign birth. Many have taken out their citizenship papers, and are good loyal Canadian citizens. Under the provisions of our Naturalization Act they must be domiciled within the British empire for five years before they can become naturalized citizens. Many find themselves in an embarrassing position because they have not been here for five years. I submit that the Naturalization Act should be amended so that they can take out their first or second year citizenship papers and assume their responsibilities as such, or else the mobilization act should be amended so that they, too, can contribute towards our war effort—and many of them are anxious to do their share.

We have many non-permanent reserve units in Canada, and I doubt if they are making any worth-while contribution to our war effort. There may have been a time in the early days of the war when they served a useful purpose, but with the selective drafts now in operation they are not much support to recruiting. I am not able to find out the exact number of these units, but there are probably eighty or ninety units of infantry, and probably nearly as many artillery units. Each unit has from two to four full-time officers, with the rank of anywhere from corporal to lieutenant-colonel. They usually train part-time a couple of nights a week. I contend that they are an added expense and are not making any worth-while contribution, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these units should be mobilized for active service either at home or abroad, or dispensed with altogether. The defence department has worked out something along this line but it does not go far enough.

In 1867 the fathers of confederation were successful in uniting the two great races of this continent, with the status of equal rights and privileges, and with a common purpose for a united Canada. After seventy-five years have we been successful, and if not, why not? We have gone a long way, it is true, but I should like to see a law passed that would make it a serious offence for any politician to raise a racial or a religious cry in order to gain some political advantage. We must admit that that has been done many times in the past, and no true patriot would do it.

My father came to Canada as a young immigrant boy from Scotland. My mother's ancestors also came from Scotland and I have a great regard for the mother country. True, I am a Canadian first, but I believe that Canada will give her all to aid the motherland at this time.

Unfortunately politics has apparently entered into this question, and the question of conscription cannot be fairly dealt with on that basis. I stated in my election campaign of 1940 that I was opposed to conscription and did not believe it was necessary, and that the voluntary system was the best. I am still opposed to the principle of conscription; it is foreign to the very spirit of democracy. In this present crisis, if conscription is necessary to win this war, let us not only conscript man-power but go all the way and conscript all our resources. We already have conscription, and it is selective so far as age groups and medical fitness go. Young men are being conscripted every day for the army, and conscripted for the duration of the war.

We have three Ministers of National Defence. We have faith in these men. They have surrounded themselves with qualified military men and army advisers, and these

military authorities in cooperation with the British war office should know where these troops can best meet the enemy and engage them. If outside Canada, so much the better. If we expect help in case of attack or invasion, and we might need it, surely we must be prepared to give help. Look at the map of the world in September, 1939, and look at it to-day; and then ask yourself, are we winning this war?

The plebiscite will not settle this question of conscription for the armed forces overseas. It was never intended that it should. If that question is introduced by the government, it will be settled on the floor of this house and members will make their own decision in view of all the circumstances, and abide by the consequences. I have faith that, if properly presented, the plebiscite will carry, and if we must have a plebiscite, let us bring in the bill without delay and get it over with. Anything that tends to confuse, retards our war effort. I cannot see why objection to the plebiscite should be regarded as a want-of-confidence motion. I do not consider it as such. We are living in the darkest days of Canadian history and we have a job to do. Let not politics or anything else interfere with it. Let us get on with the job.

Mr. J. SASSEVILLE ROY (Gaspé) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I fain would express the usual commendations in connection with the speech from the throne and compliment the mover of the address (Mr. Fournier), as well as the seconder (Mr. Macdonald, Brantford), without excepting the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), but the measures announced and the statements contained in the speeches are of such a distressing nature as to leave me no inclination to compliment their authors. Congratulations are worthless unless sincere. The remarks I desire to make are far from congratulatory. You may be positive that I deeply deplore this fact.

Besides various financial measures of an astonishing character, the speech from the throne announces a plebiscite to release the government from pledges and commitments concerning conscription and to allow them to alter the methods of raising men for service overseas. In fact, this is the last step towards conscription as the Prime Minister told us in his speech of January 26, as reported on page 44 of *Hansard:*

> National selective service is the method by which the government proposes to accomplish the mobilization of man-power on an extended scale. Let me define national service as it is understood by the government. By national service is meant any form of service, either voluntary or compulsory, which contributes directly to Canada's war effort.

And, later, he added:

> In announcing that national selective service is the method by which the government proposes to accomplish the mobilization of man-power on an extended scale, the government is not announcing a new policy. What we propose to do is to extend what, in fact, we have been doing right along, that is, to apply the principle progressively. In other words, we intend to continue to extend the application of national selective service to meet new needs as they arise.
>
> As I have already said, this policy, too, is not new, nor is it being advanced to-day for the first time, or as a consequence of high-pressure methods employed to influence the independence of members of parliament. The principle itself, as I have already explained, was approved by this parliament in June, 1940. It has already been applied to some extent. On November 12 last, I made it very plain to parliament that, with respect to the mobilization of man-power, the government's policy was one of national selective service; and, also, that an extension of the application of compulsory selective service—conscription, if you will—was a part of that policy.

Therefore, the Liberal party forgoes the doctrine which has ensured it public support for the last 25 years. This is a national political event the extreme importance of which no one underestimates.

The speech from the throne is a typical example of the usual methods used by the government in the consideration of a difficult problem and in the handling of a given situation. They wish to skirt the obstacle. So clever are they in their impertinence that they even attempt to bring the public to approve a policy that the Liberals have always represented as a national crime. The great question of the day is conscription for service anywhere in the world.

The Conservatives make it the main issue. An important number of English-speaking Liberal members are in favour of this measure. It is said that some members of the cabinet—and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) left little doubt on this subject in the minds of his hearers the other day—are conscriptionists at heart. The Prime Minister, a modern sphynx—and I regret his absence—claims that the government are gradually enforcing this measure; however, at the same time, he leaves us under the impression that he is opposed to it. He courts both the conscriptionists and the anti-conscriptionists. He claims that, in his mind, national unity is first and foremost.

In 1916 and 1917, did the Liberals act this way, did they give a thought to national unity? Have they preached a doctrine of unity, since then, while they were encouraging anti-conscriptionists in one part of the country and ultra-loyalists in another? Is it not to be feared that, at a time when national

unity is more necessary than ever, the impression may be gained that the chief purpose of the Prime Minister is to avoid a cabinet crisis and to preserve above all unity within the Liberal party.

Notwithstanding the complete reversal of their attitude the Liberal government make a show of fulfilling their promises. They assume an appearance of righteousness. They pretend to attach more importance to the pledged word. However, their opportunism causes them to create a political situation more and more tense and confused.

There are attitudes and statements that would be comical were they not so tragic.

The mover of the address, in expounding the policies of the government to the satisfaction of the Prime Minister has stated with a courage worthy of recognition, that he will ask his electors and his fellow-citizens to release the government from their promises and commitments against conscription and to accept the sacrifice of submitting to compulsory military services overseas, in order to preserve national unity.

At the outset of his remarks in reply to the speech delivered by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) on January 26, the Prime Minister blamed the Conservative leader for not having dared to use the word "conscription" in his amendment to the address in reply to the speech from the throne, in spite of his advocacy of conscription in his speech.

The Prime Minister's outburst is all the more frivolous and childish that the said amendment provides for compulsory military service in all theatres of war. Moreover, when asked what he will do after the plebiscite will have released him from his pledges and his promises against conscription, the Prime Minister evaded the issue and refused to commit himself, though his intentions had been clearly disclosed in the speech from the throne, in the speech of the hon. member who moved the address and in his own speech. It is a case of a mote in the neighbour's eye and a beam in one's own. The Prime Minister plays on words and obtains an easy victory.

After pointing out the gigantic proportions of our war effort and of our assistance and gifts to England, the Prime Minister declared that, except for some slight differences, the Liberal government's policy is the same as that of the Tory party in the matter of war and selective service.

What an astonishing confession! The Prime Minister was certainly not thinking at the moment of all the abuse, opprobrium and ignominy the Liberal party had heaped on this same Tory policy which it now makes its own. It must then be true that the punishment is found in the sin itself.

A little further on, perhaps under pangs of remorse, the Prime Minister candidly admits that, were it not for the pledges taken and the promises made during the provincial election campaign in 1939, the election results might perhaps have not been the same.

If it be true, Mr. Speaker, that inconsiderate pledges and promises were instrumental in tricking the people into approval in 1939, then the party led by the Prime Minister must also admit having as stealthily garnered the votes which returned them to power since 1921, for such is the only method they have used in every campaign. Is it to be wondered that rancours still endure and that bitter opposition is encountered? Neither should we wonder if, based on such methods, on prejudices and a most cynical opportunism, the government is now in a tottering situation and national unity is crumbling.

That very illusive national unity, invented for use by the Liberal party, based on non-participation in foreign wars and on insults for the opponents of this doctrine, is not the Prime Minister betraying it when, admitting that his party's successes are due to solemn pledges, he singles out as a target for prejudice that very province of Quebec which bore him to power and kept him there and which received at his hands that very political training which is now held against it? This is what the Prime Minister stated on January 26, as appears on page 46 of *Hansard:*

> 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 this House of Commons from the province of Quebec, the verdict of the people of that province might have been wholly different.

The Quebec Liberal leaders bear a great share of responsibility for the present situation and their electors will certainly not be satisfied with fictitious and futile explanations nor with pious regrets. They will insist that these leaders protect them against conscription, as they agreed to do when they claimed to constitute their rampart against conscription. But why does the Prime Minister, when mentioning those who have taken pledges and made commitments against conscription, always exclude himself and the English-speaking Liberal leaders?

Has not the Prime Minister himself spoken against conscription in his radio address to the nation at the beginning of the 1940 campaign? Has not the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) stated at Markinch, during that same campaign, that the Liberal government would never enforce conscription of manpower for overseas service? Again recently did not the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) go to Montreal in early December of 1941 and advocate opposition to this measure in the province of Quebec? Did not the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) also repeat recently his opposition to this measure which he called nefarious and futile. Has not the Prime Minister himself endorsed not only commitments against conscription but also promises made against any participation in empire wars by the then Minister of Justice, by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin) and the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power), when he wired Mr. Francoeur on December 26th, 1937, the following:

Lotbinière electors have voted as Canadians who put national interest above all else.

I could submit evidence to the fact that English-Canadian Liberals, with the Prime Minister at their head, have just like French-Canadian Liberals advocated in this country, particularly in the Province of Quebec, a policy of non-participation to foreign wars and, right up to recent weeks, given solemn pledges against conscription. The country must surely be aware that they are all equally responsible in trying to win over public confidence by making false promises, as the Prime Minister admits.

Why are the Quebec Liberal leaders, the honourable Minister of Public Works and his friend, the late Mr. Lapointe, alone called upon by the Prime Minister to justify their stand before imperialistic opinion? The Prime Minister makes it necessary for us to denounce his ingratitude for those and for him to whom he owes his present position and all the honours conferred upon him; he would have us believe that his friendship for the late Mr. Lapointe, his friend and benefactor, was as artificial as the tribute to his memory paid by him in this house on January 21st last.

Mr. BRADETTE: What shameful language!

Mr. ROY: It is a fact. To such evident proof of opportunism and lack of sincerity on the part of the Liberal party, I would add further evidence, more concrete proof, if I may so express myself. Let us look up page 363 of the Parliamentary Guide, Mr. Speaker, where the numerical strength of the various parties is mentioned. We see that in 1921, out of 117 Liberal members, Quebec had contributed 65 to the Liberal party. In 1925, 60 out of 101; in 1926, 60 out of 116; in 1930, 40 out of 88. Up to that time, then, Quebec constituted the main element in the Liberal forces. But in the 1935 elections, we note that the other provinces swelled the ranks of the Liberal party by adding to the 55 members from Quebec a contingent of 116 other members, making a total of 171. The new Liberal family has still grown with the 1940 elections, when Quebec contributed 61 members out of 178 or 185, if the Progressive and Independent Liberals sitting on the government side of the house are included.

Therefore, the Liberal party has started to implement its armament programme after the elections of 1935, that is in 1937, while the new family had a decided influence on the old. That was the beginning of the Liberal government's evolution towards a policy of war.

As the moving power of the Liberal party's opportunism is now coming from a different direction, the Prime Minister immediately endorses the policy of the imperialistic group forming the majority and hardly conceals his relinquishment of former policy and his severance from former supporters. The Liberal party expounded its former policy to the French population in order to climb into power. To remain in power, it now endorses the policy of the other group. This purely opportunistic evolution is the direct cause of the violent conflict existing at present between our two main racial groups whose training is so profoundly at variance.

These are the ghastly straits into which the Liberal party's opportunism has enticed the Canadian nation by promises and pledges from which it now requests a release. Before imposing conscription on Quebec, we shall grant it a plebiscite. As the government will not be released from its promises and commitments regarding conscription by Quebec, but rather by the other provinces, this, in itself, evidences the opportunism and trickery of the Liberal party.

At this dangerous turning-point of our history, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that all Canadians of good will, who are desirous of maintaining national unity, so indispensable in this hour of grave danger and who are desirous of not endangering our war effort unanimously supported for the fostering of the general interest, should react against this wave of opportunism which threatens to plunge us into disunion. We should all oppose the holding of this plebiscite which all groups of the Canadian population disapprove for various reasons.

The present trend of events more and more convinces me that conscription would be disastrous for our war effort as well as for the future of the country.

Popular confidence, especially among our youth, has been badly shaken by the pronounced depression of 1929 to 1940. Let us not forget that the financial interests, who have enlisted the conscriptionists as standard-bearers, have abandoned our youth to moral and physical suffering during that long period by the fact that they have deprived it of the enjoyment of our national resources which they make so much about to-day. What right have we, of forcing our youth to rush, on strange lands and at the cost of life, to the defence of those assets, a share of which was heretofore denied them?

The government has given us a foretaste of what may be expected if conscription is resorted to. On a request from Great Britain, they have sent bright and gifted young men to Hong Kong before they were properly trained. They were removed to China, lacking the necessary armament to bolster the defence of an insufficiently fortified outpost. May I be allowed at this point, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that about one hundred of these unfortunate young men came from the Gaspè constituency, to offer my sincerest sympathies to their families who endure such frightful anxiety and who dread the news they have been awaiting for nearly two months. We have to fear the recurrence of incidents of that kind if conscription for overseas service is enforced.

In view of the disunity now prevailing and increasing in alarming proportions from day to day, the best advice we could offer the government and the opposition, is to respect the pledges taken by both parties during the 1940 election. On this condition, it may yet be possible to maintain confidence, peace and harmony.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I shall vote against the main motion and the amendments because I am opposed to the plebiscite and to conscription, measures that I consider as inopportune.

I fail to see how else I could act. It would be useless to speak against conscription and then vote for the adoption of the speech from the throne announcing the holding of a plebiscite to grant the government the freedom they wish for imposing conscription when they please. We should fear, if this threat ever becomes a reality, to be accused of complicity and hypocrisy.

[Mr. Roy.]

Mr. J. K. BLAIR (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, first I wish to express our deep gratitude to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) for the splendid harmony he has brought about among the nations with which we are now associated. For years he has sought to be friendly with the United States. He brought about trade agreements with that country; he established the British preference, and he maintained friendly relations with the British empire. He was the medium that brought the Americans and the British together, and I consider that the meeting of the leaders of those countries on the high seas was the work of our own Prime Minister. Hon. members will remember when the British empire was somewhat antagonistic toward Russia, and will also remember the attitude of this government, which sought to maintain friendship with Russia. To-day we are glad that this spirit guided our leader. I hate to think what might have happened if we had not dealt kindly with Russia in those times. Our relations with China have been almost perfect for many years, and now these countries are in harmony in support of the British empire.

The Prime Minister has been a master not only in international affairs but also in promoting unity within this country itself. He had at his side, of course, an equally strong advocate of unity in the person of the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. We in Canada ought to realize that in some respects the people of Quebec may be a little different from the rest of us. They left Europe three hundred years ago, and their songs and their hearts are all for Quebec. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) is of Irish descent. He puts on his orange lily and speaks at orange gatherings on the 12th of July. His heart goes back to old Ireland. I put on a bit of heather and march to *The Road to the Isles* played by the pipes; we sing the songs of old Scotland, an odd psalm and *Mary of Argyle*. Our hearts go back to the land of our fathers. So it is with the Sons of England. Why, when you gather with the Sons of England in Toronto you would think there was no place on God's earth except England. But that is not so with the people of Quebec. They are more parochial; they are true to the country in which they live; they marry early, have large families, and think home is the ideal place. So we must accept them as they are. But this war is the war of Canada, and we are receiving splendid support from our Quebec friends. They are showing a spirit of true patriotism, and will continue to do so, but we must not expect them to love the British isles as you and I love them. Our

hearts and souls go back to Britain. If we thought anything might happen to Britain, we would be unable to express our feelings. Britain was the home of our fathers, and that makes a vast difference in our feelings toward it.

I do not like this defeatist talk that one hears almost everywhere one goes. Defeat is something we should never mention. It is true that other empires rose and fell. There was old Babylonia, but drunkenness and debauchery were the only things it wrote into history. It was weighed in the balance and found wanting. Then came the Persian empire. It wrote into history only one thing of importance, one thing that maintained it for many years, the word "truth". That word is still commonly used in the Liberal party. The people of the world had confidence in the Persians, but eventually they came to worship the god of Bacchus too freely and fell into drunken ways. Then came the Grecian empire. Their contribution was science and education, but they too fell by the wayside. They also worshipped the god of Bacchus too freely, and Alexander died a drunken wretch. Then came the Roman empire, and it established the word "law". Our laws are based almost entirely upon Roman law. We were part of the Roman empire for four hundred years. Four hundred years is a long time, equal to the time from the reformation to the present day. We fashioned our laws upon those of Caesar. We got our churches from the Romans, and the Roman empire lasted for many years because it had a more solid foundation than the previous empires.

We come now to our own empire. Why should it endure? It will endure because of the ingredients of which it is composed, because of the ideals and standards that go to make it up. We in the British empire have the word "truth" well established; that is well known the world over. We have the education and the sciences of the Greeks. We have a nobler, a larger vision; we have the love of humanity, and the brotherhood of mankind is stamped upon British people as it is upon no other race. We do not proclaim these things as much as we should among our own people. We do not altogether appreciate the opportunities we enjoy. For instance, there was Rufus Isaacs, who was a wharf rat. He went to India, where he stayed for a few months, returning to England as a waif, but eventually going back to India as viceroy. Opportunities of this kind are not accorded to the people of other nations. Take the Boer leaders; they were our bitter enemies; but after Britain defeated the Boers, they became true British subjects. We must remember that in the British empire there are practically no conquered races. They are given the privileges of freedom and citizenship and can rise to the highest levels. We saw Mr. Thomas sitting in one of the seats of this chamber not so many years ago. He was a blacksmith in England, and through his own efforts he rose to become minister of labour there, one of the highest honours his country had to give.

These are things that go to build up the heart and soul of an empire. But not only are we true to our own citizens; we have a kindly feeling toward all other nations. This is shown by those who rallied round us during this time of war. The other nations have confidence in the spirit of Great Britain; they have confidence in the truth of the British word, and they understand the kindly spirit that goes with it.

I believe we do not tell enough about our own race. Not long ago I asked a man where a certain German lived. That man said to me, "You know, he is a German, and we should take our hats off to Germans." I said, "I always touch my hat in deep respect to every race, but I take my hat off to none." He said to me, "They are above us in matters of culture, education and scientific development. What is your profession?" My reply was, "Well, I am a medical doctor." My friend said, "Where would the profession of medicine be without the Germans"—and he began to take his hat off. As a matter of fact he took his hat off two or three times, and asked me to follow suit. But I said, "Oh, no. Do you know about the plagues which have taken place in this world, and cut people down by millions? Do you know about smallpox, and do you know that the person who made a cure possible was Doctor Edward Jenner? Do you know that the circulation of blood was discovered by Harvey, an Englishman? Supposing I were called out to attend a case of appendicitis, and I had to go to a hospital, what would call the hospital for me but the invention of Alexander Graham Bell of Brantford, an old country Scot? Then, when I got to the hospital, who would disinfect all instruments used in the operation but Lord Lister of Edinburgh? When I put the patient on the operating table to be chloroformed, who gave us chloroform, if it was not old Doctor George Ferguson of Glasgow, the discoverer of anaesthetics? When I got my cheque for performing the operation, who would be behind that cheque? It would be William Paterson, a tramp from the highlands of Scotland, the founder of the Bank of England and all other banks."

We have a fine race of people, and we do not take our hats off to any. This ought to be made known. We do not tell our own people about our race, and I hate to see anyone sitting over here in sham modesty while we hear the Germans prate about their accomplishments, their culture and even their songs and music—and I do not like any of it very much. They say, of course, that it is better than ours, but so far as I am concerned it is not.

May I draw the attention of the house to the singing we hear from Toronto. Probably I should not criticize that city, but if one listens to his radio he will soon find that they do not even know how to sing *God Save The King*. They do not know the difference between "the king" and "our king". We must remember that when we sing "God save our king", the word "our" is the possessive, personal adjective, and refers to the personal king. When, as in the last line of our national anthem, we sing "God save the king", we are singing something altogether different. The expression "the king" is more comprehensive, including the British people, our institutions, our courts, our churches and everything else. But in spite of this fact we hear singing in churches and lodges—I was going to say in Toronto, a place where I often go—which does not seem to take notice of this fact; they sing the last line, "God save our king." While in Windsor I heard a judge of the supreme court singing the words "God save our king" in the last line of the national anthem, and I said to him, "Don't you think you are a little off the tune?"

I stand to attention when I hear the singing of "God save our king", but I stand doubly to attention when I hear the words "God save the king." And here is another thing: When we are singing *God Save The King* we mean that we are trying to cooperate with every form of democracy. Yet when our Prime Minister was elected by the largest majority ever accorded any prime minister, the men down in this front row got up and told him to get out. They would not stand for his being Prime Minister; they wanted someone else in his place. I say that those men who wanted the Prime Minister to vacate his seat after the people elected him were all off the tune, and they did not understand the meaning of *God Save The King*.

There is a vast difference between "the king" and "our king", and we ought to recognize that difference. One should listen to those churches in Toronto. I did so, the last Sunday I was home. They were singing, "God save our king", and I said, "Oh, they are just those Irish Orangemen over in Parkdale." But my wife was listening to the radio in the evening, and she heard the congregation at Old St. Andrew's singing the same way. So heaven help Toronto if they make no distinction between "our king" and "the king"! They sang it wrong in both churches.

When we sing *God Save The King* we should try to harmonize and put that thought into every speech made in the house. The House of Commons should be a great choir. When we rise in our places to make our speeches, are we singing *God Save The King*, or are we trying to disrupt? Are we trying to condemn the government unnecessarily, or are we trying to harmonize through the government a spirit of democracy and cooperation? Are we trying to sing *God Save The King*? I hear it sung in the churches, and I can think of no place it should be sung more frequently than right here in the House of Commons. This is the place where we should sing *God Save The King*. Every time a man rises in his place, I say, "Is he singing *God Save The King* when he is making his speech?" I appreciate the fact that frequently he is, but sometimes he is not.

I should not criticize Toronto, but its club rooms are dangerous places. I have great respect for the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson): I knew him years ago, and I consider him a noble leader. But he went to Toronto, and spent a night or two in those club rooms. After coming out he gave one of the silliest speeches possible, making references to friendship between the Prime Minister and the United States. It was a sort of political ballyhoo, and was done for political purposes. That speech was one of the hardest blows, not to him personally, but to the Conservative party.

The sooner we get together and realize that we have leaders, that we must stand behind them, that we must support them until the war is over, the better for all of us. After the war is over, do what you like with them; vote them out when election day comes. That is the way to sing *God Save The King*.

The reeve in my home town is the hotel keeper. At the time of election I fight against him, but as soon as he is elected I shake hands with him and say "God save the king"—to myself, of course. I am a coroner and a health officer. I can send a man a summons to serve on a jury. If I am going to sing *God Save The King* I should enquire from him if service on the jury meets with his convenience. I should not be a dictator. Then I have the right to expect cooperation. We must have cooperation so far as possible, whether we are in office or whether we are members of an opposition. If we are going

to sing *God Save The King* we must have cooperation and harmony. I sincerely hope that this will be the key-note of every speech made in the house. If we are not in tune with that sentiment, we should be, and should be ready at all times to sing *God Save The King*.

Mr. C. A. HENDERSON (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, being a new member of this house I have not taken up much of its time in debate. I have done most of my talking to private members, the acquaintance of whom I have tried to make in committees and party caucuses. I have taken most of my problems to the departmental offices. I have taken this course because I sit on this side of the house where we are in such great numbers. I have thought it best to leave the talking to older members, more especially when I consider the great cost of carrying on these debates. I had thought that this debate would have been finished in three days, but it is now going into its third week. I am reminded of the advice given me by a good friend out west who quoted from a biography of Disraeli. When Disraeli was Prime Minister of Great Britain he was asked by a new member if he thought he should speak at the first session. Mr. Disraeli said: "Well, on the whole I think you had better not, for it is always better to have the people wonder why you do not speak in the house than to have them wonder why you do." I think that is pretty good advice for a new member.

I represent the constituency of Kindersley in Saskatchewan, named for Lord Kindersley, president of the Hudson's Bay company. I desire to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his government upon the contents of the speech from the throne. The mover and the seconder of the address in reply, the Prime Minister and the ministers of the government who have spoken in this debate have made a splendid contribution in outlining our war effort to date and our future war plans. I came to this country some thirty-five or thirty-six years ago when thousands and thousands of immigrants were going into western Canada. We went 85 to 150 miles south of the railroad at Battleford and we considered ourselves real pioneers in those days. Among the farmers who settled there were many business men and we all worked together. As additional lines of railway were put through the country, we endeavoured to build for the future. Villages were put up, and banks, lumber yards, schools, churches, hospitals, flour mills and so on were built. Under the leadership of the Hon. Mr. Motherwell, the Hon. George Langley, the Hon. Mr. Dunning and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) we were helped by the provincial government to erect creameries and cooperative elevators. Manitoba under the leadership of the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) and others carried on a somewhat similar programme.

We ploughed straight furrows; we tamed the wild lands; we built our homes and erected better schools, universities and so on. We tried to build a citizenship that would be an asset to all Canada. As time went on, more railroads were built through the district, and soon the 150 mile stretch I mentioned was crossed by eleven lines of railways. Mr. James J. Hill said that if these lands were properly tilled and cultivated, they would provide tonnage for a railroad not to exceed a distance of ten to eleven miles on either side.

In those days we had markets and we prospered. We got along quite well until 1911 when we had our first setback. Our lands depreciated at least $5 an acre under the defeat of reciprocity. The United States was the first to pass the act, but they left it on the books for a number of years and we enjoyed their markets and got on splendidly until 1917. At that time more markets were opened abroad and we were asked to produce more products. The west was opened up to a greater extent than it should have been. Some of the lighter land was broken that never should have been broken. In the district where I am farming we have heavy land, dark chocolate in colour, known as edge-grain soil. This soil ranges in depth from fifteen to ninety feet and is able to store considerable moisture. We shall be able to produce crops on this land for many years provided it is properly tilled and cultivated.

Conditions changed considerably during the dry years and during the economic war that preceded this physical war. We lost our markets during the depression and now we are faced with accumulated debts. Many of our farmers have had to go on relief while others have lived on their capital and profits made during better times. We had to ask for debt adjustments and readjustments. Banks and schools closed and many lost their homes. Federal, provincial and voluntary debt adjustments have run into several millions. We have been seeking monetary reform, lower rates of interest and assisted markets, but we still have in mind the establishment of a central bank. We feel that we should have this because, when the war is over, we hope to be able to bring debtor and creditor together. Only by doing that shall we be able to settle with most of our creditors at two dollars to one on occasions.

With the help of these adjustments many of us were able to save our homes and we built up a morale that is becoming stronger day by day. The crops in 1939 were quite good and we managed to pay off some of our mortgage and machine debts. In the meantime, however, we have lost much money and many of our people. According to the last census the representation of Saskatchewan will be reduced by four, if the ratio with Quebec is applied. It would seem that our province is the dead-end province as it was called by one of the press representatives now sitting in the gallery. That may be the truth, but it hurts. We are, however, ready to stay on and win. This reduction in representation was referred to last night by the hon. member for Regina City (Mr. McNiven), and I have his permission to associate myself with what he has said. I think Saskatchewan should receive the same treatment as has been given to Ontario on two or three different occasions. That province has been able to maintain its membership at eighty-two members and, according to my figuring, based on the Quebec membership the Ontario membership should be only seventy-four. If something could be done to equalize the representation as between the east and the west, it would help us very much.

I have heard it said on the floor of this house that if we cannot get on, we should get out. Even though our numbers are fewer, we are ready to remain loyal to Canada. Even though it happened that we were no longer in the federation, we would still be loyal to the empire and would continue to deal with the motherland via the Hudson Bay railway and to fight Hitler to the end to prevent his entry into our wheatlands. We have preached Canadian citizenship to all our people. In fact I have been doing this work myself more or less from coast to coast. After all, we are all good, loyal citizens.

Perhaps I may be permitted at this time to say a word with regard to the Hudson Bay railway. If Jim Hill had been permitted to exercise the charter he asked for in the early days, he would have built up an empire in that north country. He would have opened up those mineral lands just as he opened up the lands in the lake Superior district, and all this would have been greatly to our advantage. The mineral wealth of the pre-Cambrian shield has hardly been scratched, yet the two or three mines operating there have justified the expenditure twofold, and in any event it has been very largely paid for by western Canada lands. There is ample power in the north, and if through scientific development and discovery we should be able to have that transferred, it would help us industrially. We have no great quarrel with labour and industry in this country. It is simply a question of agriculture having been the first to suffer and the last to recover.

I come now to the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act which has been referred to this afternoon, and which was passed under the administration of Mr. Bennett. Perhaps that is the act which my hon. friend opposite had in mind when he spoke of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. The Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, with its provisions extended under the present Minister of Agriculture, has done a lot of good, in the opening up of grazing pastures and the rehabilitation and reclaiming of many abandoned farm lands. Much more could be done along that line. Much more could be done for western Canada in the way of irrigation, if the waters were stored in Tramping Lake coulee and other large coulees. That would be better than paying money out for relief, and with irrigation we should be able to grow our feed, fodder and garden produce to make a livelihood on the prairies, without having to ask our eastern friends to come to our aid. The cheques that have been paid out by way of bonus have helped to raise the morale of our people and are much better than relief cheques. Rehabilitation would, I believe, be a splendid investment for the whole of Canada. We want to cooperate with all Canada, east and west, right across, in regard to agriculture, and so far as we are concerned we are quite prepared to assist the east with lower freight rates to aid in the movement of feed grain and fertilizer, and would support subsidies where necessary.

I believe that it would be a good thing to guarantee the price of live stock until one or two years after the war. I believe that would encourage our agriculturists to go into the raising of live stock more than they are doing to-day.

I should like to refer to the brief which was submitted recently to the wheat committee of the cabinet and the government by the 440 farmers from Saskatchewan, in which they asked for an initial payment of $1 a bushel for wheat, parity prices, and an amendment to the Prairie Farm Assistance Act as outlined by my colleague the member for Swift Current (Mr. Graham). I had his permission to be associated with him in that, and I shall save time now by not going into the matter in detail. In my portion of the country, for which I can speak, we have every confidence in the wheat committee of the cabinet, which was headed last year by the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar), the other members being the Minister of Finance (Mr.

Ilsley), the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon). We know they have our interests at heart just as they have at heart the interests of all Canada. They have a very difficult problem to handle, and we know, too, that they realize that our problem is great. We are not asking for anything unfair or that would make the west a burden on the treasury, but now after more than two years of war there is a great need for food for the armies, particularly in view of the one billion dollars worth of supplies that is being appropriated for Great Britain. During the first war the wheat board brought the price of our wheat down, but we believe the time has come when we should have fair play and a fair chance. We are quite prepared to cooperate with labour, with whom we have no quarrel at all.

Surely in the new order that is to come when the war is over, we shall be rid of tariffs and trade restrictions, as outlined by Prime Minister Churchill, President Roosevelt and our own Prime Minister, so that our goods will move freely into the world markets.

With regard to the plebiscite, I think that is the only honourable way of dealing with the situation. The plebiscite is not definitely conscription as yet, but I think the hands of the government should be freed so that if the need for conscription arises, the government will be free to bring it in. So far as conscription being an issue in the last campaign is concerned, in my constituency it certainly was an issue. My opponent came out for conscription in his first address, while another opponent of mine was said to be a pacifist. I supported one hundred per cent total war, with a balanced agriculture and industry, and man-power sufficient to provide all the required equipment and to keep our supply lines open.

All things considered, I think our war effort has been a splendid one for a small nation of eleven million people. I think it would be well if we were more tolerant with one another, and then we should get on better, particularly with an educational propaganda, in which, as I have good reason to know, most of our French-Canadian members have been engaged over the weekends, as I myself have been doing in the west. The first volunteer we had in my constituency in this war was a Ukrainian, a returned man. We have many Germans there too. A German lad came to my farm to take my first boy's place. He was born in Germany and naturalized in this country. He afterwards volunteered and is now overseas. We require a united people, and I think we can accomplish that with proper educational propaganda. We should be tolerant of our peoples, as Churchill is tolerant of Eire, south Africa, India and all the peoples of the British commonwealth. I listened to his speech the other night when he spoke of divisions among us, and I think we should take that lesson to heart.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that we now have Japan arrayed against us, but we have the United States in the war on our side, with all her great resources, and I do not have any fear that we shall be able to equip China and Russia and the million and a half Poles who are anxious to be armed. I am sure also, without any question of doubt, that we shall be able to complete the job. I shall have pleasure in supporting the government on the main motion.

Mr. J. E. FERRON (Berthier-Maskinongè) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the session of 1942 offers a very strange spectacle. That the opposition should blame the government because the speech from the throne does not provide for conscription for overseas service and that two or three conscriptionists in the Liberal ranks should join in this blame, is in no way abnormal. But that a dozen members professing anti-conscriptionist views, as I do myself, should rise against the government because the same speech from the throne leads them to expect recourse to conscription for overseas service, and that they should vote with the avowedly conscriptionist opposition, is something that cannot but disturb a mind as little complicated as mine.

I would not for anything in the world wish to offend a single one of these hon. gentlemen. I do not question their sincerity and I know they will pardon my telling them in all frankness that I fail to understand their conduct. I cannot understand their making a profession of confidence in the Prime Minister and ending it by saying, "I have my doubts." I cannot comprehend their making eloquent assertions that there is in this country only one party leader capable of giving to the nation a government that is wise and that truly conforms to the aspirations of those who really seek national unity, and then declaring that they will not support that leader. They describe as nefarious the policy advocated by the Conservative opposition and its leader, but when it comes to voting the address in reply to the speech from the throne they intend to place themselves at the side of the latter and to vote for and with him.

It is this confusion, Mr. Speaker, which prompts me to rise in my place and explain the vote I shall shortly be called upon to give. My views have not changed since the 1940

election. I then solemnly pledged myself to oppose any measure providing for conscription of the youth of my country for service overseas, and to-day I say to the leader of the Conservative opposition (Mr. Hanson), "Go no further!" I say to him that he shall not pass with his amendment which contains the following clause:

> Completely mobilize the wealth and material resources and, on a selective basis, the full man and woman power of the nation, to the end that the nation may wage total war in any theatre of war.

There is no doubt that this motion, particularly after the explanations subsequently given by the hon. gentleman who moved it, is one for complete conscription for overseas service. Moreover, it involves non-confidence in the only government in which I have confidence. For similar reasons I shall vote against the amendment moved by the leader of the C.C.F., the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) who likewise demands "total mobilization of wealth, industry and finance, as well as human resources."

Having voted on two occasions against motions requesting conscription for overseas service, my views in the matter can admit of no doubt.

I shall now revert to the address in reply to the speech from the throne. What does it contain? I see in it three main propositions: first, an enormous and total effort for our national defence, accompanied by a thousand sacrifices to protect our territory and help our allies resist the enemy across the seas; second, improved national selective service; third, the plebiscite.

Regarding the first proposition, I admit, Mr. Speaker, that the words "effort" and "sacrifice" are not very attractive. But thinking of the axis menace which is daily becoming graver, thinking of the enemy submarines prowling close to our shores, seeing our freedom in jeopardy and also pondering upon the value of this freedom which I heard my venerable parish priest, Canon D. Baril, appraise from the pulpit in the following words: "Never forget that under the shade of the British flag we enjoy a greater freedom than if we were free"; I would fear that if I gave a negative vote the people of my constituency and the people of my province, who want to neglect nothing to properly defend their homes, their farms, their churches, their parochial and municipal institutions and, above all, their freedom, would reproach me some day for not having agreed to those many sacrifices. In any event, I prefer being sorry for having done too much than feeling remorse at having done too little.

With respect to national selective service—for the defence of our country, be it understood—I strongly approve such a measure. I support it because it will allow farmers' sons who are indispensable to the operation of their farms—they are very numerous in my constituency—to remain on the land and produce the foodstuffs required to feed our armed forces, our factory workers and also our allies who are fighting the same fight as we are. I am in favour of selective service because I wish our hardy woodsmen to return to the forest at the proper season and get out the lumber so greatly needed for shipbuilding and countless other war purposes. In a word, I want every one to be kept where he is the most useful, in the best interests of this country.

I now come, Mr. Speaker, to one of the most controverted matters, the plebiscite. If I were to consider the feeling in my constituency as reflecting the opinion of Canada as a whole, I think I could say without any fear of being mistaken that a plebiscite is not necessary. On behalf of my constituents I would tell you: Our people want to win the war. They want to do their utmost to preserve our freedom. They are willing to accept the greatest sacrifices for the defence of our territory and they are voluntarily enlisting in great numbers to help our allies overseas. But among the numerous means of achieving victory, one only is distasteful to them: compulsion as regards overseas service. We have done our duty so far, and we are more than ever determined to do it in future. But my constituency is not the only one in the dominion, my province is not the only one in the confederation, and since the last general election many important events have happened. More than a dozen nations have been overrun by the enemy, the United States, then neutral, is now at war and Hong Kong and Singapore have fallen. In view of this situation, could I voice any objection to a question being put to the Canadian people? As regards the reply to be given, I intend to tell my constituents: "Consider the situation as it is to-day, and analyse all the facts until the date of the plebiscite. With your usual good judgment try to foresee the possible trend of the enemy action and then without passion and prejudice, vote according to the dictates of your conscience". That is the course I shall follow myself.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and to summarize what I have said, let me state that I have always been, that I still am and that I shall always be in favour of sparing no effort for our national defence. I am opposed to conscription for overseas service, because it is

intrinsically recognized as harmful to Canadian unity and further because it has been proven quite unnecessary.

I shall vote against both amendments because they are in conflict with the latter principle, and also because they have the character of motions of want of confidence in a government to which the opposition itself cannot direct any sound criticism.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the address because I believe in preserving national unity; this I think I can do only by supporting my leader the Prime Minister as well as the man who has assumed leadership in my province, the honourable the Minsiter of Public Works and Transport (Mr. Cardin).

Before I resume my seat, I may say that if I had the needed authority, I would direct to my friends and colleagues from Quebec a last appeal as follows: You as everyone else have the duty of looking into the future. But on the other hand, you have no right to ignore the past of the two great leaders, I have just named. Both have reached their second quarter of a century of public life. And their past speaks for itself. With you I beseech Providence not to remove them from our midst, but when, to my great comfort, I see the principles of Laurier and Lapointe ever advocated and ever triumphant, I say: those are not men who die forever. Their pleas for union, harmony and common sense remain alive in our memory.

I have just mentioned the name of the Right Hon. Mr. Lapointe. Tribute has already been paid to the memory of that great man; and in words that expressed my own thoughts much more fittingly than I could voice them myself. However it is my desire that the vote I shall give in a few hours, at the side of his son the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Lapointe) should be a tribute to his memory and to the principles of tolerance and harmony to which he devoted his life.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. E. H. CORMAN (Wentworth): In rising to make my contribution in this debate my first words must be of congratulation to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I think the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) did very well, as did also the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald). May I add that I have a very high regard for the hon. member for Brantford, since his riding lies adjacent to the constituency of Wentworth which I have the honour to represent in this house.

Wentworth, as every hon. member knows, has been represented in this house for a long time, but this is the first occasion in some years when it has been represented from this side of the house. I do not, however, take the stand that I am here to speak exclusively for the Liberal party. I feel that I also represent the county of Wentworth as a whole.

May I at this point pay tribute to the late Gordon Wilson who represented this riding for twenty-four years. Although we disagreed politically, the late Gordon Wilson was a very fine man and highly regarded in his community.

Let me at the beginning inform the house of my views on the big issues now before us. I am personally in favour of total selective service for overseas or anywhere in the world. In that view I think I represent the great majority in my county, both inside and outside the Liberal ranks. Wentworth has a record of which any county might be proud. More than one hundred and twenty-five years ago people in the county of Wentworth were repelling a foreign foe. Her sons have taken part in every fight since, and the contribution she made to the first great war was no small or inconsiderable one. In Wentworth county we take the stand that the fight for Canada does not begin on the shores of Canada. Wentworth county boys have fought all over the world and are willing and anxious to do so at this time.

In making the statement that I am in favour of total selective service I am not influenced in any way by the committee of two hundred whose headquarters seem to be in Toronto and who apparently are backed by influential mining interests. As I see it, their patriotic zeal is not so much impelled by love of country as by love of power. I personally do not admire their super-patriotism; they are apparently willing to sit behind their golden towers on Bay street and try to force the boys to go and fight for them. It is all very well to wrap the union jack about their wealthy well-fed persons and call on someone else's sons to defend their wealth. I think it very fine that we should have total selective service, but not because this specially privileged group wants it. Nor am I so sure that conscription is their real goal. I think conscription is really a red herring across the trail, which, if the signs were marked properly, would point to a return to the abuses of the last war. The committee of "two hundred" dress their front windows with conscription, but let us see what they have in the back of the shop. Concealed under the counters is

national government, and with that enormous power, and a little further back but ready to bring out later are such things as abolition of the excess profits tax and the destruction of the price ceiling. This committee of two hundred, who use conscription as a come-on, also have in mind the return of a great many things which made the last war linger in an unpleasant way in the nostrils of not a few people. We want no shameless exploitation of the war to make a new crop of millionaires, and we want no conscription under these terms. The purpose of this conscription ruse, as initiated from the "two hundred," is to get the gold crowd into power. If they get their way, the rest of us will be reduced as quickly as possible to economic vassalage. We shall become hewers of wood and drawers of water to Bay street.

I said I favour total selective service, and I do. But it should not be obtained by the means the Toronto group seek, namely, to ram it down our throats like a gestapo order. The proper way is to obtain it through a plebiscite. This government made certain definite pledges in 1940. I am not going to linger long over this point since it has all been gone over so often, but the government now asks to be relieved of its non-conscription pledges. When that release is obtained, as I believe it will be, then the government will be free to do as it sees fit.

When that release is obtained I intend to press for total selective service anywhere it is required at that time. Let there be no doubt how and where I stand on this. I want to see total selective service put into force by the will of the people of Canada; not instituted by a little group of fascist-minded people who would split the country wide open to get their way. It may be that in the matter of total selective service, properly and constitutionally introduced, I would go further than they, but I want to go about it in the democratic way, the Mackenzie King way.

Here I should like to read an article published in the Hamilton *Spectator* on January 23, 1942, in which the editor of that paper comments on the government's decision to take the plebiscite. The Hamilton *Spectator* is an independent newspaper; its views are read and respected by many people in Canada. The policy of the *Spectator* is directed by Mr. Fred Ker, an outstanding citizen of Hamilton, who has always been very pro-British and pro-empire, for which he is to be admired. His opinions are highly regarded. I quote the editorial:

Prime Minister King will seek an expression of the will of the people to determine their attitude on the issue of conscripting Canada's man-power for overseas service in this war. A plebiscite will be submitted to them in which they will be asked to release the government from any past commitments which restricted the methods of raising men in this dominion for military service.

In resolving to pursue this course, it is difficult to see where the Prime Minister is impairing this country's war effort or doing violence to empire unity. Rather does it appear that he is striving to prevent the very disunity and bitter division which some of his partisan opponents are charging him with fomenting.

Mr. King's course should appeal to all even-tempered persons as a reasonable one, and also the most satisfactory way of settling this issue. After all, there is no safer tribunal in a democracy than the people themselves. Their voice ought therefore to be heard; and the premier has ensured that it shall be heard. His present position is consistent with his past stand on this question. On the outbreak of war he told parliament that no conscription for overseas service would be enacted so long as his government was in power. Later he again said that he further construed the verdict of the people, in the general election of March, 1940, as a mandate from them that they were opposed to conscription for overseas service. In the face of those facts, he should not be expected to repudiate his pledges. Were he to do so, he might invite widespread discord and reap serious results. The Conservative party leadership and candidates made no issue of Mr. King's position at the last election. They stood indeed on the same anti-conscription ground.

The speech from the throne implies that an affirmative response is sought from the people; the government asks to be "released from any obligations arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service." Canada's war effort to date has not been either feeble or meagre; so far as it has gone, it has been wholehearted and generous. That Canada can enlarge this effort is admitted, and plans are now well advanced by the government to gear the country for total war. A policy of national selective service will soon be in operation whereby the federal authorities aim to place every available person in the job for which he or she is best fitted to serve. The human and material resources of the dominion will be totally mobilized to intensify the production of munitions and foodstuffs; the armed forces will be expanded, all with the purpose of giving the fullest aid to Britain of which this country is capable. Financial provisions are also to be made on an unprecedented scale, and the wealth of Canada is to be drawn upon by an orderly and equitable process to the utmost limit of its capacity.

Premier King's government need thus make no apology for the war-time leadership it has given the Canadian people. But it is not disposed to carry that leadership beyond the limits of the mandate the people have given it as regards conscription for overseas service—not until the people themselves authorize this step. If the plebiscite rejects compulsory selective service for overseas the fat will indeed be in the fire and it is hard to see how either a national election or a new parliamentary alignment that would disregard the plebiscite and enact conscription regardless of consequences,

could be avoided. Certain it is that one way or another we must have compulsory selection for service on any battlefront in the world.

Let me quote also part of another editorial from the Hamilton *Spectator* of February 10, which was written after the recent by-elections:

> The outcome, on the whole, is gratifying, inasmuch as it reflects an ability on the part of the people not to lose sight of the vital issues even in campaigns that were marked by such excesses of strife, party cleavage, class prejudice and confusion as these contests were. Representative government still means something in Canada, and the electors who voted yesterday have shown that they are quite capable of discharging their responsibility and not becoming lost in a foggy atmosphere of extreme partyism. In three constituencies, at least, they make it plain that their faith still reposes in the administration of Prime Minister King; and they have given him a mandate not only to carry on, but to prosecute Canada's war effort with increased vigour and adopt every measure that will contribute to that end.

The editorials I have just quoted represent the thought and feeling around Hamilton, and I have placed them on record in order that everyone in Canada may know the fair-mindedness of the press in the vicinity of Hamilton and their attitude toward the government's decision to take a plebiscite.

To turn to the question of money, it may become necessary that all profits be conscripted. We may reach the point where we shall so desperately need money to carry on this war that we must resort to this extreme expedient. We may have to take all capital, wherever we can find it, however we can get it, to prosecute this war to a successful conclusion. So we may have to have fiscal conscription, too. But this is nothing new or drastic; all these powers have already been given us under the National Resources Mobilization Act. We have only to take what is already ours. But we hear precious little from this total war group about this kind of conscription. Could it possibly be that, fearing the present government might just do that very thing, they want to get into power in time to stop that move? Conscript the boys by all means, they cry, but hands off our dividends!

I want to point out to those who seek conscription so eagerly and violently that conscription is only one part of a part of our war effort. The trouble is this. There are quite a few people in this country who think that the proper way to fight a war is to get a lot of men together in a hurry and send them some place; it does not matter where you send them, or why, or how; just send them, and the war problem is solved. To me, this ostrich-like attitude gets nobody anywhere.

First of all let us look at the man-power situation. We are already ahead of the last war, in the number of soldiers we have available for service anywhere in the world; in other words, we are better fitted in man-power in this war than in the last. But that is only part of it. In the last war our air service was very small in numbers. This time we already have raised over 100,000 men, and a steady stream of recruits is on the way. I do not have to emphasize the magnificent series of airports developed all over Canada since the beginning of the war. The erection of these is due entirely to the untiring work of the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) and the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power). They deserve great credit, and I believe the people of Canada are realizing this more and more each day. It is a mighty effort in itself, and will do much to win this war, since it has been shown in past battles that an army without air force protection is helpless against the enemy. I sincerely believe that the air force will play a very large part in our future campaigns. Let us pay homage and respect to the gallant boys who fly against the enemy, especially the brave lads who fly the bombers over Germany. The people of Canada and of the world owe them their deepest gratitude.

In addition to the activities of the air force, let us not forget the activities of the Royal Canadian Navy. In our navy we have hundreds of ships manned by the gallant boys of Canada. Every day we read of their exploits and see where some Canadian destroyer or corvette has left its mark upon the enemy. According to figures recently released, we have over 30,000 men enlisted in Canada's navy, and it is expected that another 13,000 will be added this year, as soon as ships can be provided. The people of Canada, especially those who live inland, do not realize the enormous work our navy is doing. It is indeed a big war effort in itself; and if we only knew the hardships and privations that these men undergo, we would surely take off our hats to these gallant seamen.

Now let us come to agriculture. My constituency is mainly an agricultural one, and the contribution our farmers are making, not only in Wentworth but, I am sure, in every other constituency in Canada, is a vast one. To feed the defence forces of Canada is a huge war effort in itself, let alone sending enormous quantities of wheat, pork, eggs, cheese and canned fruits and vegetables to Britain to feed our brothers in arms overseas. The farmers are certainly doing their part. May I interject at this point that I believe the government should have some yardstick

for the postponement of the training of farmers' sons who are really producing agricultural products for the winning of the war. For instance, I would suggest that the last boy on the farm should not be taken; and in the case of a large farm, where two boys are producing twice as much, I think there should be a further postponement. I feel sure that if a yardstick for postponement were established, there would be less confusion in the minds of our farmer friends as to the calling of their sons for military training. As it is now, they cannot get help on the farms and are worried continually that their sons will be called, leaving them with no help. I agree with the policy of the government that men in industry, really doing a war job in the manufacture of munitions, should receive postponement of training, and I believe this is being done at the present time. I would suggest also that the age limit in the proclamation be raised to thirty-five, because I know there are many single men in Canada above the age of twenty-four who are doing very little to support our war effort. I believe these men should be called before farmers' sons are interfered with, and I would ask the government to take this into serious consideration.

Part of my riding is one of the most highly industrialized portions of Canada. At a later date, and in a later speech, I hope to make more extended reference to Wentworth county, of which I am proud. But I may say now that the workers in Wentworth who are turning out the sinews of war very much resent the allegations of the total war committee, who see no other effort in this war but military enlistment. The workers believe that the man behind the man behind the gun is important also. I do not intend to dwell on the war worker unduly, but I do say that Canada's whole war production has been magnificent. Starting from nothing we have reached a productive capacity little short of amazing. There has been no industrial development like it in the history of this or perhaps any other country. This is due to the management of the present government, and especially to the work of the Minister of Munitions and Supply. If you seek to blame any administration for its shortcomings, as the opposition is only too ready to do, then you must also give credit to the administration under which such vast strides have been made.

Then there is the question of finance. To me this is a highly important part of our effort, and great credit must be given the government for their assistance to Great Britain at this time, in the gift of a billion dollars and the lending of $700,000,000 without interest. I have not time to go into the question of the financing of this war, but it is reaching unbelievable proportions. The time may come when the money system should be changed. For instance, why not have an internal currency separate and apart from our external currency for the payment of imports and exports? In other words, why not arrange with the other allied nations to agree on an allied dollar, to be used for international purposes only? If we had such a system, we could do pretty well what we liked with our internal dollar, controlled, of course, by loans and taxation. With the government's present policy of a price ceiling, we could have controlled inflation.

While dealing with the subject of finance, I should like to protest in the strongest possible terms against the decision of the wartime prices and trade board to subsidize the importation of canned grapefruit juice. In the first place, this commodity should be placed on schedule 1 under the Foreign Exchange Conservation Act, and therefore would be embargoed. However, as it is allowable for imports, I can see no reason why the people of Canada as a whole should pay somewhere around $200,000 a year subsidy to United States importers.

Mr. GRAYDON: Better give it to the growers.

Mr. CORMAN: I would lift the price ceiling and let those who use canned grapefruit juice pay for it. When we have so many good fruit juices for sale in Canada, such as tomato juice, apple juice, loganberry juice, carrot juice and many other juices, I cannot see why the importation of canned grapefruit juice should be encouraged.

In conclusion, I want to repeat that I am for total selective service of man-power, and woman-power if necessary, to win this war. I agree to some extent with the subamendment in believing that if we are to have conscription of man-power we should also have conscription of wealth and industry. I believe that everyone should put everything he has into a common effort to win this war. I also believe that any young man's life is worth more than all the money in the country, and that we should have equal sacrifice as nearly as possible for everyone. I have sufficient faith in our leader, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), to carry us through to victory, and I would ask the people of Canada at this time to place their faith in him, because I am convinced he is the only man in Canada who can keep Canada united successfully to prosecute this war.

Five times my leader has been returned to parliament by the will of the people. I have, therefore, more faith in the man who has had five mandates from the people than anyone else in Canada I know of. I intend to vote for the plebiscite, and ask the people of this country to vote "yes," so that the government's hands will be free to do what they think is best for our nation.

Mr. L. D. TREMBLAY (Dorchester): Mr. Speaker, since 1940 it has seldom been my privilege to take my seat in the house. I must admit that while I may be almost a veteran in the house, I almost feel that I am making another maiden speech, and that indeed I am desperately young.

May I apologize to hon. members for not having had the time in preparing my few remarks that I should have liked to have. I take great comfort however in seeing you, Mr. Speaker, in the chair. For the first time in my experience in the house I am going to attempt to deliver my speech in English, without the aid of notes.

Since June, 1940, I do not believe I have been in the house more than half a dozen times, and many changes have occurred since that date. May I take a moment, however, to add an expression of deep regret upon my failure to see in his seat, where particularly we Quebeckers were so happy and proud to see him, the late Minister of Justice, the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. In these times of struggle, these tragic times, he made a great contribution to Canada's effort. In Quebec he was not only considered our leader, but recognized as a great Canadian. When we fail to see him in his seat we are indeed reminded of our great loss.

I had not intended at first to speak in this debate. From the camp in which I am now on duty I followed as best I could the trend of discussions in the house. I have been gratified and happy to see so many of my French-speaking fellow citizens from Quebec voicing their views and, under circumstances such as we have to-day, they did well to do so.

It is not my intention to add anything new to the debate, because I believe practically all shades of feeling in Quebec have been expressed, and other hon. members from other parts of Canada have spoken for their constituencies. I wish, however, to be somewhat outspoken concerning my stand on several points which I shall now detail.

First, I wish to consider Canada's war effort. Then I shall discuss Quebec's participation, and make some observations about Quebec, a province which in my estimation is not understood in every quarter of our country. I desire to point out that not only am I opposed to compulsory military service for overseas, but in such opposition I am expressing the views of my fellow citizens in Quebec. I wish to say why that is so.

Let me add that we shall carry on. We are doing our very best, our utmost, for the great cause of civilization, the cause of freedom of mankind which our leaders in Quebec and other leaders across Canada have asked us to support, to fight for. I shall also say why we take this stand.

For the past several months I have been stationed outside my own province, and for the last four months I have been living in close proximity to the queen, and so greatly discussed, city of Toronto. I am perfectly happy to be there, and I am doing my utmost to understand a mentality different from that found in Quebec. As a matter of fact I sometimes have the impression that one is as far from the other as the north pole is from the south. If narrow-minded citizens are to be found in the province of Quebec, they are just as likely to be found in the queen city, in any other province of the dominion or in any place in the world.

On January 26 the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) attempted to answer the question that everyone in Canada seemed to be asking—what is Canada doing; what is our navy; what is our army; what is our air force? This question was being asked during the election campaign, and I find the answer given by the Prime Minister reported on page 36 of *Hansard*. He said in connection with our navy:

> At the outbreak of war, there were some 20 ships and less than 2,000 men in the Royal Canadian Navy.
>
> At the beginning of 1940 the navy had grown to 80 ships, and over 5,000 men; at the beginning of 1941 the numbers had risen to 175 ships, and 14,800 men. At the beginning of this year the navy comprised over 350 ships and 27,600 men.

With reference to the army he said:

> At the outbreak of war the permanent active militia, as Canada's regular army was then called, included about 4,500 men. By the end of 1939, the Canadian Active Service Force, to give the army its name at that date, had increased to 64,000 men. The first Canadian division had just arrived in Britain.
>
> At the close of 1940, the active army included almost 170,000 men. A Canadian corps of two divisions had already been formed in Britain. Canadian troops were also on active service in Newfoundland, the British West Indies and Iceland.
>
> At the close of 1941, there were more than 260,000 men in the Canadian active army, enlisted for service in any part of the world. About half this number were on active service outside Canada. A third infantry division, an

armoured division, an army tank brigade, forestry troops, and other specialized units, and thousands of reinforcements were in Britain, in addition to the original corps of two divisions.

About the air force he said:

At the outbreak of war the active strength of the Royal Canadian Air Force was some 4,000, all ranks. By the close of 1939, the strength had risen to over 8,000; by the close of 1940, it had reached 43,000; by the close of 1941, it exceeded 100,000 men.

Is that the total of Canada's war effort? I could read pages and pages of facts cited by the right hon. the Prime Minister, which demonstrate that Canada's war effort is large and magnificent. Its magnitude has been recognized and praised by people outside Canada as well as throughout the world. The Prime Minister referred to another aspect of our war effort, as reported on pages 35 and 37 of *Hansard*. He stressed the importance of our contribution in food, munitions, machines, ships, aircraft, tanks and other supplies of all kinds. Canada's war effort in these items is surprising and amazing. As I said, we have had testimonials from outside Canada, and we find one in the Toronto *Telegram*, that paper so often spoken of. Commenting upon a visit of what they termed key men to Toronto arsenals and munitions plants, the *Telegram* had this to say on January 26:

Key men of democracy's arsenal pay Toronto surprise visit.

Munitions experts from U.S. tour Toronto war plants are impressed with work.

"Most encouraging," Roosevelt's personal representative says—praise for women.

Here is what Milo Perkins, personal representative of President Roosevelt had to say:

"Our inspection of your plants was very interesting," he said. "We covered a lot of territory in the brief time at our disposal. I was particularly pleased with the plant of Research Enterprises Limited. It is a manufacturer's paradise. It is just what a plant should look like. The trouble with many of our plants is that they are old and have not always the modern machinery we saw to-day.

I was also greatly impressed by the number of young women working in the plants we visited. They all seemed capable and intelligent. They appear to be fine types of citizens who are doing important jobs and doing them well."

These experts stated that they had learned a lot in their few hours' visit to some of our war plants. The article continues:

The size and production capacity of the plants inspected yesterday was both surprising and encouraging, Mr. Currie, the president's representative, said.

"We have learned a lot which we can't discuss at this time," he added. "I will say, however, that it is most encouraging to the people of the United States to realize how much Canada is capable of doing towards our common cause, in the Pacific and in the Atlantic."

[Mr. Tremblay.]

Testimonials of that kind are much more comforting than some of the speeches which were made in some of the constituencies in the last by-elections. They are more comforting than some of the things we heard from a gentleman who has been in public life but who, I hope, is not likely to be in public life very soon again. He belittled Canada's effort, so much so that true, loyal Canadians had reason to be ashamed and veil their faces. Fortunately that gentleman encountered defeat. Then why ask for conscription? Why give the world the impression, or at least try to give the impression, because as a matter of fact you cannot fool the world, that Canada is not doing its utmost? Why deny the facts? Why insist on having conscription? A headline on the other side of the very same page of the very same newspaper might help us to understand why. The article is entitled, "Defence, excess profits and corporation taxes said in line for boost—Canada's war financing problem also likely to bring further controls on buying." Why should the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) tax excess profits heavily? Why should the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) put a limit on contractors' profits? Was the Canadian government not doing that already? It is a hundred chances to one that but for that gentleman to whom I have referred we would never have heard about conscription at a time when things were evidently going very nicely and when Canada should have been more than proud of the gigantic effort we were making. Why bring up this conscription question which, it has been said in this house by some of my fellow members from the province of Quebec, could only bring about misunderstanding and hurt Canada's war effort as a whole?

In the province of Quebec we have many a reason and every reason to be not only happy but very proud indeed of the efforts of our French-speaking province in this war. May I quote what the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Mutch) said the other day, as reported at page 250 of *Hansard* of February 2. He was speaking of Canada's efforts during the last war compared with this war and said:

I am reminded of figures which we sometimes forget, that of all those gallant gentlemen who went in the name of Canada in the last war, I believe only about 125,000 were Canadian-born.

In the province of Quebec, Mr. Speaker, we can say that we are all Canadian-born. In the other English-speaking provinces of the dominion, in the city of Toronto, for instance, a large proportion of the citizens came to Canada quite recently, within the last ten or fifteen or twenty or thirty years. They were born overseas. Some have been born in Canada of parents who came from overseas.

I perfectly understand the feelings of these citizens of Canada and can well understand their anxiety in matters where Great Britain or the British empire is deeply concerned. I have sometimes been shocked at hearing what I had considered good Canadians talk of this Canada of ours as "this country". Evidently their affections, their heart and soul, were first of all with the old land, England. Their parents, their brothers and sisters and other members of their families may be over there.

But with the citizens of Quebec province it is different. In Quebec, especially in the rural constituencies such as Dorchester county, which I have the honour to represent, practically every citizen's father is lying in the parish cemetery. His grandfather might lie there, and his great grandfather. We are rooted in the Canadian soil and have been for two or three centuries. We have no other country. We have no motherland except Canada. Canada is our only motherland. It has been said that we in the province of Quebec are not world-minded. We cannot be. Nor are we empire-minded. We are Canada-minded, and it must be said too that we are a bit Quebec-minded. Sometimes I have had the question put to me: What is the matter with Quebec? Well, here is one answer, and I hope when I have given it, that whenever the question is asked again throughout this Canada of ours, what is the matter with Quebec? We might answer with another question: What is the matter with you? Quebec, a province composed of wholly Canadian-born, has given to the navy up to October 31, 1941, 4,077 recruits; to the army, almost 50,000 recruits; to the air force, almost 800 officers and to other ranks of the air force over 11,000 voluntary recruits. I have been asked not to give exact figures, but we can put the total number of enlistments in all arms of the service as pretty close to 70,000.

We have had some handicaps; we surely have. May I quote from an article entitled "Language Difficulty" in *Maclean's* magazine of August 1, 1941, and let me say that I personally had experience of cases over a year and a half ago of many French-speaking electors—welders, electricians, radio operators and so forth—who wanted to join the Royal Canadian Air Force but were refused because they could not understand English. These are facts of which I know. This is what *Maclean's* magazine says:

Take, first, the air force. In setting forth qualifications for young men desirous of becoming pilots, observers, gunners and navigators, an educational standard was necessary. So one was written into the rules. It entailed, among other items, fluency in English, in which language the commonwealth countries happen to be conducting the war. Other yardsticks were required and these, too, were established. In general they may be described as those of the Ontario educational system. They were not set up by the politicians, but by the qualified top men of the Royal Canadian Air Force.

These are facts.

But the major language of Ontario is not the language of Quebec, and the education standards of Ontario are not those of Quebec either. Quebec schools of the higher learning have leaned from the time of their inception toward what are generally called the liberal arts. Not until June, 1941, for example, did Laval university produce a course leading to the degree of mining engineer satisfactory to the Corporation of Professional Engineers of Quebec. Ontario, on the other hand, carries the student along more rapidly in the subjects classed under the science heading.

That is one handicap. Nethertheless we can boast of this, and I may give the testimony of the provincial secretary of Quebec, speaking on November 24, 1941, of what is being done in that province:

Ships are now being built in Canada in such numbers and at such speed that soon our yards will be turning out a volume of tonnage comparable with that produced in England. Much of that shipbuilding is now being done in the province of Quebec.

You all know of the expansion of the Canadian navy: from thirteen vessels to about four hundred, in two years, is not a bad record. Not only have many of those vessels been built, but much of their equipment, including guns of various calibres, has been made right here in the province of Quebec. Ships have been manned with competent officers and crews found and trained on the banks of the St. Lawrence river.

Rifled cannon barrels, as well as the controlling mechanism, consisting of wheels and cogs, springs and pinions and levers, are being fashioned by Quebec craftsmen who are conscious of their responsibility. They know that the failure of a part may mean the failure of a gun, and the failure of a gun may mean the failure of artillery support for their own brothers and sons locked in battle with the enemy.

High-speed tanks, too, are rolling off the assembly lines right here in Montreal. . . . In Quebec we are producing more in a week than was produced in a month in the last war.

So much for what we are doing in a material way. Now, what about man-power? Quebec can justly boast that it provided the first full regiment of infantry in Canada. It was a French-Canadian regiment.

Le Régiment de Maisonneuve.

It was recruited to full strength under its gallant leader, Colonel Robert Bourassa, himself a veteran of the last war, and who unfortunately, after proceeding to England with his unit, has now been invalided back and lies here paralysed. He led the van of Canada in recruiting and the sympathy of all Canadians must go out to him now, to console him in his suffering.

His was the first regiment. The two regiments which followed in recruiting to full

strength were one from Ontario and the other one again from the province of Quebec. Several other regiments, both English-Canadian and French-Canadian, have gone from this province.

These are facts which are known to all and which it is right to recall in times like these.

That is what Quebec has done. Now, what is Quebec doing? We are increasing our production. We can boast of one plant in particular, which is being operated in Sorel, the city of the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin), which experts marvel at, and the war products of which are going all over the world. The premier of the province and all our leaders, religious, civil and political, have brought home to Quebec the ideals for which we and our allies are fighting. Recently the premier of Quebec said:

> More than ever determined that the war must bring us triumph, Canada's largest province is leaving no stone unturned in seeking means to have its share of the national effort in keeping with its important place in confederation. Its sons, worthy representatives of whom the old French province may well be proud, are serving under the colours on divers fronts. Behind them stands, solidly to a man, the whole population of their province, with an indomitable will that their effort under arms be rendered effective by the total employment of every resource of the home front—mines, forests, the land, production and service—to the great end of victory.
>
> Progress is enormous in every department of our governmental service and every domain of our economic life. Our proverbially sound business and industrial organization has been raised to unprecedented proportions, and in its entirety is being utilized in the battle for freedom.

Our beloved leader whose departure we regret so much, and whom I mentioned a while ago, led us towards this war effort, and we are proud of it. He fought prejudices wherever he met them, and we belong to his school. We are proud to be his disciples.

But there are things we cannot understand; things in which we cannot acquiesce. I have reference to the sort of appeal to prejudice which has been made in recent by-elections against the province of Quebec, belittling everything and ignoring totally the contribution of that province in the present war. One cannot believe for a minute that speeches such as that reported in the Toronto *Evening Telegram,* made by that dear Doctor Shields, at Aurora, can improve the situation in circumstances such as we are living under to-day. I would not care to put any of his divagations on *Hansard.*

Some hon. MEMBERS: Dispense.

Mr. TREMBLAY: But if such men really wanted to contribute to Canada's effort, they would not preach disunity; they would avoid everything tending in that direction.

[Mr. Tremblay.]

Now, sir, why is the anti-conscription sentiment so strong in the province of Quebec? That is a known fact; it has been so apparent in the house since this debate started, that Quebec stands to a man against conscription. We are against conscription. Why? Precisely by reason of the means and ways by which conscription was just thrown at us in 1917. We are willing to do, we are indeed doing all that is humanly possible. But hon. members may remember the discussions that took place in this house in 1917 and before the general election of that year on conscription. Quebec then was the billy-goat. The way conscription was put into force in Quebec was atrocious, just terrible. There was an evident will to misunderstanding. In our little parishes you can go into practically every house in the county of Dorchester and in every rural county in Quebec and they will tell you what seem like wild stories; they will tell you of their youngsters, seventeen and eighteen years old, quite a number of whom had hardly left their own parishes before, had never seen a soldier or a khaki uniform. They were working on the farms with their fathers—and that is another respect in which Quebec may differ from other provinces; the son to-day is working his father's land, and his father may be the second or third generation on that same land. Well, what happened when conscription was brought about? Military police were sent throughout those French-speaking parishes in Quebec province and at night pulled these boys right out of their beds and, without being able to give any explanation of what was happening, brought them down to the drill hall. It is this procedure which brought about this testimony which I found in *Maclean's* magazine of January 15, 1942:

> No matter how things may appear on the surface in Quebec, the fact remains that the word "conscription" is still the issue of the hour, even with our own Pacific coast an imminent danger zone. And yet, strange to say, it is not the question of service to the state or the democratic cause which is the burning issue, but the use of a word which has come to enjoy a grisly connotation in French-Canadian minds . . .
>
> Many people believed the Jap attack on the United States would bring about an immediate *volte face.* It did not, with the new battlefield of the Pacific barely opened the Hon. Arthur Matthewson, English Protestant provincial treasurer, and a Black Watch officer of fine fighting record from the last war, was on the air speaking of "sinister forces" at work to destroy national unity through their insistent drive on this one bogey-word. He spoke of certain sections of the press. It is a well-known fact that Matthewson was gunning primarily for the Montreal *Gazette* and, in lesser degree perhaps, for Jean Charles Harvey's *Le Jour,* the very name of which is anathema to French-

speaking leaders of church and public life. The Toronto *Telegram* may also have been included.

All that is associated in our mind in Quebec with the personality of Arthur Meighen. Can you imagine anything worse? He was, rightly or wrongly—we are convinced rightly—blamed for what happened in 1917. At any rate it would have been sinister to see that same Meighen returned to this house. This writer appreciates that so well that he said:

> The latest point is Arthur Meighen. Feeling here is that if the Conservative party had definitely wanted to assure itself of no seats in Quebec at the next federal election, even though Meighen steps down before that time, it could not have made a better leadership selection.

That is a truism in Quebec. How could well-intentioned people expect, or how could it be explained, that those who undertook that conscription campaign, knowing these facts, really wanted to increase Canada's war effort? They merely wanted to secure power; that is quite obvious. Fortunately for Canada, fortunately for peace and good understanding throughout the country, the good and sensible citizens of Quebec were guided rather by common sense than by appeals to prejudice. Let us hope this may indeed constitute a lesson, painful as it may be, which will assure harmony and goodwill and cooperation from all sections of Canada.

It has been said, I have heard it in the house since this morning, that another good, kind-hearted Conservative member would resign his seat in the house to give Mr. Meighen another chance. I say—Give Canada a chance, not Mr. Meighen. Here I might make a practical suggestion. I am sure he would be defeated anyway in any constituency in Canada wherever he decided to run; why sacrifice one of the remaining Conservative seats in the house? We have a county open in Quebec, Charlevoix-Saguenay; send him there; the result will be the same.

The reason why we in Quebec like the present Prime Minister and support him and have confidence in him is just because of the psychological fact that he understands Quebec, or at least seeks to do so; he is fair; he is just; that is his record, and we are prepared to support him again, even if we have one or two defections.

I should like to quote from the Toronto *Globe and Mail* of February 12, following the recent by-elections.

> In countries where the British flag waves no politician ever permanently wrecked his career by taking a courageous stand in a good cause which failed at the moment to prevail. Let Mr. Hepburn and Colonel Drew remember the career of Lloyd George. In 1900 he narrowly escaped death at the hands of an irate mob in Birmingham, who resented his pro-Boer sympathies, and within eight years he was chancellor of the exchequer and the idol of the working classes of Britain.

They need not have cited this example; they could have mentioned the case of the present Prime Minister, in 1917, which would have given the same lesson to Mr. Drew and the others.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the fact that hon. members have unanimously permitted me to speak beyond my allotted time. I appreciate it the more because it is unlikely that I shall be back here very often; that may account for the generosity of my hon. friends.

Mr. W. G. WEIR (Macdonald): Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of hesitancy that I rise to continue this debate this evening, a debate which has been going on now for some time. I am sure every phase of the discussion has been pretty well covered, and no doubt most hon. members would like to bring the debate to a close as quickly as possible. I should like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. That they acquitted themselves well, no one will deny.

On this, as on other occasions, the speech from the throne provides an opportunity for the widest possible range of discusssion. Anything may be talked about during this debate. It is only natural, however, that the discussion so far should have been devoted largely to the one matter that has created the greatest interest, not only in this house but throughout the country; that is, the reference to the holding of a plebiscite asking the people of Canada to release the government from previous pledges made in connection with one phase of Canada's war effort. It is only natural that the discussion should largely centre round that point, and I should like to confine my remarks this evening more particularly to the same matter.

The constituency which I have the honour to represent in this house is for the most part Anglo-Saxon, and is looked upon as such. At the same time it contains numbers of French, Belgians, Icelanders, Ukrainians, Hutterites, Germans, and some Czechoslovakians and Norwegians—all Canadians, I may say, but I merely mention them to indicate the complexion of the constituency. While it is true that the Anglo-Saxon group is in the majority, nevertheless the other groups make up well-nigh forty per cent of the population of my riding, and of this number the French-Canadians form the largest group. Here again these French-Canadians are representative not only of the province of Quebec but also of France itself.

Naturally there is in my constituency as wide a division of opinion on the issue of conscription for overseas service as is manifest throughout the country at this time. Even so, I have had Frenchmen come to me and say they were in favour of conscription. On the other hand I have had English people come to me and say they were opposed to conscription. I had an opportunity to talk with one man who has lost a son in this war. I discussed with him what the government was doing, what its war programme was, and what the programme was for the future. I tried to place it before him in as reasonable a manner as possible. He was a man with a good many contacts among the people, and when I got through I asked what he thought would be the attitude of the people with whom he was in contact with respect to the government's conduct of the war. His reply was that if the people were told what I had told him on that occasion, he thought the vast majority would agree with what I had said.

This conversation brought home to me one other point; that is, the value of the instrument of propaganda in this war. I fear that we have failed to tell the people of this country about Canada's war effort in such a manner as to drive it home and cause them fully to realize what this war means not only to Canada as a nation but to each person individually. Probably we as members of parliament have failed to do our part in this regard, more particularly among our non-English-speaking Canadians. In time of war the instrument of propaganda is so important that I am bound to say I think we should make the best possible use of it.

There is another point I should like to mention, which I fear is not fully appreciated, and again this arises in connection with the French-Canadians in my own constituency. A number of them were called back to France at the time of the last war, to fight with the French armies. Later they returned to Canada. These men are as true Canadians as one could find anywhere, but to-day they are mystified and bewildered as to just what is going on and just what is going to happen. To some extent it is their desire to help the free French, but it is difficult for them to realize exactly what has taken place.

I mention these few points merely to aid in appraising the situation that exists in Canada to-day, because I am sure what I have said with respect to my own constituency could be repeated with respect to other constituencies throughout Canada, in greater or less degree. I keep asking myself, then, what there is to be gained by forcing the issue of conscription at this time. If it would help win the war, or if it would shorten the length of the conflict, there might be some purpose in urging its adoption now. It is doubtful, however, whether it would do either at the present time. It is admitted that we could not satisfactorily conscript men for the air force or the navy; in fact it is not necessary to do so, since men for these services are coming forward voluntarily in greater numbers than can be accommodated and trained. Then, under our National Resources Mobilization Act the government already has authority to call men and women for home defence, and to place them in any kind of service the state may require. If this authority is not being used to the extent it should be, there may be ground for criticism. That authority could easily be extended to take in a much wider age group, if necessary, and it could be expanded in other directions. If necessary, we could call up men and train them for four or six months, giving them a thorough training and then letting them return to civilian life. This could be done with group after group, making certain that we would have a large number of men in this country thoroughly trained at least for home defence.

The issue, therefore, comes down to the one question of selecting men by conscription for overseas service only. In other words, its application would affect only that group of men whom we might desire to send beyond our territorial waters. The enactment of conscription is not going to change the situation with respect to the postponement of military service, or the method of dealing with conscientious objectors. These items are details of what we already have, and would not likely be changed by the extension of conscription for overseas service. We would likely continue to call up men by age groups; so that feature of the present policy would not be changed.

Here we are; we have, on the one hand, those who propose conscription for overseas service, regardless of anything else; and we have on the other another group just as strongly opposed to conscription as those who are in support of it. The two groups are as far apart as the poles.

Then, also, the people of this country had commitments made to them during the last election by at least the government and the official opposition, to the effect that no conscription measure would be enacted. I should think, sir, that those who supported the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) or Doctor Manion during the last election campaign, would all welcome the opportunity of being relieved of the commitments made at that time. Anyone who claims that conscrip-

tion was not an issue in the last election is not telling the truth. For my part I tried to keep it from being an issue; but when a former cabinet minister came to my constituency, visited certain districts, and raised the issue in those places, I had to refer to it as well. I did so simply by reading statements made in this house by the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe. I said that I did not know what the future had in store for us, or what changed conditions might bring about, but there was a statement made by a responsible minister of the crown, and as such it must be accepted, for the time being at least, as a matter of government policy.

I was not aware of the position taken in this regard by my opponents in the last election. For the most part I had thought that they, too, had refrained from making it an issue in that campaign. I found, however, in the local press, the week preceding election day, that both of my opponents, in a paid advertisement over their own names, and over the signatures of their respective associations, declared themselves in those advertisements as being opposed to conscription.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Which parties?

Mr. WEIR: The Conservative party and the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. We thus have these two points of view which, as I have mentioned, are as far apart as it is possible to be. We have the commitments which were previously made, and now we have these impassioned and emotional appeals from both sides, appeals which are only opening the gulf wider.

In the face of this turmoil and excitement, and having regard to the experiences of the past, can anyone contend that an appeal by way of plebiscite back to the people is not the sane and reasonable course to pursue? The gulf is too widely open to risk taking any other choice. For my own part I am supporting the proposal for a plebiscite, and I shall ask my constituents to relieve the government of the pledges previously made. I would appeal to them, regardless of their political faith, or to what race they may belong, to support this plebiscite and to vote wholeheartedly to give the government full authority to proceed with the prosecution of the war in whatever manner may be necessary, as occasion arises.

I do not think we can fail to keep in mind what happened in Australia during the last war. In that country, on two different occasions a vote of the people was taken with respect to conscription, and the sending of men outside of that country. On both those occasions it was defeated. The second time the proposal was made the government gave the measure its wholehearted support, and yet it was defeated by a larger majority than it had been on the first vote.

Having said that, I should like to say something along a little different line. I believe there is some criticism which can be made, and I am surprised that in this debate some reference has not been made to some of these matters. The National Resources Mobilization Act gave authority to call men and women in Canada for any purpose the state might require. I am bound to say that I do not think this authority, so far as the direction of man-power is concerned, has been exercised to the extent it could have been, or to the extent the country expected it would be.

I recognize immediately that it is not easy, and that it takes time to redirect people to classes of work other than those to which they have been normally accustomed. In the province from which I come there is a shortage of men on the farms. That, I believe, is recognized more and more throughout farming areas all across Canada. There is also a reported shortage of men for bush work, and also a shortage of men for some other lines of work. At the same time there are a number of men probably unfit for military service, and unfit to undertake heavy manual labour, who are without jobs. Perhaps we can look upon them as the non-manual-labour type of men. These men, however, are useful, and they could do much, if they were directed to where there is work to be done. I have had letters from and conversations with travellers who have been laid off. I have talked to men who were semi-retired office men, who are looking for something to do. Apparently as yet we have no plans to use them. I am bound to say this is a feature of our man-power situation which deserves more attention.

Then there is the question of conscientious objectors who were required to perform some service for the state. In Manitoba, for the most part they have been used in the national parks. There is no doubt that they did good work and that they were easy to handle. That kind of work, however, can wait. These men must be put to more useful employment. Under the circumstances which existed last year I am free to confess I do not know to what other type of work they could have been turned. But I feel they should be put to something more useful in the future.

I realize here again—and I do not wish to be misunderstood in this regard—that there are difficulties in the way of utilizing these people.

We had an experience recently which shows the difficulty that arises when we attempt to move a people from one area to another. We must keep these things in mind, and I have an appreciation of what the government is up against in its attempt to reallocate people to different types of work and in different places.

May I here, however, suggest to the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) that he give consideration to utilizing the services of these conscientious objectors in essential work, where they could be utilized in groups, under supervision. I have in mind at the moment the production of sugar beets, wood-cutting, lumber mill work, and work in some of our coal mines. All these are essential requirements, and all are experiencing difficulty in securing labour.

So far as the sugar beet growers of Manitoba are concerned. I believe I may say that unless some steps are taken to assure them of a supply of labour, the sugar beet acreage in that province will be greatly reduced in the coming year. The beet growers would, I believe, be prepared to use this type of labour. They would be willing to pay to the government an agreed-upon contract price for work done. The government, on the other hand, could continue to require these people to perform a service, and, a useful service, under supervision, as it has in the past. Of course, the government would be required to provide accommodation and pay whatever compensation was decided upon, but it is doing that anyway. If it carried out the suggestion I have made, it would only be extending that principle a little further. A similar policy might be worked out with respect to the other types of work that I have suggested, and it might be extended to other types of seasonal farm work.

I do not propose to place on the record again what Canada is accomplishing in providing men and weapons of war. This has been done already by others in a most effective manner, and I am sure that the country has now a pretty complete picture of what Canada has done in a very short period of time. I wish, however, to refer to certain other features of our production which I fear are being lost sight of but which, to me at least, are most important. These have a direct bearing upon the extent to which our man-power may be available for military service. These things were of secondary importance during the last war. We are liable to lose sight of what is being done and of what it may be necessary to do in order to maintain the flow of things we are manufacturing at the present time.

[Mr. Weir.]

Right now our munitions and supplies are going to every theatre of war. Our ships are sailing every sea and our aircraft are to be seen in every sky. Our foodstuffs are available in ever-increasing quantities. Do we ever stop to think of what is behind this effort, the effort that Prime Minister Churchill called magnificent? This is a war that requires equipment superior to that of the enemy, and lots of it. Equipment, planes, tanks and ships are the items being called for. These things require not only men to make them, but men to keep the raw materials flowing and men to move these things to the places where they are required. To illustrate what I have in mind I should like to refer briefly to a few changes that have taken place in our production field during this war compared with the last war. In 1914 our production of aluminum was 13,000,000 pounds; in 1939 this production had risen to 150,000,000 pounds. The comparative productions in other metals are as follows:

	1914	1939
	Pounds	Pounds
Copper	75,000,000	608,000,000
Nickel	45,000,000	226,000,000
Lead	36,000,000	338,000,000
Zinc	21,000,000	394,000,000

The production to-day of alloys is ten times what it was in 1914. We are producing our own requirements of mercury and are sending substantial quantities to Great Britain. Our oil production in 1914 was some few thousand barrels; to-day it is over eight and a half million barrels. Our gold production is away up as compared to what it was then. Timber production is another important item, and this has been expanded both for our own purposes and to meet the needs of Great Britain. Before the war Great Britain secured immense stocks of foodstuffs from European countries and from other parts of the British empire. As we know and regret, these supplies have been largely cut off, thus throwing a greater responsibility upon this country to provide these essentials. Our financing arrangements with Great Britain, which have been mentioned in this house on several occasions, amount virtually to an open charge account in Canada for Great Britain. This financing must be of inestimable assistance to the mother country These things are essential, and their production must be maintained, and increased in many instances.

Keeping what I have said in mind, and adding to it our industrial production; our financial assistance; our contribution to the armed forces, to the air force, to the navy; our efforts in charitable work through the Red Cross and other services, one cannot help but realize, having regard to our geographical position,

that the contribution of Canada is something of which every Canadian can be justly proud.

For the moment some of these accomplishments are being lost sight of. For the time being our efforts are being overshadowed by developments elsewhere. The centre of the stage is being taken by developments on the battle fronts and the diplomatic activities in London, Washington and Moscow. Our minds are filled with what is happening in Libya, on the Pacific, at Singapore, at Hong Kong and in Russia. The success of the efforts in these far-flung battlefields nevertheless is still dependent to a very large extent upon what we as individuals do on the home front to maintain those in the front lines.

I had intended to refer to two or three other matters, but other opportunities will be provided for that. In 1940 the present government received a mandate to prosecute this war. There is no doubt that the efforts of the government were under review at that time. The people of Canada showed their confidence in the present Prime Minister in a manner unexcelled in the history of this country. When the history of this period is written I feel confident that the name of W. L. Mackenzie King will stand high among the names of the great world leaders because of the part he has played at this time. We entered this conflict determined to see it through regardless of cost, and we are still going to do that. The people of Canada are prepared for added sacrifices; they are ready to do whatever may be required of them. For the most part many are doing that already in their own quiet way, probably about as effectively as if they were under more rigid direction. All they ask is that they be told the job the government wants to have done. They are prepared to do it. The only other thing they ask of those who are directing the war effort of this country at the present time is that the burden of this terrific effort shall be distributed equitably.

Mr. MAURICE GINGUES (Sherbrooke) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues who have already spoken in this debate in congratulating the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) for the speech he has delivered in moving the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I also wish to compliment the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) on the effective manner in which he has seconded that motion.

I regret that I do not have their parliamentary experience on the occasion of my first speech in this house, for, as a matter of fact, I rise to-night for the first time since I have the honour to represent the constituency of Sherbrooke, in order to express my views to the Parliament of this country in such an important debate.

It has been ordained by Providence that I should deliver my first speech in this house at the most critical period in the history of the world and of our country. But, Mr. Speaker, before coming to the matter which to my mind transcends all others, may I thank the good people of Sherbrooke—a constituency both agricultural and industrial, where citizens of both races give to the country the example of practical and true harmony—for the honour they have done me in selecting me as their representative in the Canadian parliament. I said that I would discuss a matter which in my opinion transcends all others, and I meant the plebiscite. Since the reading of the speech from the throne, much has been written and said about conscription of both man-power and wealth, and the subject has entailed the expenditure of much money and energy. It seems that if we had taken as much care to explain to the nation the reasons for the plebiscite this house would probably be ready to-night to vote on the main motion. But once again in Canada politics had to come before country. Conscription for overseas service is the only thing that some people have seen or wanted to see in this question. The plebiscite does not mean that we shall have conscription, either of man-power or of wealth. Mr. Speaker, the plebiscite is necessary if we wish to continue to assert and proclaim everywhere that we are fighting for the preservation of democracy, for in asking the people to release them from pledges given at the 1940 general election, the administration upholds and maintains the basic principle of democracy, which is the free expression of the people's will. Moreover, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the government are acting in an honest and statesmanlike manner; they are showing once again that they do not want to imitate our enemies and break their pledged word.

The plebiscite will in no way tend to hasten or delay conscription, but it is needed because the conflict is drawing ever closer to our shores and a time may come when the Canadian government will be compelled, for the defence of our territory and our homes, to take emergency measures. Let us not forget that the dreadful scourge of war is at our very door and that Canada, our fatherland, is threatened.

Never, as I say, have we faced such a terrible threat and this government know the danger that hangs over us, they are fully

aware of it. Such is the reason why, while it is still time, he is calling upon the people of Canada to appreciate the gravity of the situation and asking them to give him the confidence which he needs, not to apply conscription but simply to be ready at any time to defend Canada and carry out a total and voluntary war effort.

The situation in the Pacific is daily becoming darker, and in spite of the magnificent effort put forth by this country, to use the words of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the threat to Canada is becoming more and more serious. It would be criminal indeed to let ourselves be lulled by over-confidence and then awaken just a little too late and find ourselves under the yoke of the enemy. This government enjoys the confidence of the people. It received a vote of confidence from the people in March, 1940, when we were already at war. The situation has worsened since then. As this government has conducted the war effort efficiently so far, the people are confident that it will do nothing to weaken that war effort, but will do all that is required for the defence of the country. That does not mean resort to conscription for overseas service, for the government will always be responsible to parliament and the people's representatives remain free to approve or reject the measures submitted to them.

For my part, I will show my confidence in the government by my vote on the main motion and I shall vote against both amendments; for I know that if I am here to-day it is not so much because of the esteem my fellow-citizens have kindly shown me as because of the fact that I was the candidate of the leader of the government, of the Prime Minister. I deem it my duty to give a vote of confidence to the present administration. And all who hesitate to show such confidence in the government play into the hands of those who would overthrow the Prime Minister and disunite us that they may rule. Alas, I know full well that in every parliament the world over are to be found elected representatives of the people for whom a renewal of their mandate is more important than the country itself. In this critical hour when danger threatens everything that we hold dear we must forget re-election and think only of the country. As far as I am concerned, even if it means an end to my political career, I will be doing my duty if my stand is such as I conceive it to be in the interest of my countrymen, my province and my country.

[Mr. Gingues.]

As the only man whom we can confidently trust is our Prime Minister, I intend supporting him by voting for the main motion. It is unfortunate that plebiscite and conscription should appear synonymous in the eyes of certain people. After the speeches heard during the present debate from government leaders as well as from some honourable members, I am convinced that there is no ground for such a conscriptionist measure. On the contrary, it would hamper our war effort.

Since the question of conscription has been raised, Mr. Speaker, I must make known my opinion on this measure and the attitude I will take if it is ever brought before us. Before taking my seat in this house, I was opposed to this measure which I considered unjust and inhuman, neither useful nor necessary. I still hold the same opinion and nothing will change my mind on this point. I oppose conscription of wealth as much as conscription of man-power, for in my opinion we are at this time making the best possible use of Canadian resources. If we stop to consider the taxes which Canadians are called upon to pay, we soon realize that taxation has reached a point beyond which we risk achieving destruction of private enterprise. The present taxes of every kind which must be paid by the humblest workingman as well as by the greatest financier, national defence tax, income tax, excess profits tax, succession duties, are all very well, but it cannot be denied that we have gone far enough and I trust the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), when presenting his next budget, will not increase unduly the burden already carried by the Canadian people and will rest content with the taxes we already have to meet. After all, we cannot ask from the taxpayer more than he can pay.

Notwithstanding all these taxes and all these measures, opposition members attack the government for being unwilling to assume their responsibilities. When has the government hesitated to assume responsibility, I ask you? Was it when they submitted their bill for the mobilization of national resources? Was it when they increased taxation, was it when they forced employers to pay cost-of-living bonuses to their employees or when they enforced that radical but necessary measure of price control?

No, Mr. Speaker, the present government never has refused to assume responsibility. Far from it. They have been wise enough to make it impossible for certain individuals to exploit for their own benefit the financial and industrial resources of the country. This

explains perhaps the reason why a small group of men would overthrow the Prime Minister, while loudly proclaiming their would-be love of country, trying to appear more patriotic than their neighbour and endeavouring, in this critical period, to divide the Liberal party so as to obtain power and thereafter so direct our war effort that this same group of men may hold sway over the economic life of the country just like they did after the last war. The people must be cautioned against those evil persons who are ready to revive, for the workers and the farmers, the sorry policy of relief and bread lines.

I wish to state frankly, that we are fighting and we shall keep on fighting not only to defeat nazism, but also to ward off the return of disastrous conditions, to increase economic security for the worker and the farmer.

I am opposed to conscription of manpower. In the course of this debate, all kinds of sound arguments have been stated to show that this method has been a failure, but there is another reason on which I would like to dwell. This matter, Mr. Speaker, reminds me of the Canadian mothers. I wish to state that, at this particular moment, I am not speaking as the representative of Sherbrooke constituency only; I wish to speak on behalf of Canadian mothers, whether they speak French or English or any other language, provided they be Canadian. It is for them that I speak against this unfair, useless and inhuman measure; while doing so, I think of the Canadian mothers whose lives are filled with self-denial, devotion to duty, and who raise large families for their country. During the last war, the government of the day, believing that there could be no victory without conscription, enforced that method of raising men. The results are so well known that I need not recall them.

What happened since? Canadian mothers have pondered over this. In the last 25 years the birth rate has fallen to an alarming degree. If we are unfortunate enough to enforce such an unfair measure now, birth control will become more prevalent in the future and, Mr. Speaker, I claim that by the enactment of a law that would undermine the family, we would endanger the very foundation of the nation. We are fighting for the conservation of our property and the continued development of our country, for building a great Canada, a Canadian mentality, a Canadian spirit. This end will never be attained through immigration, but rather by encouraging large families, by showing that we are worthy of the great cause for which we are fighting: Christian civilization.

It behooves us, the parliament of the nation, to act in such a way that the world may gauge the depth of our sincerity. In opposing this measure for this reason based on common sense and truth, I have confidence of acting as a Christian, as a member of a Christian parliament. And whenever consription is brought up, I shall fight it with all my strength. I hope that, at the conclusion of the war, when we see the flag waving as an emblem and a guarantee of peace and freedom, then the citizens of our large cities may erect, on our public squares, not only memorials to our gallant soldiers as a reminder for generations to come, but also monuments to the Canadian mothers.

I wish to say a few words about the province of Quebec, the loyalty of which is apparently questioned by some. Have hon. members already forgotten that on October 25, 1939, the people of that province, called upon to select a government, chose the party which had had the courage to fight for the principle of participation in the war? Has there been a proper realization of the importance of that election and has due credit been given to those who were responsible for the result obtained? If Quebec had unfortunately turned out to be what some think it is and had returned to power the Conservative party disguised as the "National Union" government, Canada's war effort would have been considerably weakened.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to say that on that occasion it was the Liberal party that risked everything and that it was the Liberal leaders who waged the good fight, not the leader of the opposition nor the men who to-day are seeking to divide the nation. On the contrary the whole Conservative organization of Quebec supported the "National Union" candidates. It seems to me that on that occasion the people of Quebec gave manifest proof of their loyalty and patriotism, as they have given since at every opportunity. There are extremists in Quebec as there are elsewhere, but believe me, Mr. Speaker, their number is small in Quebec as it is small elsewhere.

If I remind the house of this action taken by my province in 1939, it is because of the important effect I believe it has had on our war effort.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is serious, danger is at our door. Let us not wait until we have to defend ourselves at Vancouver, Halifax, Quebec or Toronto. Let us join in a holy

union, laying aside all prejudice and political passion. Let us put our trust in the best administration Canada has ever had. To those who abstain from voting on the main motion or who vote against it, I say that they are doing a disservice to their country.

As was so well said in his first speech in this house by an hon. member whom I wish to warmly congratulate, the hon. member for Verdun (Mr. Côté): Let all those who have lately devoted so much energy to dividing the nation now concentrate their activities on helping our war effort, and I am convinced that this effort will remain voluntary and will be able to bring us victory and peace.

The people of the United States are now using a motto which constantly reminds them that they are at war. On all sides they see posted up the words "Remember Pearl Harbor." The regretted Minister of Justice, Right Hon. Mr. Lapointe, speaking in Sherbrooke at the outset of the war, gave us a motto when he said: "One country, two languages, different religions, but only one heart." This is what we see in Canada to-day and what we will always see: 11,500,000 Canadians living side by side, speaking two languages, professing different religions, but with a single heart tending towards the one ideal—the maintenance of democracy as the unshakeable bulwark of our liberty.

Mr. B. M. HILL (Charlotte): I wish to extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier) and the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald) upon their admirable speeches in opening this debate. The experience which they obtained in England, together with their legal training, helped them much and added to the excellence of their addresses.

We have heard a great deal in this debate concerning an all-out war effort. This is a term used to indicate a balanced war effort in which our military establishments, combined with our industrial effort in the production of war equipment and material for the use of our citizens, are so balanced as to result in the greatest possible war effort of our country. This can be brought to one hundred per cent effectiveness only by a certain measure of national selective service. I would add to the criticism of the government voiced by some hon. members this one thing, that a greater proportion of national selective service might have been brought about.

[Mr. Gingues.]

Canada's war effort to-day is second to that of none of the united nations, having regard to our population. Under the leadership of our Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) a great deal has been accomplished. I followed for many years his efforts to bring about economic cooperation between the United States and Canada, and between the British empire and the United States. I am one who believes that if this cooperation had been brought about several years ago, it would have had a steadying influence in the world and might have prevented this world war. When the history of this war is written I am sure that the work of our Prime Minister in bringing about cooperation between the great Anglo-Saxon nations will be recognized as one of the most important phases of our war effort.

Since the outbreak of the war the heads of our military, naval and air departments have given outstanding service. The figures covering the expansion in these departments have been given to the house; and I shall not repeat them. But may I say that the successful handling of Canada's financial effort by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) is second to that of none of the other united nations. The excellence of his work is being recognized by the people of Canada. On February 10 the Minister of Finance spoke before the Rotary club of Montreal. In an editorial on February 11 the Montreal *Star* paid him this tribute:

> There is, as a rule, very little in financial matters that makes for inspiration, but Mr. Ilsley's handling of his theme was not only masterly, it was inspired. And it stirred responsive emotions in the minds of all who were privileged to hear him. There were passages in his speech that reached a high measure of eloquence, but they were not mere flights of rhetoric. They came straight from the heart of a man who has shouldered a great responsibility and a tremendous task, who is conscious of the immense strain which Canada's commitments place upon the nation, but who has absolute confidence that the nation will not fail.

That is a well-earned tribute. In his speech the Minister of Finance said:

> Let me tell you what I think we should aim to do: I think we should aim to make a reputation for Canadian achievement in this war which will be the talk of the world for generations, that will be the pride of ourselves, our children, and our children's children.

I agree with the sentiment there expressed. Let me add that I feel, and I believe all hon. members feel, that no sacrifice is too great for our generation to make to ensure that when those children's children take our places as citizens of this great dominion, Canada will still be Canada.

The work of our Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) stands out as one of the greatest pieces of organization in our war effort. I know that other hon. members who belong to the engineering profession will join with me in expressing satisfaction at the splendid service given to Canada by a member of our profession. Canada was indeed fortunate that at the outbreak of the war there was a member of the cabinet so highly trained in engineering and whose later experience in industrial engineering had so fitted him for the great task of directing the reorganization of the industrial life of Canada for war. As soon as the war broke out, the minister called many of the best industrial organizers and organizations of the dominion to Ottawa. Many of these men were experts in various lines of industry, and to their credit be it said that they volunteered their services and were permitted by their companies to give their time and effort to placing the industrial life of Canada on a war footing.

There was much to be done at the start; in fact chaotic conditions existed. Canada had but one munitions plant producing war equipment. The whole industrial life of the country had to be changed from peace-time pursuits to a war-time basis. During the first year of the war many of us felt that the progress which was being made was not as great as it should be. But in changing over the entire industrial life of Canada we had to creep before we could walk and walk before we could run, and I believe we have yet to learn to run efficiently enough to enable us to win this war. If, however, one takes the actual production month by month since the beginning of the war, it will be noted that while at first we progressed in arithmetical progression, we are now going ahead in geometrical progression.

When we look at the present output of Canada in war material and farm production we realize that we are well on the way to the goal of mass production, a term which has been used for all-out efficient production. And when we look at the number of people employed on war work and the number in our army, navy and air force, we realize that we are approaching the limit of our manpower along certain lines. There is, however, one large field which, I believe, has not yet been touched; that is in the smaller centres of population in our country. I am convinced that the Minister of Munitions and Supply has organized the great centres of mass production in Ontario and Quebec so well that he may now turn his organizing ability to the smaller centres without hurting production in the larger centres; those centres will go on under their own momentum. But in many small towns in Canada—and I know for a fact in many small towns in New Brunswick—there are many thousands of men and women who could be employed in war work without in any way interfering with the ordinary life of the country. I assume that the work of organizing these people, which has to do with national selective service, will be done by the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) in conjunction with the Minister of Munitions and Supply. In New Brunswick, in the smaller towns of 1,000 to 5,000 population, there are many men and women, men not eligible for war service, who are employed only part time, or employed in non-essential work. These people could be organized to advantage, and I believe it is the duty of the Minister of Munitions and Supply to give this matter his most serious attention at an early date.

In the constituency which I have the honour to represent there are four small towns with populations ranging from 1,500 to 5,000. No war work is being done for the Canadian government in any of these towns, though one small factory in one town is doing work for the British government, in the production of shell boxes. I believe this condition exists also in many small towns throughout Canada. It is just possible that the smaller communities in Quebec and Ontario have had their available labour moved to the larger centres, but that is not the case in many sections of the prairies and in eastern Canada. I know also that when the rationing of gasoline, the rationing of tires, the reduction in the use of automobiles and the reduction in tourist traffic take place, many men will be thrown out of employment in our garages and service stations. They are not men of military age. They are practical mechanics, with many years of experience in this work. These men should be most valuable in the war service of Canada, and steps should be taken at once to see that when they are thrown out of work in the spring, their services will be utilized.

In many sections of New Brunswick there is a feeling of frustration among the people because of the fact that they are not employed at something they feel is of value to the war effort of this dominion. I should like to suggest to the Minister of Munitions and Supply that one method by which this situation could be overcome would be by the appointment of an assistant, or perhaps two assistants, one of whom should be a business man, who would be located in these smaller provinces. They should be located, not in Ottawa, but in the province whose war effort they are interested in building up. Then they could be in constant touch with the local

government, and with industries throughout the province; they would know where labour could be found and could advise the minister as to the steps that should be taken to place industries in suitable locations, where these men might be given employment in active war work.

I have been told that the unit cost of production is far greater in these small centres than in the mass-production centres. I believe this is true, up to the point where you have to bring labour from other sections or other provinces to these mass-production centres. The moment you do this, you have to add the cost of transporting these men. They have to leave their families behind; they have to maintain themselves in these centres. Already the government has embarked upon housing schemes for these workers. If it would take all these costs, which are costs to this country, into consideration, I believe it would find that the cost of extending production in these mass-production centres is greater than would be the cost of production in the smaller places. Then, again, suppose we are not getting the production we should get in these smaller centres, and these people are not taken to the larger centres. This means that we lose a certain amount of production. Supposing a shell produced in a smaller centre cost $2 instead of $1.75. Many battles have been lost in this war because of lack of equipment, and I would rather have a $2 shell than none at all. I would recommend to the minister that he give most serious consideration to this matter, for I believe that production can be stepped up to a far greater extent by this method in the coming year than by the further extension of facilities which already exist in the more thickly populated centres of production.

I have some information here which comes from a quarterly review of public affairs published by Dalhousie university, in the city of Halifax. The Minister of Munitions and Supply was formerly professor of engineering at that university, so he should have some regard for these suggestions. In this publication I find that on a per capita basis, in the maritime provinces only one-third of the amount of money has been spent on war products that has been spent in the whole of Canada. When this matter was brought to the attention of the government it was said that in the maritimes we did not have the industrial equipment with which to do this work; but according to this report, having regard to each thousand dollars invested in industrial plant, we still have only one-half as much money being spent in the maritimes as is being spent in the rest of Canada. The greatest injustice to New Brunswick is shown in the final figures, which have to do with grants in connection with the construction of industrial plants in Canada. I find that New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island obtained only one-fourth of one per cent of the total amount spent for this purpose throughout Canada, though this district has five per cent of the population of this country. This, I think, accounts for the fact that we are not getting war orders in that part of the country, and for the further fact that there is a feeling of frustration among the workers there.

All hon. members must realize that there is a limit to the man-power that can be secured for military purposes. This is governed by the number of men in our population who are physically fit and between certain ages. The only way by which any increase can be brought about is by new classes coming of age or by the extension of the age limit. There is a grave question in my mind as to whether the extension of the age limit will not result in men being placed in military service who could be far more useful to our war effort in the production of military equipment. While this is true of the men available for war purposes, I am not one of those who believe that our production of materials, equipment and food for the carrying on of our war effort will ever reach a maximum. If this war should go on for another ten years, I think every hon. member is convinced that our production at the end of that period will be greater than at any intermediate stage. The reason is that while our man- and woman-power available for industrial production may reach its limit, the improvement in machines, the bringing into production of more electrical power, and the use of more efficient methods of production will each year enable the same number of employees to produce larger quantities of goods. Then, again, as the necessity arises, greater effort will be made by the man-power employed in the production of equipment.

A great deal has been said in this house with reference to the immediate conscription of man-power for overseas service as an absolute essential to an all-out war effort. After listening to the enlistment records as given by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), I am quite convinced that voluntary enlistment has not failed; in fact, that it has not yet faltered. I am one of those who believe that an army of men enlisted for overseas service of their own free will is a far more effective army than one of men who had to be enlisted by compulsion. I also believe that as long as our voluntary enlistment method does not fail, we should not bring in compulsory service for overseas. I believe, too, that an army for home defence

obtained by compulsory service is just as effective in its own land as one which is formed by voluntary enlistment. My reason for making that statement is that the men have the incentive of fighting on their own soil. Therefore I believe that conscription for home service would produce an able and efficient army for the defence of our shores, should that defence be required.

The county and province I represent in the house has, I am proud to say, shown voluntary enlistments for overseas service equal to those of any other part of the Dominion of Canada. In proportion to its population, New Brunswick has the best record for voluntary enlistment in the army, for active service overseas, of any military district.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What about Prince Edward Island? They are classed along with Nova Scotia, but their average is very high.

Mr. HILL: They are mixed with the Nova Scotia district, so we cannot get the exact figure.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, but their average is extremely high.

Mr. HILL: Yes, I believe it is; but I am speaking of military districts. The voluntary enlistment record of New Brunswick, for all branches of the service, including the navy and the air force, stands with three other districts as being highest in the dominion. Every time recruits have been called for, or a drive has been put on to increase the numbers of those enlisted for active service overseas, the county of Charlotte, and the province of New Brunswick as a whole, have always filled their quota. In New Brunswick we have a mixed population, comprising the two great races of Canada. Approximately one-third of our population in New Brunswick is of French origin. I know all hon. members from New Brunswick, on both the government and opposition benches, and including the house leader of the official opposition party, the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) will agree with me when I say that we are justly proud of the record of our French citizens, as far as enlistments for active service for overseas are concerned. They have kept that record up, man for man, according to their population, along with their English-speaking compatriots in our province, and I know that all citizens of New Brunswick are proud of this fact. When a further call is made to bring up the strength of our overseas service, New Brunswick will not be lacking.

We have heard a great deal in the house about the conscription of wealth. I say that we have already started on the conscription of wealth. When a country which produced only $10,000,000 from income tax during the whole four years of the last great war, now produces between $600,000,000 and $700,000,000 from the same source within twelve months, we are certainly on the road to the conscription of wealth. It is my firm conviction that when the Minister of Finance brings down his next budget, hon. members and the people of Canada generally will be satisfied that we are increasing the conscription of wealth in Canada.

The government proposes a plebiscite of the people, not to decide the question with respect to compulsory national selective service, but to determine whether the people are prepared to release the government and private members from pledges given during the last election campaign. In that campaign the Prime Minister and other Liberal leaders pledged their party that conscription of men for overseas service would not be brought into force without consulting the people. The leader of the National government party went farther, and pledging his party and himself, stated that he was unalterably and absolutely opposed to conscription. He based his opposition on the fact that during the last war he had supported conscription, and supported the Union government; but he claimed that conscription was a failure at the time of the last war, and that it stirred up so much misunderstanding throughout the country that it had retarded Canada's war effort. He added that for that reason, and because it was the duty of a public man to uphold the unity of Canada, he was absolutely opposed to conscription of men for overseas service. I believe that that speech pledged his party and his supporters to no conscription for overseas service.

The leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Coldwell) was reported in the press during the campaign as stating that his party was unalterably opposed to conscription of men for overseas service. In view of the definite pledges given to the people at that time, binding practically every hon. member, I cannot see how any hon. member can object to referring this matter to the people for their decision, as promised by the Prime Minister. The people are to be asked whether they are prepared to release the government and every member of parliament from the pledges given, and to place full responsibility for every action and decision

with reference to our war effort squarely on the shoulders of their representatives in parliament.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, believe that pledges made to the people should be carried out, and I have confidence that the decision of the majority of people in Canada will be in the best interests of the country as a whole. I have confidence that the people of the constituency of Charlotte, which I have the honour to represent, are prepared to make any sacrifice to win the war. If they will by their vote place the responsibility on me as their representative to take decisions on the serious problems which come before parliament—and these problems will be serious, before the war is ended, problems which I believe will affect the entire way of life in the country—I am prepared to assume that responsibility, and do what I believe is in the best interests of Canada, and the war effort of the dominion.

Mr. HECTOR AUTHIER (Chapleau) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, although we have now reached the nineteenth sitting of the house no one has yet forgotten the eloquence and the remarkable reasoning of the mover, the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Fournier), and the seconder, the hon. member for Brantford City (Mr. Macdonald), of the address in reply to the speech from the throne and, after so many others, I also wish to offer my congratulations. Brevity is imperative at this stage and I will be brief.

The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) has moved an amendment containing but one point—and it is not striking for its novelty—namely conscription of Canadians for overseas service. His speech, fair enough in form, was spoiled by two or three partisan tirades and certain passages, which I really find quite insulting, where he quoted Lincoln to show off as cowards and slackers those who favour voluntary enlistment. I had attached little importance at first to this quotation from Lincoln, as we are in the habit —save perhaps for the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot)—to overlook many things from the leader of the opposition. But since hearing this same quotation from the lips of the honourable member for Royal (Mr. Brooks), I could not overcome the urge to protest.

Needless to state that I do not hold anything against Abraham Lincoln, who never spoke a word about us.

The generous soul of the great emancipator must be very sad when Tories use his words to insult people whose only crime is to be loyal to their country first and above all. Lincoln fought to preserve unity in his country; but our Tories are doing their utmost to divide theirs.

No, French Canadians are not cowards because they are opposed to conscription for overseas service. On the contrary, they endure sarcasm, abuse and severe retaliation on the part of a fanatical press and others. They accepted conscription for the defence of our country without a moment's hesitation; they will accept it also for the defence of the continent. They have approved the policy of voluntary participation and have generously contributed to Canada's war effort outside the country.

Why did they do it? To please their compatriots of Anglo-Saxon origin who were naturally and spontaneously drawn in this war by the call of blood. We certainly hate nazism, that German form of superimperialism which is repugnant to our Catholic mind; but such ideological considerations would have been insufficient to make us vote for war. The reason why we voted with our fellow Canadians of Anglo-Saxon origin, whose feelings we understand and appreciate, resides in a true desire to cooperate with them. Since then, we have been cooperating with them throughout. But we are not ready to accept conscription of man-power for overseas service, which would only result in disrupting the country without adding anything worthwhile to our war effort. Our English-speaking fellow Canadians should, instead of pressing this point, abide by the well defined attitude which prevailed when we entered the war. When the defence of Canada is at stake—the urgency of which is daily becoming greater—French Canadians are prepared to make all necessary sacrifices. I am one of those who believe that we should have larger home-defence forces, better equipped and better trained than those we now have. Too many people are apparently obsessed by the idea of sending overseas as many of our soldiers as we can. It is a fixed idea with them. And in a changing world like ours fixed ideas must be looked upon with a great deal of suspicion.

People who have neither learned nor forgotten anything since the last war are dangerous people.

How much nearer to my heart is the leader of the government (Mr. Mackenzie King) who so ably manages to analyse fresh developments and the changing aspects of the world drama, and who knows how to draw from them the conclusions of real interest to us. When the history of this country is written, his prudence and circumspection will assume a legendary character. And it is this sage among sages

who has been attacked and vilified throughout the country by a press in the pay of narrow and fanatical partisans, worthy successors of those who, in the last century, set fire to the Canadian parliament buildings and cast stones at a noble representative of the King in Canada, the father of our constitutional liberties. Fortunately, the majority of the people see clearly in the matter and, on February 9, those enemies of the Canadian mind already reaped part of the punishment they deserve and which will surely be visited upon them.

I anticipate with much pleasure the forthcoming entrance into this house of the victors in the recent elections: my old friend the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Saint-Laurent); my former colleague in the Quebec provincial legislature, the member for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Fauteux) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell), whose special ability is everywhere acknowledged; and, finally, the vanquisher of the Tory leader in the constituency of York South. Since this latter victory. I think less unkindly of Toronto.

Incidentally, I wish to tell the members of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation that I share many of their views in the field of economics. I shall not, however, support the amendment proposed by their leader. He goes too far. We cannot, in the midst of a war crisis, risk so radical an economic and social revolution. But the after-war will bring a new order which will surely borrow something, perhaps a good deal, from the doctrine to which they adhere. With the hon. member for North Battleford (Mrs. Nielsen) I suggest to the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) and to the leader of the official opposition that they withdraw their amendments so as to make the adoption of the address unanimous, as it should be.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot resume my seat without saying a few words about the proposed plebiscite and a few other questions which command the attention of my electors and of parliament.

The war takes a new turn from month to month, and sometimes oftener. We must be prepared for any emergency.

I said a moment ago that I would have no objection to our conscripts serving for the defence of the American continent. But it would be necessary to modify the existing act for that purpose. The Prime Minister, wishing to be true to his promise and to respect the will of the people, is asking by means of a plebiscite to be freed from all obstacles that would prevent him from adopting measures which the government might deem necessary.

I have enough confidence in the Prime Minister to support him on this occasion. All measures submitted to the house later on will be judged on their merits. Moreover, the electors will be free to vote according to the dictates of their conscience on this plebiscite.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) is asking the Canadian people to subscribe to a $600,000,000 loan. I wish him all the success possible, but I must say frankly that the circumstances are not as favourable in my district on this occasion as they were for the preceding loan. Rumours have been heard that the gold mines may soon be forced to curtail their production. Miners and those living in mining towns, alarmed at such rumours, will naturally keep their savings instead of buying government bonds. They are likely to forget that government bonds are for all practical purposes like money in the bank.

I cannot see how the country would benefit by closing gold mines producing at the rate of $200,000,000 a year. Even if the United States were to suspend all gold imports, it would still be to the advantage of Canada to build up reserves for the future. A reserve of two billion dollars in Canada would be the equivalent of that existing in the United States. That would mean ten years' production for our mines.

Logging is also an important industry in the section of Quebec which I represent. I read in the press recently that the price of pulpwood was fixed by the timber controller. By unanimous request of the people of Quebec, the government of this province are investigating prices and sales conditions of pulpwood, in order that reasonable prices may obtain in certain sections of the province where wood is practically given away for nothing. In fact, in my constituency settlers clearing new land several miles from the railroad have often had to deliver their wood, with the bark removed, on the car for $6 and $7 a cord. This price represents poor wages for cutting and barking, very little for hauling and nothing at all for the wood itself. There can be no justification for the maintenance of such unfair prices, and I hope that the timber controller will cooperate with the provincial administration, which is willing to remove such abuses.

In his amendment to the address, the leader of the opposition referred to the necessity of preparing for the after-war period. Everyone knows that the government has the question under consideration. In a statement subsequent to the speech from the throne, the Prime Minister referred to colonization as a means to that end.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to recall that I have been living for thirty years in the colonization district which I have the honour to represent in this house. When I first settled in that part of the country, there were only a few squatters, possibly a dozen families in the neighbourhood, and the labourers working on the construction of the Transcontinental railway. One hundred miles from that railroad, on the shores of lake Temiskaming, there were half a dozen parishes, and less than ten thousand people all told. According to the figures of the latest census, the two constituencies Témiscamingue and Abitibi, forming the northwestern portion of the province of Quebec, now have a population of 110,000. The fact that their population increased by 100,000 in thirty years is chiefly due to land settlement, which ought to go on for a long time to come in that vast area. I do not say that the best tillable land in Canada is to be found there, lest I should distress my right-hand neighbour the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Sissons). But it is the last extensive land settlement area that remains in the province of Quebec. May this fact not be forgotten in the post-war programme. It would be advisable to do some preliminary work there. The Canadian government has for some years extended assistance for the building of roads in mining areas. A similar policy should be adopted with a view to opening or completing certain main roads leading into our best remaining lands.

During this session I shall no doubt have another opportunity to bring up this subject which is of vital importance in any post-war planning. I have no objection to the government helping the farmers of the west, the industries of central Canada and the fishermen of our coastal provinces, but they should also encourage the efforts of the settlers in the newly opened lands of Quebec, who are constantly extending our agricultural area through hard and often thankless work, for which they deserve all the more credit.

Mr. JOSEPH H. LECLERC (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, as very few minutes remain before adjournment, I shall be brief. I have but a few remarks to make, anyhow.

At this stage of the debate on the address, which has now lasted for three weeks, I must say how much I admire your patience in listening to the same arguments put forth in different tones. I intend being very brief as I do not approve of indefinitely travelling beaten roads. Believing, however, that the people of my constituency wish to know what stand their representative is taking, I wish to say a few words on the subject of conscription, which is so much in the public mind at the present.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need for me to play both ends against the middle, as I expect nothing from politics and my sole ambition is to remain ever faithful to those whom I represent.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LECLERC: I do not hesitate to say that the electors in my constituency, in my province and in the country have much more confidence at the present moment in the Right Hon. Mackenzie King than in the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen who has just met defeat in York South. All Liberal members, including the dissentients, state that their confidence is far greater in the King administration than in any other.

I am not a real politician, Mr. Speaker, but it does seem to me that you will readily understand how illogical those dissenting Liberals are. Should we all follow their example and vote with the Conservatives against adopting the address in reply to the speech from the throne, the present government would be overthrown only to be succeeded by a union government. For my part, I do not feel inclined to present the electors of Shefford constituency with such an offering. Has not the Liberal party just won four victories? This is a clear proof of the confidence the electors still place in the hon. Prime Minister. So that my position will leave no doubt whatever, I wish to state that I am personally opposed to conscription for overseas service for many reasons. The first is that I took this pledge at the last election and if there is anything I wish above all else, it is to continue to deserve the respect of my compatriots. A second reason is that, at the present time, events are taking a disquieting turn and in spite of what certain strategists, with nothing but defeats to their credit so far, might say, I feel that the sending of troops to foreign lands becomes more and more a reckless adventure.

Mr. Speaker, after this explanation, which I believe is clear enough, I shall add that it is not my intention, in constituencies which I do not represent, of holding meetings that might stir emotions in a time when composure and moderation are desirable. I do not look upon myself as the saviour of my race and I do not take myself seriously enough to assume leadership of a new party.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LECLERC: The hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) has

assumed leadership of the Canadian party; however, noblesse oblige; will he prove equal to the task? Using the expression this hon. leader has coined to designate his humble colleagues, I trust his "followers" in the future will be sufficient in number to insure greater success for him than at the last election.

I could add much more, but I said I would be brief. The electors of Ontario, along with those of my province, have rejected the ultra-conscriptionists. Common sense has prevailed. The electors of those constituencies have done good work for national unity and I congratulate them. Therefore, for the sake of unity, I shall not rehash the old or the new stories; I shall follow the advice of the well-meaning people and remain calm and moderate, so as to assuage the bad feelings all too prevalent.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude my remarks I want to make a request to the government concerning farmers' sons who, though indispensable on the farm, are called for military service. At the present time, we experience all kinds of difficulties when we try to obtain even short postponements for those who are necessary on the farm the whole year around. The mobilization act should be amended so that farmers' sons who have never left the farm and bona fide farm workers could obtain an indefinite postponement. I maintain that the farmer who owns fifteen or twenty milch cows, not taking into account his other live stock—yearlings, hogs, et cetera—and a maple bush, never enjoys free time from one end of the year to the other. A farmer who has to look after twenty-five or thirty milch cows, even if he enjoys perfect health, cannot do all his work without the aid of at least two helpers. Whether these helpers are his own sons or hired men, they are absolutely needed for the operation of his farm. In 1941 there was a labour shortage. In 1942 the situation appears to be getting worse, with indications of a smaller agricultural production. The government is aware that England, whose people are now on short rations, needs all that we can produce on our farms.

I wish to point out that I have received no requests for postponement from men of the town of Granby and that those I have received from farmers' sons are legitimate. We are at present obliged to parley with the registrars who apparently know very little about farming.

Needless to say that the production of foodstuffs is just as essential as that of arms and munitions. The government should therefore leave the farm workers on the farm and have the mobilization act amended so that farmers' sons absolutely needed on the farm may obtain an indefinite postponement.

44561—44½

On motion of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury) the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Crerar the house adjourned at 10.52 p.m.

Wednesday, February 18, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that the clerk of the house has received from the chief electoral officer certificate of the election and return of the following member, viz:

Of Joseph William Noseworthy, Esquire, for the electoral district of York South.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED

Joseph William Noseworthy, Esquire, member for the electoral district of York South, introduced by Mr. Coldwell and Mr. MacInnis.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

APPOINTMENT OF GEORGE A. TOUCHE AND COMPANY AS AUDITORS

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Transport) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 9, respecting the appointment of auditors for National Railways.

He said: This bill is to provide for the appointment of auditors for the Canadian National Railways.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

HEALTH OF DISCHARGED MEN—REMARKS OF PREMIER OF ONTARIO AS REPORTED IN TO-DAY'S PRESS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): Mr. Speaker, in this morning's *Citizen* there appears a Canadian Press dispatch referring to Premier Hepburn's comment on the statements made in this house last Monday in regard to health conditions among discharged men. May I emphasize that this statement was officially presented on the records of the assembly at Queen's Park, Toronto. I quote from his remarks:

Mr. Hepburn said he did not blame defence minister J. L. Ralston, navy minister Angus

Macdonald or air minister C. G. Power for their criticism of him but he did blame Prime Minister Mackenzie King.

"He (Mr. King) is not the kind to shoot you verbally but he would buy a gun, hand it to the other fellow and tell him to shoot you."

The report of the same incident appearing in the Toronto *Star* does me the honour of indicating that the premier also referred to me. I wish to state to this house most definitely and emphatically that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) had no knowledge of my intention to make a statement on the subject of health conditions among discharged men, and therefore the statement of the premier of Ontario is absolutely false and utterly untrue in every detail. May I add, sir, in anticipation of further prevarications from Queen's Park, that until the present moment the Prime Minister of Canada had no knowledge of the statement I am making now.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Referring to the matter mentioned by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Mackenzie), I notice that the account which appears in this morning's *Citizen* of Mr. Hepburn's remarks is headed as follows:

Hepburn Scores Press Reports as "Erroneous."

Ontario Premier Absolves Three Defence Ministers for Criticisms, Placing Blame on Mr. King.

It might be thought that as the Minister of Pensions and National Health is not included in the category to which reference is made, there has been some suggestion made by me to one or other of the other ministers. The article states:

Mr. Hepburn said he did not blame defence minister J. L. Ralston, navy minister Angus Macdonald or air minister C. G. Power for their criticism of him but he did blame Prime Minister Mackenzie King.

Then referring to myself:

"He (Mr. King) is not the kind to shoot you verbally but he would buy a gun, hand it to the other fellow and tell him to shoot you."

Just in case anyone reading that particular article might infer that I handed a loaded gun to one of my colleagues in the defence departments, I wish to say that I had no knowledge that any minister of the crown was going to make any reference whatever to the subject which was referred to the other day by the different ministers whom the Premier of Ontario has mentioned.

Mr. HOMUTH: Would you, shoot him yourself?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would not say whether I think he is worth shooting or not.

[Mr. Ian Mackenzie.]

INCOME TAX

1941 FORMS—NEGOTIATIONS WITH PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Gibson) a question based on a conversation I had yesterday morning with a gentleman in reference to the purchasing of victory loan bonds. He was at a loss to know how many to buy because, he said, he was unable to obtain forms to figure out his income tax and did not like to commit himself without knowing how much money he would have left with which to buy bonds. I saw him again this morning and he was greatly perturbed over an article in this morning's *Globe and Mail* referring to the fact, I presume, that the Minister of Finance and the Ontario government have not yet come into agreement as to what is to be the situation in regard to the Ontario income tax. I told this gentleman to possess his soul in patience and buy all the bonds he could, but I would like the Minister of National Revenue to tell us when the forms will be ready. I went to the post office this morning, after having this second conversation, and was still unable to obtain the income tax forms, except for the very low brackets. What we do not know yet is whether we will have to pay two income taxes, one to Ontario and one to the dominion.

Hon. C. W. G. GIBSON (Minister of National Revenue): The hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) was kind enough to give me notice of his question.

In recent years the income tax branch has been collecting income tax for five of the provinces. This required special forms for each of those five provinces. In view of the recent provincial negotiations it was uncertain whether or not these special forms would again be required. The consent of the provinces was necessary before leaving particulars of the provincial taxes off the forms. As a result the individual forms were not available this year until ten days later than the usual date. Forms T-1, for individual incomes over $5,000, and T-1 special, for individual incomes of $5,000 and under, were available in January, together with an informative pamphlet which had been prepared for use in the event of the income tax forms not being available before the end of January. I am informed that 3,000 of the forms T-1, for incomes over $5,000, and 120,000 of the forms T-1 special, for incomes of $5,000 and under, were delivered in Toronto in January, and that a total of 218,000 of form T-1 and 879,000 of form T-1 special have now been delivered in Toronto.

I might point out that it is the practice of local inspectors to supply the demand from their own offices, and then to make general distribution through banks, post offices and other appropriate places. I understand that the post offices and sub post offices in Toronto district have been supplied with forms, following their receipt by the inspector of income tax in Toronto. Whether or not that applies to Ottawa, I do not know, but I shall secure the information for the hon. member. The forms are of course available at the income tax offices.

RUBBER, OIL AND GASOLINE

DUPLICATION OF TRANSPORT SERVICES BY BUS, TRUCK AND RAIL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Munitions and Supply. In view of the shortage of crude rubber, oil and gasoline, what steps has the government taken to survey the duplication of transport services by bus, truck and rail, with the object in view of having services which can be dispensed with discontinued, thereby conserving tires, oil and gasoline?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): As my hon. friend knows, the regulation of truck and bus traffic is a matter under the jurisdiction of the provinces. A bill was introduced in this parliament to give the dominion government jurisdiction, but it did not pass. I may point out however that we are not issuing new tires for buses, unless it can be shown that these buses serve an essential war service. I think that as a result of what is being done, coordination will be worked out.

Mr. LOCKHART: Would the minister use his influence to see that buses do not pass, at a rate of sixty-five miles an hour or more, civilians who are travelling at forty miles an hour? That is happening on the highways.

Mr. HOWE: I have no influence in that quarter.

ALASKA HIGHWAY

COMMUNICATIONS WITH NORTHERN OUTPOSTS FOR DEFENCE PURPOSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. C. GREEN (Vancouver South): I should like to ask a question of the Prime Minister. A press dispatch this morning from Washington quotes President Roosevelt as warning that an enemy attack on Alaska is a perfectly possible military operation, and as declaring that there is an urgent need for improving communications between the United States and Alaska. In fact the president is quoted as saying that a decision to start must be made within the next two or three weeks, if something is to be done by January, 1943. The dispatch also states that there have been renewed discussions with the Canadian government with respect to the Alaska highway, or some alternative means of rushing men and equipment to the northern outposts of the continent.

This is a matter of vital importance to Canada, and a statement on the subject from the Prime Minister as to how Canada is cooperating would greatly reassure the Canadian people.

Mr. CHURCH: And Japan has the command of the sea there.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): In reply to the hon. member for Vancouver South, may I say that the appropriate defence agencies of the two countries have been and are giving close consideration to the problem of communication with Alaska. I do not know that I can say more than that at the present time.

Mr. GREEN: Will the Prime Minister at an early day make a statement concerning the Alaska highway, or some other means of communication?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot say offhand how soon a statement can be made on the matter. But at the appropriate time it will be made.

Mr. CHURCH: The proposed road and air bases there are of little use without sea power.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT IN AMHERST, N.S., FOR LACK OF REROLLING MATERIAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Munitions and Supply, arising out of a telegram received from a representative of the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee at Amherst, Nova Scotia, stating,—

> One hundred and fifty men out of work in rolling mills, Canadian Car and Foundry, Amherst, for the lack of rerolling material. Man named Sonnell claims that he can supply material.

Has the minister any knowledge of this situation, and if so what steps does he propose to take to remedy it?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member gave me notice of his question, but I received it only as I was coming into the house; therefore I have not been able to look into it as fully as I should like. I might say however that these small rerolling mills deal directly with the scrap metals trade. Their raw material is scrap rail and scrap metal of various kinds, and it is doubtful if this operation would come within the purview of the steel controller. However I shall take the matter up with the steel controller and see if something can be done.

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland): I have had similar telegrams, and I took the matter up with the heads of the company in Montreal and in Amherst. I thought it was more appropriate to do that than to take it up with the minister.

AIR TRAINING PLAN

QUESTION AS TO PARTICIPATION OF INDIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence for Air if the government of India was consulted when the empire air training scheme was set up, and if there are any natives of India at the present time in training in Canada?

Hon. C. G. POWER (Minister of National Defence for Air): Offhand I would say that so far as I know there are no natives of India at the present time in training in Canada. Suggestions have been coming from time to time from the government of India to the effect that some of their people should come here for training, but these representations have never come to anything.

SUGAR

APPLICATION OF TWENTY PER CENT REDUCTION IN COMMERCIAL USE—WINES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Black) asked me about the reduction in the quantity of sugar available for wineries. I find that the twenty per cent reduction applies in respect to wineries, just as it does in regard to other industrial users.

With regard to beer, which was mentioned yesterday, I find that my answer given at that time is only 99·9 per cent right. In other words, one-tenth of one per cent of sugar is used in the manufacture of beer. The amount is so insignificant, however, that no order was made with respect to it.

[Mr. Gillis.]

OIL

STEPS TO INCREASE CANADIAN PRODUCTION—DEVELOPMENT OF TAR SANDS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. E. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Munitions and Supply. In view of the serious situation in the far east, and the possibility of our losing our far eastern oil supply, what is the government going to do to cause an actual increase in Canadian production of oil?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Various steps have been taken. The tax structure was revised at the last sitting of the house to encourage drilling for oil throughout Canada. That revision had a very stimulating effect in the direction indicated. At this time steps are being taken to develop small oil areas for specific uses. Those negotiations are going on at the present time. I do not know that we have gone further than that. But I can say that we think we are developing considerably the production of oil. I have no suggestions to make to the government to enlarge our operations in that respect.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Is anything being done with the tar sands?

Mr. HOWE: I have a very exhaustive report on the subject of tar sands, and I should be very glad to let my hon. friend have a copy of it. It indicates, however, that the location of the sands and the possibility of development is too remote to be of any great use in this war.

BRUCE COAL COMPANY

QUESTION AS TO INVESTIGATION BY ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to a question asked by the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) and reported at page 401 of *Hansard* for February 9.

The hon. member for Témiscouata has raised the question of the Bruce Coal company receiving contracts from the government since it was made public that they were under investigation by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

All contracts placed by the Department of Munitions and Supply with the Bruce Coal company were placed prior to the seizure by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, on January 21, of all books and files of the Bruce Coal company, and none have been placed since. The Bruce Coal company is still delivering coal on contracts placed prior to

the Royal Canadian Mounted Police's action on January 21, and will continue to do so until such time as this department receives the proper legal advice to the contrary.

SHIPBUILDING

SUGGESTED AUGMENTATION OF PROGRAMME BY BUILDING OF WOODEN SHIPS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Munitions and Supply. According to a statement in last night's press, the chairman of the wartime shipping board, Mr. MacMillan, stated that supplies from this country are being held up owing to the lack of ships. Will the minister give further consideration to the proposal that our present shipbuilding programme be augmented by the building of wooden ships, especially as we have the materials and men available?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): I did not understand Mr. MacMillan's statement to be that supplies are being held up because of the lack of ships. I hardly think that that is true. Of course, there is always the danger that our increased output of supplies will outrun the increase in shipbuilding. I may say that the matter of the building of wooden ships has been considered fully by the department and is I think a closed issue.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

PLANS TO ENSURE ECONOMIC SECURITY OF NATION'S WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Pensions and National Health. First, has the government taken under consideration any pension plans to ensure the economic security in old age of the nation's workers, over and above a subsistence relief plan? Second, if the problem has been considered, has the government evolved a plan which it considers workable? Third, is there any likelihood in the near future of the introduction into parliament of legislation establishing such a plan?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): I shall consider very carefully the question of the hon. member when I see it in print and give an appropriate answer at the appropriate time.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Tuesday, February 17, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Coldwell.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to prolong this debate unduly, because I think it has perhaps gone too long already. I was astonished to learn that I am the 136th speaker, and I am included in the previous 135. I was astonished also to learn that of the 135 who have spoken, 95 are supporters of my right hon. friend, including, if I may say so, the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) who has constituted himself a party sole in this house. My primary object in asking your indulgence and the indulgence of hon. members is to pay at least some attention to the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). I desire to analyse his position, although not at great length, and compare his amendment with my own. I shall make other observations, some of which may not be strictly in order. If they are not, then I ask the indulgence of this house. During the course of my remarks, I desire to say something about the victory loan now before the country and to give it my support. I do not intend to proceed precisely in the order I have indicated.

Before going any further, I should like to offer to my hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty), who is just departing from the chamber, my congratulations upon his natal day and upon being fifty-three years young. On coming into this house after an absence of five years I found him occupying a most responsible position in the government of this country. He has been universally courteous to me and I appreciate it. With these few brief preliminary observations, may I refer to the course of the debate.

Although I consider the debate has been long, I consider also that for the most part it has been conducted upon a very high plane. Of course, there have been a few glaring exceptions, but on the whole I think I am justified, notwithstanding any criticism that may have been levelled at the debate from outside the house, in saying that I believe most hon. gentlemen have shown a sense of their responsibility, having regard to the distressing times through which we, in common with our allies, are now passing. So far as I am concerned personally I have tried at all times to keep the debate on a high plane and to avoid raising strife, especially racial strife. I do not think anyone can accuse me of doing that here in the past, nor will they

be able to accuse me of doing it in the future. In any appeal I have made in this house or in the country I have tried to appeal to reason alone, and I shall continue to pursue that course no matter what criticism I receive.

Aside altogether from the speeches of cabinet ministers who have participated in this debate, there have been two or three others that are outstanding. I should like to take this opportunity of congratulating the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Gray) upon the manner and matter of the speech he made. I think it took great courage on the part of the hon. gentleman to say what he did. The plane upon which he carried on his discussion was of the highest, and I think it was one of the best speeches we have heard in this house.

I should like to offer a token of appreciation to the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Moore), who I am sorry is not in his seat at the moment, for his address. It revealed to me an intelligent grasp of the problem of government which I do not think is excelled and perhaps not even equalled by any other member of the house.

I am sorry to say that there have been other speeches delivered during the course of this debate which do not deserve such praise as I have attempted to shower upon the two members to whom I have referred. I listened with the greatest regret, and as intently as I possibly could, to the speech of my fellow New Brunswicker, the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Veniot), and in my view it was one of the most dangerous speeches ever uttered in this House of Commons during all the years I have been here. I say, further, that I think it was quite unworthy of the hon. member and, from his own personal position, quite unnecessary. The particular part of his speech to which I refer was that portion in which he declared that the issue of compulsory military service was a racial issue. I deny that allegation categorically and with all the force and power at my command. I do suggest that there is no racial issue involved.

An hon. MEMBER: You made it one in 1917.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There was no racial issue involved in this question, now or then or at any other time. It has become a political issue, and for that I am truly sorry. There is raised in this issue only the question of equality of service and equality of sacrifice. The hon. member for Gloucester has made a speech which is designed to set race against race; and having regard to the conditions existing in the province of New Brunswick from which we both come, it may have repercussions which will not help the position of those whom he champions.

I deplore the attitude of the hon. member for Gloucester. He knows, as I do, that the Acadian portion of our people is loyal. I have said so before, and I reaffirm it now, that it has enlisted for active service in far greater numbers than it did in the last war; that as opportunity offered, men came to the colours—an opportunity which was denied them in the early stages of the war by the ineptitude of the recruiting officials of the Department of National Defence, a situation which was rectified after proper representations were made to them. I understand from officers in the army that these young men have made good soldiers. I saw many of them in Britain and I am glad to pay this tribute to them.

One of the difficulties with respect to our young Acadian men in New Brunswick was that in the early stages of the war there was a lack of trained officers and instructors speaking the French language, but that difficulty has, I believe, been overcome in very large degree. I verily believe, and I want to pay this compliment to our Acadian population, that they would have accepted compulsory service without any demur if their leaders, including the hon. member for Gloucester, had shown the way. On the contrary, he has indicated his determination to make this not only a political but a racial issue. I deplore that. How can his action help the cause of national unity? I am going to leave his speech there.

Mr. VENIOT: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes.

Mr. VENIOT: May I ask the hon. member if he has read a book called "Crisis of Quebec, 1914-18," by Elizabeth H. Armstrong of New York?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No, I have not read it. As a matter of fact I do not think I ever heard of it before. I would not go to New York for inspiration on this question.

Mr. VENIOT: If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have allowed the hon. member to ask his question, Mr. Speaker, and may I now be allowed to proceed with my speech?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. VENIOT: If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. VENIOT: —that book is in the parliamentary library.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am thankful for that information, and if I can get around to reading it within the next two or three years, I shall probably do so.

While we have been debating the issues raised in this debate, what has been happening outside? With the exception of the position in Russia, the campaign in every other theatre of war has been going from bad to worse. Never since Dunkirk have I felt so upset as I was on Sunday with the fall of the great bastion of Singapore, announced by Mr. Churchill. The position in the Pacific has been one of continued deterioration. No wonder that Australia is alarmed!

Then there was the spectacle of the German warships successfully negotiating the strait of Dover in the face of the combined resources of the British air and naval forces—something which had never been accomplished by a foe of Britain in more than a century.

These are things to make one think, and certainly I drew some conclusions. One of them was this. If we do not face realities, we may lose this war. We have a just cause, and the intentions of all of us, this government included, are of the very best. But we cannot win this war with good intentions, even if we have a just cause.

Canada's war effort has passed the organization stage and we are now in production. Great strides have been made; let us freely admit that. But because great strides, on a comparative basis, have been made, do not let us be lulled into a sense of false security. That I fear is happening here. That I fear is happening in the United States, judging by the newspaper reports to-day. That has happened all along in Canada. It is not enough for ministers to make laudatory speeches so long as there remains so much to be done, so long as our position in this struggle is at such a low ebb. I am speaking of the whole picture—not of just our own effort.

Let me illustrate. A few days ago Mr. Ralph Bell, for whom I have a very high regard, told the board of trade in an eastern city that the growth of aircraft production in Canada had been eighty per cent, and he added that it had been "one of the industrial romances of the British empire." That is very fine stuff for an after-dinner speech, but what in fact does it mean? Eighty per cent of what? It really means nothing in terms of production. What was our production of planes? Practically nothing before this war—thirty planes a year. It is just that sort of extravagant statement which breeds complacency.

Mr. HOWE: If my hon. friend will permit me, he spoke of ministerial statements. Mr. Bell was not speaking for the Minister of Munitions and Supply. He was, as a matter of fact, speaking contrary to instructions issued to all officers of the department.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does that apply to Mr. Carmichael?

Mr. HOWE: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister had better "inspire" him. I do not advocate firing either Mr. Carmichael or Mr. Bell; both are high-class men. If Mr. Bell exceeded his instructions, he must have had a reason for doing it. I am not complaining especially about that statement of Mr. Bell; I am complaining about the effect created in the minds of the people of Canada who have still to be shaken out of their complacency with respect to winning this war. That, and nothing else, is the point of the reference.

I want to say this, and I have said it before, that we have done well in respect of the air training plan. It has been our biggest undertaking. I have often said that we started too late; but that is water over the dam; we have done well, and I want to give credit to the minister who fathered this scheme. He knows what I think about it. I have told him this on many occasions; and as far as I am concerned I do not want to embarrass for a minute either him or any other of the defence ministers; I want to help them.

I sometimes wonder whether the Canadian people will ever wake up to a knowledge of the life-and-death character of this struggle—and for us here in Canada. Sometimes I despair. Can it be that nothing but a blood bath, perhaps at our very doors, will awaken us to realities? Something has to be done to instil into the minds of the Canadian people the danger which now confronts them.

The house will, I believe, bear with me a few moments while I make some references to the speech of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) of January 26. It will be recalled that near the outset of his remarks he attempted, by banter and otherwise, to belittle the terms of the amendment which I had the honour to move. I confess that his observations left me cold. There is no one in this house who does not understand the purpose and the import of the amendment. As analysed by the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) the other day, its purpose is fourfold. First, it condemns and opposes the plebiscite. Second, it proposes a total war effort without any limitations. Third, it emphasizes the necessity of complete mobilization of all our resources for

total war, without any limitations. Fourth, it regrets that no mention is made in the speech from the throne of proposals for the post-war period.

In the speech which I made on January 26, I did not ask the house to listen to references to the latter part of this amendment. I did not think I could inflict at that time a speech of the length which would be necessary to elaborate my views. I propose to do so, in a very summary way, to-day at a later stage.

But to return to the Prime Minister's gibe, I suspect that its basis was the omission from the amendment of the word "conscription." Now, I ask this question, does not everyone in this house and the country know the import, substance and meaning of the amendment? Call it what you like, it means total and complete effort and, if you like so to describe it, conscription of everything—wealth, resources and man-power; for that is the price we shall have to pay for victory.

With respect to his announcement of the generous treatment which the government has decided to accord Britain, both in regard to the present adverse balance of war accounts to date and also with respect to the gift out of our abundance, in food, materials and supplies, I have nothing but praise and commendation.

So far on the battle front we have not contributed much. I say that in no disparaging sense. The air training plan and our contribution of mechanical transport, and now of munitions, have been both impressive and substantial. The opportunity, apart from the ill-fated expedition to Hong Kong, has not been present. That time will come, and the contribution of our gallant men overseas will be, I feel sure, as important, as heroic and impressive as was the contribution of Canada's sons in the last war.

In the meantime, why should not Canada make this contribution? It is a magnificent contribution. But may I be permitted to remind the Prime Minister and hon. gentlemen opposite that it is the contribution of the Canadian people and not of any political party—a contribution in which every one of us has a share—a contribution given gratefully, with a sense of gratitude not for favours yet to come but—mark you well—for services already rendered to us and ours, for value already received over a long period of years, for protection to us and to ours, for security to our shores over a long period of years, when we looked upon the British navy as our one sure and only defence—a defence to which, be it said and to our shame, we have not, in the days gone by, contributed a single man or a single dollar.

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

Yes! Why should we not now in this, the greatest crisis in history, give of our abundance, and for services rendered?

The enunciation of the establishment of two new divisions overseas in 1942 is not a new policy. It is a continuation of the policy heretofore adopted and, I believe, endorsed by the great mass of the Canadian people, although we know there are exceptions. The extension of our active army programme is an extension of the existing programme and is based on the extension of our productive programme. It is creditable to Canada and to the Canadian people, but it is not beyond what we should do.

And it will be welcomed in England; for the danger of invasion is still imminent. Do not let us for a moment forget that. It is much more than a possibility; it is wholly probable that the attempt will be made in the very near future, and Canada will be proud to have two more divisions to aid in that gigantic struggle.

I hope that the government will see to it—I hope that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) will see to it—that adequate reinforcements for these six divisions overseas are provided. When the battle begins, when the casualty lists begin to roll in, then will be the testing time—then will be revealed whether our method of obtaining recruits for service anywhere is satisfactory.

I listened with profound interest to the statement of the Minister of National Defence the other day. The requirements of the active army for the next fiscal year will be substantial. It may be that we shall produce the numbers required by the voluntary system. I am doubtful. I gather that the minister is doubtful too, because he left the door wide open so that he might turn to the other avenue if the present system failed. I observe, however, that he is cheered by the results for the month of January. I wonder whether my hon. friend knows that these results were obtained because of two important factors—Pearl Harbour, and the belief that conscription for overseas service was not only a possibility but a probability. I have concrete evidence of the truth of this latter factor—a personal experience in my own riding.

I do not intend to argue further the point of selective national service. The government will interpret, it does interpret no doubt, the by-elections as a mandate to carry on the voluntary system. That may be open to question. I imagine that conscription was only one of the many elements entering into the result. There were others. In Welland, I should say there was the most brazen appeal

in the way of wholesale bribery to a constituency that we have witnessed for many a long day. We had the spectacle of a minister of the crown, and perhaps his most outstanding executive, telling the people of Welland that, if the Minister of Labour were elected, new war plants would be established in the community.

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely false.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, I base that statement on reports in the newspapers.

Mr. HOWE: Will the hon. member lay those reports on the table?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I haven't got them with me.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am man enough to say this, however—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Just hold your horses for a few minutes and listen to me. If the minister pledges his word that neither he nor Mr. Carmichael made any effort at bribery of the electors of Welland, of course I will withdraw.

Mr. HOWE: What Mr. Carmichael said is a matter of permanent record.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister speaks for himself, and I assume he speaks for Mr. Carmichael.

Mr. HOWE: Mr. Carmichael's speech is a matter of permanent record in the hands of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. What I said I said in a very public way, and if the hon. member can find one man in the constituency who says that I said what he has indicated, I should like to meet the gentleman.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Of course I will take the minister's statement that he did not say it. My information was quite the contrary, but the minister's word on the floor of the house, under the rules of the house I do accept and must accept.

Mr. SLAGHT: Where did your information come from?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, now, I am not under cross-examination.

I desire to make one further reference, and a very limited one, to the Prime Minister's declaration on the plebiscite. I do not intend to labour this point further. I do not intend to labour a discussion on the principle of the plebiscite when the bill is introduced, but I am wondering whether the Prime Minister and the government have taken cognizance of what occurred at St. James street market in the city of Montreal last week and, in particular, the declarations of Mr. Henri Bourassa who, coming out of his retirement, rent the veil of the temple of Liberalism and exposed the fallacies and futilities of the political stratagem behind this gesture of a plebiscite. He announced his unalterable opposition to conscription for overseas service, and he warned his compatriots not to vote to release the Prime Minister from his pledge. To me that is portentous. The strangest part of his speech, to me, and one for which I am sure there can be no foundation, was his warning to his great audience to be prepared for the attempt by the government to impose full conscription, under pressure from Washington, not from London. Well, I have no fear that Washington will attempt in any way to intervene in our domestic affairs here. But that is the sort of thing the government is going to meet in the province of Quebec, and I deplore it.

An hon. MEMBER: You taught them that in 1911.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I did not teach them anything. Nobody can teach Mr. Bourassa anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I call attention to the fact that the leader of the opposition is now giving his address after listening to 135 speeches and very rarely interrupting. I would ask hon. members to refrain from interruptions.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not mind ordinary interruptions, but if they are intended to throw me off my train of thought I do object.

These declarations of this gentleman are rather ominous. I hope the Prime Minister and those who surround him will give thought to their effect in the province of Quebec. To me, one of the most striking statements made, and one with which I fully agree, was the declaration of Mr. Bourassa's belief that Sir Robert Borden and Mr. Meighen were more honest in their attitudes than the present ministers.

In closing this part of my remarks, may I quote just one paragraph from Mr. Bourassa's speech, which was the gem of it all. He said:

> The attitude of Prime Minister King is similar to that of the young man who became engaged to be married. Later he came to his fiancee and asked to be given back the ring. He doesn't tell the young lady that he doesn't intend to marry her, but he wants the ring back just in case he doesn't.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: He's Scotch.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not think the fiancee will believe him.

I should like now to pay some attention to the speech of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley). The Minister of Finance made an impassioned address in this debate, during which he elaborated upon the ethnical background of himself and the people he represented. He said in effect that they were British and that they thought in terms of the British empire and, I gather, not as isolationists. These utterances struck a responsive chord in my heart, because his background is my background. My people, too, are British and think in terms of the British empire. Most assuredly they are not isolationists. And then as I listened to his address I could not help but think how unhappy the hon. gentleman, with such a background, must have been in days gone by when he found himself led and surrounded by isolationists, like the Prime Minister, by others of his cabinet colleagues who, like the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson), in the not far distant past were not only isolationists, but positively for neutrality—

Mr. THORSON: That is not true.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, that is a matter of interpretation. I think I could prove it. I reflected to myself, as I have so often done during the course of this debate, that party loyalty and party politics make strange bedfellows. Whatever may be said about the Conservative party or about any individuals within the ranks of the Conservative party, it cannot and it never shall be said that the Conservative party ever failed at any time to give adherence to the British crown and the principle of British connection. It has never wavered in that regard, and please God, it never shall. Whatever the consequences may be, and come what may, it will continue to press, as it has from the very beginning of hostilities, for a full-out war effort.

But to return to the minister's speech, it was an apologia or defence of the government's proposal of a plebiscite. In my view he had a difficult job, and he did a far better job than did the Prime Minister. It did not carry conviction, because all the way through it was based on false premises. "It was an intelligent defence of an indefensible project," as one writer has stated. I wonder just how it struck the hearts and minds of the loyal British people of Digby-Annapolis-Kings, whom the hon. minister represents in this house? I wonder whether he has not been hearing from some of the more thoughtful of his own supporters, as I have, men who have in the past supported him through thick and thin, and who now write to me that never, never again will they do so. That is what I got from some of them.

The minister appears to have some confidence that the voluntary system of recruiting is a success in producing adequate numbers of recruits for the active army and for service overseas. But the admissions of the Minister of National Defence, which I cited at length in my previous address, as well as those of others, all indicate to me that the voluntary system has reached the end of its usefulness if we are to have those reinforcements and reserves of trained men for the active army when that army finally gets into action and the casualty lists begin to roll in.

Aside from all that, there are strong reasons for abandoning the system. I do not intend to argue that point again, but this question I ask the minister: Why did he not give us a straightforward pronouncement of his own attitude on the principle of compulsory service? It is an open secret in Ottawa that the minister and his fellow Nova Scotians in the cabinet, not to speak of others like the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie), are personally in favour of the principle, but that they have consented to a compromise for a plebiscite, and to father it on the cry of "Trust the people." If that be true, it is not a very manly or courageous course.

Searching the minister's speech, there is some evidence discernible that he is in favour of the principle of compulsory service if he were free and not restricted by the theory of cabinet solidarity. There is his declaration that if the plebiscite passes affirmatively, "We shall then be free to act and will act," and I underline those words, "and will act."

Mr. ILSLEY: Just read the rest of it.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is the crux of the statement. The speech will speak for itself. What does that statement mean?

Mr. ILSLEY: I do not think it makes much difference, but I do not like to have anyone quoting me stop in the middle of a sentence. My recollection is that I said, "will be free to act in the best interests of the nation in the war effort," or something like that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): "And will act." That is the point upon which I wish to lay emphasis.

Mr. ILSLEY: I deplore this, Mr. Speaker, but my hon. friend should quote me accurately and finish the sentence.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister is importunate. I recall that just a few days ago he rebuked me very severely for interrupting him. I should like him to take a leaf out of his own book and not interrupt me. He can correct me later on, if he wants to make another speech.

Mr. ILSLEY: I did not misquote my hon. friend.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, the words are there, "We shall be free to act and will act." What does that mean? If that is a sincere declaration—and I do not suggest that it is not—if released by the plebiscite, the government will then act to put the principle into effect. "Free to act and will act" means that the government will act affirmatively to put the principle into effect by repealing the limiting clause of the mobilization act. What other interpretation can any thoughtful person put upon that language? But compare that declaration with the language of the speech from the throne, and with that used by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister desired to be free to act, but never did he say that the government would act. On the contrary, the Prime Minister's declaration was a bid to the people to free him of his pledge and then allow him and his government to do as he pleased. Does the minister adhere to that, in the light of his declaration that the government when free to act, would act? The two positions are incompatible. No wonder the loyal people of this country are bewildered by the ambiguity of such a position and such declarations!

I was glad, Mr. Speaker, to hear the minister address some plain and wholesome truths to his supporters from the province of Quebec, and, above all, his challenge to their contention that under no circumstances should this nation compel its nationals to undertake military service abroad. What he said needed to be said. Why? Because for twenty-five years the people of Quebec have been taught in season and out of season, by the leaders of the Liberal party in that province and, indeed, by others high in the councils of that party, that they had no national obligation to the state, to the empire, to the world at large in such circumstances as have now developed. He did well to remind our French-Canadian compatriots that this struggle was not one for imperial aggrandizement but a life-and-death conflict between two philosophies of life, between freedom and slavery; and that this struggle will be decided not within the territorial limits of Canada but in theatres of war far distant from our shores. Indeed he might and should have gone much further and pointed out to them that their ideas of imperialism, which have been so repugnant to them, are ideas which are outmoded and no longer in existence. In this twentieth century, Mr. Speaker, imperialism means trusteeship, not aggrandizement. That is a principle which the minister might very well have brought home to his compatriots, but he missed the golden opportunity.

But on the principle of cabinet responsibility and solidarity the minister backed up and endeavoured to justify the plebiscite, and he announced his intention of supporting it in the country. Having taken a noble stand in the early part of his address, he boxed the whole compass. He started off with the lofty attitude of a statesman; he took his seat with the stature of a party politician.

I want now to put this question squarely to him: If the testing time comes, will he support the principle of compulsory military service? And will the government act? He should make his position clear. The people of Canada want to know. The people of Nova Scotia want to know. They will not be content with a declaration of "wait and see." That policy smacks of opportunism, of putting party politics above the safety of the state, and that is not good enough. The manly course is to say and say now what the government will do if the plebiscite carries. And if the plebiscite fails to carry, what then will the minister do? Will he say, "I bow to the will of the majority no matter if I disagree on a great matter of principle"? If I apprehend the minister's position aright, as disclosed by his speech, he will resign; and he will be right, and his people will applaud him. If the result is indecisive, and if eight provinces out of nine vote "yes" and one great province votes "no", as well it may; what then? Will he adopt one of the only two courses open to him, that of resigning on a matter of principle, or will he proceed on the British principle of constitutional government, which as a student of the law and of the constitution he must believe in, namely, the adoption of a policy on this question, one way or the other, and stake his political life on the position he then takes?

May I commend to him and to this house the authority of a great student and writer on the law of the constitution, Dicey, where in chapter 94 he discusses and sums up the argument against introducing the principle of the plebiscite into parliamentary institutions, and where he advocates the doctrine of the rule of intelligence. The late Lord Asquith was a great lawyer, a great parliamentarian, a great orator and a great debater; someone has said he was the last of the great Liberals. I think I should qualify that and designate the

hon. member for Ontario the last, at least in Canada, of the Liberals. Asquith said that the referendum would impair, if it did not destroy, the sense of parliamentary government. To use his own words, "It would really destroy the law of government by representation." I commend this dictum to the minister as a lawyer, as a parliamentarian and as a Liberal, if there be such a genus still at large in Canada.

I want now to say a word about the loan; and I suspect that the minister made his speech when he did, and said some of the things he did say, not so much in support of a bad case for the plebiscite but because he was alarmed for the success of the loan, and he had reason for that fear. When I first read of the plebiscite proposal, one of my first reactions was that the proposal, put forward in the form it was and at the time it was, would be disastrous. The timing was frightful, having regard to the loan. The minister has been hearing from the country, and so have I. The minister made a vigorous attack upon some of those who wrote him. He called them saboteurs of the national war effort, and declared that their action was a strike against the state.

I do not think that calling names will help his position. Rather would I commend to him the appeal to reason when dealing with these people. Apparently a large number of people have been writing the minister, threatening to cancel their pledges to buy war savings certificates, and to boycott the victory loan, as a means of expressing their disapproval of the government's subterfuge of a plebiscite on an important issue.

Human nature being what it is, that is a natural thing for some people to do. I have heard it on many sides. But I deprecate that attitude; I oppose it. On cool reflection I am sure those who have so declared themselves will reverse their judgment.

Let me make my position and the position of the Conservative party clear on this issue. Notwithstanding our disapproval of the government's policy, notwithstanding our belief that it is a policy of evasion of responsibility, and the negation of responsible government, we believe that the loan should and must be supported to the limit, and I appeal here and now to the great army of loyal Conservatives in this country, as well as to the great mass of our citizens, to rise above the situation which the government has created and which they abhor, and put this loan over.

To them I say: That is the nobler course; that is the patriotic course; that is the course which national obligation imposes; that is the course which we owe to the men overseas and to those we are asking to go overseas to fight for us, to defend us. Any other course is unthinkable—any other course will but play into the hands of the isolationists, the unpatriotic, the disloyal. Let it never be said that this nation stultified itself. The wealth of the nation must be put at the disposal of the state. It must be marshalled and mobilized. Yes, and if needs be, if it means the winning of the war, it must be conscripted. Let there be no mistake on that score.

Many times I have told this house that the people of Canada would give the government the money to carry on the war, give it in abundance and in full measure. They will hold them accountable for how it is expended. That prophecy has been amply justified up to now. It will continue to be justified. I have supreme confidence that no matter how distasteful government policies may be, no matter how much we abhor the lack of leadership so apparent in this plebiscite, the loyal people of Canada, who all along have been ahead of the government in a determination to pursue total war with total effort, will never stultify themselves. I know they will not do it.

I endorse the minister's appeal in this regard. The great army of Conservatives in Canada will respond to the nation's need in full measure.

May I turn now to the amendment which I had the honour to move on January 26, and which is based on two fundamental principles. The first relates to the proposal for the plebiscite. I shall not take time at this point to read it.

I dealt with the question of the plebiscite at considerable length in my previous address, and I do not propose to repeat my arguments to-day.

I would, however, commend to the Prime Minister and to all thoughtful students of parliamentary government the highly significant and reasoned address delivered to this house on Monday, the 9th instant, by the hon. member for Ontario. I regretted that the Prime Minister was not present to hear that speech. As a student, as a Liberal, he could not have listened to it without some heart-burnings and stirrings of mind and conscience; for the hon. member put the matter of plebiscite and government responsibility before this house and before the people of Canada far better than I am capable of doing, far better than anyone else so far has done. With inescapable logic, with apt phrase and sound reasoning, he exposed the fallacy of the government's proposal.

The second underlying principle of my amendment is my attempt to state, in general but unmistakable terms, the principles under which I think this country can and should wage war. I shall not read it, but it is a matter of record.

There is no ambiguity about this amendment. We propose the complete utilization of everything we possess to wage total war and to attain victory. It includes much more than the mere mobilization of our man-power for service anywhere. It visualizes the utmost use of our wealth and material resources to back up our man-power. It means among other things, the conscription of wealth, to accomplish that end. Indeed, we have the power to conscript wealth to-day. Up to date the power has been exercised in a very limited degree, but the power is there to be used and the people of this country are prepared to make this or any other sacrifice if called upon to do so. All they require is to be told what to do. I have scores of letters from men who are capable, willing and anxious to do something, but they do not know where to go to do it. Our people will never refuse this or any other government all the tools that are necessary, including, if needs be, both their lives and their wealth.

There is a great deal of mixed thinking on this question of conscription of wealth.

Taxation—heavy and severe taxation such as that to which we have subjected ourselves —is a form of conscription. The direct deduction of the national defence tax from the mechanic's pay cheque is a form of conscription. The levy of income tax is another form; but it is not confiscation, because any income tax is predicated on the theory that there must be capital and/or services upon which the income is earned and these are to be maintained; else there is nothing to tax. We have conscription in the form of the new Dominion Succession Duty Act.

Yes, let us completely mobilize the wealth of the country to attain total war! But do not believe—and I direct the attention of hon. members to this point—that such mobilization means the complete nationalization of all our financial institutions, as my friends on the left pretend they would have us do. That is socialism, pure and unadulterated.

I reject socialism, because it not only eliminates the principle of private enterprise but contemplates a definite revolution in our economic fabric. Most of us are individualists. I believe we all pride ourselves upon being individualists. I am, and I admit it without shame or apology. But I do recognize that in war time I must subordinate my undoubted rights as an individual to the paramount necessities of the state—even, perhaps, under the censorship to which we referred the other day. I may for a while not object to the viciousness of a censor. But I am not willing to give up my rights forever.

The official opposition finds it impossible to support the subamendment of the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell). Let me analyse that amendment. In part it states that:

> In the opinion of this house no total effort adequate to meet the present needs of the war, domestic problems, and the preparation for post-war conditions is possible without total mobilization of wealth, industry and finance as well as human resources.

The underlying thought of that section of the subamendment is much the same as that part of my amendment to be found in subparagraph (a) which reads:

> (a) completely mobilize the wealth and material resources and, on a selective basis, the full man and woman power of the nation, to the end that the nation may wage total war in any theatre of war.

To that part of the subamendment I can not take exception. While it is not inherent in the literal wording of the subamendment, I suspect that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar intends his resolution to be an endorsation of the principles of socialism as the fundamental agency for governing the nation in war time. But if he so intended, he has not expressed it—

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Meighen accepted it.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Meighen did not say so.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Meighen stated before the York South electors that he accepted my outline for the conscription of wealth on his own behalf and that of the Conservative party.

Mr. MacINNIS: He accepted it for himself and the Conservative party.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But if the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar so intended, he has not expressed it, and therefore I find myself in substantial agreement with the section of his subamendment to which I have referred. The second paragraph of the subamendment requests that:

> . . . the forthcoming plebiscite should seek the support of the people of Canada for the complete and effective conscription of war industries, accumulated wealth and financial institutions, at the same time and on the same basis of sacrifice as the suggested extension of the conscription of man-power.

This section of the subamendment at least tacitly approves the proposed plebiscite and seeks to have an additional question submitted to the people of Canada. This is

directly inconsistent with the first part of my amendment which condemns the proposed plebiscite as an evasion of responsibility and a negation of responsible government. The submission to the people of the question proposed by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation subamendment would, in my view, equally be an evasion of responsibility and a negation of responsible government. Both the question proposed by the government and that proposed by the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation should, in my opinion, be determined by this parliament. If the opposition were to vote for both the amendment to the amendment and the amendment, it would in effect be voting to approve and then to disapprove the proposed plebiscite. We would be directly inconsistent with the principles enunciated in our own amendment, and I reiterate that we have not deviated from the opinion regarding the proposed plebiscite which is expressed in my amendment.

I do not intend to labour this, but may I refer particularly to one principle which the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar enunciated: The national ownership, or at least the control of all our war industries to produce everything we require to maintain civilian health and morale and to provide our fighting forces with adequate equipment. How can we who believe in private enterprise subscribe to that principle? We have to a large degree nationalized the war industries of Canada. Are we to go the whole length? Are we to accept socialism as an economic factor in war time and then have it continued in the post-war period?

Mr. REID: You mean one form of socialism.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): One form of socialism. That is what these gentlemen mean, and for myself I certainly cannot accept it. However, in voting against it we are not to be taken as disapproving "total mobilization of wealth, industry and finance as well as human resources."

The fourth part of my amendment refers to the question of post-war problems. One cannot, within the brief compass of a speech, touch upon all the topics with which one would desire to deal. I put that clause in my amendment because there is definitely no reference to this matter in the speech from the throne. If the Minister of Pensions and National Health will give me his attention, I should like to say that I referred to this in the amendment because I recall that in a speech which he delivered in Quebec city on June 20 last he painted a glowing picture of what was to be at the conclusion of peace—a peace, he declared, dictated "by the people" and a post-war world where problems will be solved "by the will of the masses of the people." He then proceeded:

> Never again, I hope and pray, shall you and I know the Canada we knew before this war broke upon us—when unemployment and relief and distress and hunger and poverty and want were rampant in the richest country in all the world. The new day, the new order, the new plan must bring, and will bring, a remedy for all that.

I can just hear him raising his voice to high heaven. He then went on to speak of a policy of collective security based upon collective force and collective preparedness rather than upon collective idealism. But he failed to sketch the new plan, like so many people who talk about the ideal condition that is to be when this war is over. It is true he gave his vision of post-war Canada, a vision of timed public works, of coordinated municipal, provincial and federal effort, of progressive highway development—nothing new about that; they have all been tried and they will not bring about the millennium—to be ruled by a sound and progressive agricultural policy. We are still waiting for that. He omitted to refer to the soundness of the principle of private enterprise. Has he divorced himself from that? Is he fearful of that?

Then, rising to great heights of eloquence—I can hear him now—he adopted the classic cry of the old London watch: "Watchmen, what of the night?" from the book of Isaiah. And he quoted the answer:

> The night is far spent—the long, long night is nearly over—the morning cometh.

And he wound up with this prediction:

> We shall soon witness the glory of the dawn.

Magnificent! My heart glowed when I read the report of that speech, but I fear we have not yet witnessed the glory of the dawn and we are not likely to until victory is won. Meanwhile, what of the preparations for the post-war period? In his speech of February 6 the minister stated that the government had submitted to the house a series of far-reaching measures dealing with post-war problems and announced that at least two further important measures would be submitted at the present session. He cited the Unemployment Insurance Act of 1940 as being primarily a post-war measure. I concur in a degree, but no one, even rising to the wildest heights of his imagination, can ever say that unemployment insurance is a cure for unemployment. It is merely a palliative.

He then referred to the post-discharge plan, passed somewhat belatedly, I believe, by means of an order in council, after he had been hearing from the returned soldiers and the

country. This gives the benefit of the Unemployment Insurance Act to members of the armed forces and provides certain other measures of assistance to discharged men, and the minister referred to it as a post-war measure of the highest importance. In a degree that is also true, but it, too, is merely a palliative and not a cure for what may be.

He then stated that of the measures to be introduced this session one would deal with a system of land settlement which would be one of the most constructive and far-reaching proposals of its kind ever submitted to parliament. We may expect something enormous. We shall reserve judgment with regard to this announcement, but I should like to say this to him and to members of the government: Be sure to benefit by the history of the past. I lay it down as axiomatic—it is no use putting a man on the land who does not have his roots deep in the soil and a love for the soil. Furthermore, any man put on the land should have had some knowledge of farming prior to his enlistment. Over and above all—as important as any at all events—before asking a man to go on the land the government of this country and the provincial governments should propose and put into effect, by coordinated effort if possible, policies which will result in farmers receiving for their products such financial returns as will make it profitable for them to go on the land and remain there. This is fundamental, and if you do not do that, no land policy will succeed.

Most people in this country are and have been fearful that when the war is over and a lasting peace, let us hope, is attained, large numbers of our people will find themselves out of jobs and that we shall experience a depression far greater than that after the last war and greater even than that of the great depression period.

May I suggest that these prophets of calamity bear in mind that the biggest job on our hands apart from the war, and as big a job at least as that of defence, will be waiting for the people of Canada—the job of rebuilding our national economy—and that a depression need not occur unless by private and official folly one is created.

In this connection may I refer hon. members to a speech made by Mr. W. J. Cameron on the Ford Sunday Evening Hour on October 12 last, in which he deals with this matter and deals with it realistically. He said:

> Look at the factors. First, a production plant largely obsolete for years, never able to supply all our people, is now being modernized and enlarged. Second, a general stock so greatly reduced by defence restrictions on manufacture and purchases that, with defence secured, the demand for all sorts of merchandise will require every man and machine we have to satisfy it. Third, new industries like aviation being firmly established, the use of plastics extended, older industries rejuvenated and a closer partnership formed between larger and smaller businesses. Fourth, with its production mechanism smashed to pieces, where can Europe look for the means of rehabilitation after the victory, except to America? Why, it will require twenty years of shipbuilding alone to replace the bottoms that have been sunk the last two years! These factors unless we are hopeless fools, will help to accomplish the transition without hard times.

Then he goes on to state that a depression was in the cards following previous wars, but that this time it is not in the cards, that conditions are different. Many minds are giving forethought to preventing a depression, but nothing can protect us or our nation against ourselves. Then he adds this wholesome admonition and preaches the doctrine of thrift which I should like to have every man, woman and child in Canada take to heart:

> Let those who are earning more money put some of it where they can get it back. A spending panic is as bad as a hoarding panic. We can protect our nation and we can protect ourselves if we assert and believe, on the basis of facts, that a post-defence depression is not necessary and can be avoided.

I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for having spoken so long, but perhaps the house will bear with me for about five minutes more.

To me the plebiscite is as objectionable as when it was first announced. But the government will not alter its course. It will pass the address notwithstanding the opposition which comes from various diverse elements, and for various reasons. That being so, we should next await the government's proposals with respect to the *modus operandi* of the plebiscite. Let us examine them judicially with a view, if possible, to improving them. During this debate we have not had much light thrown on this topic—the discussion has centred around the principles involved. Let us then turn our attention to the proposals, and examine them as business men, not as partisans. I shall then, I hope, have crystallized my views on what I think I should advise our people to do.

Then we can turn to the general business of the session. I have offered the government, and I renew this offer, constructive cooperation in its general war programme. I have tried to follow a consistent course in that regard, no matter what certain critics have said, and I shall continue to do so. I may not be a Willkie, but no one will ever be able to say that I and those who sit round me have sabotaged or obstructed the government's war effort. On the contrary, we have sought and shall seek to help the government by constructive criticism, but we must not be ex-

pected to submerge our opinions on matters of principle. That we shall never do. That we should not be expected to do.

I listened on Sunday, as all hon. gentlemen no doubt did, to Mr. Churchill's speech in which near the close he announced the fall of Singapore. I listened to it with mingled feelings. Here was disaster; here was defeat. But I was buoyed up with his soul-stirring message to us and the other nations, and I shall close by quoting one paragraph from his address which sank into my heart, my mind and my soul. He said:

> This, therefore, is one of those moments when the British nation can show its quality of genius. This is one of those moments when it can draw from the heart of misfortune the vital impulse of victory. Here is a moment to display that calm and poise, combined with grim determination, which not so very long ago brought us out of the very jaws of death. Here is another occasion to show, as so often in our long history, that we can meet reverses with dignity and with renewed accession of strength.

The house divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Coldwell), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Blackmore	MacInnis
Castleden	Marshall
Coldwell	Nicholson
Douglas (Weyburn)	Nielsen, Mrs.
Fair	Noseworthy
Gillis	Quelch
Hansell	Shaw
Johnston (Bow River)	Wright—16.

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott	Clark
Adamson	Claxton
Anderson	Cleaver
Authier	Cloutier
Aylesworth	Corman
Bence	Coté
Bercovitch	Crerar
Bertrand (Laurier)	Cruickshank
Bertrand (Prescott)	d'Anjou
Bertrand (Terrebonne)	Davidson
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)	Dechene
Black (Cumberland)	Denis
Black (Yukon)	Desmond
Blair	Diefenbaker
Blanchette	Donnelly
Bonnier	Douglas (Queens)
Boucher	Dubois
Bourget	Dupuis
Bradette	Durocher
Breithaupt	Edwards
Bruce	Emmerson
Brunelle	Esling
Cardin	Eudes
Casselman, Mrs. (Edmonton East)	Evans
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)	Farquhar
Chevrier	Ferland
Church	Ferron
Fournier (Hull)	Fleming
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)	Fontaine
Fraser (Northumberland, Ont.)	MacKinnon (Edmonton West)
Fraser (Peterborough West)	McKinnon (Kenora-Rainy River)
Fulford	MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
Furniss	McLarty
Gardiner	MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
Gauthier	McLean (Simcoe East)
Gershaw	Macmillan
Gibson	McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
Gingues	McNiven (Regina City)
Gladstone	MacNicol
Golding	Marier
Goulet	Martin
Graham	Maybank
Grant	Mayhew
Graydon	Michaud
Green	Mills
Gregory	Mullins
Hanson (Skeena)	Mulock
Hanson (York-Sunbury)	Neill
Harris (Danforth)	Nixon
Harris (Grey-Bruce)	O'Neill
Hatfield	Parent
Hazen	Perley
Healy	Picard
Henderson	Pinard
Hill	Poirier
Hoblitzell	Pottier
Homuth	Pouliot
Howden	Power
Howe	Purdy
Hurtubise	Ralston
Ilsley	Raymond
Isnor	Reid
Jackman	Rennie
Jean	Rhéaume
King, Mackenzie	Rickard
Kinley	Roebuck
Kirk	Ross (Calgary East)
Lacombe	Ross (Hamilton East)
Lacroix (Beauce)	Ross (St. Paul's)
LaCroix (Quebec-Montmorency)	Ross (Souris)
Laflamme	Roy
Lafontaine	Ryan
Lalonde	Sanderson
Lapointe (Lotbinière)	Senn
Leclerc	Sissons
Leduc	Slaght
Leger	Soper
Little	Stirling
Lizotte	Stokes
Lockhart	Sylvestre
McCann	Taylor
McCuaig	Telford
McCubbin	Thauvette
McCulloch	Thorson
MacDiarmid	Tremblay
Macdonald (Brantford City)	Tripp
Macdonald (Halifax)	Turgeon
McDonald (Pontiac)	Tustin
McGarry	Vien
McGibbon	Ward
McGregor	Warren
McIlraith	Weir
McIvor	White
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)	Whitman
	Winkler
	Wood—190.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the amendment.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken on the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition and I intend to say a few words.

It seems to me it is important to give the house an idea of the real feeling and sentiment of the province of Quebec. Members who live one-half of the year in their constituencies have one superiority over those who have not the same advantage on account of pressure of business. They meet thirty, forty, fifty people each weekday—people who tell them about their joys and their troubles and ask them for information and help. Of course all those who come to the office of a member do not give information about personal matters. Some come just to ask for a recommendation, or a word of encouragement. But others have sufficient confidence in their member of parliament to tell him about very personal matters, to open up their hearts to him and ask for advice. They also inform the member about the general feeling of those who live near them and of the community in which they reside. Therefore a member of parliament has the advantage of knowing well the feeling and sentiment of his constituents. So that when the opinion of members of parliament is asked by the government, it is very easy for them to inform the government about the soundness or unsoundness of any policy.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, hon. members exchange gibes in this house. They try to break the monotony and dullness of the proceedings with some repartee; but though this happens at times I must congratulate very heartily and very warmly not only the mover and seconder of the address but all my colleagues who have taken part in this debate, from the Prime Minister down. We realize the seriousness of the moment, but what I cannot comprehend is the use of commonplace sayings when each of us should be at liberty to speak with more freedom than ever in expressing his own views. Whether or not my colleagues share my views, there is one thing I must and will do; that is, respect their views.

With the loss of our mutual friend, the late Minister of Justice, this House of Commons reminds me of the Quebec seminary where I was a student, after one of the greatest educators in Canada, Monsignor Mathieu, had left that institution to become the first archbishop of Regina. At times I have seen the broad smile of the former Minister of Justice, even while I was speaking; and once I remember he told me he had been told by someone sitting in front of him not to smile when I was speaking, because he was encouraging me. As I rise to speak to-day, sir, I remember some events of my political life, particularly the day when the former Minister of Justice, Mr. Lapointe, came with my leader, the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King) to the house in which I live, at Rivière du Loup. Though notice of this event had been given only a short time before, and the weather was bad, some eight hundred people from my county came in to pay their tribute of respect both to my leader, the leader of the Liberal party, who was then leader of the opposition, and to their old friend the Minister of Justice. The Prime Minister, I am sure, must remember the kind faces of those good people. Many of them were farmers; and they all said how delighted they were to have the privilege of shaking hands with him. Among them was an old gentleman who died a year or two ago at the age of ninety-four, who had voted for my grandfather, for my father, and for myself, and who used to preside at my meetings. He was a dear old gentleman, tall and with a long white beard; and I introduced him to my leader as the Liberal patriarch of my county. The Prime Minister was thoughtful enough to send that old gentleman birthday messages of greetings and good wishes each year until his unfortunate death.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is not an exceptional case. I am proud of my people. I respect them. When I speak to them, and when they do me the honour of listening to my speeches, I consider it a very great privilege. It is a great sacrifice for me to remain in politics. I could have an easy life otherwise, but it is my duty in time of war to stand by my people and show my appreciation of the confidence they have placed in me during the long time I have represented them in this House of Commons.

This afternoon I listened to the acting leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson)—I wonder if he is still acting, or if he is the full leader? He said, "If we do not face realities we may lose this war." I agree with that. Then he added, "We, the loyal people, are bewildered." It sounded like, "We, the people of England; the 'tailors of Tooley street.'" Is he the only person in Canada who is not complacent? Speaking of the plebiscite he said it was neither the manly nor the courageous course, and then he spoke of the probability of the invasion of England. The question is not whether the plebiscite is a manly or courageous course. The question is whether the plebiscite is the best course to follow at the present time, bearing in mind also that the plebiscite is closely related to conscription for overseas service. Then the hon. gentleman said the province of Quebec

should understand that this war is a conflict between two philosophies of life, freedom and slavery. A friend of mine who occupies a high post in the government of Quebec told me once that French-Canadians are not strong for abstraction. There is one point however I should like now to suggest to the government. I have already made the suggestion, but unfortunately it was not accepted. I suggest that a radical change be made in the information service of the government.

Why do we have trouble and agitation on the part of people in Toronto and elsewhere who have advocated total war? We have it because the information service of the government is totally inefficient, and because it is headed by a man who has been loaned by a big company and who receives at least $15 a day for expenses, while at the same time receiving salary. He is a neurasthenic and a fascist. How can fascist propaganda be dear to the hearts of French-Canadians in Quebec, any more than to the hearts of the good English-speaking or French-speaking citizens in other parts of Canada? This I do not understand. There should be a radical change in that regard. Moreover, with regard to information, the province of Quebec should be given the same brain food as any other part of Canada. We are all citizens of the same country, and I cannot understand why one story should be told in Quebec and another in Ontario, the maritimes and the west.

There is one other point I have stated before; let me repeat it. The day when our English-speaking compatriots will have with regard to Great Britain the same views we French-Canadians have toward France. That day we shall have a perfect union of hearts in Canada. As we are at war it is essential to have enough courage to take the necessary steps to bring about a most efficient war effort. What do I mean when I say that? I mean that each one should be at his place, so that he can do the best possible to help the country win the war.

There are farmers' sons who would like to enlist but who cannot. They are in the same position as any young man who has a beautiful and charming sweetheart he cannot marry now because he has to take care of his old parents. That applies to many farmers' sons. Although my offer to recruit a whole regiment in my constituency was turned down two years ago, yet from the city of Riviere du Loup, with a population of only 9,000, over 1,200 boys have enlisted in the three branches of the service. From Cabano, a town in my constituency with a population of 2,000, over 250 boys have enlisted voluntarily in the army.

[Mr. Pouliot.]

Very often farmers are confronted with the problem of choosing between entering the army and putting a padlock on the old homestead or the old farm which for generations has been cultivated by the same family. Everyone knows that Great Britain can live only with the supplies shipped from all parts of the world. What the farmers are doing for this country—and when I refer to this country I include the army as well as the civilian population—they are doing for Great Britain. They are doing the same even for Russia, since the invasion of the fertile plains of the Ukraine by the barbarous huns.

Our friend Mr. Lapointe, the former Minister of Justice, lived in my constituency for many years. He was born there, and he loved it so much that even last summer he paid it a visit, as he had done each year, to spend some months of relaxation. In August, 1940, after the National Resources Mobilization Act was passed, he had been working very strenuously in Ottawa, and proceeded to Temiscouata county to take a vacation. While he was away from Ottawa, regulations were drafted in virtue of the mobilization act, and according to those regulations farming as well as other essential occupations were classed as seasonal. Mr. Lapointe was not here when those regulations were approved by order in council. They were drafted by men who knew no more about agriculture than the fellow who sees a horse and then says, "What a nice cow!" or sees a cow and says, "What a fine colt!" They knew positively nothing about agriculture.

What happened afterward? Members of parliament had to carry on the fight with the authorities to have opportunity given farmers to stay on the land and continue their work —a work which is not "secondary", but which is essential.

Listening to speeches in the house and reading them in *Hansard* I have been pleased to note that even hon. members favouring the conscription of man-power have suggested the exemption of farmers on the very ground that their work is essential to Canada in a time of war as well as in a time of peace. May I pay tribute to the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson); to his very able deputy, General LaFleche; to General LaFleche's associate, Major Benoit; to the registrar at Quebec city and his staff, and, now that some improvement has been made in the commission of our district, to the commission itself.

Members of parliament are deluged with requests, and they are reasonable requests, from farmers for delay in their training. I am ready to do any useful work for my constitu-

ents even if I have to work day and night. I am ready to argue the case of the farmers in my constituency with any official in the Department of National War Services or the Department of National Defence. But this is a ridiculous burden to be placed upon members of parliament; these cases should be taken care of automatically. As soon as the man can show that he is farming in earnest, that he is able to do his work well as a farmer, that he is contributing to feeding the army and the civilians of this country, he should be permitted to continue to do his work without being disturbed.

I should like to read a few remarks made by my leader, the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), on June 19, 1940, as reported on page 922 of *Hansard*. He said:

An hon. member on this side of the house made the statement publicly this morning that he felt he could go into his constituency and, by making it known to his constituents that this measure had to do with the protection of Canada and our own Canadian soil, bring forward in a very short time men from the forests, from the fields and from the factories, all prepared immediately to join the Canadian forces to resist any possible invasion, and that he would be prepared to guarantee that that could be done in constituency after constituency throughout the country, once it was understood that there was the necessity of defending our own Canadian shores. I pointed out to him that in doing that he might be making the greatest mistake possible with respect to the national interest; that, to win this war, we might wish to keep at work in the forests the men who are now working in the forests, to provide the timber which will be required for docks and wharves and required immediately; that the men who are working in the factories may be a thousand times more useful to the government of this country in giving their skilled labour to the manufacture of aircraft, munitions, or other weapons of war than they could possibly be in lining up and presenting themselves for military service; equally that on the farms, if we are to perform what will be expected of us, we shall need all the production that can be effectively and rapidly carried out on the farms of our country.

That was expressed much better than I could say it. I urge hon. members to read this in *Hansard* to-morrow. I do not find it absurd to have to come to the assistance of farmers, farmers' sons and farmers' helpers. What I find absurd is to have to do this work, sometimes without satisfactory results, when the matter could be definitely and automatically settled. These farmers should be allowed to continue to do their work in peace until the war is over, and even afterwards. Our farmers, settlers and farm hands are the most stable element we have in this country. Moreover they are the ones who have time to think and to think right. No government in this country can expect to serve us, no party can expect to serve us, unless they keep faith with our farmers.

Why did the Conservative party headed by Sir Robert Borden lose the confidence of the Canadian people? Because they broke the pledge they gave to the farmers that conscription would never be imposed upon them. When the farmers came to Ottawa they found that the doors were shut against them. They were not received then any more than they were received afterwards when Mr. Bennett was Prime Minister and had the Royal Canadian Mounted Police with loaded guns waiting to receive such peaceful people as the farmers of our country.

I do not want the Liberal party to fall into the ditch where the Tory party has been stagnant since the last war. I sincerely believe that the Liberal party is the only force that can maintain order when this war is over and after we have won it.

We were told the other day by the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) that in the province of Quebec we did not understand the meaning of a total war effort. My fellow citizens of the province of Quebec understand quite well what is a total war effort. They apply to this country the well known proverb that charity begins at home. They want to see this country well protected in the east as well as in the west and in the centre. They are good Canadians and they understand that their duty is to defend the shores of British Columbia as well as the shores of the maritime provinces and their own. They are ready to do anything they can to help Great Britain win this war, and the proof of this is the number of French-Canadians who have enlisted from my part of the country. But they want this country to be well defended. Before any move is made to impose conscription for overseas service they want the defence of this country to be complete and assured.

After consultation with some of our colleagues, it is my duty as the private Liberal member for Témiscouata to move, seconded by my hon. colleague and friend the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lizotte), the following amendment to the amendment:

That all the words after the words "this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers", in the said amendment be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

are contemplating, with regard to conscription of man-power for overseas service, a reversal of policy which is uncalled for, untimely and detrimental to the defence of Canada;

I should like the farmers of York-Sunbury to see the grin on the face of their member at this moment. Not one of them surely would vote for him if they had seen him this after-

noon grinning as I spoke of the distress of the farmers. I continue the reading of my amendment:

This house further holds the view that the defence of Canada should always have priority over any commitment with or in favour of any other country and also that it would be in the interest of Canada and our allied countries as well that farmers and farm hands should be exempted from the military service.

I regret, sir, that the only way open to me to carry out what I propose is to move a subamendment. I do know that some officials of some of the departments hold the same opinions as I and many other members have, regarding the necessity of exempting farmers and farm hands from military service because their work is really a war work. But on account of the stupidity of so-called experts this has not yet been decided upon. That is to be regretted. For the common good it should be made easier for the farmers to continue with their work in peace. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but with so many countries at war and out of production it is all the more necessary for us to stop this policy of cutting the acreage under production, and instead, to get more and more farm goods produced. We do not know what will happen after the war, but certainly it will take time for many warring countries to recuperate and produce enough even for their own consumption. Therefore I urge the government to appreciate that what is being done now by the mover and the seconder of this amendment is not anything that is detrimental to the Liberal party or to the welfare of this country, but rather it is something that should have been done two years ago when we declared war. At that time it was mentioned vaguely, and I congratulate the government upon having changed the regulations of the national war services department to provide, by order in council, that farming is an essential as well as a seasonal occupation. But that is not enough. It was a mistake to state in those regulations that farming was a secondary occupation. It is not. The farmers have to work from dawn to dusk in winter as well as in summer. I urge the government to strike out the word "secondary," leaving in the word, "essential." I earnestly hope that the government will accept the subamendment as their policy with regard to the farmers of this country.

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two Mountains) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the amendment which the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) has just moved to the amendment has my unqualified support. I will vote for it with satisfaction, knowing that I shall be performing a great duty towards agriculture. The agricultural industry is and remains our first line of defence. We should ensure the defence of Canada first of all by protecting our farmers through exemption from military training and from compulsory military service.

The hon. member for Témiscouata need have no regrets. He is moving in the right direction, and I follow him with pleasure on the path of Canadianism and of honour.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I must protest against the amendment just proposed by the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) and seconded by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lizotte). I do not know what the people of the old country can be thinking of us and of Canada at the present time. If it were not for the glorious British army, navy and air force, that slumbereth not nor sleepeth while Canada talks, the enemy would have descended upon the St. Lawrence before this and blown down the citadel at Quebec.

May I say to my hon. friend the member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix), who wants to change the flag, that he had better hang on to the union jack because if Hitler comes over here—and the enemy is not far from our shores at this moment—it will be the black flag that will be hung on the citadel at Quebec and on the parliament buildings at Ottawa—and there will not be any referendum about that either. I protest against this amendment. The city of Toronto sent 55,000 men to the last war, 4,700 of whom lie buried in France until the resurrection morning. They fought for Canada, Britain and the glorious country of France, which in the last war did so much to ensure that freedom and liberty and civilization shall not perish from the earth. Let me say to my hon. friends from the province of Quebec—and I have a great many friends amongst them—what I said when I first entered this house, that no city in the world is less bigoted than the city of Toronto from which I come. Nowhere do protestants and catholics and all races and classes of our people get on better together than they do in Toronto. Toronto subscribed one-third to the victory loan and enrolled of its citizens who enlisted from there and in other cities across Canada nearly one-third of the recruits for the army, navy and air force. They did not need to be conscripted. They did not need to be sent to the war because our young people rose as one man to serve, and if we had had a proper system of recruiting in this country we would have had a million men now under arms under the voluntary system, although the other system is fairer and more equitable to all.

I object to the principle of this amendment. Farmers' sons in our province in the last war did not want to be exempted. The farmers of Ontario showed their patriotism in going to the war, and they were patriots at the ballot box on election day when they asserted the rights and privileges of the people of Ontario in respect of the reciprocity treaty of 1911—that much-attacked province which is contributing more men, money and munitions than any of the other provinces.

The enemy is not far from our shores at the present time. But for the British fleet and air force, Quebec, the maritimes and Ontario would long ago have had first-hand experience of the concentration camp, the loud-speaker, the sergeant-major, the spy, the tramping of feet, the gestapo, the whip, the spirit of barbarism, brutality and savagery. I repeat that but for Britain we should have known these things long ago in Canada from coast to coast; yet we sit here day in and day out, debating such things as this amendment, refusing to pay a tribute to the people of the mother country who are bearing the brunt of the war and, up to the last summer, were bearing it alone over the whole civilized world, fighting our battles on the Atlantic, in the Mediterranean, in Libya and every other place. There is no such thing as home defence as applied to Quebec, or Three Rivers, or Montreal, or Ottawa, or Winnipeg, which can have any bearing on our future. The defence of Canada will not be at those cities; it will be decided in Europe and Asia. There is, indeed, no such thing as home defence in modern warfare. We must go wherever the enemy is. The fate of civilization for the next two hundred years is being decided on the shores of Britain, in Russia, in the Mediterranean, on the sands of Libya, and in the Pacific—that great ocean which is lost to us to-day, in which Japan is dominant in sea power—and the fate of freedom is in the scales. Talk about building a road to Alaska; all the bases which may be belatedly constructed at the Pacific coast will not count a snap of the fingers without sea power to back them up on the Pacific, because without control of the sea you cannot transport either troops or food or munitions or anything else to the endangered areas in the Pacific without a base. If the battle of the Atlantic is lost, the same consequences will follow.

For over two years of the war Britain had to fight and go it alone. Later we found two new allies—Russia and the United States. The latter country was not ready for war; like Canada, she had been listening to the babble of the pacifists and isolationists. Canada urged Britain to throw away her army, navy and air force, and did the same herself, with the result that when war came we were not prepared. We threw away our defences and our friends.

All this talk about home defence and the plebiscite which the hon. member for Témiscouata mentions in his amendment is just a smoke-screen gotten up and thrown out at the last moment to cover up the mistakes some of whose consequences we have seen in the Pacific—Singapore, Hong Kong and other places. As I understand the hon. member's amendment, he wants to exempt farmers' sons and railway employees. They are not asking to be exempted. I have spoken of one province where the farmers are going to the war. The hon. member stated that a plebiscite is a reversal of policy. There I agree with him. It is true. Did you ever know this government to carry out any of their pledges, either as regards trade, defence, immigration, armaments, or anything else? I never have. They had posters on the billboards, "Beat Bennett and Bad Times". Well, they beat Bennett but they did not beat bad times. "End Unemployment; Vote Liberal". The people voted Liberal but the government did not end unemployment. So much for their pledges to get in on, but never to stand on. If there is a reversal of policy, it is just an afterthought at the last minute to tide things over until such time as the situation rights itself, and to save the wrath of the people.

What are the people of eastern Canada depending upon for their defence? Are these hon. members representative or typical of opinion in Quebec and Ontario? I admit that these two provinces have done very well, but the enemy would have been here long ago—in the spring of 1940 they would have come up the St. Lawrence by air and sea, but for that one agency, the mother country, which has protected our shores in peace and war alike, ever since we have been a country.

I concede that the hon. member who moved this amendment possesses some likable qualities. Sometimes he speaks out, like the former house leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (Mr. Woodsworth) on behalf of the underdog and the common people; sometimes, I think, he goes too far at times about Conservatives, and in this motion to exempt the sons of farmers, and railway workers, he has gone too far. Nor do I agree with him in his plea about home defence. I can tell him this, and the government likewise, that there is no such thing as home defence. We found that out on the Pacific coast. We threw overboard our old ally, Japan, which had been a good friend to us and to the empire; we threw Italy over-

board; we supposed that we could discard our own defences and our friends as well—with the results which are now evident in the Pacific. The situation is very grave at present for the people of our great Pacific province, and it is not going to be cured by the sort of home defence which is indicated in this amendment, or by holding secret meetings of this house which will cover up our mistakes. As I said yesterday, secret meetings about what? About home defence? About nothing. There is nothing to hold a meeting about. The British people in their own house, as is evidenced in ninety-five pages of *Hansard* published last January, have gone into the whole trouble at Singapore, Hong Kong and other points in the Pacific.

Our people are getting sick of this talk of home defence and plebiscite. Canada is being injured in the eyes of our empire. Last session I asked the minister to produce papers on the subject of home defence for cities, and he replied that it was a matter for the localities interested. They might lend them a few magic-lanterns and some sirens and whistles to blow, or fireworks, but as for providing an army, navy or air force, there is not a thing for home defence in any city in Ontario, excepting the black-out. There is no use in fooling the people into supposing they are secured by measures of this kind or any other provision for local defence which is simply no home defence at all. Home defence simply and mostly consists of one local volunteer company, the police, the girl guides and the boy scouts, and it can be nothing else, even though the people of the good county of Témiscouata should send five or six members to the House of Commons. All Canada is dependent on the mother country to defend us.

There is no doubt that the plebiscite is a reversal of policy, not mentioned in the 1940 election. Even hon. members who support the government knew nothing about it until the proposal was introduced to the house. Did you ever hear of such a thing? The people of this country know that, in the first year of the war, without a plebiscite, mechanized hordes swept over Norway, Czechoslovakia, the low countries,—Belgium, Holland, Denmark—France and all Europe, all of which countries had been talking about home defence One of the countries which was overrun, Luxembourg, had a police force of 250. In the second year of the war the enemy conquered Jugoslavia and Greece. Their "home defence" fell to the ground and amounted to nothing. I can tell you this: but for the agency I have named, Britain, the enemy would long ago have been in the maritimes, in the province of Quebec, and through Ontario right to the head of the lakes.

I did not intend to speak in this debate, but I object to the remarks which have been made about the soldier city of Toronto. We are not sitting up all night long worrying about Quebec. I know the people of Toronto; I was born there. They are hard-working patriotic citizens. I have never had any bigotry in me, nor have I ever met a bigoted citizen there, and I am only one of five or six hundred thousand persons similarly conditioned. We are not worrying about Quebec or any other province; our only worry is to win the war. We like the people of Quebec; they are our own kith and kin; they have done a great deal for Canada, and in this war they have done better than they did in the last—the records speak for themselves. But let me say that I hope that in the speeches in this house we have heard the last of home defence and shall hear more of what we owe to the mother country, which has protected our shores and ourselves from the same air forces and mechanized hordes which overran the small countries of Europe, and threatened the very life of freedom and civilization.

On motion of Mr. Neill the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Thursday, February 19, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

NEW MEMBERS INTRODUCED

Hon. Louis Stephen St. Laurent, K.C., member for the electoral district of Quebec East, introduced by Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and Hon. C. G. Power.

Gaspard Fauteux, Esquire, member for the electoral district of St. Mary, Montreal, introduced by Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and Hon. P. J. A. Cardin.

HONG KONG COMMISSION

INQUIRY AS TO ORDER OF REFERENCE—SITTINGS IN CAMERA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is reported to me that Sir Lyman Duff, the commissioner appointed under order in council to conduct the Hong Kong inquiry, has announced that owing to the nature of a substantial portion of the

evidence which will be adduced before the Hong Kong commission, he is satisfied that it would be inadvisable to hold an inquiry in public, and he has decided accordingly. May I ask the Prime Minister if this report is correct? May I add that certainly there are some portions of the evidence to be adduced which would be, in my judgment, of a confidential nature; but there is a large body of evidence which will be produced before the commissioner which, in my view, should be made in public, in the public interest, and especially that part relating to the sending of untrained men overseas, and the action of the department and the government in the premises.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the word my hon. friend has just given the house is the first intimation I have received of the decision of the chief justice in the matter of holding sessions of his commission in secret. I assume my hon. friend's information is wholly reliable.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I assume it is; I have not had confirmation from the chief justice.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I assume it is, too. Neither of us apparently is aware of the facts. However, at the time I asked the chief justice if he would undertake the inquiry I gave him the assurance that the government would not wish to restrict him in any particular, and that it would be for him to decide how the proceedings should be conducted, what assistance he would require in connection with the conduct of the proceedings, and in fact all matters with respect to the commission. I assume if the chief justice has decided to hold the sittings of the commission in secret, as was the case with the United States inquiry into conditions at Pearl Harbour, he has evidently had the best of reasons for so doing. I do not know that I can say more than that.

TAXATION

DOMINION JURISDICTION IN RESPECT OF INCOME AND CORPORATION TAXES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance a question in reference to the invasion of the municipalities' field of taxation. I shall supply him with a copy of it.

The city of Toronto is a municipality contributing huge sums of money in income and corporation taxes. Last June when the appropriation bill was under discussion here I suggested that the government should get the opinion of the supreme court of Canada as to whether the federal power has jurisdiction to take away these municipal and provincial revenues and raise moneys for provincial purposes by taxation, which under the British North America Act are allocated to provincial authorities. The point is open to much doubt. The city of Toronto is a large city, and its income and corporation taxes run into many millions of dollars. It is suffering the loss of these revenues, and municipal budgets are all upset, and also the province.

I would suggest that any agreement reached with Ontario herein, when made, be validated. When it was under discussion last June I made that suggestion. There should be some procedure to validate the taking away from Ontario of these large revenues, especially from municipalities throughout the province. The words, or the definitions of them, are not clear in the appropriation act. I suggest to the minister that when he has the agreement with Ontario completed, he validate what has been done under the agreement; and he should also earmark this money so that the municipal share will go direct to the municipalities, such as Toronto, Hamilton, London, Ottawa and other places. The revenues of the municipalities have been taken away from them so often that we might just as well abolish our municipal institutions.

I would like to ask the minister if he is prepared to recoup Ontario and the city of Toronto for the taking away of the income tax and corporation tax revenues under the appropriation bill of last June. If the agreement based on it is to be validated, then the minister should earmark the money for the municipalities so that they can get the money either directly or through the province. I should like to ask the minister if he has any further statement to make in view of this and of Ontario's objections yesterday. He gave a statement yesterday that the first objection was last Friday, asking for validation. I raised this same question when the appropriation and unemployment insurance bills were being considered last June and argued that the federal government had no power to take away these provincial revenues or impose taxes for provincial purposes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CHURCH: The only way they could do it is by consent of the provinces concerned, and such agreement needs validation.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): The question of the validation of the agreements with the provinces is now receiving

the consideration of the Department of Justice. It was assumed throughout the negotiations that this government had been given the authority to enter into these agreements by the relevant section of the supplementary appropriation act which was passed last spring. Last Friday, Mr. Conant, the attorney general of the province of Ontario, for the first time raised the question that this was not sufficient authority and stated that if the province of Ontario entered into an agreement with the dominion they would like it ratified by the parliament of Canada. I told Mr. Conant directly then and there that he was entitled to ask that we have the necessary authority to enter into an agreement and that I would consult the Department of Justice at once and if an act was required, that act would be introduced.

Mr. CHURCH: It savours of British Honduras, the whole programme.

JAPANESE NATIONALS

EVACUATION TO BRITISH COLUMBIA INLAND AREAS—MESSAGE FROM KELOWNA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): I should like to ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) a question based upon a telegram which I received this morning from the city clerk of Kelowna, British Columbia. This reads as follows:

Copy of resolution passed by municipal council of Kelowna on sixteenth.

Whereas under dominion regulations all male Japanese of military age have to vacate areas west of Cascade range by April 1st; and whereas apparently no supervision or restrictions have been made of this evacuation; and whereas these Japanese are steadily seeping into the Okanagan valley seeking to purchase land, residences and to settle, many of them coming in new automobiles and acting in a very truculent and insolent manner; and whereas public indignation is being roused to such an extent that violence against this infiltration may easily break out and unless stopped almost certainly will break out;

Be it resolved, (1) that all male Japanese of military age be interned by the dominion government; (2) orders in council be issued prohibiting the sale or lease or rental of land and other real estate to Japanese during the present crisis; (3) any evacuation of other Japanese to east of Cascade be under strict supervision of the dominion government only to such areas as may be deemed advisable where strict police supervision can be made at all times and in such a manner as not to arouse popular indignation and outrage.

A copy has been sent to the Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister in position to make a statement which will alleviate the anxiety of those who take charge of the inhabitants of the interior of British Columbia?

[Mr. Ilsley.]

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend was good enough to send me a telegram which had been received this morning, and while it is not in the same terms as the one he has just read, the purport is much the same. I would say at once that the policy of the government for the duration of the war is to restrict, except under permit from the Minister of Justice, the acquisition of land by purchase, lease or otherwise by persons of Japanese origin or by Japanese controlled companies.

In replying to my hon. friend, I think I ought perhaps to express just a word of caution with respect to the wording of messages and public utterances generally which may relate to the present position of Japanese nationals and other persons of Japanese origin in Canada at this time. I need not say how critical the situation is and how necessary it is, if we are to maintain law and order in the different communities and prevent hasty and unwarranted action on the part of individuals who may not be sufficiently appreciative of the effect of their actions, for all to be as restrained as possible in the language used in dealing with these difficult questions.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

PLANS TO ENSURE ECONOMIC SECURITY OF NATION'S WORKERS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): Yesterday the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Ross) asked a question with reference to old age pensions. I would inform him that this matter does not come within the jurisdiction of my department. His question should be addressed to my colleague, the Minister of Finance.

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, as the question I asked yesterday on the orders of the day, at page 687 of *Hansard*, comes within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Finance and not of the Minister of Pensions and National Health, I would ask the Minister of Finance to be good enough to give me an answer at some future day.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Yes, I shall be glad to do that.

SS. "LADY HAWKINS"

INVESTIGATION OF LOSS IN ATLANTIC BY TORPEDO ATTACK

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I forwarded a notice of a

question to the Minister of Transport on February 4, and I asked a question publicly on February 13. I am wondering if the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services has drawn it to his attention. If so, may I have a reply on this question about the sinking of the *Lady Hawkins*?

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Transport): I understand that the subject matter of the question asked by my hon. friend comes within the purview of the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services. I understand that the minister is now or will be quite soon in a position to give an answer.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): May I be permitted to say that in the interests of the relatives of those who perished on the *Lady Hawkins*—I am speaking of the passengers as well as the crew—some assurance should be given that a thorough investigation will be held into the loss of this ship.

[*Later:*]

Hon. ANGUS L. MACDONALD (Minister of National Defence for Naval Services): Mr. Speaker, I can now give the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) an answer to the question he asked the other day respecting an investigation of the loss in the Atlantic of the SS. *Lady Hawkins*.

The matter of routing, diverting and protecting shipping is a naval responsibility of the allied powers and strictly cannot be discussed in public or made known to our enemies.

It may be said, however, that the SS. *Lady Hawkins* was independently routed, not convoyed. She sailed from a United States port after the British Consular Shipping Adviser had consulted with the master of the ship and had issued relevant instructions and precautions. The Consular Shipping Adviser works closely with the United States port director.

When the Commander in Chief, America and West Indies, reported that the *Lady Hawkins* was overdue, an investigation was carried out by instruction of the Chief of the Naval Staff of Canada. Nothing has come to light to indicate that the regrettable loss of this ship is anything other than an unavoidable accident of war.

FIRST VICTORY LOAN

PERCENTAGE OF SUBSCRIPTIONS REACHING BANKS OR LENDING INSTITUTIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): On the orders of the day, on Tuesday last, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lockhart) requested information as to the amount of 1941 victory loan bonds that had been sold by original purchasers and had reached the hands of banks and lending institutions.

I have had inquiries made to see whether I could add anything to the remarks I made on Tuesday. I learn that it is practically impossible to make even a rough estimate of what holdings have been sold since the time of their original purchase. The hon. member will realize that in the 1941 victory loan, bonds in bearer form were issued in denominations from $50 up to $25,000. These bonds are sold in the open market and pass freely from hand to hand without any record of such sales being registered in the Bank of Canada.

It might prove useful to place on record the figures for the combined total security holdings of the Bank of Canada and the chartered banks as at June 30, 1941, immediately after the sale of the 1941 victory loan and as at December 31, 1941, the latest available date. On June 30, 1941, the holdings of dominion and provincial direct and guaranteed securities totalled $2,085,220,028, and on December 31, 1941, the holdings of these securities totalled $2,124,401,449, or an increase of only $39,181,421.

However, in that period there were a number of factors that would affect these figures to some extent, namely, an increase in the amount outstanding of Dominion of Canada treasury bills, maturities of dominion and provincial issues, etc. The very satisfactory market which has prevailed on these victory bonds is a further indication of the fact that they could not have been sold in any large volume. Considering all these facts, I am of the opinion that there is nothing in the situation as a whole to cause any worry.

At the same time, I think I should repeat what I said on Tuesday, namely, that in the case of the short term bonds more sales appear to have been made by original purchasers than I would have liked to see. I did not regard this situation as very satisfactory and I trust that in the present offering those who buy the short term issues will do so with the intention of holding them.

WHEAT

INQUIRY AS TO ANNOUNCEMENT OF INCREASED PRICE

On the orders of the day:

Mrs. DORISE W. NIELSEN (North Battleford): I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to inform the house whether an announcement will be made regarding an increased price for wheat before the prairie farmers begin their spring ploughing.

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question should have been addressed to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In reply I would say that the matter has been receiving consideration, and we had hoped to have reached some finality by this time, but I expect that we shall reach finality in our recommendations within a very few days.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Will the bill be referred to the agriculture committee?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): That is the intention.

AIRGRAPH SERVICE

SPEED OF DELIVERY TO OVERSEAS TROOPS AND POSSIBILITY OF EXTENSION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): I would ask the Postmaster General, with respect to the sending of airgraph letters overseas, first, whether his department has been able to ascertain the length of time it takes on the average for letters mailed in Canada to reach the troops overseas; and, second, whether this same airgraph service is being extended to the troops overseas so that they may send airgraph letters home to Canada.

Hon. W. P. MULOCK (Postmaster General): The hon. member for Parkdale was kind enough to advise me in advance that he intended to ask for this information to-day. In reply to his first question, the shortest time is five days and the average is twelve days, which time will doubtless be materially reduced when climatic conditions are more favourable. In reply to his second question, the United Kingdom and Canadian postal administrations have already studied the establishment of a return airgraph service. Inauguration depends on the establishment of a regular, direct airplane service of reasonable frequency from the United Kingdom to Canada.

Mr. COLDWELL: Has any consideration been given to the extension of the airgraph service to our men serving in the middle east? If not, will the minister give it consideration? I had an inquiry regarding that in to-day's mail.

Mr. MULOCK: Does the hon. member mean service from England to the middle east, or from Canada?

Mr. COLDWELL: From Canada.

[Mrs. Nielsen.]

Mr. MULOCK: I shall be glad to obtain the information and give the hon. member an answer in the course of the next day or so.

PETITION

REQUEST FOR INTERNMENT OF JAPANESE ADULTS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. R. W. MAYHEW (Victoria, B.C.): Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a petition signed by 1,100 residents of the municipality of Saanich which I ask permission to lay on the table at this time. Saanich is in the county of Nanaimo, and as the representative for that district is at present serving overseas, I am laying this petition on the table in his behalf. I shall not read the whole petition but just the substance of the prayer, namely:

We therefore do earnestly petition the government of the Dominion of Canada to take immediate steps to eliminate all possibility of subversive acts by the resident Japanese in this province.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed from Wednesday, February 18, consideration of the motion of Mr. Alphonse Fournier for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Pouliot.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, with respect to the amendment to the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) I should like to ask whether Your Honour has considered whether the amendment to the amendment is in order. I respectfully submit that it is not in order inasmuch as it deals with a future contingency with respect to which it is impossible for any final opinion to be pronounced at the present time.

First of all I would point out to hon. members that, as they are well aware, while an amendment may deal with three or four different subjects it has to be considered as a whole, and if any one part of it is out of order the amendment as a whole would necessarily be declared out of order. The amendment to the amendment is couched in language which in part would read: Your Excellency's advisers are contemplating, with regard to conscription of man-power for overseas service, a reversal of policy which is uncalled for, untimely and detrimental to the defence of Canada.

How can any hon. member say what the ministry is contemplating, and contemplating with respect to a situation that may or may not arise in the future? I should like to ask whether an amendment on the following lines would not perhaps be in accord with what hon. gentlemen opposite who are smiling at the moment have not been saying right along: That the ministry are contemplating, with regard to conscription of man-power for overseas service, a continuation of the policy which has been in existence since this parliament came into being. An amendment setting forth either point of view as to what is in contemplation by the ministry would, I submit, be out of order, inasmuch as it would relate to some future action by the government which cannot be decided at the present time, and which, as has frequently been said from this side of the house, if the government is given a free hand to deal with the important matters to which this particular amendment relates, will be decided in the light of all the circumstances as they exist.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I rise to support anything that the member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) proposes, and whatever representations I shall now make will be strictly confined to the question of the legality of this proposed amendment and certainly not out of sympathy for the purpose of the hon. member for Témiscouata, which I think everybody knows is political. But I believe that he is within his legal rights in making this motion and it is for that reason alone that I now rise.

If I gathered aright what the Prime Minister stated, his point of order is based on an argument with respect to the use of the word "contemplating". The argument is that the government is not contemplating what is suggested, and that therefore the first part of the motion is based on a false premise. I do not so construe the word "contemplate", because according to Webster, in its ordinary connotation it means "having in view as contingent or probable; to view or consider with continued attention; to meditate upon." Surely this government has been meditating upon a reversal of policy, otherwise it would not have asked for a plebiscite. The holding of a plebiscite itself indicates in a degree that the government has such a reversal in view as contingent or probable. I would suppose that this amendment would be in order, although I am not in sympathy with it. But the rules are there, and I think they should be followed. It is not being attacked on the ground of irrelevance—that is quite certain—but on a play on the word "contemplating" as used in the proposed amendment. My view is that, under the correct wording of the rule and of the meaning of the word "contemplating", this amendment is in order, and I so submit.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) for his remarks, but I regret that he has said that this subamendment has been moved for political motives. Here, sir, is the definition of the word "contemplate" in the house copy of the *Oxford Dictionary* which I have just taken from the table:

> Contemplate. . . . Gaze upon; view mentally; expect; intend, purpose; meditate. So Contemplation . . . (***templum*** temple, open space for observation).

Now, no one besides the members of the cabinet knows what happens behind closed doors in the east block. But here, sir, is the speech from the throne which I hold in my hand and which contains the following paragraph, as reported in *Hansard* of this year, page 4:

> My ministers accordingly will seek, from the people, by means of a plebiscite, release from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service.

The words "overseas conscription" are not mentioned in that paragraph. But let us see the wording of the amendment. The first paragraph reads thus:

> This house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers are contemplating, with regard to conscription of man-power for overseas service, a reversal of policy which is uncalled for, . . .

The only difference between the wording of the amendment and the wording of the speech from the throne is that in the amendment the word "overseas" is included. On the other hand, if you take the wording of the speech from the throne, one article of the programme of the government is to seek release from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service. Very well; I believe that the amendment, which was very carefully drafted, is in line with the speech from the throne, and I will further submit that, technically, the Prime Minister can say that no one knows what the government contemplate, but when the government come with a programme for the whole session, and when an article of that programme is to relieve the government of all restrictions concerning military service, it seems to me that it is perfectly in order to move an amendment with the wording of the one I have had the honour to move. I rely upon you, sir, and your knowledge—which is much greater than mine—of the English language, and your knowledge and experience of the rules and practice of this house, to render an unbiased decision. It is a matter which becomes purely legal. The whole thing is to decide whether

the speech from the throne indicates that the government is contemplating a change, whatever it is, regarding military service in this country. I leave the matter in your hands to decide whether the subamendment is in order or not.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Might I, with all respect to the Prime Minister, ask him if he can give the house some precedent or ruling as to whether or not the amendment to the amendment is out of order. Has the question not come previously before this house or another house?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, I have not precedents at hand. I have no doubt that many could be found and cited. I can only say to my hon. friend that I think anyone familiar with the rules of the house with respect to amendments will agree that the point of view I have taken accords with the rules of the house as they are laid down with respect to motions in debate.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is it not a fact that this is a brand new point and has never been heard of before?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, no.

Mr. SPEAKER: With reference to the remarks made by hon. members on the amendment to the amendment made by the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), I have been considering yesterday and this morning the relevancy of this amendment.

The hon. member for Témiscouata has moved as an amendment to the amendment on the address, a subamendment containing these words:

> This house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers are contemplating, with regard to conscription of man-power for overseas service, a reversal of policy. . . .

In answer to the statement made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), I take it that the plain meaning of the word "contemplating" used by the hon. member for Témiscouata is the putting into effect now of a reversal of policy, and he refers specifically to the conscription of man-power for overseas service.

The house cannot now entertain an amendment to this subamendment which deals with a future action of the government. The rule is well known that not more than two amendments can be moved at a time. For this reason it is necessary that the strictest rules of interpretation be applied to a second amendment.

A motion of no confidence—and this I may interject is a motion of no confidence—based on the fact that the government has reversed its policy, would be in order, but to base such a motion on the unproved assumption that the government is just contemplating a reversal of policy seems to be holding the government responsible for something it has not yet done. If such a practice is encouraged the only limit to no confidence motions will be the collapse of human imagination. What the government is contemplating is a fact which the government alone knows and which is not supported by the speech from the throne, neither by the Prime Minister's statements during this session nor any measure now before the house. It is an assumption which the house is asked to vote upon without the government having the opportunity to modify it by another amendment; for the reason, as I have already said, that there can be only two amendments before the house at one and the same time, and the government therefore is in the position of having no opportunity to modify it by another amendment.

What is the object of an amendment? It is, as May says, to effect such an alteration in a question as will obtain the support of those who, without such alteration, must either vote against it or abstain from voting. The impossibility of moving a further amendment in this case is all the more serious because the amendment, being against the adoption of the address, is a motion of want of confidence based on the government's future action of which the house can have no knowledge. For that reason it is futile and should not be allowed. I therefore rule the subamendment out of order.

Mr. POULIOT: I respectfully appeal from your decision, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker put the question as follows:

> The speaker having decided that the subamendment moved by the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) is out of order, the hon, member for Témiscouata appeals from that decision.

The house divided on the question: Shall the speaker's decision be sustained? And the decision of the chair was sustained on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Abbott	Breithaupt
Anderson	Bruce
Authier	Brunelle
Bercovitch	Cardin
Bertrand (Prescott)	Casselman, Mrs. (Edmonton East)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)	Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)
Black (Cumberland)	Chevrier
Black (Yukon)	Church
Blackmore	Claxton
Blanchette	Cleaver
Bonnier	Cloutier
Bradette	

Corman
Coté
Crerar
Cruickshank
Davidson
Dechene
Denis
Diefenbaker
Donnelly
Douglas (Queens)
Dubuc
Dupuis
Durocher
Edwards
Emmerson
Eudes
Evans
Factor
Fair
Farquhar
Fauteux
Ferland
Ferron
Fleming
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fraser (Northumberland, Ont.)
Fraser (Peterborough West)
Fulford
Furniss
Gardiner
Gershaw
Gibson
Gingues
Golding
Goulet
Graham
Grant
Gray
Green
Gregory
Hansell
Hanson (Skeena)
Hanson (York-Sunbury)
Harris (Danforth)
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Hazen
Healy
Henderson
Hill
Hlynka
Hoblitzell
Homuth
Howden
Howe
Hurtubise
Ilsley
Isnor
Jackman
Jean
Johnston (Bow River)
King, Mackenzie
Kinley
Kirk
Kuhl
Laflamme
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Lapointe (Lotbinière)
Leader
Leclerc
Leduc
Leger
Little
Lockhart
McCann
McCuaig
McCubbin
McCulloch
MacDiarmid
Macdonald (Brantford City)
Macdonald (Halifax)
Macdonald (Kingston City)
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGarry
McGibbon
McIlraith
McIvor
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)
MacKinnon (Edmonton West)
McKinnon (Kenora-Rainy River)
MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
McLarty
MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
McLean (Simcoe East)
Macmillan
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
McNiven (Regina City)
MacNicol
Marier
Marshall
Martin
Maybank
Mayhew
Michaud
Mills
Mullins
Mulock
Neill
Nicholson
Nielsen, Mrs.
Nixon
O'Neill
Perley
Picard
Pinard
Poirier
Pottier
Power
Purdy
Quelch
Ralston
Reid
Rennie
Rhéaume
Rickard
Roebuck
Ross (Calgary East)
Ross (Hamilton East)
Ross (St. Paul's)
Ross (Souris)
Rowe
Ryan
St. Laurent
Sanderson
Senn
Shaw
Sissons
Soper
Stirling
Sylvestre
Taylor
Telford
Thauvette
Thorson
Tremblay
Tripp
Turgeon
Tustin
Veniot
Vien
Ward
Warren
Weir
Whitman
Winkler
Wood
Wright—182.

NAYS

Messrs:

Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Bourget
Castleden
Coldwell
D'Anjou
Douglas (Weyburn)
Gauthier
Gillis
Lacombe
Lacroix (Beauce)
LaCroix (Quebec-Montmorency)
Lizotte
McGregor
MacInnis
Noseworthy
Parent
Pouliot
Raymond
Roy—19.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the amendment.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss this afternoon the question of the Japanese in British Columbia. Since it is an important and burning question there at the present time, it is almost impossible to tell the tale in the required time, and I may ask to have a few minutes longer. If so, it will be the first time I have had to do so.

I am not unmindful, nor shall I try to be, of the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) when he warned against hasty and unwarranted language, calculated to inflame the situation in British Columbia, as regards Japanese. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to that appeasement talk for twenty years from the government benches, and I think the time has come to take a different stand. I believe we can best serve the interests of our country, and promote peace, by having plain talk, straightforward discussions and, I hope, definite action, with respect to the issues before us.

In the first campaign in which I took part for election to this house in the fall of 1921, I was struck by two outstanding features in the district, first, the predominant place the Japanese had acquired in the fishing industry, and, second, the vast increase in their population in British Columbia, both through immigration and by birth. The fishing industry was dominated by the Japanese during the last war, when our men were overseas. Then, later, they started a policy of pushing the white men out of that industry. The methods they adopted in that procedure were too often those which are not expected in ordinary business competition.

Early in 1922 I got the then government of the day to make a cut in the quota of fishing

licences allotted to Japanese in salmon trolling—a part of the fishing industry—to the extent of thirty-three per cent. Later, in the summer, a royal commission was appointed, and it decided to cut all Japanese salmon fishing licences to the extent of forty per cent. The following year they were again cut another fifteen per cent, and the year after that another ten per cent. This made a very substantial reduction, which has been since maintained.

The house is aware that a few weeks ago all Japanese fishing vessels, numbering about 1,200, were seized. If the influx had been allowed to continue, and had not been checked in 1922, as I have described, the number now to be seized would have been something like 3,000 or possibly 3,500. That would have greatly aggravated the situation in British Columbia to-day.

Then, let us look at the other point, namely their increase in numbers by immigration and by birth. The Japanese birthrate is about double that of the white race—rather more than that. And that, of course, goes on all the time. We can stop immigration, but we cannot stop increases by birth, especially when the Japanese government allows to emigrate only those women who are likely to bear children. If they do not have those children, they are sent back to Japan, and others are sent out in their places.

Prior to 1884 there was no immigration of Japanese into British Columbia. From that time until 1907 they came in in ever-increasing numbers, until the situation became alarming. Then the government of the day—a Liberal government, by the way—made a deal with Japan or, as they called it, a gentleman's agreement. On the face of it, it was an arrangement whereby Japan pledged itself to see that no more than 400 Japanese left Japan to come to Canada in one year. No greater travesty of language could be found than to call that a gentleman's agreement, because when one makes a gentleman's agreement it is presupposed that both parties to the agreement are animated by the desire and intention to adhere to it in faith, truth and honesty. But when you find that one of the parties has not the slightest intention of adhering to those principles, control becomes much more difficult. In other words, in those circumstances a gentleman's agreement is just a joke. I have said that the matter was a joke, and I make that statement sincerely because I found that instead of only 400 entering Canada in any one year, the Japanese were entering to the extent of 1,700. That is a matter of record; I have taken it from the records. Then, the other part of the contract was such that the whole matter was left wide open. I shall leave that part of the subject for the moment.

In the spring of 1922, for once in their lives the British Columbia members had sense enough to take united action. I do not believe they have ever done it since, nor do I think it had been done before. We all got together—I believe there were four groups at that time—and presented a resolution to the house asking for the total exclusion of orientals from British Columbia and Canada. The government opposed the resolution and moved to amend it by striking out the words "total exclusion" and inserting the words "effective restriction". Of course the government's majority carried the amendment. We were told at that time that the two expressions were synonymous, and that the term "effective restriction" meant total exclusion. The government majority carried the amendment—and that was the end of total exclusion. It did not operate as we had been led to believe.

Time has gone on and taken its toll of those fourteen members who supported that principle. There have been deaths, both politically and physically at one end of the rainbow, and the senate and big government appointments at the other end. All these have reduced that little band to the point where I am the only one left. I can say, like the man in the Bible—in the Book of Job, I believe it was; some of my parson friends can correct me if I am wrong—"I only am escaped alone to tell thee." I continued pressing the matter as best I could, but I found that governments were not sympathetic.

There was too much talk of appeasement in the air. One of the arguments was this, "We want to do a big trade with Japan, with her seventy million people. We do not want to lose that trade. If we do anything they don't like they will take their trade to the United States." That argument had some plausibility; at any rate it was good enough to stall me off for a year or two.

Then I saw the psychological moment open in 1924. The government of the United States, out of a clear sky, passed a total exclusion act against orientals, including Japanese. There was our chance to do the same, without loss of trade. I begged the then Prime Minister—the same one as we have to-day—to make it apply to all orientals; but he could not see his way clear to do so. He did apply it to Chinese, and that action has been most successful. Unfortunately, however, it was not applied to Japanese.

I continued from time to time to do what I could; and then along about 1928—possibly it was 1929—the Prime Minister was kind enough—and I give him full credit for it, because he did not have to do it—to readjust the joint agreement so that instead of an entry of 400 a year there would be only 150. He put some teeth in the terms of that agreement, so that we really had at least a gambler's chance of enforcing it. I believe the Japanese with their accustomed ability and subtlety found loopholes whereby at least to some extent they evaded the terms of the arrangement, but not to any great extent. Then, of later years the war has stopped any serious immigration.

I was told at that time that there were other reasons why we should not do anything to offend the Japanese nation, reasons of a diplomatic nature. I remember as well as if it were yesterday the answer I gave—I believe it is in *Hansard*—"The house and government might be assured that the Japanese nation would attack us the very moment it suited them, no matter what we had done by way of appeasement, favours or anything else." The very moment it suited them to attack us they would do so—and to-day tells the answer.

If my advice had been taken, even as late as 1924, to-day there would have been in Canada perhaps 5,000 or 6,000 fewer Japanese than there are to-day. Six thousand taken from 24,000 would have helped to ease this very acute situation which exists in British Columbia to-day.

I continued to look anxiously at the situation, and in 1938 I thought I had another opportunity. I brought in a bill to provide for an educational test. The Japanese were not mentioned by name, but the provisions of this bill would have applied to three-quarters of the world's population. If it had been put into force, it would have set up a method which has been used in Australia and New Zealand for thirty years without any objection from the Japanese. This has helped to keep Australia and New Zealand white. The government refused to allow my bill to go through. The matter was put to a vote and, if hon. members are interested in the matter, they will find it fully set out in *Hansard* of May 31, 1938, at page 3411. The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Hanson) and the hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. O'Neill) should be proud now that they withstood the pressure of the whip at that time and voted in the interests of their province rather than at the dictates of the party. In justice to the hon. member for Victoria, B. C. (Mr. Mayhew), I must say that he was sick at home at the time and could not possibly be here.

In September, 1940, Japan signed the deal, agreement or whatever you call it with Italy and Germany. In plain English, they bound themselves to enter into war against us and the United States whenever it suited Germany or Hitler. Pressure was put upon the government by British Columbia, and I suppose some realization of the situation also led the government to take action. They appointed a hand-picked committee to investigate the subject, which committee came back with a number of recommendations, I believe ten in all. There were only two of any importance, Nos. 5 and 7, and I shall deal with them. No. 5 recommended against allowing Japanese to enlist in our volunteer army then being raised. That was a very good idea, otherwise we would have had perhaps 1,500 Japanese training in our army, possibly in key positions, petty officers and the like. They would have been familiar with every detail of our army operations. Protests were made by the mayor of Nanaimo, and I think by other cities and by myself, and the recommendation of the committee carried. That was all right.

Recommendation No. 7 was that there should be a re-registration of the Japanese in Canada. It had been claimed by many people that the registration that had been taken was just a fake as regards the Japanese. Only those who felt like it registered, and there was a demand for a new registration. The recommendation was that they should be photographed at the same time. That was a good idea, but it had one fatal defect, if deception is regarded as a fatal defect. It was clearly understood that this registration was compulsory. We were told how well it was going on, how successful it was, and it was hoped that we malignants would now be satisfied and keep quiet. The whole thing turned on the point that it was compulsory.

If it had been voluntary, what use would it have been? Supposing we decided to make a history of the people by the name of Smith, to have a record of everything they had done, whether they had been in gaol and so on. If this was carried on voluntarily, how many Smiths would come forward except those with clean hands? Was it expected that Japanese who had entered the country illegally would come forward and say, "Yes, I came in illegally, take me." Of course they would not. A Jap is not a fool, any more than we are. The guilty ones did not register and the whole thing was a gigantic failure. It could not be otherwise if it were anything but compulsory.

Our main complaint was that many of them had come into the country illegally and this re-registration would have discovered that. Was it expected that those who had come in

illegally would disclose that fact? The thing is ridiculous. When the war came on, after Pearl Harbour, it was discovered that it was not compulsory, that it was just a gesture to keep us quiet, just a farce. Then what happened? The war was on and the people know what war means; this government should know what it means. These same people were given two months in which to register; they were given until February 7 to get things fixed up, to get a fake birth certificate or a forged entry card. You can buy them in Vancouver. If they could not get either, they were given two months before they would be subject to the same action as that to which any other enemy alien would be exposed. Why give them two months? We were practically saying to them, "We are at war with you, but we will give you two months in which to get faked papers, or get out of the country." I never heard the like of it before, and I hope I never shall again.

If I were challenged to offer proof of these things, I could no more do it than I could offer proof of the day of the week on which my last birthday fell. You do not keep track of these things that are so well known. I suppose I could have kept the newspapers that I read at the time, but I did not. I never dreamed that such action would be necessary to show that they had said it was compulsory. On February 9, the Prime Minister made this statement, as reported on page 398 of *Hansard*.

> The committee received the utmost cooperation from Japanese nationals as well as from Canadians of Japanese racial origin. When a state of war was proclaimed as existing between Japan and Canada, the registration was all but complete.

The utmost cooperation! We know the extent of that cooperation. Here is what a man wrote—a white man for a change, and perhaps we can take his word—to the local paper in Vancouver a few days ago:

> About three years ago I was talking to a Canadian-born Japanese boy in a store and said to him, "if the Japs ever came over here would you fight against us?" He replied, "I wouldn't want to, but I would either have to or commit suicide."

That is the sort of blind it is. There is your cooperation. Only when they attacked Pearl Harbour was it announced that the whole thing had been only voluntary. Here is an article that appeared in the papers a few days afterwards:

> During the registration proceedings, several hundred Japanese left Canada for Japan. Most of these were known to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Many of them were believed to have entered the country illegally.

It is only after war breaks out that we discover all that. They were given two months in which to fix things up or get out. If that registration had been compulsory, we would have got the best of these Jap agents and the best of their spies. They have now gone home with their charts and plans and with a local knowledge that could not be bought for any money. Perhaps we shall see some of these Japs again peering over the side of the bridge of a German gunboat in Vancouver, Nanaimo or Port Alberni, because we now know that many of them were expert naval men. Agitation continued, and the government called a conference which was held here on January 8 and 9. With possibly one or two exceptions, the twenty-five gentlemen who attended this conference were in government service. Their continuing or advancement in the branch of the service in which they were, might depend upon—putting it politely—their thinking the same way as the government about these matters.

I suggested that they should call in the British Columbia members who were elected by the people and who have some claim to represent the people. But, oh, no! I should like to give another quotation. I shall not give names because I do not think it is fair to attack people when they are not in a position to reply. When an official is mentioned, I shall refer to an official, and when reference is made to a member of the government, I shall simply call him a minister I quote:

> I fail to see any need of getting the members from British Columbia together and asking them what they think should be done.

They were not called together, but the twenty-five government officials were there in full strength. They were fully informed of the government's views because some came from the Department of External Affairs.

I have here the statement got out by the Prime Minister. This is an official document, after the conference had reported, and so there is no harm in my quoting from it. It contains seventeen paragraphs, a great many of which are build-ups for the rest of it. I will deal with the more important ones, paragraphs 6, 7, 8 and 11.

Paragraph 6 recommends that the government should seize immediately the Japanese fishing boats. That was done. It was done immediately war was declared, and for that action I have nothing but the utmost praise. It was done promptly and thoroughly. I have a vague idea that I see in it the efficient hand of the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services (Mr. Macdonald). At any rate it

was done, and done well. While this is not part of the report, I may as well finish up that matter by saying that after they had 1,200 Japanese boats in their hands, the question arose, what to do with them? It was desirable to get them back into fishing again, so that white men could catch the fish so badly needed for the British market. Therefore they set up a committee to try to sell these boats. Whoever chose that committee deserves great credit. They made excellent choices. Here they are: Chairman, Hon. Mr. Justice Sidney Smith, a man with a master mariner's papers, so he would understand boats; Commander B. L. Johnson, D.S.O., R.C.N.R., a man of outstanding ability and repute in Vancouver. Then there was a Japanese, Kishizo Kimura, who I am told, is a very able man, familiar with the work that he undertook. I give all credit for that. Like all government offices, it is true that they were rather slow in going about their work, but they got started at last. They issued a circular, a copy of which I hold in my hand, explaining their procedure. I am very glad to get this circular because I can pass the information along to the fishermen, who are continually writing to me to know what to do. I am afraid that the whole scheme will not be entirely successful because the government will have left on their hands hundreds of boats. That is not the fault of the government or of this committee. Well, they got this thing started and have sold fifty-six boats up to date, and marvellous to relate, they told the members of parliament about it. They even accepted a suggestion I made—another remarkable thing. I suggested that they could not sell these boats for cash because the fishermen did not have cash, but they would be able to buy them on time, and accordingly that was arranged. The general idea of a lot of these officials, the people on these new boards, seems to be that there is no loyalty, intelligence or usefulness in any member of parliament. I do not know where they get the idea because it is not so very long since the people elected us. But that is the idea you find among the people on these new boards and among these dollar-a-year men. Since we are not told what is being done, we shall have to guess or simply deal with what we see, and if we guess wrong, the government is to blame. I do not think members of parliament are any more unworthy than they were in years gone by.

I want to quote recommendation 7 in which was contained the policy of the cabinet. It reads:

> For the same period—
>
> That is during the war.
>
> —the sale of gasoline and explosives to persons of Japanese racial origin will be directly controlled under conditions to be prescribed by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

That is a good idea too, a very good idea, but unfortunately I read in the papers—I have to go to the press for information because I cannot get it anywhere else—that these sales are still going on.

Mr. HOMUTH: The sale of powder is still going on?

Mr. NEILL: Explosives. A man wrote to the Vancouver *Province* the other day and suggested that if this order was in effect, why was the Japanese station at the corner still selling gas the same as usual? That has been going on for two and a half months now, and I rather think permission has been extended to the 1st of April. The language is doubtful, but if it can be interpreted to the benefit of the Japanese, be sure it will be so interpreted. You are dealing with clever, subtle, unscrupulous enemies—and they are enemies—and when you say that you are not going to stop the sale for two months, that is just an invitation to them to accumulate as much gas and explosives as they can in the meantime. We say to them: "Remember, on the 7th of February or on the 1st of April we are going to shut down on you." Is that not an invitation to them to get explosives and gasoline against a rainy day? That time limit should never have been put in. The order should have been made applicable at once.

I want to say one more good thing for the government, and it will be the last, I am sorry to say. It does not pay to state your case unfairly, and I wish to be strictly fair. In these two instances I have mentioned, the seizing of the Japanese boats, and this order with respect to the sale of gasoline and explosives was made applicable to all Japanese, and all honour is due to the government for doing it.

There are three classes of Japanese we must deal with. There are the Japanese nationals, those born in Japan and never naturalized in Canada; they are Japanese nationals. Then there is the man born in Japan and naturalized in Canada. He is called a naturalized Japanese or a Canadian. Then there is the Japanese who was born in Canada, who can call himself a Japanese-Canadian if he likes. The government orders with regard to seizing the boats and the sale of gas and explosives applied to all three classes. That was all right.

Now I deal with paragraph 8. It says that Japanese nationals will be forbidden to possess or use short-wave receiving sets or radio transmitters in Canada. A most excellent thing. Hon. members can all understand why it was necessary to do that. That was fine. But it

does not come into effect until the 1st of April. Did the Japanese give us four months' notice of what they were going to do at Pearl Harbour? Yet we say to them: "Go wandering about with your cameras and take pictures, and use your receiving sets to send word to Japan, and your receivers to get instructions from Japan. You can do this as much as you like until the 1st of April." Even if the order had been withheld, and they had been allowed to continue doing these things without being told of any date when they must stop, it would not have been so bad, because then they would never have known when the order was coming into force. But they were warned—you will not be interfered with until the 1st of April. The order was the equivalent of that. We told them: "Do your dirty work now. Use your radio and your receiving set but, remember, hide or bury them before the 1st of April, and then everything will be lovely." They told the Japanese nationals that they must not use these things in a protected area. But they can use them outside. I have a police order to that effect. It is signed by the police and says:

> No enemy alien shall have in his possession or use while in such protected area any camera, radio transmitter, radio short-wave receiving set, firearm, ammunition or explosive.

But that order does not apply outside the protected area, and it does not apply to a naturalized or native-born Japanese.

Mr. RALSTON: I am not quite familiar with the regulations as to cameras, but does my hon. friend suggest that the same date applied with regard to evacuating a protected area and the possession of cameras? They must evacuate by April 1.

Mr. NEILL: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend used the same date, April 1, when speaking of cameras and receiving sets.

Mr. NEILL: Yes. I said that the language was so ambiguous that it could be read two ways. It reads:

> Notices ordering all enemy aliens to evacuate the coastal area of British Columbia west of the Cascade mountains by April 1 and to surrender cameras and radios will be posted in public buildings to-day.

Then:

> Orders to Japanese . . . to get out of the coastal areas within forty-seven days and to surrender cameras, radios and other banned articles, were issued to-day.

Mr. RALSTON: I think my hon. friend is reading some sort of newspaper paraphrase of the order. The order to give up radios and cameras is effective immediately. The order of evacuation is not. The order referred to, is effective on April 1.

Mr. NEILL: It is signed by Colonel Hill, and states that no enemy alien shall have in his possession or use while in such protected area any camera, radio transmitter, radio short-wave receiving set, firearm, ammunition or explosive.

Mr. RALSTON: That is effective immediately. You don't wait until April 1 for that.

Mr. NEILL: Well, as I said, it is doubtful. There is, however, no question whatever that a man who is not a Japanese national can do these things any time, any place. The order applies only to nationals; that is, to men born in Japan and coming over here, and these are comparatively few in number, something like 1,700 out of 24,000, and only while they are in the area. The remaining 22,000 of naturalized Japanese are free to come and go, as I have said, anywhere. They can photograph what they like, radio what they like. They can do something else which I have not touched upon, and which is—not to make a joke—a burning question in British Columbia. Three, two, one of them can do endless damage in British Columbia with a box of matches. The most deadly enemy of the lumber industry in British Columbia is fire. Lumbermen are so afraid of it, it is so dangerous, that they shut their camps down in the middle of summer, as soon as the humidity reaches a certain point. A man can wander out in that bush, ten, fifty, a hundred miles from anywhere, and do more damage with a box of matches than it would take two armies to put out. The large number of forest rangers whom we have could not touch the fringe of the thing if these aliens were determined to commit sabotage. Some of the biggest lumbermen on the coast are much alarmed at this situation. If the Japanese were out of the area, they could not do this damage, because you can't do a thing if you are not there.

I have spoken of the freedom of Japanese to come and go with cameras, radios and matches. That is not restricted to two months or four months; that is for eternity, if the war lasts that long; it is for the duration of the war that the naturalized or Canadian-born Jap can go out and commit sabotage; he is free to do it the whole time, and he is the most dangerous of the lot. The naturalized Japanese speaks our language fluently, possibly he has been to college. He possesses far greater potentialities of trouble as a spy or an agent than if he had just come from

Japan. The fellow dressed up like a white man, speaking our language glibly, is the one who should be interned. It is very hard for me to believe that the government are so remote from what is taking place or may take place as not to understand the situation.

Paragraph 10 of the statement to which I referred makes a rather vague reference to the establishment of a civil corps for Canadian and naturalized Japanese. Because the project is a voluntary one, and in view of the vagueness to which I have referred, I imagine that presently it will fade away.

I should now like to make three charges against the government. The first is this, that, with the exception of seizing these boats, they have been far too slow in handling the Japanese situation. They have let days go by when it should have been hours, and a month when it should have been days. Look at what was done in Mexico. There the government dealt with the whole lot as soon as war was declared, and ordered into the interior every Jap who was on the coast. They did it; they didn't talk about it. Cuba did the same thing. They arrested, I believe, eighteen Japanese, all but two of whom were naval officers. Nicaragua took the same course, and took it speedily.

Mr. CRERAR: Could my hon. friend tell the house—I am merely asking for information—what has been done in the United States?

Mr. NEILL: No. I have not made myself familiar with what is happening there. I know that on the Pacific coast they took prompt steps. But they did not have the same incentive and need for action as we have, because there were not fishermen in the state of Washington; most Japanese there worked in paper mills and the like of that. But I am not in a position to state in detail what was done. I have troubles enough of my own. I do know what the situation is in British Columbia.

The only reason why we have not had a Pearl Harbour bombing in Canada is that we have no Pearl Harbour to bomb.

I note here that the council of the city of Vancouver has passed a resolution urging the government to get a move on. The report speaks of increasing irritation and criticism at the coast over the apparent failure of the government to implement its announced policy of removing Japanese.

The legislature of British Columbia, before adjourning a few days ago, passed unanimously a resolution urging the dominion government to strengthen Pacific defences. The feeling is very strong at the coast. I wish I could get the government to realize it.

Here is one incident I must quote, reported under a big headline in a leading Vancouver paper, the *Daily Province*:

Japanese live undisturbed on dike adjoining airport.

There are 200 Japanese living a mile west of the airport. They are living on a dike. It would be very easy to blow up or open that dike, and the airport would be rendered useless for a long time to come. Yet they are living undisturbed within a mile of the airport; they are on a dike into which a gap could be blown with a few sticks of powder that would make the airport useless for a long time to come. Why does the government not take some action in this case?

The second charge is that even the small restrictions to which I have referred are applicable only to nationals, and I say it is inexcusable that they are not made applicable to all naturalized Japanese aliens in this country. To whom do you suppose they think they owe loyalty? If they were scattered all over Canada, the case might be different, but think what may happen when they are turned loose in a small area, when 25,000 are concentrated in an area where they could so readily combine to take action against Vancouver, or Victoria, as the case may be. It constitutes an unspeakable menace; I cannot understand why it is allowed to continue.

The third charge is that the government have shown indifference to British Columbia defence, also to air raid precautions work and the like of that. I am not blaming the government for preparations which they might have made six years ago. That is not their fault; I know that. We could not get the appropriation through the house. The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation moved resolutions condemning the government for proposing, as the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) did, to spend some money for these purposes. But I do blame the government for not having taken the situation in hand since war was declared. They are too slack; they appear to adopt the attitude, "Oh, well, we have to take chances; we are doing the best we can; it will be all right." Well, they told us it would be all right about Hong Kong. But people make mistakes—even military men, even high military men. They told us it would be all right at Singapore. Yet we know that mistakes were made there. Here is the government's paper, the *Vancouver Sun*, expressing this opinion:

Canada obviously has not made its plan of defence on the assumption of any real attack on the Pacific coast. . . . That is the plan which must be reconsidered . . . we do expect

a well-equipped, mobile striking unit which could pounce upon any Japanese landing attempt from Alaska southwards.

No such force exists on our coast. No such force exists in Canada.

I am afraid that is too true. Perhaps in the secret session which is to be held we shall be given more information on this matter. I do not propose to blame the government for things which happened before they had control and knowledge of the situation, or for not having done what at the time was beyond their power. But the government must be ready at that secret session to give us genuine information, not general assurances and smooth-sounding platitudes. There has been too much of this in connection with the management of the war.

There is a certain place—I will not name names, I will call it *Y*. When the government began to think about building aerodromes I thought that *Y* would make a good site for one, and I said so. I put it up to the officials, and they said that they were experts and ought to know better than I did. Well, I accepted that decision—but they are building that aerodrome now with frantic haste. I fear we may have to paraphrase the hymn and say:

> Too late, too late will be the cry
> The Japanese gunboats have gone by.

There was another aerodrome at a place we will call *X*. I wrote to the government in connection with this one, informing them that there were two things wrong about it. This was a year or two ago. I pointed out to the officials that there was a Jap village 200 yards from the mouth of it where the Japs could take photographs and keep a record of any aeroplanes leaving, with all the details, so that they could have it all recorded for the benefit of the Japanese. They were about as far from the mouth of the aerodrome as Sparks street would be from where I am standing. I have in my desk a letter in which some official tried to stall me off. I was told that they would expropriate the Japanese, but that they could not do it because there was some hitch. However, they said they would look into the matter. Imagine looking into the question of expropriating this particular property when other nations, as we know, take first what they require and then talk about expropriation. Again, I pointed out to the officials that there was a Jap who had been seen taking photographs from an aeroplane over the harbour, where the aerodrome was being built. It was a civilian aeroplane. I took this matter up with various bodies—I will not mention any names because I do not wish to give them away—and what was the answer? I was informed that the investigation was closed. They had ascertained the name of the man and had found that he had gone to Japan. I suppose he took photographs with him as a memento of us because he loved us so much. Well, he has gone back to Japan with whatever photographs he took—we do not know how many—and God knows how many more may have gone there. But the officials did not seem to think it was important. I was told that it would be difficult to take photographs through the glass of any aeroplane unless you had a particular sort of apparatus with which to do it. Well, would the Japanese not have that type of apparatus? I submitted all these matters to the department, and I have it all on record. One of the officials said to me, "There is nothing to this anyhow because it is not against the laws of the country to take photographs of an aerodrome."

I took it up with some of the higher officials, and they juggled with it and finally explained that they could get the Japs under the Official Secrets Act. The aerodrome is still there; the Japs are still staying there under their four months' lease of life, and doubtless they are still taking these photographs, which I have no doubt will be sent to the right place.

These men are not all Canadian nationals. Some of them may be the very best class of spies and foreign agents, and I contend that there has been too much sympathy for the Japanese viewpoint and Japanese interests. We must remember that we are at war with these people. Ottawa is 3,000 miles away from us out there, and it is useful to have a man here who is familiar with conditions on the coast to advise. So they sent for a man who for ten or fifteen years had been notorious—there is no other word by which to describe his activities—in the province of British Columbia, for his championship of the Japanese, for his advocacy of their interests. He was a protagonist of the Japanese. There was never a man who believed so strongly and implicitly in Japan.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has exceeded his time, and he may proceed only with the unanimous consent of the house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Go ahead.

Mr. NEILL: I thank the house and the Prime Minister; I have never asked for this licence before. To proceed, I may say that a great deal of ill-will has been excited in British Columbia. The people out there said that this man was paid a big salary as a provincial official, and they wanted to know

why they should be paying him if he was so disloyal to the province. That was before the war, and it was said that it was only a matter of opinion. He has now been transferred to a position in Ottawa in which he can give advice—that is what he is here for, to speak with authority. He is on the ground, and he is also in a position to have early knowledge of any action that might be taken against the Japanese and to drop a hint in the right place. Anything of that sort, just a hint in the right quarters, might make a great deal of difference in the carrying out of a policy.

Perhaps I shall be told that this is unfair, that this is a fine man, and that I should not make such statements. I agree that he is entitled to his weird opinions; he was entitled to that before the war. But since the war, no —a thousand times no. He is too one-sided and biased to be kept in such a place.

During the last war there was a member of the royal family, Prince Henry of Battenberg, I think, who was married to Queen Victoria's daughter. He was an admiral of the fleet and his loyalty could not be questioned, but he voluntarily asked to be retired. It did not look well to see a man of German origin in command of the fleet, and so he asked to be retired. I submit that in this case a feeling of decency should have impelled this gentleman to whom I have been referring to ask to be relieved of his position, where he is open to suspicion. Scripture says that we should abstain from even the appearance of evil.

We who have taken the position that I am now taking have been called all sorts of names. We have been called agitators. It is said that we are willing to exploit the interests of Canada for our own political advantage; that we are rabble-rousers, Jap-baiters, and that we have a very dangerous influence—that was not said of me; it was said of a reputable alderman in Vancouver. I have heard that sort of thing, and hints of it even in this house, and certainly in the government press. You can get a man to write any letter you want; you can get a white man to make a tool of himself for a Jap if you pay him enough. There was a man who wrote to the papers saying what fine people the Japs are. I laid a trap for him and I discovered that he was a white man all right, but also a paid agent of a Japanese association, but he did not say that when he signed his name.

Yes, we are all bad because we want a white British Columbia and not a place like Hawaii! Fifty years from now, unless something is done to stop it, all west of the Rockies will be yellow. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we want but little; we simply want to be left alone, like New Zealand and Australia, all white. I have no ill-will against the Japanese. Perhaps you may think I have been showing ill-will, but I assure you I have none towards the Japs. No Jap ever "did" me—I never gave him the chance. I wish to be fair to the Japanese, and I think that if we expatriated them, as we ought to do, they should be given full justice in regard to their property, because I am strongly in favour of a Japan controlled by the Japanese, just as I am in favour of a Canada controlled by Canadians. Let us continue to trade with them; let us do business with them across the ocean; but do not force into one nation two peoples separated by something that is wider than the ocean, two peoples who are different in race, in religion, in traditions and in their whole philosophy of life. This difference always has prevented assimilation and always will prevent it, between two nations so utterly divergent in every respect. The greatest path towards assimilation is marriage. Well, the Japs have been here fifty-eight years and there is no record of a single marriage, although there might be one. I asked a Japanese to produce the record of one marriage and he could not do so. We have heard of second generation Japanese born here going to Japanese schools here to learn Japanese, and that has been regarded as a small matter. We went into their textbooks and had them translated and we found that they were very anti-British. Yet there were people who thought that was a small matter—only the sort of thing that irresponsible people like myself would talk about. But when the war came, it was thought wise to shut down the Jap schools. There were fifty-nine in British Columbia, and leaving out small areas where they could not run a school, the great bulk of those children must have attended some Japanese school.

I have one more word. When the time comes to talk peace, I suggest that the services rendered by Canada and by her Prime Minister should surely entitle both him and this dominion to be fully represented when the terms of peace are being settled, when the treaty comes to be made, and have their voice heard in no uncertain terms. I do suggest—perhaps it is too early to talk about it now, but it is well to get it started—that we should make an arrangement that when peace time comes, we expatriate all the Japanese left in Canada; do it on fair terms, buy them out, pay them liberally. It was done in the present war, I believe, between Russia and Germany; and after the last war it was done on a large scale, some 200,000 people, between the Greeks and the Turks, I think. If they could move 200,000, it is

much easier for us to move 25,000, and it is better to move them while their numbers are so small. Let us settle once and for all this canker in the life of Canada which prevents us from being a united white Canada. And that is what British Columbia wants.

Mr. COLDWELL: I rise to a point of order. I believe we are discussing the amendment to the motion. I submit to you, sir, that on the basis of your ruling on the amendment to the amendment the amendment itself is clearly out of order.

Your Honour ruled that the subamendment sought to condemn the government on what amounted to a want of confidence motion for something it contemplated doing. The amendment states:

> This house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers, instead of giving to the country the leadership so essential at a time properly described in the speech from the throne as the greatest crisis in the world's history, on the contrary, have sought to evade their responsibility by holding a plebiscite.

My submission is that the government has not held a plebiscite, but that the speech from the throne contemplates the holding of a plebiscite, which is precisely in the terms of the amendment to the amendment that was ruled out of order. Therefore on precisely the same ground this amendment to the motion is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the difference is very apparent. The government has announced its determination to hold a plebiscite. The amendment that I ruled out of order referred to a contemplated future action of the government, which may or may not take place. Therefore I cannot see any similarity between that proposed subamendment and the amendment which is now before the house.

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two Mountains): Now that the proposed subamendment of the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) has been ruled out of order, and before the vote is taken on the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) I intend to move an amendment to the amendment of the leader of the opposition.

Canada in its entirety condemned conscription on March 26, 1940. Canadians of all origins repudiated this measure. There is no better demonstration thereof than the defeat of the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen in York South on February 9. Personally I will not relieve the government from its solemn pledge and sacred commitments. Now the Prime Minister of our country, who heads the most powerful government which Canada has ever had, would withdraw before a clique of imperialists. Why this plebiscite, if not because the government wishes to be released from its pledges and commitments? It would be so easy for the government to respect the precise, clear and almost unanimous mandate which it received from the people of this country on March 26, 1940. Furthermore, thousands of Canadian voters approved the same mandate on February 9 last; they requested the government to respect its commitments to the people of Canada. I will not mention to-day the results of the by-elections of February 9, but I will speak again on that subject at the right moment.

The Canadian party has sown the seed of Canadian ideals. This seed has already sprouted in good soil. Having regard to the generous and sympathetic welcome with which the electorate greeted our doctrine, we are sure that our ideas and principles will make their way.

The amendment to the amendment which I shall move is not an amendment to the address in reply to the speech from the throne, but an amendment to the amendment of the leader of the opposition. Lest hon. members should misunderstand the meaning of the amendment I shall move, let me give the following explanation.

I cannot support the leader of the opposition; on the contrary I must disapprove of his amendment as firmly as I can, because sub-paragraph of paragraph 2 states that:

> —this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers have not seen fit to recommend to parliament without delay additional measures designed to
>
> (a) completely mobilize the wealth and material resources and, on a selective basis, the full man and woman power of the nation, to the end that the nation may wage total war in any theatre of war.

During all my life I have been opposed to conscription and mobilization for overseas service. It is not in this most decisive hour that I will fail in my duty. According to the very words of the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, "conscription for overseas service would be an error of such tremendous magnitude that it would split the country wide open."

Many of my colleagues have already voiced their disapproval of the plebiscite. They have spoken in this debate and asserted that they would vote against the address in reply to the speech from the throne. Because my colleagues are sincere and consistent and have asserted that they are beside me against conscription I beg them to help me defeat the amendment moved by the leader of the opposition requesting conscription and mobilization for overseas service.

This amendment to the amendment will also deal with the necessity of exempting from military training and compulsory service, farmers, farmers' sons, fishermen and fisheries employees, and all persons employed in war industries. Agriculture is our first line of defence, because it feeds our armies and our civilian population. As for employees of war industries, their work is essential to the carrying on of the war and to the defence of Canada. The great majority of munition workers already possess invaluable training and experience; to replace them would mean disorganizing and even ruining our production of aircraft, tanks, ships, guns, machine guns, shells, and so forth.

The government has not the right to commit the tremendous error of ruining or even lessening our agricultural production. Nor has it the right to harm the output of our munition factories. Many married farmers and their sons had to abandon their farms to join up in the training camps. Even more numerous were the aged and sick farmers who were compelled to sell their farms and herds because their sons were mobilized and called for training. Farm labour has become so scarce that we anticipate with great fear the imminent failure of agriculture in Canada.

During the year just gone by agricultural production has decreased by twenty-six per cent. This decrease is reaching such a point that our best informed agricultural economists are thunderstruck by the seriousness of this situation.

I shall deal further with the vital importance of maintaining, and even of increasing, production in our war factories. Many young men who had acquired a previous experience in this line had to leave their factories to take up military training. I know many tradesmen, skilled mechanics, plumbers, welders, electricians and graduates from our technical schools who were compelled to leave their work, so important to our war production, in order to respond to the colours. In many cases they were replaced by apprentices or completely unskilled workers.

One should not wonder, then, why our war factories have worked and are still working at a very slow rate. In order to redress this deplorable state of affairs an investigation should be conducted into the acts of the responsible parties.

According to the war aims of the allies, we are fighting first of all to maintain Christianity in the world, and then democracy, liberty, justice and right. Why is it that the Lord's day is violated more than ever in our war industries? Sunday is God's day. For thousands of years it has been respected and observed by all Christian and civilized peoples. Do you believe, Mr. Speaker, that Christ, whose teachings are constant and eternal, will bless the success of our armies? Our Lord Jesus Christ decreed that Sunday must be observed as a day of rest and prayer. Those who violate His commandments must expect the worst catastrophes. Let the government stop everywhere, while there is still time, all work performed on Sundays, and God will bless the success of our armies.

Coming back to the necessity of maintaining and increasing our agricultural production, I wish to direct the attention of the house to numerous difficulties which face the farmers and gardeners when they wish to obtain the labour required to operate their farms. It is evident that at the present time our farmers are living through the most difficult period they have experienced for many years. In many cases they are driven to bankruptcy as a consequence of their being exploited by the trusts controlling feeding stuffs, chemical fertilizers, and all by-products of wheat such as bran and shorts. At times when wheat was worth 38 cents a bushel the farmers have had to pay as much as $3.40 and $3.60 for one hundred pounds of wheat flour. Feeding stuffs which three or four years ago they could buy for $19.80 a ton are now sold to them for as high as $38 a ton by the powerful companies which derive their profits from the sacrifices, the labour, and the misery of farmers and workers.

These monopolies will kill the production of bacon, cheese and butter in this country. Farmers tell me they are getting rid of their dairy cattle, and would sacrifice their bacon hogs rather than lose money on them every day. Others have already abandoned their farms because they cannot get labour. No farmer can face the actual agricultural situation without losing his savings and the capital which it took many years to build up. On top of all these vicissitudes he must bear daylight saving time. Anyone with the least knowledge of farm life would never impose daylight saving upon farmers. The government seems to think that the farmer does not experience enough difficulties yet in securing the required labour. Is there no expert on the department's staff who can tell the government that daylight saving time is very detrimental to the agricultural class? Is there no one who can show that harvesting cannot be done before the sun has dried up the dew which covers all fields at daybreak? Will the government ever be aware that the imposition of daylight saving time upon farmers deals a very hard blow to agriculture itself? Indeed,

it deprives production of thousands and thousands of most precious hours, the hours which follow sunrise.

I see these gentlemen protesting that the farmer will work more and longer hours in the evening. No, Mr. Speaker, this argument is false, and invented in their imaginations. One cannot work in the fields at such a late hour because the dew has already descended. Why not maintain standard time in all rural municipalities? Daylight saving will save very little, if we look at the immense loss of time imposed upon agriculture.

A while ago I called to the attention of the government the evil doings of the trusts who exploit farmers and workers. During the months of October, November, and December last, the very companies I denounced a while ago bought from farmers potatoes at a price ranging from 40 to 50 cents a bag. These potatoes were stored away in huge quantities by financial sharks. The wartime prices and trade board set the maximum price for potatoes at $2 a bag. Once more the worker, the consumer and the farmer have been robbed. As for the government, it is still buying from Canada Packers, for army consumption, potatoes stored away by trusts who thus make profits of 250 per cent. The same story repeats itself. During the fall of 1940, for our military training camps the government bought butter from Canada Packers at prices as high as 36, 37 and 38 cents a pound. The same butter—that is, 60,000,000 pounds—was stored away by a gang of scoundrels who, during July, August and September, bought it from farmers at prices as low as 21, 22 and 23 cents a pound. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I protested against it in this very chamber. I was given the official figures, and the government set the price of butter at 34 cents a pound. It was too late. The people and the government had been robbed and exploited by unbridled profiteering which led democracy to the verge of the abyss.

Before concluding, I wish to point out to this house that the market gardener's co-operative association of the province of Quebec in the district of Montreal will be deprived of 6,000 to 8,000 experienced workers in 1942. Where are we heading for, if not for agricultural disaster? I had the same representations from the United Farmers. The Catholic farmers' union of Quebec also shares these views. We receive thousands of resolutions passed by county corporations and local municipalities requesting that farmers and farmers' sons be exempted from military training. If we do not grant the unanimous request of our agricultural classes, if we do not exempt from military service the employees of our war factories, we may justly fear great set-backs. Suppress the vital strength of our nation, its agriculture, its war factories, and you will see its first line of defence crumble; you will see the country fall into decay and ruin.

Consequently I wish to move, seconded by the hon. member for Quebec-Montmorency (Mr. LaCroix):

That all the words after "this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers" in the amendment, be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"(a) did not deem it proper to advise Your Excellency that the government should adhere to its commitments and the terms of its mandate against conscription for overseas service which it received from the people of Canada at the general elections held on March 26, 1940;

(b) that the farmers, farm employees, fishermen, fisheries employees and all persons engaged in industries connected with agriculture or with war industries, should be exempt from military service."

Mr. HOMUTH: Why not add barbers and bakers?

The house divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Lacombe), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Bourget	Lizotte
d'Anjou	Parent
Gauthier	Pouliot
Lacombe	Raymond
Lacroix (Beauce)	Roy—11.
LaCroix (Quebec-Montmorency)	

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott	Cleaver
Anderson	Cloutier
Authier	Coldwell
Aylesworth	Corman
Bence	Coté
Bercovitch	Crerar
Bertrand (Prescott)	Cruickshank
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)	Davidson
Black (Cumberland)	Dechene
Black (Yukon)	Denis
Blackmore	Desmond
Blanchette	Diefenbaker
Bonnier	Donnelly
Boucher	Douglas (Queens)
Bradette	Douglas (Weyburn)
Bruce	Dubuc
Brunelle	Dupuis
Cardin	Durocher
Casselman, Mrs. (Edmonton East)	Edwards
Castleden	Emmerson
Chevrier	Eudes
Church	Evans
Claxton	Factor
	Fair
	Farquhar

Fauteux
Ferland
Ferron
Fleming
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fraser (Northumberland, Ont.)
Fraser (Peterborough West)
Fulford
Furniss
Gardiner
Gershaw
Gibson
Gillis
Gingues
Gladstone
Golding
Goulet
Graham
Grant
Gray
Graydon
Green
Gregory
Hansell
Hanson (Skeena)
Hanson (York-Sunbury)
Harris (Danforth)
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Hatfield
Hazen
Healy
Henderson
Hill
Hlynka
Hoblitzell
Homuth
Howden
Howe
Hurtubise
Ilsley
Isnor
Jackman
Jean
Johnston (Bow River)
King, Mackenzie
Kinley
Kirk
Kuhl
Laflamme
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Lapointe (Lotbinière)
Leader
Leclerc
Leduc
Leger
Little
Lockhart
McCann
McCuaig
McCubbin
McCulloch
MacDiarmid
Macdonald (Brantford City)
Macdonald (Halifax)
Macdonald (Kingston City)
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGarry
McGibbon
McGregor
McIlraith
MacInnis
McIvor
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)
MacKinnon (Edmonton West)
McKinnon (Kenora-Rainy River)
MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
McLarty
MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
McLean (Simcoe East)
Macmillan
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
McNiven (Regina City)
MacNicol
Marier
Marshall
Martin
Maybank
Mayhew
Michaud
Mills
Mullins
Mulock
Neill
Nicholson
Nielsen, Mrs.
Nixon
Noseworthy
Perley
Picard
Pinard
Poirier
Pottier
Power
Purdy
Quelch
Ralston
Reid
Rennie
Rhéaume
Rickard
Roebuck
Ross (Calgary East)
Ross (Hamilton East)
Ross (St. Paul's)
Ross (Souris)
Rowe
Ryan
St. Laurent
Sanderson
Senn
Shaw
Sissons
Soper
Stirling
Stokes
Sylvestre
Taylor
Telford
Thauvette
Thorson
Tremblay
Tripp
Turgeon
Tustin
Veniot
Vien
Ward
Warren
Weir
White
Whitman
Winkler
Wood
Wright—195.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the amendment.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Before the vote is taken on the amendment I wish to say just a word or two. Amendments are sometimes peculiar things. We read part of them and we say we agree; we read another part of them and we say we disagree; and it is a case of deciding which part outweighs the other part, in order to know how to vote. That, Mr. Speaker, is the position in which we in this corner of the house find ourselves with respect to the amendment moved by the leader of the official opposition (Mr. Hanson). There are some things in the amendment with which we agree—agree most heartily. I might suggest that paragraph (b), that the government have failed to "supply the imperative needs of agriculture, industry, and the fighting forces of the nation" is something with which we agree.

It is already recognized, of course, that we of this group represent constituencies in western Canada. For the most part our ridings are agricultural; and we agree that the government has failed, and miserably failed, to supply the needs of agriculture comparatively with the needs of other industries since the war began.

Before coming to Ottawa I took a trip through the eastern part of my constituency, and honestly I was ashamed that I lived in a country where the governmental administration of the nation was such as to bring upon the farmers of that constituency the embarrassment and suffering which it does. Men came to me almost crying, saying that they had met the government's request to reduce their wheat acreage and yet could not get their bonuses paid. I know that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) can rise in his place and say that perhaps something was wrong with this case or that case. I am not saying that there is anything particularly wrong with the fundamental principle underlying the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, but I do say that there is something miserably wrong with the administration of it. Men came to me almost crying, saying, "What am I to do? I have no money and the grocer will not let me have groceries on credit even though I am expecting a cheque any day from the government for my acreage reduction."

What could I tell these people? And that is the position not only in my constituency, but in many others. Indecision after indecision has resulted from some important point with respect to the administration of that act. Farmers who should have been paid last fall are not yet paid, and we receive letters every day asking what is wrong and why these

farmers cannot get payment for their acreage bonus. That sort of thing should not go on in time of war when we desire our people to feel free to fight for a country that is worth fighting for. We are leaving in the minds of some of these people the thought that perhaps, after all, there is not very much to fight for. I do not like to think that: it should not be. I am perfectly satisfied that we have one of the greatest countries on God's earth. Then let us satisfy the needs of the people who belong to and are appealing to this nation.

The other paragraph reads that the government has failed to make mention of things with respect to preparation for the post-war period. I am not going to take time now to go into a discussion of what might happen in this matter, but I will say that not very much encouragement is offered to this country from the point of view of what will take place after this war is over, judging by what is happening to-day to the dependents of men who fought in the last war.

I have a letter which is only characteristic of many that we receive. It is characteristic of the underlying principle that the government has not been able to care for the veterans and their dependents who fought for this country to make it safe for democracy in the years from 1914 to 1918. I have a letter from a young lady whose mother is the widow of a man who fought for four years in the last war. Her dependent's allowance has now run out so that she is thrown on the rolls of public charity—a woman of 65. Listen to what this young woman has to say:

> My father was a veteran of the last great war and served at the front for four steady years. His number was 435830.

We may as well put this on the eternal records of this house.

> Upon his return, of course, he was honourably discharged. Well do I remember his homecoming and how shocked we were to see how greatly he had aged in those four years of absence from home. However, I am wandering from my point, upon obtaining the age of sixty he became entitled to a veteran's allowance of $40 per month, but as usual he was squeezed down to the magnificent sum of $25 per month upon which he and my mother were expected to live, or, should I say, expected to exist. His strength failed rapidly the latter part of his life; he suffered terribly from neuritis and bladder trouble, and finally in January he was told an operation would be necessary in order that he might live. In short, he had the operation and died at the age of sixty-three, leaving my mother, who is the same age, shocked, lonely and heart-broken, knowing full well those years spent in damp trenches had at last taken their toll.

What happened? The poor widow had nothing. She applied to the administration for assistance. What do they do? They round out the year by continuing to pay her $25 a month, and when the year ends she gets a notice that this is the final payment. I took this matter up with the department. Of course, we have our acts that govern the administration of these departments. I took it up with the department and got it in writing. I received a letter from them saying that they could no nothing for this woman. I want to read a part of the letter. This is from the war veterans' allowance board:

> I regret to inform you that there is absolutely nothing that can be done, under the terms of the War Veterans' Allowance Act, for . . .
>
> I am sorry that I cannot send you a more hopeful communication.

That is a very bright spot, is it not, in the administration of this country's affairs when we are fighting a war and asking young men to go to the front? I have two boys in the air force. What am I to think if I know that should they marry and come back and die, their widows will be turned over to public charity and be obliged to go and bow down in obeisance to the city fathers in order to get a hand-out? Is that the way we are going to treat them?

It is all very well for the department to say, "We regret to inform you that absolutely nothing can be done under the terms of the act." They attempt to hide behind some statute. Well, I am a preacher, but I would say, "damn the statute." Let us scrap the statute and put another one in its place in order to give something of encouragement to the aged mothers who have raised their families, struggled hard while their husbands were spending four years in damp trenches in the last war. The government by reason of the War Measures Act can contravene existing statutes; they can scrap them; they can change them while we are sitting right here. But when it comes to changing them in order to get a few dollars to the needy wives of our veterans, oh, no, no, they cannot do that! They then use the War Veterans' Allowance Act to hide behind.

I know they may say, "It will cost so much money." I know we have a war on and it takes money to fight a war. But before the war is over, we shall perhaps be raising and spending three or four billion dollars a year to blow into kingdom come, yet we cannot afford a few dollars to help the destitute widows of the soldiers who fought for this country.

With that part of the Conservative amendment this group heartily agrees. We are, however, going to vote against that amendment. We do so by reason of another part of it. I do not wish this statement to be interpreted that we are therefore voting on

the side of the government; we are voting against the main motion too. Let me make this statement on behalf of this group. This group with which I am associated favours the general principle of plebiscites and referenda designed to determine the direct will of the people. We agree with that part of the Conservative amendment which asserts that by holding this plebiscite in the manner in which it is to be held the government is evading its responsibility. We favour also paragraphs (b) and (c) of the amendment, which state that the government has failed to supply the needs of agriculture and has neglected to make mention of post-war reconstruction. We shall oppose the amendment on the ground that we have no confidence in the Conservative party's stand on the mobilization of our wealth and material resources as suggested by their amendment. Nowhere in their speeches or their recommendations have they indicated that their idea of conscription of wealth and resources means the same as the conscription of finance as advocated by this group.

Mr. MacNICOL: What do you mean by conscription of finance?

Mr. HANSELL: I suggest that the hon. member ask his own leader, who himself says he wants to mobilize wealth.

Mr. MacNICOL: You said you did not agree with that; now what do you mean by it yourself?

Mr. HANSELL: Those who proposed this amendment have never asserted that there is any need for change in the basic principles now operative in the present privately controlled financial system.

Mr. F. G. HOBLITZELL (Eglinton): I am going to vote for the amendment to the motion, which implies endorsation of the plebiscite resolution, because I believe in the principle of universal compulsory selective service. If the amendment is defeated so that we cannot have immediate universal compulsory selective service, then I feel that the only course open to me is to vote for the main motion endorsing the plebiscite proposal to free the government from any election pledge given against conscription and thus allow it to bring in compulsory selective service if it will do so.

In pursuance of this reasoning I shall use what influence I have to induce the electors to vote "yes" on the plebiscite. If the plebiscite is carried, I shall then urge the government to introduce universal compulsory selective service immediately.

I would prefer the immediate release of the government from its anti-conscription commitments by a vote of this house, but since that does not appear to be feasible, I shall support the plebiscite on the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Hanson—York-Sunbury) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Adamson
Anderson
Aylesworth
Bence
Black (Cumberland)
Black (Yukon)
Boucher
Bruce
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)
Church
Desmond
Diefenbaker
Fraser (Peterborough West)
Gray
Graydon
Green
Hanson (York-Sunbury)
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Hazen
Hoblitzell
Homuth
Jackman
Lockhart
McGregor
MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
MacNicol
Neill
Ross (St. Paul's)
Rowe
Senn
Stirling
Stokes
Tustin
White.

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott
Authier
Bercovitch
Bertrand (Prescott)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Blackmore
Blanchette
Bonnier
Bourget
Bradette
Brunelle
Cardin
Casselman, Mrs. (Edmonton East)
Castleden
Chevrier
Claxton
Cleaver
Cloutier
Coldwell
Corman
Coté
Crerar
Cruickshank
d'Anjou
Davidson
Dechene
Denis
Donnelly
Douglas (Queens)
Douglas (Weyburn)
Dubois
Dubuc
Dupuis
Durocher
Edwards
Emmerson
Eudes
Evans
Factor
Fair
Farquhar
Fauteux
Ferland
Ferron
Fleming
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fraser (Northumberland, Ont.)
Fulford
Furniss
Gardiner
Gauthier
Gershaw
Gibson
Gillis
Gingues
Gladstone
Golding
Goulet
Graham
Grant
Gregory
Hansell
Hanson (Skeena)
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Healy
Henderson
Hill
Hlynka
Howden
Howe
Hurtubise
Ilsley
Isnor

Jean
Johnston (Bow River)
King, Mackenzie
Kinley
Kirk
Kuhl
Lacombe
Lacroix (Beauce)
LaCroix (Quebec-Montmorency)
Laflamme
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Lapointe (Lotbinière)
Leader
Leclerc
Leduc
Leger
Little
Lizotte
McCann
McCuaig
McCubbin
McCulloch
MacDiarmid
Macdonald (Brantford City)
Macdonald (Halifax)
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGarry
McGibbon
McIlraith
MacInnis
McIvor
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)
MacKinnon (Edmonton West)
McKinnon (Kenora-Rainy River)
McLarty
MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
McLean (Simcoe East)
Macmillan
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
McNiven (Regina City)
Marier
Marshall
Martin
Maybank
Mayhew
Michaud
Mills
Mullins
Mulock
Nicholson
Nielsen, Mrs.
Nixon
Noseworthy
O'Neill
Parent
Picard
Pinard
Poirier
Pottier
Pouliot
Power
Quelch
Ralston
Raymond
Reid
Rennie
Rhéaume
Rickard
Roebuck
Ross (Calgary East)
Ross (Hamilton East)
Roy
Ryan
St. Laurent
Sanderson
Shaw
Sissons
Soper
Sylvestre
Taylor
Telford
Thauvette
Thorson
Tremblay
Tripp
Turgeon
Veniot
Vien
Ward
Warren
Weir
Whitman
Winkler
Wood
Wright—172.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Slaght	Brooks
Purdy	Esling
MacKenzie (Lambton West)	Cardiff
Ross (Moose Jaw)	Perley
MacKenzie (Neepawa)	Ross (Souris)
Macdonald (Kingston City)	O'Brien

Mr. PERLEY: I was paired with the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. PURDY: I was paired with the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Esling). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment.

[Mr. Hoblitzell.]

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I was paired with the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. MacKenzie). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. POULIOT: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no seconder.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that, with the consent of the house, I would propose that we would not sit to-night if we conclude the debate at the present time. I would move the formal motions for the committees of ways and means and supply.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion? I declare the motion carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. SPEAKER: On division.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Aye.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those opposed to the motion will please say "nay."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Nay.

Mr. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The house divided on the main motion (Mr. Fournier, Hull) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Abbott	Dubuc
Authier	Dupuis
Bercovitch	Durocher
Bertrand (Prescott)	Edwards
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)	Emmerson
Blanchette	Eudes
Bonnier	Evans
Bradette	Factor
Brunelle	Farquhar
Cardin	Fauteux
Casselman, Mrs. (Edmonton East)	Ferland
Chevrier	Ferron
Claxton	Fleming
Cleaver	Fontaine
Cloutier	Fournier (Hull)
Corman	Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Coté	Fraser (Northumberland, Ont.)
Crerar	Fulford
Cruickshank	Furniss
Davidson	Gardiner
Dechene	Gershaw
Denis	Gibson
Donnelly	Gingues
Douglas (Queens)	Gladstone
Dubois	Golding

Goulet
Graham
Grant
Gregory
Hanson (Skeena)
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Healy
Henderson
Hill
Hoblitzell
Howden
Howe
Hurtubise
Ilsley
Isnor
Jean
King, Mackenzie
Kinley
Kirk
Laflamme
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Lapointe (Lotbinière)
Leader
Leclerc
Leduc
Leger
Little
McCann
McCuaig
McCubbin
McCulloch
MacDiarmid
Macdonald (Brantford City)
Macdonald (Halifax)
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGarry
McGibbon
McIlraith
McIvor
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)
MacKinnon (Edmonton West)
McKinnon (Kenora-Rainy River)
McLarty
MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
McLean (Simcoe East)
Macmillan
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
McNiven (Regina City)
Marier
Martin
Maybank
Mayhew
Michaud
Mills
Mullins
Mulock
Nielsen, Mrs.
Nixon
O'Neill
Picard
Pinard
Poirier
Pottier
Power
Ralston
Reid
Rennie
Rhéaume
Rickard
Roebuck
Ross (Calgary East)
Ross (Hamilton East)
Ryan
St. Laurent
Sanderson
Sissons
Soper
Sylvestre
Taylor
Telford
Thauvette
Thorson
Tremblay
Tripp
Turgeon
Veniot
Vien
Ward
Warren
Weir
Whitman
Winkler
Wood—144.

NAYS

Messrs:

Adamson
Anderson
Bence
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Cumberland)
Black (Yukon)
Blackmore
Boucher
Bourget
Bruce
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)
Castleden
Church
Coldwell
D'Anjou
Desmond
Diefenbaker
Douglas (Weyburn)
Fair
Fraser (Peterborough West)
Gauthier
Gillis
Graydon
Green
Hansell
Hanson (York-Sunbury)
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Hazen
Hlynka
Homuth
Jackman
Johnston (Bow River)
Kuhl
Lacombe
Lacroix (Beauce)
LaCroix (Quebec-Montmorency)
Lizotte
Lockhart
McGregor
MacInnis
MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
MacNicol
Marshall
Neill
Nicholson
Noseworthy
Parent
Pouliot
Quelch
Raymond
Ross (St. Paul's)
Rowe
Roy
Senn
Shaw
Stirling
Stokes
Tustin
White
Wright—61.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the chief whips.)

Slaght	Brooks
Purdy	Esling
MacKenzie (Lambton West)	Cardiff
Ross (Moose Jaw)	Perley
MacKenzie (Neepawa)	Ross (Souris)
Macdonald (Kingston City)	O'Brien.

Mr. PERLEY: I was paired with the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Ross). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

Mr. PURDY: I was paired with the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Esling). Had I voted, I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I was paired with the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. MacKenzie). Had I voted, I would have voted against the motion.

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

That the said 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.

SUPPLY

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

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

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is this subject to notice, or is it the regular motion?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is the regular procedure immediately following the adoption of the address.

Motion agreed to.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health) presented the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the standing committees of the house, as follows:

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Messieurs

Abbott
Anderson
Bertrand (Laurier)
Diefenbaker
Douglas (Weyburn)
Factor
Fair
Fleming
Gershaw
Gibson
Gladstone
Gray
Gregory
Kirk
Lalonde
Leger
Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)
MacNicol
McCuaig
McDonald (Pontiac)
Mills
Mutch
O'Brien
Pinard
Pouliot
Power
Roy
Tremblay
Weir.

RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES

Messieurs

Bence
Bertrand (Laurier)
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Black (Cumberland)
Bourget
Breithaupt
Chevrier
Corman
Coté
Crerar
Douglas (Queens)
Dupuis
Emmerson
Eudes
Factor
Farquhar
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fulford
Gingues
Golding
Gregory
Hanson (Skeena)
Harris (Danforth)
Hatfield
Healy
Howden
Howe
Isnor
Jackman
Jaques
Jean
Kirk
LaCroix (Quebec-Montmorency)
Little
Lizotte
Lockhart
MacInnis
MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
McCulloch
McIvor
McKinnon (Kenora-Rainy River)
McNiven (Regina City)
Maybank
Mills
Mullins
Nicholson
Nielsen (Mrs.)
Nixon
O'Brien
O'Neill
Picard
Pouliot
Roebuck
Ross (Calgary East)
Ross (Souris)
Shaw
Sissons
Turner
White
Whitman.

MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS

Messieurs

Bonnier
Boucher
Casselman (Mrs.) (Edmonton East)
Castleden
Chambers
Cleaver
Cloutier
Coté
d'Anjou
Donnelly
Douglas (Queens)
Dubois
Durocher
Factor
Fournier (Hull)
Gershaw
Gibson
Gillis
Gingues
Gladstone
Graham
Hansell
Harris (Grey-Bruce)
Hazen
Healy
Hlynka
Hoblitzell
Howden
Jutras
Lacombe
LaCroix (Quebec-Montmorency)
Lapointe (Lotbinière)
Lockhart
Macdonald (Halifax)
Macdonald (Brantford City)
MacKenzie (Lambton-Kent)
McGregor
McIlraith
Matthews
Mayhew
Parent
Poirier
Ross (St. Paul's)
Roy
Senn
Stokes
Telford
Tomlinson
Veniot
Wood.

BANKING AND COMMERCE

Messieurs

Bercovitch
Black (Cumberland)
Blackmore
Blair
Breithaupt
Claxton
Cleaver
Coldwell
Donnelly
Dubuc
Eudes
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fraser (Northumberland)
Fraser (Peterborough West)
Graham
Gray
Hanson (York-Sunbury)
Harris (Danforth)
Hazen
Hill
Jackman
Jaques
Jean
Kinley
Lacroix (Beauce)
Laflamme
Lapointe (Lotbinière)
Macdonald (Halifax)
Macdonald (Brantford City)
Macmillan
McCann
McGeer
McIlraith
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
Marier
Martin
Maybank
Mayhew
Moore
Perley
Picard
Raymond
Ross (St. Paul's)
Ross (Calgary East)
Slaght
Thorson
Tucker
Ward
Woodsworth.

STANDING ORDERS

Messieurs

Bertrand (Prescott)
Brunelle
Cardiff
Denis
Douglas (Weyburn)
Edwards
Golding
Graydon
Jaques
MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
Marier
Marshall
McGibbon
McLarty
McLean (Simcoe East)
O'Neill
Rennie
Ross (Moose Jaw)
Stokes
Sylvestre.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Messieurs

Abbott
Anderson
Authier
Bercovitch
Black (Yukon)
Blanchette
Boucher
Bourget
Brooks
Casselman (Mrs.) (Edmonton East)
Church
Clark
Coté
Cruickshank
Desmond
Ferland
Fleming
Fontaine
Fournier (Hull)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Fraser (Northumberland)
Fulford
Gladstone
Golding
Grant
Graydon
Henderson
Homuth
Isnor
Johnston (Bow River)
Leader
MacInnis
McCubbin
McDonald (Pontiac)
McGeer
McIvor
Marshall
Mullins
Mulock
Purdy
Rickard
Roebuck
Ross (Hamilton East)
Slaght
Thorson
Tremblay
Tripp
Veniot
Winkler
Wright.

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

Messieurs

Authier
Aylesworth
Bertrand (Prescott)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Blair
Cardiff
Clark
Cloutier
Cruickshank
Davidson
Dechene
Desmond
Diefenbaker
Donnelly
Douglas (Weyburn)
Douglas (Queens)
Evans
Fair
Ferron
Fontaine
Furniss
Gardiner
Golding
Hallé
Hatfield
Henderson
Lafontaine
Lalonde
Lapointe (Lotbinière)
Leader
Leclerc
Leger
Lizotte
MacDiarmid
MacKenzie (Lambton-Kent)
McCuaig
McCubbin
McGarry
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
Matthews
Mullins
Nielsen (Mrs.)
Perley
Poirier
Quelch
Rennie
Rhéaume
Rickard
Ross (Souris)
Ross (Middlesex East)
Ross (Moose Jaw)
Rowe
Senn
Soper
Sylvestre
Turgeon
Tustin
Ward
Weir
Wright.

DEBATES

Messieurs

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

MARINE AND FISHERIES

Messieurs

Bradette
Brooks
Brunelle
Crete
Dechene
Farquhar
Ferron
Gauthier
Gillis
Green
Hanson (Skeena)
Hazen
Hill
Kinley
Kuhl
Lafontaine
Lapointe (Matapedia-Matane)
Leduc
Macdonald (Kingston City)
MacInnis
MacKenzie (Neepawa)
Macmillan
McLean (Simcoe East)
Neill
Pottier
Reid
Roy
Ryan
Stirling
Telford
Tomlinson
Tripp
Tustin
Veniot
Warren.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

(Members to act on the part of the Commons)

Mr. Speaker and Messieurs

Adamson
Aylesworth
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)
Bruce
Cardiff
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)
Castleden
Emmerson
Eudes
Farquhar
Fontaine
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Gershaw
Goulet
Graham
Green
Henderson
Howden
Hurtubise
Jaques
Jean
Lizotte
Macdonald (Halifax)
MacKenzie (Neepawa)
MacKenzie (Lambton-Kent)
Macmillan
Marier
Martin
Mayhew
Moore
Poirier
Pouliot
Purdy
Raymond
Reid
Rickard
Ross (St. Paul's)
Shaw
Telford
Thauvette
Warren
Winkler
Wood
Woodsworth.

INDUSTRIAL AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Messieurs

Abbott
Blackmore
Bruce
Church
Cote
Dubuc
Eudes
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Goulet
Hanson (Skeena)
Homuth
Jean
Laflamme
Lafontaine
Leger
MacInnis
MacKenzie (Neepawa)
Macmillan
MacNicol
McCann
McGarry
McNiven (Regina City)
Massey
Mutch
Neill
Nixon
Pottier
Roebuck
Ross (Calgary East)
Ross (Hamilton East)
Sanderson
Slaght
Stirling
Taylor
Turgeon.

PRINTING

(Members to act on the part of the Commons)

Messieurs

Bercovitch
Bertrand (Terrebonne)
Blanchette
Bourget
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)
Castleden
Chambers
Chevrier
Claxton
Corman
Denis
Dubois
Dupuis
Durocher
Edwards
Emmerson
Esling
Evans
Ferland
Fleming
Fraser (Peterborough West)
Furniss
Goulet
Grant
Green
Hallé
Healy
Hlynka
Hoblitzell
Hurtubise
Kuhl
Leader
MacDiarmid
MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
McGregor
McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
Mills
Moore
Mulock
Nicholson
Purdy
Rhéaume
Ross (St. Paul's)
Sinclair
Sissons
Soper
Tucker
Tustin
Weir
White
Whitman
Winkler
Wood.

MINES, FORESTS AND WATERS

Messieurs

Adamson
Authier
Bence
Black (Yukon)
Bradette
Crerar
d'Anjou
Edwards
Esling
Evans
Furniss
Grant
Hansell
Hurtubise
Johnston (Bow River)
Lacroix (Beauce)
Lafontaine
Leduc
Little
MacNicol
McCann
McCulloch
McDonald (Pontiac)
McKinnon (Kenora-Rainy River)
Nielsen (Mrs.)
Parent
Sanderson
Sinclair
Sylvestre
Tremblay
Tripp
Turner
Ward
Warren
White.

RESTAURANT

(Members to act on the part of the Commons)

Mr. Speaker and Messieurs

Black (Yukon)
Dupuis
Edwards
Farquhar
Furniss
Goulet
Howden
Jaques
Laflamme
Lafontaine
Macdonald (Brantford City)
MacInnis
McGregor
McIvor
Mayhew
Pinard
Purdy
Rhéaume
Thauvette
Tucker
Tustin.

[Mr. Ian MacKenzie.]

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre) moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

POWERS OF COMMITTEES

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

That the standing committees of this house shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the house and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 6.30 p.m.

Friday, February 20, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

READING OF SPEECHES—FORTY MINUTE RULE—STATEMENT OF MR. SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have a statement I should like to make to the house. Now that the debate on the address has been completed, I have been concerned with what I am sure has been evident to all members of the house, namely, the breach of the rule which deals with the reading of speeches. I would refer hon. members to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, at page 95, citation 293, which states:

Besides the prohibitions contained in this standing order, it has been sanctioned by usage both in England and in Canada, that a member, while speaking, must not:

(o) read from a written, previously prepared speech.

As long ago as April 19, 1886, a resolution was adopted by the house, which reads:

That the growing practice in the Canadian House of Commons of delivering speeches of great length, having the character of carefully and elaborately prepared written essays, and indulging in voluminous and often irrelevant extracts, is destructive of legitimate and pertinent debate upon public questions, is a waste of valuable time, unreasonably lengthens the sessions of parliament, threatens by increased bulk and cost to lead to the abolition of the official report of the debates, encourages a discursive and diffuse, rather than an incisive and concise style of public speaking, is a marked contrast to the practice in regard to debate that prevails in the British House of Commons, and tends to repel the public from a careful and intelligent consideration of the proceedings of parliament.

During the course of the debate members have been reading from manuscripts without

regard to the rule, and all sides of the house have practised it. I think that I express the general sense of the house when I say that this practice is to be deplored. It is true that the debate just completed was very important, as hon. members are likely to be quoted thereafter for their attitude now, and in consequence they wish to have the written word before them rather than rely on the inspiration of the moment to find the proper expressions. I wish to intimate to the house that I shall have to insist upon members observing the rule. I realize the difficulty of enforcing it and the chair can only do so with the positive support of all members.

On a former occasion I agreed, and the house consented, that when important statements involving government policy are made by ministers on behalf of the government, such statements could be read rather than expressed extemporaneously. This practice is, I understand, being followed in the British House of Commons and it has been extended here to include statements made by the official leader of the opposition, whose status is regulated by section 42 of the Senate and House of Commons Act, chapter 147.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer. That is standing order 37, which reads:

> No member except the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition, or a minister moving a government order and the member speaking in reply immediately after such minister or a member making a motion of "no confidence" in the government and a minister replying thereto, shall speak for more than forty minutes at a time in any debate.

The house in generous mood usually consents to an extension of this rule beyond the forty minutes. But I feel that hon. members rely upon the indulgence of the house to obtain extra time. It may be that some ministerial statements require a longer period than forty minutes, and it would be inappropriate and perhaps inadvisable that the rule should be applied to them Here, again, however, I think all such ministerial statements should be prepared in view of and be in conformity with the rules of the house. I must, therefore, point out that the Chair should not be placed in a position where discrimination is necessary and hon. members must realize that with every right to be heard in the house, such hearing must be subject to the rules of the house.

MAIN ESTIMATES 1942-43

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting estimates for the financial year ending March 31, 1943, was presented by Hon. J. L. Ilsley (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the house, and referred to the committee of supply.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PRECEDENCE FOR GOVERNMENT BUSINESS ON AND AFTER MONDAY, FEBRUARY 23

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the house I should like to move the following motion:

> That on and after Monday, the twenty-third of February, 1942, 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 the introduction of bills, questions by members, and notices of motions for the production of papers.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I had rather assumed that in the absence of this notice the government would have been disposed to give a few days to the discussion of private members' motions. I know the practice we followed in the previous sessions of this parliament. At the first session we were all very much obsessed and upset by the course of the war and I agreed to the waiving of the rule at that time. At the second session the Prime Minister urged the same reasons for such a motion, and now after almost a month or four weeks of this session, private members, in the absence of any notice to the contrary, had assumed, I think, that some provision would be made for discussion of their motions. My hon. friend the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Perley) has a motion on the order paper which he is prepared to discuss on Monday, and which in the absence of this notice he had the right to assume he would be within his rights in presenting to the house. I do think that the Prime Minister should not press this motion to-day but leave at least one day open for the discussion of private members' motions. It is not very much to ask for. I do not see how otherwise we could get consent to this motion being brought down at such a late date. I would ask the Prime Minister to let private members have at least one Monday.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that this matter was raised at an early stage of the session and at the time I replied, as I recall it, to the effect that the arguments which had weighed with the Commons in previous years were even stronger this year, and I assumed that the house would so regard them. I must say that the government does so regard them. We believe that

the international situation is more critical at this time than it has been at any other time since the commencement of the war and that government business ought to be proceeded with as rapidly as possible, particularly that part of it which relates directly to the war.

Much has been said in the debate on the address about the time that must elapse before the plebiscite can be held. A month has been taken in debate on the address, in which private members have had the opportunity to speak on different matters, and if I were to meet my hon. friend's wish and have Monday next devoted to private members' resolutions, that would again delay the progress of the legislation with respect to the plebiscite.

I expect to announce a little later this afternoon that a secret sitting of the house will be held on Tuesday afternoon. I must say that I think hon. members will upon reflection see that there are strong reasons why the time of the house should not be taken up with a discussion of private members' resolutions until at least very considerable headway has been made with government business.

As to the particular request which my hon. friend has made in respect to one of the members of his party who had expected to speak to his motion on Monday, it will be recognized at once that were I to meet his wish, much as I might desire to, I would be discriminating against other hon. members who may equally wish to speak on their motions, some of which may even appear on the order paper before that of my hon. friend.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No, his is No. 1.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, if we allow No. 1 to proceed, No. 2 will wish to have his say as well. I would ask the house to consent to the passing of this motion to-day so that on Monday we may continue with government business.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, if I may say a word. I agree with the Prime Minister that the house has had a very long debate in which a number of matters have been discussed thoroughly. I think now the country would expect us to get on with government business connected with the war. We should proceed without delay. But I do say this to the Prime Minister, that opportunity should be given to the private members to move their resolutions on the order paper, and I would suggest that, either by consent or by a change in the rules, time be allowed towards the end of the session for private members to present and debate their motions. There are occasions during the session, too, when government business is not always ready for presentation to the house, and it might be possible on such occasions, if sufficient notice were given to members who have resolutions on the order paper, to allow them to be proceeded with then. But I would urge that all of us forego the particular matters which we wish to discuss that are not related to the war effort and that we make every effort to speed up the business of the house, which, I take it, at the present session will be devoted mainly to the war. So far as we are concerned we shall be glad to support the government in speeding up its efforts in that regard.

So far as resolution No. 1 on the order paper is concerned, we are very much interested in that motion, but I understand that a statement will be made regarding its subject matter, and may I suggest to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) that it be made as soon as possible.

With these qualifications we agree to what the Prime Minister has suggested.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I find that the hon. member for Rosetown-biggar (Mr. Coldwell) does not give me any support, and I certainly do not want to be the hold-out. I am not usually that type. I have just conferred with my colleague, the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Perley), and while he is anxious to debate his resolution he advises me that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has given an undertaking that the wheat question will be the subject of a bill which will be brought down and debated in due course and referred, I understand, to the committee on agriculture. At that time he will have the opportunity which the moving of his resolution would have afforded him in the house. On that theory he is quite content to waive any rights he has. Of course, if notice of this motion had been given yesterday, we would not be having this debate at the moment. Rather reluctantly I am going to give my consent to the motion of the Prime Minister.

Motion agreed to.

PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT

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

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this house has appointed the Honourable the Speaker and

Messrs. Black (Yukon), Dupuis, Edwards, Farquhar, Furniss, Goulet, Howden, Jaques, Laflamme, Lafontaine, Macdonald (Brantford City), MacInnis, McGregor, McIvor, Mayhew, Pinard, Purdy, Rhéaume, Thauvette, Tucker and Tustin, a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the restaurant, so far as the interests of the Commons are concerned, and to act as members of a joint committee of both houses on the restaurant.

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT

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

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this house will unite with them in the formation of a joint committee of both houses on the subject of the printing of parliament, and that the members of the standing committee on printing, viz., Messieurs Bercovitch, Bertrand (Terrebonne), Blanchette, Bourget, Casselman (Grenville-Dundas), Castleden, Chambers, Chevrier, Claxton, Corman, Denis, Dubois, Dupuis, Durocher, Edwards, Emmerson, Esling, Evans, Ferland, Fleming, Fraser (Peterborough West), Furniss, Goulet, Grant, Green, Hallé, Healy, Hlynka, Hoblitzell, Hurtubise, Kuhl, Leader, MacDiarmid, MacKinnon (Kootenay East), MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria), McGregor, McNevin (Victoria, Ont.), Mills, Moore, Mulock, Nicholson, Purdy, Rhéaume, Ross (St. Paul's), Sinclair, Sissons, Soper, Tucker, Tustin, Weir, White, Whitman, Winkler and Wood, will act as members on the part of this house, on the said joint committee on the printing of parliament.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

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

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this house has appointed the honourable the Speaker and Messieurs Adamson, Aylesworth, Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon), Bruce, Cardiff, Casselman (Grenville-Dundas), Castleden, Emmerson, Eudes, Farquhar, Fontaine, Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont), Gershaw, Goulet, Graham, Green, Henderson, Howden, Hurtubise, Jaques, Jean, Lizotte, Macdonald (Halifax), MacKenzie (Neepawa), MacKenzie (Lambton-Kent), Macmillan, Marier, Martin, Mayhew, Moore, Poirier, Pouliot, Purdy, Raymond, Reid, Rickard, Ross (St. Paul's), Shaw, Telford, Thauvette, Warren, Winkler, Wood and Woodsworth a committee to assist his honour the Speaker in the direction of the library of parliament, so far as the interests of the Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of a joint committee of both houses on the library.

Motion agreed to.

SECRET SESSION OF THE HOUSE

ANNOUNCEMENT OF DATE—PROHIBITION OF UNAUTHORIZED REPORTS

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

That on any day set aside for that purpose by the house without notice having been previously given, the sitting of the house shall be a secret session until the house shall then otherwise order, and that all strangers be ordered to withdraw during such secret session; provided however, that this order shall not affect the privilege enjoyed by members of the Senate of being present at debates in this house.

He said: This resolution is similar to one which was passed by this house during the war, in 1918, when a secret session of the House of Commons was held. The motion at that time fixed a definite day. The present motion, as hon. members will see, leaves the date to be arranged by agreement.

In the British House of Commons, in order to protect secrecy, there has been passed under the authority of the Emergency Power (Defence) Act, 1939, the following regulation:

His Majesty, in pursuance of section one of the Emergency Powers (Defence) Act, 1939, and of all other powers enabling him in that behalf, is pleased, by and with the advice of his privy council, to order, and it is hereby ordered that regulation three of the Defence (General) Regulations, 1939 (a), shall have effect as if at the end thereof there were inserted the following paragraphs:—

(2) If either house of parliament in pursuance of a resolution passed by that house holds a secret session, it shall not be lawful for any person in any newspaper, periodical, circular or other publication, or in any public speech, to publish any report of, or to purport to describe, the proceedings at that session, except such report or description thereof as may be officially communicated through the press and censorship bureau.

The government has thought it advisable to enact a similar regulation, adding it to the defence of Canada regulations, in the following terms:

39AA. If the Senate or House of Commons, in pursuance of a resolution, holds a secret session, no person shall in any newspaper, periodical, circular or other publication, or in any public speech, publish any report or description of the proceedings at that session, except such report or description thereof as may be officially communicated through the Speaker of the House.

As to the time of the secret session, I have had a conference with the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) and also with the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group (Mr. Coldwell) and the leader of the Social Credit group (Mr. Blackmore), and we have agreed that Tuesday afternoon would be the most convenient time at which to

hold the secret session. I might say there is a special reason for selecting Tuesday, inasmuch as the Senate has been adjourned until Tuesday next, and as senators will have the privilege of being present in the gallery when the secret session is held, it would obviously be desirable to have the sitting held on a day that senators were likely to be here. I have nothing else to add at the moment.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I do not rise for the purpose of either debating or opposing the resolution to which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has referred. I note that the terms of the resolution are quite general; it does not limit the action of the house to any one particular secret session, but it contemplates other secret sessions if they are found necessary or desirable or are asked for. I did not understand that such would be in the motion; however, I am not objecting to that, because it may become necessary to hold further secret sessions.

I am not at all optimistic that a secret session will be of great value, because it seems to me that we cannot possibly use any information which we get there—especially in view of the amendment to the defence of Canada regulations to which the Prime Minister has alluded. At the same time, it will afford to hon. members an opportunity of putting questions to the ministers, and I hope that some useful purpose will be served.

I am curious to know who will prepare the official report which is to be given to the public.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Speaker.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It says that?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not in the resolution; in the order in council.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh, the order in council? I have not had that before me. It, of course, will be official, coming from that source. I am content to leave the matter at that for the moment.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I am opposed to the passage of this proposed motion for the reason that it upsets the whole constitutional practice of the British empire since we have been an empire. What does the motion say? I quote:

> That on any day set aside for that purpose by the house without notice having been previously given. . . .

You will observe those words, Mr. Speaker, "without notice." In the parliament of Great Britain notice is given, sometimes a week or ten days ahead. Yesterday notice was given for a two-day session, grand assize to inquire into the whole war, to be held in the open House of Commons but not in secret session. The resolution goes on to say:

> . . . the sitting of the house shall be a secret session.

Matters of the utmost importance will be discussed in that session. Talk about having a judge inquire into Hong Kong and Singapore! I have in my hand here volume 377 of the Parliamentary Debates of Great Britain, 173 pages, dealing with all phases of the war in the Pacific and all other theatres. All these questions are discussed in public with pages of criticism. The same is true of Australia.

My first objection to this motion is that the functions of parliament are being taken away from us with all these secret bodies that have been appointed. In fact, parliament is looked upon by the government as a nuisance—here to-day and gone to-morrow. They have closed the doors upon us. The last clause of the resolution declares that the privilege enjoyed by members of the Senate, of being present at debates in this house, shall not be affected —a sop to the senators. Well, the senate have been here for four hours since last June, without duties to perform. Three sessions ago I asked the government so to arrange matters as to provide more work for the other house of parliament. That other house is composed of men of ability and they should be given more to do.

My main objection to the resolution is that no secret committee or private caucus should decide these questions, because we are simply turning over the whole military work of the nation to a political body. Military problems should be dealt with by the military authorities and the army council. Of course, there are certain state secrets that should not be given away even to this parliament. That holds true in the old land. There are state secrets of such importance to the safety of the realm that they should not be divulged even to members of parliament. My objection, however, is taken on this ground, that this is more or less a political body, and we are supposed to meet in public and not in secret. We should not ask the heads of the services to come into this chamber, with the doors locked, in a sort of star chamber, to answer questions. We are only wasting the time of the heads of the departments. Military strategy is for military experts, not for us.

Under responsible government there are ministers who are answerable to parliament, and they are the ones who should answer

here any questions that are to be asked. We have had only a political administration of the war, as I have mentioned before. As regards the troops in England, we were told at the fall session that it would be the government of Canada who in the last resort would say where they should be dispatched. I have the exact words on record here in *Hansard* of November 6 and 7 last.

The ordinary member of parliament is in a critical position in this war. There are ministers in the government who have the direction of affairs relating to his majesty's forces, and perhaps they cannot always, for reasons of state, give a direct reply to questions. But I do not like to have criticisms of his majesty's forces. There are three splendid soldiers who are in charge of departments having to do with affairs relating to the military forces, and who served their country well in the last war. Criticism is the function of this house, and it should be made in public. Moreover, the opposition has a duty to perform publicly. We should know the facts. That is what is wrong with our war effort. For five years before the war the people were in the dark; they were not given any facts even in this house. They were given just so much information, so much of the facts, as their rulers wanted them to know.

In a war like this, criticism is necessary, and it is the duty of every member of parliament, if he is sincere and considers the issues well, to do what he can to give constructive criticism. This should not be regarded as being necessarily an attack on the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) or on any member of the government or on the government itself, because no member of any government is infallible. We all make mistakes, even the greatest leaders. Napoleon and Nelson both made their mistakes, and Great Britain has never had a greater leader than its present Prime Minister, no man comparable as a leader except, perhaps, the great Pitt, and yet he made mistakes in the long war with Napoleon.

The question of tactics is one that should be the responsibility of our military commanders and military council. The trouble is that we have been disregarding this principle; that is the reason for most of the mistakes that have been made in the war by the allies. Mistakes have occurred in consequence of political interference with army, naval and air force commanders. That is so in the Pacific and it was so in Libya, Greece and Singapore. The direction of the war, and all questions of strategy, should rest with the militia council, the purely civilian function of administration being the direct responsibility of a war cabinet. And here let me say that we should have had a war cabinet long ago and an all allied war council also.

I have already said that in my opinion this motion is not in order. If it passes, the rules of the house will be changed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I call attention to the fact that the hon. member is committing a breach of the rule to which I referred this afternoon. He is reading his speech.

Mr. CHURCH: I am referring to the present system and the changes which are being made in our parliamentary practice, and quoting *Hansard*. I am pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that under our present parliamentary system this motion is not in order, but will be if it passes. There are permanent officials who are able to look into these problems. It should be the duty of the militia council to consider the questions which it is proposed to bring before us. What do I know about military matters? I have never been a military man, and I know nothing whatever about military tactics and strategy. I am only a common or garden variety member of parliament. What does the combined membership of this house know about military problems, except for those hon. members who have served overseas? As I say, there are three ministers of the government who have had considerable war experience, and in my opinion we should be very reluctant to take out of their hands and out of the hands of the army council the administration of a war like this. We do not know where it will end.

I do not wish to reflect on our parliamentary system, but even in the old country the Prime Minister there has said that the present political system is not sufficient to cope with all the changes that are taking place. In the old days wars lasted for a few weeks, now they last for years. The enemy is coming pretty close now; we must prepare to meet him at the gate. If we are to change the procedure of parliament, let us do it in a lawful way. I wish to commend you, Mr. Speaker, for the fair way you have presided, because I think not only have you added to the dignity of parliament, but in the last weeks you and your splendid clerk of the house have almost saved parliament itself.

If the government have some new method by which they want to conduct the business of the house, well and good. I contend there should be an empire war cabinet, and we should have an allied war cabinet with the United States and the Netherlands in it, so as to have a united effort in this war. The war has now lasted for two and a half years, and what has been done in reference to the houses of parliament? Nothing has been done. In the past two and a half years we

have failed to achieve production sufficient for a total war effort. It is too late to change that system now or the methods which are being used in a parliamentary way. We have staked all the assets of this country on this war to defeat Germany and Japan; we should exert ourselves to get a system and machinery of government which would be more efficient than a proposal to sit in caucus or private session and have questions asked. The enemy I believe are superior in their strategy in these matters.

The method I would propose would be, instead of our meeting in secret, to have an army council and the three ministers meeting with them to decide all these matters of strategy in military affairs. We have made mistakes in the past; I believe they have all made mistakes. The government should not be afraid to tell the people of Canada that they have made mistakes, because the people do not expect their leaders and governments to be gods. They all make mistakes. But I say if we are to be efficient and achieve our ends in this war, we shall have to be more active. The parliament of Canada too often forgets that we are part of an empire—the British empire. Meeting in secret in this way we forget that we have a duty to the other dominions and the mother country. We should not allow secret meetings to interfere with that duty.

It is contended by some that by having this secret session, members of parliament will be enabled to get some news to reach the public and give members an opportunity to question the government. The effect of the whole thing will, in my opinion, be bad. The other dominions, whose efforts are as great as ours, have been left out of consideration in this motion. In my judgment Canada's parliament should not meet in secret; Canada can afford to state her case and her policy before the court of public opinion of the world. We have a strong case, and the case has been made clear by this parliament. We cannot conduct a grand inquest or assize into this war behind closed doors. I am opposed to the motion.

What about the press? The press of this country has been doing a magnificent work and giving leadership in this war all over Canada. Some journals have raised great war funds, such as the *Evening Telegram's* British war victims' fund in Toronto; yet the press is being left out in the cold. The press was the main factor in England before the war when all the leaders over there were pacifists and the people listened to the babble of pacifists and tossed away all their defences; it was the press that opened their eyes and brought them around. They made us realize that the enemy is at our gates.

We have no mandate from the people to upset these constitutional practices by secret meetings in a great war like this. In the last war only one secret meeting was held. The people want to know the facts, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about our war effort. No one wants any military or state secrets revealed; they should not be revealed even at a secret meeting. Some of these secrets should be known only to the king and his military advisers and relate to the defence of the realm.

I shall oppose the motion. The people have not been given sufficient information either before or since the war began. They are totally ignorant of the main problems. On March 21, 1939, on a motion to go into supply I urged the government to give the people the facts, and I quoted what Prime Minister Chamberlain said in England that if the people are not allowed to know the facts concerning the danger at their gates, if they are allowed to know only what their leaders want them to know, that course leads to danger. Within five or six months of that time war was declared, and the people did not know the facts even then.

The motion has connection also with the bureaucrats and boards and commissions, numbering, with employees, some 3,500 to 4,000, who have been appointed and are taking away the functions of this parliament whether we meet in public or in private. They have taken our functions; they have upset the rules and regulations and changed the whole purpose and intent of parliament, with their press agents, radio spokesmen and these other officers that have been appointed. About the only intimations and information given to the public that are not under the control of this magnificent information bureau are the *Votes and Proceedings* and orders of the day. Everything you read has to be stamped with a badge showing it to be issued under the authority, advice and consent of this wonderful department and its minister, this information bureau and the minister thereof, and even at that the public are not getting much information. Then you have a secret service, unnamed spokesmen on the radio almost every night. I call them the ghosts behind the scenes, dealing with all these matters.

Sometimes the information given by this standing army of officials is only half the truth. All kinds of bureaucratic orders are issued by them, involving fines and gaol

penalties over the head of parliament. Gradually the functions of this parliament are being taken away altogether. A civil war was fought in England for nearly one hundred years over just this question of the control of the public expenditure and to have their representatives in parliament made responsible to the people. Now the principle fought for in that war has been altogether upset. Are we just to act the part of yes-men and nodders of approval of everything the bureaucratic dollar-a-year men pass? Goodness knows they are passing enough. One czar announces he is going to take the cuffs off the trousers of members of parliament, they are going to abolish ties, they are not going to let the well-groomed Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) wear vests any more, and all that kind of thing, and in the women's column and the society column there are pages of what is to be cut out. Who is paying for it over the head of this parliament and we know nothing about it? This is absolutely illegal, and has been done without the consent of the houses of parliament. We have never heard a word about it, yet penalties and fines up to $5,000 are announced every day by these people, who form what is almost a separate parliament by themselves as czars and dictators. The rules and regulations they pass have the force of statutes, without the knowledge and authority of this parliament, but now we are going to impose more secret government upon the people in the way indicated of a secret session of this house. These boards, commissions and so on are usurping the powers of parliament; they even exercise control over members of the cabinet by the orders they issue secretly. Some of this may be and is necessary to a limited extent. The radio is another secret institution. The Department of External Affairs, as I have contended for some years has been conducted as though its business was its own, without parliament being given all the facts.

That is not the way in which things are done in England. There they publicly debated the whole Pacific question, the collapse of Singapore and everything else. The British *Hansard* contains sixty-five pages of questions and answers and statements made in the house by responsible ministers. Some of the questions were asked in the house by government supporters, admirals, major-generals, some of the finest soldiers to serve in the last war and many of whom are serving in this war as well. All these matters were discussed in public there; and no questions were asked, and no information given, which would reveal any particular military secrets. We are in the very darkest hour of the war, and this is no time to withold anything from either the public or the press. The real facts and the real picture should be given. As I have said, I believe the press has a great function and duty to perform. It is a connecting link between the government and the electors, as members of parliament are; and the censorship over the press, instead of being further extended, should be abolished altogether. In my opinion the opposition have been led into a trap by supporting this move to meet in secret. In Australia the prime minister, Mr. Curtin, and the leader of the opposition, Mr. Hughes, who was in Canada many times during the last war, have spoken strongly on the whole question of publicity and criticism of our war effort and the danger ahead. They have done splendid work in asserting the rights of Australia as a dominion. Sometimes, when I see what little information we are given compared with the information given in the Australian parliament and when I see the dictators at their doors I think we have let Australia down in not making greater efforts to help her by the Singapore base in 1937-38. The very life of the British commonwealth is at stake, yet we go ahead holding secret meetings, plebiscites, and all that sort of thing.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that anything that might be accomplished in secret, with reference to the Pacific question, could be better accomplished publicly in this house. We have met intermittently; on again, off again, on again; and one branch is here very seldom. Its members have been sent home, with no war work to do. Instead of having this secret meeting of the house, we should have a reallocation of duties as between the two houses of parliament, in connection with the war. It may be too late now to do very much about the Pacific coast. Our belated air bases and the proposed road through British Columbia will get us nowhere without the most important thing of all, supremacy on the sea. Information in this connection should be given the house publicly, not in secret.

I have a great deal of respect for the Prime Minister. I believe he has worked hard, and in many ways I think the government have done a good job, except in regard to manpower. But I believe the government misjudged the whole European situation, as well as the Pacific question. I believe it would be far better for the Prime Minister to make a statement in this house, similar to that made in the British house with regard to the Pacific, Singapore, Hong Kong, and all the other places, and have a two-day debate. This is a story that goes back twenty years.

Canada, as a part of the British empire, has no divine right to expect victory, or that victory may be attained by secret meetings. The path is going to be more difficult from now on. As I said in this house four years ago, on February 12, 1938, we were short-sighted in not backing the Singapore base as New Zealand and Australia did; and now it is too late. The government seems to think there is a royal road to victory, and as a result we have neglected to prepare for war on land, sea or in the air. Victory will come only with resolute leadership, a total war effort, service and real sacrifice. There is no use in talking about victory, as though it would be ours by divine law; we can gain victory only by telling the people the truth, by facing the real facts and building upon the worst of them.

The time has come when Canada must decide whether or not she will do her duty, when the government must speak to the people and let them know the facts. Man-power is the main issue, whether it is discussed in public or in secret. By proposing to hold this secret caucus we are upsetting the practice that has existed for the last two or three hundred years. Up to the present all our meetings have been held in public. I often feel that they have not been adequately reported by the press, but often you cannot blame the press because in many ways parliament has simply effaced itself by allowing its functions, privileges and powers to be taken away and given to these bureaucratic boards, with a resulting lack of information. It seems to me the government is always very glad to see the House of Commons go home, to get rid of it, in order to have a breathing spell and conduct the war itself.

I am afraid of this secret meeting; I am afraid we are falling into a trap. I do not want this motion to pass without a protest, because as soon as the motion passes we create a precedent for the separatists and isolationists of the future, for those only too eager and anxious in the future to initiate the methods of Hitler and Mussolini. I believe I represent a large body of public opinion which is opposed to any such principle. I do not want to see the House of Commons dealt with in this way. So far as I know, there is nothing to meet about in private. The question of the security of the Malay peninsula was dealt with in public in the British house, where they have also discussed Libya, Greece, Crete, Singapore, and all the other places. Only the other day Prime Minister Churchill discussed the very thing about which we are to meet in private; and what did he say to the British house? He said we had to send to Russia tanks, aeroplanes and other equipment that had been destined for Libya and various other places. Then he went on to say that the fall of Singapore had very gravely affected command of the sea; and, after all, it is Britain's command of the sea that enables Russia to obtain supplies of all kinds from the United Kingdom and the United States. At the present time that command is seriously threatened. That was what he told the British House of Commons in public, and that is the very thing about which we are to meet in secret. Unfortunately Japan has obtained temporary command of the sea in the Pacific. You can meet in secret all you like; Japan has that command, and that is a terrible thing for the British empire.

For the first time in many years we find Great Britain committed to an important campaign in the Pacific at a time when she has commitments in other places. The United States cannot now get a fleet across the Pacific because she has no bases and Singapore has fallen. This is the kind of information we may get, and it has all been given publicly in the British *Hansard* and by the British Prime Minister. Great Britain and the United States have not full command of the seas because their lines of communication will be broken by raiders. Japan is even in a position to land forces. This is what is happening while we are sitting here.

This is not the time for us to embark upon this new secret course. The losses sustained yesterday in our own navy amounted to 55 men. We have a duty to the rest of the dominions and the rest of the empire. Nothing should be done to change our constitution because we are entering the darkest hour of the war. Great Britain had to do everything alone up until the end of last June. We now have two active allies. Russia has been a revelation and her military strength has saved Great Britain. Otherwise, the mechanized hordes might be now in Great Britain. We are going to have dark days ahead, and I was hoping that some information would be given to the people. I believe the proposed secret session is a retrograde step.

The press has been eliminated by this motion. The press has been a great factor in giving information to the public of this country, and we owe a great deal to it. Were it not for the press and the money it has spent, the people would not know anything. The establishment of the information bureau was a reflection upon our press. During the last war there was no censorship of the press in effect. Mr. Chambers, the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod was the censor. We should

follow the lead of England where there is no censorship. The editors of the papers are directly responsible. This will be the first time in the history of this House of Commons where the press has not been present, except the one meeting which was held in the days of Sir Robert Borden.

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, I think we are all anxious to get more information, but after we do get the information in the secret session which is to be held, how are we going to impart that to our constituents? The people of the country are the ones who really want information. I know that we as members of parliament will be satisfied, but if the information which we hope to get is given to us then, a tremendous responsibility will be thrown upon us. We will be laying ourselves open to criticism or suspicion if any information given in this secret session should get out. It is a detriment to the freedom of parliament. Of course I am willing to take that chance, as are other members. I have made up my mind that I shall see what comes forth in this secret session, but if I do not think sufficient information is being given, I shall not attend further sessions as a result of which I might lay myself open to criticism.

I should like to ask the Prime Minister if every Tuesday is to be set aside for a secret session. The wording of the motion is:

That on any day set aside for that purpose by the house without notice having been previously given—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I propose to move a resolution in a moment, fixing Tuesday, February 24, as the day.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Will that be every Tuesday?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I do not quite understand how you are going to do it.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, before the discussion closes I should like to say a few words because I am very strongly in favour of the holding of a secret session. The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) always interests me because he is so typically Conservative. He does not like a change except when it suits his own convenience. As for the argument that this upsets the whole procedure of the British empire for the past several centuries, if we accept this view then perhaps we should regret very much that this same procedure has been upset about once a week during the last year at Westminster itself. We are following good British precedents in holding a session of this description when it is thought necessary.

We want to know something of the government's difficulties. There is information which we cannot get in public because the questions we might ask would give information to the enemy. We are not holding this secret session, as the hon. member for Broadview seems to suggest, in order to badger officials of the Department of National Defence or any other department. I imagine that the only people who will be present at the session will be the responsible ministers, the officials of the house, members of parliament and members of the other place if they care to occupy seats in the gallery. Consequently there will be no opportunity, nor will there be any desire, to pillory anyone in connection with our war effort.

I feel sure that after members of parliament have had the opportunity of asking questions of an intimate nature and receiving replies, they will be in a much better position to decide what questions it is in the public interest to ask the government in the public sessions of parliament. In war time there are matters which we dare not raise on the floor of this house. Several times during the debate on the address some hon. members came very close to asking for information that ought not to have been asked for. On one or two occasions ministers themselves, in placing publicly before the house details regarding equipment and so on, divulged information that might be of interest to the enemy. Of course that was because members of the house sought the information in the only way in which it could be sought.

The object of this secret session, from my own point of view at least, is not to pillory the government, not to indulge in criticism of the government in secret—I shall do that in public—but to gain all the information we possibly can so that we may be able to discuss matters intelligently on the floor of this house.

May I say that I am sorry the government has decided that the inquiry into the Hong Kong affair shall also be held in camera.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government did not decide that. The chief justice made his own decision.

Mr. COLDWELL: I am sorry that the commissioner so decided. I cannot think that any of the facts upon which a judgment could be based in connection with that episode ought to be withheld from the public. It is thoroughly in the public interest that the facts in connection with it should be given.

So far as the secret session of the house is concerned, let us understand among ourselves that—as in Great Britain and as, I believe, in Australia and New Zealand, where secret sessions have been held—it is not being held in order that members may pillory, criticize or do anything else of the kind to the government, but rather that we may obtain information which because of the war situation could not be given publicly and upon which we may base considered and careful comment afterward.

Mr. J. H. HARRIS (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who during the last twelve months have found it necessary on a score of occasions to withdraw from secret sessions which have been held on matters of great concern and of like nature to the one now under consideration. I realize and recognize the gravity of the present situation and am anxious that everything that can be done shall be done, and accordingly I shall revise my conduct and sit in at this secret session of the house.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): When I say that, Mr. Speaker, may I add, in reply to the "hear, hear" which came from the rear, that the basis of my conduct in this matter is a little different from that which obtained on a previous occasion. The previous occasion to which I refer, sir, had to do with the conduct of the war expenditures committee. There will be a time and place when we can debate that matter, but in the meantime I address myself to this particular question.

One other observation I should like to make, and it is that the report of this session is in very able hands, being in the hands of the Speaker. I recognize that we are not now in committee of the whole and that we cannot by question and answer get information from the Prime Minister as to the wisdom of having you alone, sir, assume that great responsibility. The thought ran through my mind that you might wish to have someone, the leaders of the parties perhaps, associated with you in the task of drawing up that report, but on reflection I am of the opinion that it might better be left to Mr. Speaker to draft the report of the secret session. All hon. members of goodwill in this house in the one task which is predominant in our minds will, I hope, be satisfied with that report. Nevertheless, in a democratic institution, we must reserve our right not necessarily to concur in the report which after careful consideration emanates from Your Honour. I felt that I ought to make a statement of this kind, Mr. Speaker, so that you would have in mind the feeling of some of the members in this very difficult time. I am confident that the report may well rest in your hands.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I have on one or two occasions been a member of committees which were supposed to hold their sittings in camera. I quite understand that there may be a slight difference in interpretation as to committees holding their sittings in camera and committees holding their sittings in secret. But whether it be in camera or in secret, the result of information getting out from those committess is just as serious as the result of information getting out from a secret session of this house. Yet to my amazement I have discovered that not only has information gone forth from committees that have been held in camera, but it has actually been printed in the press and blazed before the public. I objected to that on one occasion, and perhaps I shall do so again. Because of that I believe that when a secret session is held it should be regarded as secret by every member, and not one word should be breathed outside of what has gone on inside the chamber during the secret session.

May I add that I am a strong believer in the administration of law and justice. I do not suppose that I shall ever be a judge. I hope I never am, because I am afraid that I would be a little hard upon those who break the law. When people go out deliberately and utter words of a subversive nature they should be punished. Yet, though I say that, I am rather inclined to think that to put members of parliament under the defence of Canada regulations because of this secret session is perhaps not just the best thing. Personally I find difficulty in thinking my way through the question who is to determine whether or not some utterance made on a public platform was made on the basis of what the speaker might have heard at a secret session of this house.

I would also ask the Prime Minister whether a *Hansard* report will be kept of the secret session. If such a report is kept I do not see that it could be a secret session. If it is not kept, who is to know whether this or that member has revealed something secret after the session is over? I am wondering whether a better method of dealing with any such betrayal of information would not be to bring the member before the bar of this house. I offer that as a suggestion.

One further question. During the secret session are we to understand that the house will go into committee of the whole in order that questions may be asked? I am one of those who have in the past advocated a secret session every once in a while. I agree with the hon. member who leads our friends of

the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation; I have no desire whatsoever to badger the government or put forth any political arguments or put the government on the spot in any particular, but there are some things which I believe the members of the House of Commons should know in order to be able better to serve this country. That is my attitude. At present we are in the dark on many matters of public concern. I have had people ask me things about which they have obtained information somewhere but about which I have not known a thing; I am in the dark about them, and I am certain that all members feel as I do in that respect. I think the secret session will serve a good purpose if the government will be absolutely open and free to say, "Gentlemen, this is the situation; there it is; now, what can we do to benefit that particular thing?" If the government will be absolutely open and frank I am sure that it will receive the cooperation, and not the opposition, of members of this house in a secret session.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word in reference to some of the remarks that have been made.

First of all, the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Ross) drew attention to the wording of the resolution itself. I agree with him that it is a little ambiguous. The explanation is that at the time the resolution was placed on the order paper it was impossible to say what day could be fixed for the secret session; I knew that hon. members desired to be assured that a secret session would be held very soon. I accordingly had the notice placed on the order paper to provide for an early date. In order to remove ambiguity and to place the matter in a shape which I think would be preferable, I would ask the house to allow me to amend the resolution before it is put to the house by Mr. Speaker so that it may read:

> That on Tuesday, the twenty-fourth instant, the sitting of the house shall be a secret session until the house . . .

Et cetera. That removes any ambiguity about secret sessions being held from week to week, or anything of the kind, and is, I think, preferable in every way.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is what I thought it would be.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes; my hon. friend says he thought it would be that. The intention of the government was simply to make the resolution broad enough to fix a day, but it was not intended that there should be a series of secret sittings of the house.

Mr. SENN: Will the sitting be confined to one day?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope it will not occupy an entire day, but I cannot say how long it will last. We will see what time is necessary when the sitting actually takes place.

May I say this with respect to the secret session, particularly in view of what has been said this afternoon? At the previous session a request was made for a secret session of the house. The government has not met that request up to the present time. We thought it was inadvisable for many reasons to have secret sessions if they could possibly be avoided. But when the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) asked at the beginning of this session if a day could be fixed for a secret session, I felt, and my colleagues agreed with me, that to refuse that request would cause the government to appear to be unwilling to give information to hon. members which they ought to have and which they could not obtain in any other way. We agreed to the secret session in order that we might not be misunderstood with respect to our wish not to withhold anything that hon. members desired to have in the way of information and which we of the government were in a position to give.

But may I say to hon. members that there is great force in much that has been said this afternoon by some hon. members who have evidently been giving this matter a great deal of thought. If the session related to a matter which concerned Canada only and to giving information which would concern Canada alone, I should feel that the responsibility upon the ministry was much less than it is in the light of a situation such as exists in the world to-day. Canada's war effort is bound up with the war efforts of all parts of the British empire. It is also linked now not only with the war effort of the United States but also with those of the united nations, some twenty-six in number; and our plans, as I think is generally known, are related to the combined plans, in so far as they have thus far been combined, of all the nations which are allied with us in the war. It is going to be exceedingly difficult for the government to disclose much information with respect to questions which will arise in the minds of many hon. members, without giving information which, if it were ever publicly disclosed, would react, not against the government of Canada, but against the war effort of the combined nations; and I want to make it perfectly clear that when the secret session

is held the government will have to keep constantly in mind that great and very grave responsibility.

I do not mind saying that time and again we have received communications from England regretting that we had found it necessary to make certain statements in this parliament with respect to some phases of our war effort, particularly in answering questions as to the extent of equipment and production in certain directions, and the like. These things may not appear to us to have the significance which others attach to them. But in relation to a war effort so closely knit as this is, between many nations, and directed against a foe who stops at nothing to obtain information on every single point about which it is possible to acquire information, the responsibility of giving any information other than that which can be communicated in open parliament is very grave indeed.

Now, I have confidence in the honour and integrity of all hon. members; but when I acknowledge that personally I repeatedly find it very difficult, while in conversation with different persons, quite unconsciously not to tell something which is in the nature of a state secret, I can imagine how difficult it is going to be for many hon. members who, perhaps, have not to reserve their words with the same caution that I have to apply to my own, to avoid, in the course of conversations with friends or on occasions when some particular point is raised, not to unwittingly give out information which has been obtained at a secret session, never thinking it to be of the significance which in fact it may have. I had thought that when the session was being held I might say a word of caution in this connection, but perhaps it is as well that it should be said now. What I wish, however, to make clear, and I would like the country to understand it, is that the government is not asking the house to meet in secret session in order that it may disclose something which it regards as critical or as otherwise necessitating a secret session. It is seeking, rather, to meet the wish of some hon. members to get information which otherwise they might not be in a position to secure.

My understanding with regard to the secret sessions held in Britain—and I have taken occasion to make careful inquiries—is that such sessions are usually held at the instance of the government itself, where the Prime Minister has some statement which he thinks it is desirable to impart to the members but which he would not wish to impart openly. Secret sessions are for that purpose rather than for the purpose of giving an amount of detailed information.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Would the Prime Minister allow me? I am surprised to hear him make that statement, because my understanding was entirely the reverse—that it is very rarely the government asked to have a secret session for the purpose of making statements, but that it usually came from the demands of private members.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I had not finished what I was going on to say. My information as I have given it to the house is exactly as I have received it in a communication which I shall be glad to show my hon. friend later, but the communication goes on to state that in the secret session opportunity is afforded members of the opposition, or members of parliament generally, to make to the government suggestions and criticisms which they would hesitate to make in open session. The one point I wish to stress is that facts in regard to such matters as equipment, disposition of troops, questions of strategy, and the like, which might assist the enemy, are not disclosed at all at secret sessions in Britain; those sessions are as limited, in the matter of disclosure of detailed information, as it is possible for sessions to be, and usually, as hon. members know, the sessions themselves are few and far between and do not last for any length of time.

As regards the question which an hon. member has raised as to the use of *Hansard*, of course no record of any kind will be kept. The purpose of the session is that discussions may be off the record and that nothing shall go out, nothing shall be retained of the record, with respect to questions that have been raised or answers given.

As to procedure, whether the house will proceed in committee of the whole, I understand that in Britain the Speaker is usually in the chair when the minister concerned or the Prime Minister is making his statement. The house then resolves itself into committee of the whole so as to permit of question and answer on the statement which has been made. That may be found to be the most convenient way to proceed when we meet on Tuesday, but that the house can decide for itself when in secret session. That is all I wish to say, but I should like to have the motion put in the form amended as indicated.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): A question arose, from the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore), about the record.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I answered that. There is none to be kept.

Mr. McIVOR: One question. When two know a thing it is a secret, and when three

know it it is not. Is any penalty attached to anyone who is known to be giving out news, apart from yourself, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have mentioned the order in council that provides penalties for a disclosure on the part of anyone with respect to what takes place at a secret session.

Motion as amended agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—HON. MR. HANSON

CENSORSHIP OF MAIL ADDRESSED TO OR DISPATCHED BY MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to refer at this stage to the question of privilege which I raised on Monday last regarding the censorship of mail addressed to or dispatched by members of parliament. I had anticipated that an additional reply would be forthcoming either from the Prime Minister of from the Postmaster General before this. It will be recalled that I requested that the rules and regulations governing this practice be laid before the house, and the Prime Minister promised to endeavour to secure information. I now wish to renew that request and to seek from the Prime Minister or the Postmaster General an unequivocal assurance that the practice of which I complained will be abandoned.

Since I spoke on Monday last I have been doing a little investigating myself and I find that every telegram that I send, or any other member sends, is censored, whether it is within or without the country. I find also that so far, in Ottawa, our long distance telephone messages have not been tapped but that telephone messages from certain defence areas are tapped and recordings made of them.

I do not want to use too strong language about this. I can quite appreciate that telephone messages from a defence area, and telegrams from a defence area—perhaps letters from a defence area, if that is the right technical term to use—addressed to certain people, especially outside Canada, may and in certain instances should be censored. But a telephone message to me from Halifax surely ought not to be censored. A telegram from myself to somebody in Winnipeg ought not to be copied and censored.

This thing has gone beyond all reason. I do not think hon. members are aware how far it has gone.

Mr. REID: In British Columbia they warn you before you telephone outside the country.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The only warning I ever had over the telephone was not to talk about the weather. I talked to my daughter in Halifax.

Mr. RALSTON: And other things too—ships and so on.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): You are not to talk about that, or things of that sort. That is quite all right. But we have reached the stage where any telegram I send to any of my political friends is copied, and the contents may be submitted to some minister across the way. Surely this sort of thing cannot go on. I am not disloyal; I am not dealing in treason. I may be at times engaged in political warfare, but I am certainly not dealing in treason. Nobody will for a moment think I am. If I were, I would be unworthy to occupy not only this position but a seat in this house.

I do appeal to the Prime Minister to have some review made of this whole position. I sent for an official of the company the other day and he was good enough to come and see me. I had been warned that my conversations were being tapped—I think that is the word—and I know from investigations I have made in New Brunswick that it is quite possible to do that. Anybody can listen in. In operating the telephone they can listen in and they do listen in. I made it my business as director of the New Brunswick Telephone company to inquire once pretty thoroughly into the question, because complaint had been made to me, and the party making the complaint had just cause for doing so. I found out what the *modus operandi* was. I did not think it was right, and that was in peace time. I certainly raised cain so far as I was able to in connection with it.

Mr. POWER: Who does the tapping, the telephone company or some employee of the government?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I found out that, so far as anything transmitted out of this building is concerned, there is no tapping. I was therefore reassured and I was very much relieved. The minute you take down your telephone you are automatically put in touch with central in Ottawa and there is no intervention. I am assured that there is no opportunity for intervention in this building. That of course is a relief. At the other end of the wire there may be opportunity for intervention.

Mr. POWER: By the telephone company?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It must be with the cooperation of the telephone com-

pany. Out of Halifax, there is no doubt about it that the officers were sitting right in. We have had the spectacle of a prosecution of one of the leading citizens of Halifax on the basis of a telephone conversation. I do not know much about the merits of that case, but this gentleman was prosecuted and he was found not guilty. The government has appealed that decision. There may be sound grounds for that; I do not know, but I am informed that that was a case which should never have been brought up. Of course opinions may differ about that. Counsel may have been asked to give an opinion, or the Royal Canadian Mounted Police may have felt strongly, or it may even have come up to the government itself. I do not know. However, the situation exists. That is what I am referring to and I think we should know something more about it.

On the point of censoring letters to or from members of parliament let us have an end of that. On the question of telegrams, it is well to be forewarned. I suppose we shall have to get a secret code. I do not want every member of the government to know what I am sending out to Mr. Meighen, we will say. I just mention that in passing. It would be terrible if we were to have this espionage go the extent of including long distance telephone messages. Liberty in this country will be gone. Surely we are confined enough now; we are regimented enough. I am willing to take my share with anyone in that regard on my personal prerogatives and freedom of action. But this is spying; this is espionage, and I object to it. I want it to end if I can possibly have it ended.

I renew my request with added force to-day for the production of the regulations in regard to this matter so that we may know under just what system we are living.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): May I say to my hon. friend that when he brought this subject up the other day I immediately spoke to one of my colleagues in reference to having the whole situation carefully reviewed. It was pointed out at the time that it concerned different departments of the government, and in order to have a complete review I have waited until inquiry could be made sufficiently comprehensive to give my hon. friend a reply. I will try to see that the review is expedited and an answer given to him in a day or two. But I would say to my hon. friend that I do think he is unduly concerned about the extent to which others are interested in his mail or his conversations.

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I would hope nobody is. But apparently they are.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I mean so far as the government is concerned. The last thing I should wish, and I am sure any of my colleagues or any members on this side of the house, would be to have the slightest knowledge of any matter which my hon. friend regarded as confidential.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is a fair statement, of course.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would say first that as far as the safety of the state will permit all his confidential correspondence should be kept so. I agree that every precaution must be taken to preserve the absolute right of every citizen to have his mail kept free from censorship as far as possible, but there are certain military obligations that have to be observed at this time. I suppose that by degrees we shall overcome the difficulties that arise in that connection. I would say, however, that spying or espionage is not a part of what the government is seeking in this connection.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I should like to support the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) in this matter, and I should like the Prime Minister to make a much more definite statement than that he will give the leader of the opposition a copy of the regulations or even make further inquiry and give further consideration to the matter. Under the circumstances I do not think that is good enough.

I can see a reason why letters, telegrams and so on from certain defence areas should be censored, but I cannot see why letters addressed to members of parliament should be censored even when they come from those particular areas. We are here representing the Canadian people. If there are those among us who are suspect, they should be dealt with in another way. May I add that I do not think there is any such member in the house. But for my own part, for example, a soldier who has written to me on matters concerning himself would hesitate to write to me at all if he knew that the letter was going to be opened and a paragraph from it forwarded say to the Minister of National Defence, who in turn might forward it to the soldier's commanding officer, and the man would then undoubtedly receive some penalty or reprimand for having written to a member of parliament. We are fighting for democratic rights, and surely one of the democratic rights a citizen possesses, whether he is in

uniform or out of uniform, is the right to approach his elected representative in this house without let or hindrance.

I strongly support the leader of the opposition in the protest he has made. I regret that the Prime Minister has not given a more categorical assurance that this interference with mail, at least mail addressed to members of the House of Commons, will cease immediately. The situation is much too serious to be allowed to rest simply with a promise of consideration. In saying what he did I am sure the leader of the opposition, as I did, was speaking not merely on behalf of opposition members of this house; I have heard expressions of opinion from members on the government side which coincide very closely with the opinions we are expressing. Let us not in this struggle for liberty and democracy allow these elementary rights of citizenship and parliamentary representation to be taken from us or interfered with.

I strongly urge upon the Prime Minister that he give a categorical assurance to this house that at least so far as members of this house are concerned this interference with the right of the citizen to approach his member unhampered, unhindered and unsupervised will cease immediately.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think my hon. friend can have quite caught the purport of my reply to the leader of the opposition. I did not say the matter was receiving consideration; I replied that I intended to make a full statement when the review which is now being made of the situation is completed. May I add that I did express to the Postmaster General the personal view that I thought all letters addressed to members of parliament should go without censorship altogether and that I should like him to have that aspect of the situation inquired into particularly and let me know if there is any reason why that rule should not prevail.

My hon. friend spoke of the tapping of telephones. I do not mean to pose as an authority, but some years ago I, along with another gentleman, was appointed a commissioner to inquire into certain conditions of employment obtaining among telephone operatives. The commission learned at that time that one aspect of telephone operations as conducted by the company itself was to have as part of a regular procedure what was known as a listening board, at which operators sat and took down parts of conversations. It was considered part of the regular business of the telephone company.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not think that is true to-day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let me finish, because it may serve my hon. friend's purpose as well as my own. I have kept it in mind ever since. The explanation which was given was that the company was interested in knowing whether telephones were being used for private purposes or for purposes of business, there being a higher rate charged on telephones used for business purposes than on those for domestic use. Upon the report made by the commission this parliament subsequently passed an enactment making it an offence to disclose any information obtained over a telephone in that way. Parliament did not do away with the listening boards. I do not know whether they are still used, but I know that at that time it came as a surprise to everyone—this was some thirty or more years ago—to discover that while there was such a law with respect to disclosing contents of telegrams, it did not apply to disclosure of telephone conversations. It may be that conversations over the telephone are listened to still, but I would certainly not countenance the government listening in on telephone conversations unless for very exceptional reasons.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The fact is they do. Recordings are made of conversations in Canada to-day in certain areas. I am not unreasonable about that. There may be sound reasons for it, because this country is full of spies. I have no doubt of it. And they are not hiding up in this gallery listening to the twaddle that goes on in this house. They are down where there is business going on that might interest their nation. I agree with that. But so far as we are concerned here why should there be any attempt to censor our telegrams or our telephone conversations?

WAR APPROPRIATIONS

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF BILLS FOR PRESENT AND ENSUING FISCAL YEARS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Minister of Finance when it is expected that the war appropriation bill for the next fiscal year will be introduced. Will there be a supplementary war appropriation bill for the present fiscal year, and if so when will it be brought down?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY: (Minister of Finance): Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not completed my plans with respect to the introduction of these bills. What I have in mind is the introduction of a bill relating to the financial arrangements

with Great Britain, as the first of the financial bills; then, probably shortly after that, the introduction of both the supplementary appropriation bills for the present fiscal year and the war appropriation bill for the next fiscal year, bringing them in at the same time.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There will be a supplementary bill as well?

Mr. ILSLEY: It would appear that a supplementary appropriation bill will be necessary.

HONG KONG COMMISSION

REPORTED APPOINTMENT OF COLONEL GEORGE DREW AS COUNSEL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. T. FULFORD (Leeds): Is it true that Colonel George Drew has been appointed by the opposition as counsel to the royal commission investigating the Hong Kong affair; and, if so, could that be the real reason the Ontario legislature has been adjourned?

[*Later*]

Mr. FULFORD: When may I expect an answer to my question?

Mr. SPEAKER: The leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) is not bound to reply.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

INQUIRY AS TO ANNUAL REPORT AND REPORT OF THE AUDITORS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Transport, when it is anticipated that the annual report of the Canadian National Railways and the report of the auditors of the Canadian National Railways will be laid on the table? I should think we ought to have this information before Bill No. 9, respecting the appointment of auditors, is proceeded with. It will be recalled that last year these reports were delayed and it was not until late in the session that they were received and the committee set up. I can understand that with the present tremendous volume of work there may be some delay on the part of the Canadian National in getting out these reports, but perhaps this would be timely notice to the minister, if we could have the reports later. My suggestion is that this bill be not proceeded with in the meantime.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I shall draw the attention of the minister to my hon. friend's remarks.

WAR INSURANCE

CONTRIBUTORY INSURANCE FOR MEN IN SERVICE—WAR RISK PROPERTY DAMAGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Would the government advise us as to whether they have in view making available to the general list of airmen, pilots and officers on active service, officers and other ranks of the active army in hazardous jobs, the personnel of the naval services and the merchant marine, some sort of contributory scheme of life insurance, such as that in force in the United States? Would it be possible for the government to make available to the insurance companies of Canada the statistics with respect to the mortality in these services, from time to time, so that the life insurance companies would be able to set rates which would be available to the members of the forces? At the present time no such statistics are available, and the making of rates is more or less of a gamble.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Would the government advise the house and the country as to what war risk property damage insurance is available to the public in such places as Halifax and Vancouver, and other vulnerable points? Some months ago I inquired by letter of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, under whose jurisdiction I understood this came, as to what had been done in this matter. I was advised—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): —that the whole question was being considered. It seems to me that we should follow the example of Great Britain and act in this matter without delay.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman should ask his question without making a speech.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I should like to just finish my question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I should like to say further that in certain circumstances it is delaying our war effort. Shippers who in all probability have bank commitments are diffident about shipping their goods—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Let the Speaker call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): That is not a question at all for the orders of the day. It is definitely out of order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): It is not a question; it is a statement.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I think this is a question that should be answered at once.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Minister of National Defence for Naval Affairs (Mr. Macdonald) has no right to lecture either the hon. member or myself across the floor of this house.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I raised a point of order, and I had every right to raise it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman should have asked his question. He proceeded to make a statement. He should address his question to the government.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): As to the first two questions, I submit that they should be placed on the order paper, because they are not the sort of question which the rules permit on the orders of the day. As to the third question, there may be a slightly greater element of urgency in that, because it relates to war risk insurance. I can say to my hon. friend that some time ago I instructed an eminent member of the legal profession in whom I have confidence to make a report to me on the type of war risk insurance scheme that would be appropiate to this country. He has not yet done so, though I understand that he is just about ready to do it. When that report is received the government will take such action as is appropriate in the circumstances.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): It is three months since I first inquired. This matter should be dealt with.

DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS

EXTENSION OF POWER OF REQUISITION TO MINISTER OF MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to direct one more question, this time to the Minister of Munitions and Supply, who is not here. Perhaps it might be addressed instead to our new friend the Minister of Justice, who has just come to us. My attention has been called to order in council P.C. 995, passed on the 9th instant under the authority of the War Measures Act, on the recommendation of the acting Minister of Justice. This order in council amends the defence of Canada regulations, as consolidated in 1941, by rescinding the present regulation No. 48 and substituting a new regulation No. 48, whereby the Minister of Munitions and Supply is given power—a power heretofore reserved to the ministers of defence, air and navy—to requisition, among other things (a) any chattel in Canada; and (b) any British ship or aircraft registered in Canada.

If it is not convenient for the ministry to answer my questions to-day it will be all right to have them answered later. But I should like to ask, first, the reason for this amendment to the regulations. Why is this power now sought to be vested in the Minister of Munitions and Supply rather than in the defence ministry, and what is the reason for this extension of the power of requisition—because I think in substance there is an extension of that power. Then I wish to know if the owner of such chattel, ship or aircraft, as the case may be, is to be compensated therefor, or is it to be conscripted, if that is a proper word to use in this house? And will members of parliament be provided with copies of the order in council? I think everyone ought to know about this; that is why I am drawing attention to it.

These are wide powers which are given to the ministers, I have no doubt quite properly. I am not criticizing the policy at all, but I want to get before the public the fact that there already exist very wide powers, and that now the Minister of Munitions and Supply, in addition to the defence ministers, can come in and take anything I have. They are welcome, as far as I am concerned, but the public ought to know about it and the reasons for the extension of that power to the fourth minister.

Hon. L. S. St. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, this order in council was published in the Canada *Gazette* of February 14, 1942.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): How many people read it?

Mr. St. LAURENT: If it is desired, copies can be made available for the information of hon. members. As to the other information requested, might that stand over until the beginning of the week, so that an appropriate answer may be prepared?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Surely.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

TRANSFER OF UNEMPLOYED WORKERS—UNEMPLOYED EMPLOYABLES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I gave notice of a question or rather a series of questions that I intended to

ask to-day of the Acting Minister of Labour (Mr. McLarty). My questions arise out of a picture which appeared some days ago in the Winnipeg *Tribune* depicting the delivery of an unemployment insurance cheque to a young man, twenty years of age, unmarried and living at home. Since unemployment insurance is denied to those who can secure employment or who have been given an opportunity for employment, I should like to ask the minister the following questions.

Why was this young man, who is apparently able-bodied and intelligent, not transferred to some work or occupation suitable to him where his services might be utilized instead of paying out unemployment insurance to him? And arising out of that question: Have the national employment or regional committees transferred unemployed men to such positions as are vacant and available within or without the province where such persons were living at the time they became unemployed? If so, how many persons who would otherwise be entitled to unemployment insurance benefits have been transferred in that manner? Finally, how many unemployed employables are there in Canada to-day?

Mr. SPEAKER: The questions asked by the hon. member really should not be asked on the orders of the day.

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Acting Minister of Labour): I have no objection to answering the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) with such information as I have. The case to which he refers has perhaps received some publicity because it was the first cheque paid out for benefits under the unemployment insurance fund. The young man in question was an usher in a theatre, and the employment service has been and is still endeavouring to secure him work. Not being a robust young man, he could not join the forces and cannot take on heavy work. In other words, he is pretty much limited to the class of work he was doing or work of a clerical nature.

With reference to the second question about the transfer of unemployed workers, I am advised that the employment offices are endeavouring to secure employment for any unemployed by every possible means, by transfer if necessary, provided they are willing to be transferred.

I am sorry that I have not had sufficient time to get the figures as to the unemployed employables, but I shall be glad to furnish my hon. friend with that information.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

PLEBISCITE ACT

PROVISION FOR TAKING OF VOTES ON ANY QUESTION SUBMITTED BY WAY OF PLEBISCITE

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure respecting the taking of the votes of the qualified voters on any question submitted by way of plebiscite and for such purposes to make provision for the printing and publication of a Plebiscite Act and instructions issued thereunder, the preparation of voters' lists and other plebiscite documents, including forms and ballot papers, to provide for the fees, allowances, expenses or other remuneration of certain officials and employees.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Do I understand that the minister does not intend to make a statement?

Mr. McLARTY: My intention was to make a statement.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Now is the time to make it, before Mr. Speaker leaves the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It could be made in committee of the whole.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think the minister ought to make a statement now because there are certain members who want to speak on this resolution.

Mr. McLARTY: There is no objection to following that procedure. I thought possibly the statement could have been made in committee of the whole, but it does not make any difference, certainly as far as I am concerned. In rising to move this resolution standing in my name, I realize that in some respects it is unique. A resolution of this kind is usually moved to accord the house and the committee an opportunity of considering the legislation which will be based upon it and of dealing with the matter in a general and not a detailed way. In the case of this resolution, however, the situation is somewhat changed. Ever since the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne commenced, most, if not all, of the attention of the house has been directed to the particular subject matter of the resolution which I am now moving. There were other important matters mentioned in the speech from the throne, but they were more or less neglected, or at least not extensively referred to. For that reason, I feel that I can best occupy the time of this house if I do not traverse the ordinary course which would ordinarily be traversed with a resolution of this kind, but deal with the particular

features of the enactment which it is proposed to have follow the passing of this resolution.

Now that the holding of the plebiscite has been decided upon, I believe it will be the wish of this house that it be proceeded with in the fairest manner possible, in the speediest manner possible and in the most inexpensive manner possible. That being the situation, I think I can best use the time of the house in dealing with certain particular features of the enactment.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the remarks which you made earlier in the day about hon. members not reading statements, that in the statement which I propose to give this afternoon there is nothing argumentative; I trust it is largely expository and explanatory. If I refer to my notes somewhat extensively, it will be only for the purpose of contracting the time that otherwise it would be necessary to take to deal with this resolution and perhaps of not overlooking some of the more important features. I shall endeavour, however, to trespass upon your injunction to the smallest possible degree.

This will not be the first plebiscite bill to be enacted in Canada. Hon. members are aware that the prohibition plebiscite act was passed by the parliament of Canada in 1898. One of the outstanding features of that act—it was not a lengthy one—was that it did not reenact any election act; it enacted the specific legislative features that were necessary to found the legislation upon and then left to directions the creation of the appropriate machinery and the procedure that would be followed. In the case of this enactment, it is suggested that a similar course be followed, that we do not try to reenact the whole election act, as we did in 1938, but that we enact essential legislative features, leaving to regulations, which regulations will be modeled as closely as possible upon the provisions of the election act, to provide the machinery which will be necessary to give force and effect to the plebiscite bill.

There will be another difference between the present bill and the act enacted in 1898. It is not proposed to put in this measure the exact wording of the plebiscite or the date upon which the plebiscite will be held. The wording has already been given by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), and that wording, together with the date, will be incorporated in a proclamation, provision for which is made in the bill itself.

It is proposed also that after the bill has received its second reading, it will be submitted to a special committee of the house for consideration. To that committee will be submitted, not only the bill itself but the regulations and the forms which will be promulgated after the passage of the bill.

This course appears to have a number of advantages. In the first place, the regulations must necessarily be lengthy. They will consist of two major divisions—those dealing with the Canadian service voters and those dealing with the ordinary voters in Canada. When combined, these regulations will comprise something like one hundred and thirty sections, and, when printed, cover about one hundred and twenty-five pages; and it is thought, bearing in mind the opportunity possessed by a special committee of receiving submissions and taking evidence, that they would receive a more thorough and, as well, a more expeditious consideration if, in the first instance, they were discussed in the special committee rather than in committee of the whole house.

As a safeguard, the bill will provide that the regulations shall, as near as may be, conform to the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act, 1938, and, in the matter of taking the vote of Canadian service voters, to the method employed at the last general election.

The bill consequently, Mr. Speaker, will not be a lengthy one. It will have but ten sections. Of these, several are of a nature which will require very little discussion, and for that reason I shall not deal with them at this time.

Perhaps the most important sections of the bill are those which provide for qualifications and disqualifications of voters. But before dealing in a general way with those sections, might I make one or two preliminary observations on the general principles which have been considered in the framing of the bill.

In the first place, it is the desire of the government and will, I believe, be the desire of parliament that the fullest possible opportunity shall be accorded to the people of Canada to express their views upon the particular question which will be submitted. On the other hand, it is equally desired that this expression will not be stifled by any undue restriction on those who will be permitted to vote.

In the second place, it is recognized that while the pledge was given to the qualified voters of Canada, there are certain classes of voters who, because of war-time conditions, must necessarily be excluded from voting, and others who, on account of their religious beliefs, would not in any event be affected by the giving of the pledge. Bearing in mind these observations, there are two classes

of voters for whom the bill provides: (1) the Canadian service voter; and (2) the ordinary voter.

(1) The definition of a Canadian service voter is an extremely wide one and is made as ample and complete as could be devised. This provision in the act has only two restrictions, namely, that he or she be a British subject and at the time he or she became a member of such forces or corps, was ordinarily resident in Canada.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is there any age limit?

Mr. McLARTY: I was just coming to that. Service may be performed within Canada or any other part of the world, but their right to vote is definitely ensured. Whether they are or are not over twenty-one years of age is not a restriction.

(2) But in the case of the ordinary voter, different considerations apply and the explanation cannot be as brief.

The general qualifications applying to electors under the election act apply in the plebiscite. Any voter must be a British subject, must be twenty-one years of age at the date of polling, must have been ordinarily a resident of Canada for twelve months prior to the polling date and ordinarily resident in the polling division on the twenty-eighth day before polling day.

There are necessarily some disqualifications, and with these I should now like to deal.

(a) In the first place, I would point out that those who are disqualified from voting under the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act, 1938, will be disqualified from voting at the plebiscite.

(b) In addition, every interned person will be disqualified.

(c) In addition, too, every person resident in Canada whose racial origin is that of a country at war with Canada, if such person would be disqualified by reason of race in any one of the provinces of Canada while residing therein from voting at an election of a member of the legislative assembly of that province, and who did not serve in the naval, military or air forces of Canada in the great war, as defined in the Pension Act, or in the war declared by his majesty on the tenth day of September, 1939, against the German reich and subsequently other powers.

The purpose of this section can be best illustrated by a concrete example. Suppose a citizen of Japanese origin were permitted to vote, the fact that he was permitted to do so would be resented. It would quite possibly result in some measure of public disorder.

[Mr. McLarty.]

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is that an extension of the present principle, or is it the same principle?

Mr. McLARTY: It is the same to this extent. The present principle, under section 14(2) of the Dominion Elections Act excludes from voting in a dominion election any person who is excluded from voting in any province. This is an exception to this extent, that if they are excluded in any particular province and are of enemy origin, they are excluded from voting on the plebiscite. By a country of enemy origin I mean if they originate from a country with which Canada is at war. The only limitation is to the extent to which any particular race may be excluded by provincial legislation.

Mr. STIRLING: Does that apply only to that province or to all Canada?

Mr. McLARTY: If a person is excluded from voting in any one province and the person comes from a country with which we are at war, that person is excluded throughout Canada generally.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is clear enough.

Mr. MacINNIS: That applies to only one particular race, but we are at war with a number of different countries.

Mr. McLARTY: Perhaps we might better deal with these questions in committee. Careful consideration would have to be given before a reply was made to the question of the hon. member.

Mr. MacINNIS: I did not ask a question. I followed the precedents given me by other members of the house, and I do not think certain members of the house have privileges over those accorded to other members.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not in committee on the resolution now, and questions can be permitted only with the consent of the minister.

Mr. McLARTY: I have now dealt with the exclusions from voting on the plebiscite under the terms of the proposed bill. I do not apprehend, Mr. Speaker, that criticism will be directed to or exception taken of those who have been excluded from the vote. I rather surmise that any criticism which may develop will be that certain classes have not been excluded.

Canada is a country which, while not as great in population as many other countries in the world, is composed of many nationalities and of many creeds. Until the beginning of the present century the population of this

country was largely of British and French stock. But at the turn of the century, Sir Wilfrid Laurier announced that the twentieth century belonged to Canada and that we had a vast and largely undeveloped area which, if populated, would result in this country becoming the granary of the empire. A broad, liberal and expansive immigration policy was instituted and, as a result, a great many immigrants came to Canada from European countries and from the United States. They brought their families with them and intended to make this country their permanent home. In due course a vast majority of them became Canadian citizens under the terms of the Naturalization Act. They took the naturalization oath, which is as follows:

I, ... , swear by Almighty God that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to His Majesty King George the Sixth, his heirs and successors, according to law. So help me God.

What does naturalization involve? It involves this: I quote the terms of the Naturalization Act:

A person to whom a certificate of naturalization is granted by the minister shall, subject to the provisions of this act, be entitled to all political and other rights, powers and privileges, be subject to all obligations, duties and liabilities, to which a natural-born British subject is entitled or subject, and as from the date of his naturalization have to all intents and purposes the status of a natural-born British subject.

I am fully aware, Mr. Speaker, that the judicial committee of the privy council has dealt with this particular section of the act. It has decided that the right to exercise the franchise is not inherent in those who enjoy by virtue of this naturalization the "political and other rights". I might also point out that those citizens who enjoy these rights are subject to "all obligations, duties and liabilities" which are conditions precedent to their enjoyment.

It is not the intention of the government to take away lightly either the privileges or the responsibilities which arise from citizenship. Neither is being done under this legislation which is now proposed. The right to do so would require to be clear and imperative; and the fairness in doing so would require to be immediately apparent.

This is not, however, a general election. Such an election would necessarily involve a number of considerations, and—important as any one might be—the overriding consideration would be the particular government which would exercise power in Canada, at least until a subsequent government was elected to give direction and maintain control.

In this plebiscite the electors of Canada are asked to answer one question and one alone:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

The question is one which seeks relief from commitments. But the one especial commitment referred to is the matter of military service.

May I go one further step? While no further disfranchisement is envisaged, it is provided that anyone who holds the views of conscientious objection to military service and who votes on the plebiscite, shall, after so voting, be disqualified from applying for postponement of military service under sections 18 and 19 of the national war services regulations.

I should now like, Mr. Speaker, to deal with some of the more mechanical phases of the bill.

In the first place, there is the preparation of voters' lists. A great deal of consideration has been given to the most appropriate method of compiling the voters' lists to be used in the plebiscite.

It was first suggested that the lists prepared and printed in connection with the last general election might be sufficient for the purpose. But the objections to this course, bearing in mind the events of the last two years, seemed to make this extremely undesirable.

In the first place, in the larger cities and towns many changes of residence occur every year, but more changes than usual have occurred in the last two years. In the second place, a great many have changed their residence by reason of their enlistment in the military forces of Canada. In the third place, it is estimated that in the neighbourhood of 400,000 young Canadians have attained voting age since the last general election. Their names, of course, would not appear on such voters' lists.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Four hundred thousand?

Mr. McLARTY: That is the figure which has been given to me. That would of course, include both sexes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is larger than I got from the bureau.

Mr. McLARTY: Well, those are the figures which were supplied to me by the chief electoral officer, and I understood he obtained them from the bureau of statistics.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, there may be some explanation.

Mr. McLARTY: In the fourth place, there are many places now in Canada where large

industrial plants have been established since 1940 in districts which at that time were sparsely settled but which now have populations running into thousands, and where the 1940 lists would prove of no value whatever.

Another suggestion received was to the effect that no lists of any kind be used but that every voter take an oath in the polling station before being allowed to vote.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I should like to know who made that.

Mr. McLARTY: Mr. Speaker, I personally received a number of such suggestions. I cannot recall at the present moment from whom they came.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Perhaps that is an embarrassing question.

Mr. McLARTY: Not at all.

Mr. MacINNIS: Is the resolution now open to questions, or do we have to wait until we go into committee?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The house is not in committee, and the minister has the floor. Unless he consents to any questions being put, as he has the floor, questions are not in order.

Mr. McLARTY: If it were a situation where questions could not be asked later on, I would have not the slightest hesitation in replying to them now. I should like, however, if possible to complete my remarks on the resolution by six o'clock to-night. I think I can do so without any difficulty; and while I have no objection to answering questions, perhaps, with the opportunity which will be accorded later on, it would be better to postpone them.

Mr. MacINNIS: If they are awkward questions!

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. It is the privilege of the minister to make his statement uninterrupted.

Mr. McLARTY: As I have said, another suggestion received was to the effect that no lists of any kind be used but that every voter take an oath in the polling station before being allowed to vote. It was felt that there were two serious objections to this course.

In the first place, it was believed that a procedure of that kind would be strongly resented by very many voters who by this method would consider themselves as challenged at the poll.

In the second place, such a procedure would very materially slow up the taking of the vote and would probably necessitate almost doubling the number of polling stations to be used. The increased cost of these additional polling stations would amount to almost as much as the preparation of the lists themselves.

After consideration, therefore, it has been decided to prepare a complete new list of voters in each polling division. These lists will be compiled by enumerators who will secure the necessary information. When prepared by the enumerators, these lists will neither be revised nor printed, and will constitute the official lists of voters to be used at the polls.

But in order to avoid the revision of the list and so that each qualified voter has an opportunity of exercising his franchise at the plebiscite, the vouching provisions of the elections act, restricted under the act to rural polling divisions, will be made applicable to both urban and rural polling divisions.

This will mean that where the name of a qualified voter has been inadvertently omitted by the enumerator from his list, such voter will be allowed to vote on polling day upon taking the required oath and upon being vouched for by a voter of the same polling division, whose name appears on the official list of voters as prepared by the enumerator.

In order that this vouching provision will not be made use of illegally, penalties will be specially provided in the bill.

In recommending the use of what are known as open lists, three considerations have been given weight.

In the first place, it was felt that this method would provide the best opportunity for every person entitled to vote to do so.

In the second place, by avoiding the delay ordinarily necessitated by revision, it is estimated that there will be a saving of at least one week and possibly more in the taking of the vote.

In the third place, it will prove to be less expensive, and it is estimated that a saving of about $200,000 will be effected by the use of the open lists in preference to the closed ones.

Might I state that this provision, as any other provision in the bill, will not be as immutable as the laws of the Medes and the Persians, but will be capable of such changes and amendments as the committee to which it is submitted may deem desirable.

I should now like to deal with the time required for taking the vote.

The chief electoral officer has prepared a memorandum setting out the minimum time required for the taking of the plebiscite, and since it is somewhat detailed, I believe it would be of advantage to read the memorandum prepared on that subject:

The minimum time required for the taking of a plebiscite, from the day that I am authorized to proceed with the printing of the necessary material to polling day, is ten weeks. This period may be divided into two sections.

For the first section, a period of six weeks is required for the preparatory work and I find it difficult to break down this section step by step as it consists of the period required for the printing of the necessary material, the shipping of this material to the various returning officers and its distribution by the returning officers to the enumerators appointed to prepare the lists of voters in each polling division.

I do not see how it could be possible to get the necessary enumeration material printed and transmit the same to every returning officer in a shorter period than five weeks. This would allow one week to the returning officers to make their distribution to the enumerators.

To obtain this result it would be necessary that my requisitions be given priority by the king's printer.

For the second section, a period of four weeks has been fixed in the proposed regulations; the day fixed for the commencement of enumeration in urban and rural polling divisions being the 28th day before polling day. As at the last general election the enumerators are allowed six days to complete their house-to-house visitations and three days to make the necessary number of copies of their list of voters, which in most cases must be written by hand. The lists are then transmitted to the returning officer who must in turn divide the lists for polling divisions containing more than 350 names, certify each part of the list so divided, and affix to each sheet of the enumerators' lists an impression with a rubber stamp designating that it is the official list to be used at the poll, then transmit the official list to the deputy returning officers with the ballot papers and other documents.

It is felt, especially in sparsely settled districts, that this preparation of the list by the enumerators, the sending of such list to the returning officer, the preparation of the list for the poll by the returning officer and its transmission to the deputy returning officer in the ballot box could not be accomplished in a shorter period than four weeks. It is true that the period between the date of the issue of the writs and polling day at the last general election was approximately eight weeks, but in that connection I wish to point out that on the day of the issue of the writs every rural enumerator had already received from the returning officer a complete set of enumerator's supplies with his instructions. After the writs had been issued all that was necessary for the returning officer to do was to complete the official appointments of the enumerators and transmit same to them with advice stating the days upon which the various operations had to be performed. Moreover, the remainder of the material required for a general election, consisting of some 300 printing jobs, was completed at the date of the issue of the writs and ready to be sent forward.

Furthermore, consideration must be given to the time required to prepare ballot papers, regulations and instructions for the special returning officers, and other officials who will conduct the taking of the vote by Canadian service voters in Canada, in the United Kingdom, in Newfoundland, et cetera. The printing of this material and its transmission to the United Kingdom et cetera will take quite a period of time. This material should be received by the special returning officer in London at least three weeks before polling day, since the voting starts twelve days before that day.

I should like now to deal with the estimated cost of the plebiscite. It is estimated that the cost of the plebiscite will be $1,500,000. It is not anticipated that this figure will be in any way exceeded, and it is possible that it will be somewhat reduced.

The suggestion has been made that we should endeavour to use voluntary workers in this connection. It would, however, be unwise to assume that the plebiscite could be carried on in all districts on a voluntary basis and, for this reason, in budgeting the cost it is necessary to assume that payment will be required for all services to be rendered.

The amount so stated will be required if everyone necessary for taking the plebiscite requires to be paid for his or her services.

On the other hand, it is the hope of the government that a large number will undertake the work without remuneration, and, if this hope is realized, it will result in a considerable reduction in the amount of this expenditure.

I have endeavoured to place before this committee the general principles which have been followed in the framing of the measure, and the general procedure which will be followed in the taking of the vote. I believe that the bill itself is the best guarantee of the desire of the government that people in every electoral district of Canada and those enrolled in military service will have that opportunity, which only a democratic form of government provides, of expressing freely his or her wish upon the issue which is involved.

The bill is one which is so just and fair that, bearing in mind the fact that the holding of a plebiscite has been already decided by this house, and irrespective of opinion held as to the desirability of holding one, all parties and groups can agree upon it.

Might I point out, however, that the measure is not unchangeable in form and immutable in its terms. If, in the course of its consideration, it can be shown, on the one hand, that the bill is too broad or, on the other, too narrow, every consideration will be given to the suggestions thus made.

The important point for this committee to remember is that this bill, when finally passed, will be evidence—and conclusive evidence—that the parliament of Canada, notwithstanding that the clouds may be threatening and the skies black, has kept faith with the people of this country.

At a time when we are fighting to maintain the democratic way of life throughout the world, let us endeavour in every way to maintain it in our own country.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): This is not a very good time to start an extended debate on a matter of this kind. I do not propose to debate the measure at length, but, there are some observations which I desire to make with respect to this resolution. The proposal to which the resolution seeks to give effect has already of course been the subject of a lengthy debate in this house, and personally I see no great advantage to be gained by entering into a long discussion of the principle involved.

I have not changed my view with respect to this plebiscite. To me it is just as objectionable as when it was first announced. I am still convinced that it is an unworthy evasion of a responsibility which properly belongs to this house. I am still convinced that the importation of this practice into our parliamentary system is inconsistent with the principles of responsible government. The Secretary of State said that it was unique in the history of parliamentary institutions, or rather that the legislation proposed was unique in the history—

Mr. McLARTY: I wonder if my hon. friend will allow me to correct him on that. When I began my remarks I said that the position was unique in one respect, namely, that the general resolution which would ordinarily be discussed on this motion had already been discussed in the debate on the speech from the throne.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then I misapprehended the purport of the minister's statement. I stand corrected, and I am obliged to him for the correction, but I would say this, that a government asking to be released from a position which it voluntarily took, without being asked to do so by the people of the country, is unique in the history of Canada—absolutely unique. In this connection I want to quote a paragraph that has come to my attention in a periodical with which I think all hon. members are familiar. I am quoting from *Maclean's* magazine of February 15 under the caption "Backstage at Ottawa, by the Man with a Notebook." I think most of us have read these articles from time to time. This is what he says:

> In the whole long history of British government, in all the story of democratic government, there has been nothing like this.
>
> Democratic governments—though not British governments—have taken both plebiscites and referendums; plebiscites to give them direction before legislation was passed—with the verdict not binding—referendums to approve or reject legislation already passed. Nowhere in democratic government has there been a case where the leader of a government, whether in peace or war, has taken a plebiscite to release himself from a pledge.

That is true. Never in the whole history of parliamentary government have the people of the country been confronted with a proposal to release a leader of a government from a pledge of this or any other kind, a pledge which, as I stated on a previous occasion, was self-imposed and which I assert was not an issue in the last general election.

In the course of his remarks the Secretary of State made the assertion that this was not the first plebiscite bill to be found upon the statute books of this country. I recall that some forty-three years ago the then leader of the government, Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in order to stall off a proposal which was then being pressed upon him by the temperance and prohibition forces, did hold a plebiscite on the question of the sale of intoxicating liquor in Canada. I was a boy in 1898 but I remember the occasion well, and I remember the anxiety everyone felt as to what would be the result of the plebiscite. I recall, too, that the temperance people fathered the affirmative, and the brewers and distillers fathered the negative—fathered it pretty well, I think.

Mr. POWER: Look at the results—not the brewers and distillers; but there were a great many wet votes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In your province, yes. The liquor interests were pretty well out opposing the plebiscite. That was their right; I am not questioning it, nor am I making any attack on the liquor interests of this country. I am merely reciting a matter of history. But this is the point: on that plebiscite the people voted by a substantial majority to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquor.

Mr. POWER: Thirteen thousand.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, the people of my hon. friend's province voted overwhelmingly against it, but the great mass of the electorate in every other province, I think, voted for the principle. Sir Wilfrid refused to act, on the theory that the majority was not sufficiently decisive. That is my recollection. I have not looked up the debates; I did not think it necessary. I should not have referred to it at all had not the Secretary of State himself said that there was a precedent for a plebiscite. But Sir Wilfrid did not act, on the theory, as I recall it, that there was too nice a balance among the electorate. I think that is a fair statement of the position.

An hon. MEMBER: A great number did not vote.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Many did not vote, and there will be many who will not vote in this plebiscite; make no mistake about that.

That brings me to the consideration of this question: if upon this plebiscite the result is inconclusive, what will the Prime Minister do?

An hon. MEMBER: Stall a while.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): "Stall" is not a nice word to use; it is a slang word and I am not going to use it. But I have no doubt that if the result is indecisive the Prime Minister will do nothing unless the ministers who sit around him and beside him and who want to do something compel him to do something. If the exhibition we had from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) the other day is an indication, I am not at all sure that party loyalty and partisan considerations will not outweigh principle with hon. members on the treasury benches. I am afraid it will.

Why is this plebiscite being taken? Perhaps I should not rehash that whole story again, especially when it is so near six o'clock. But without doubt this plebiscite is being taken to save the face of the ministry. Has it a single element of courage about it? Silence gives consent.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): We are just being courteous.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, the minister usually is very courteous. I should thank him. But I am not quite so sure that that is the reason for his silence. If the result is indecisive, I ask, what is the ministry to do? Will they tell the house and the country? That is one of the first considerations. Someone should answer that question before this debate closes.

Mr. KIRK: You should go out and make it decisive.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does the hon. member say that it is any responsibility of mine to go out and ask the people to vote for this plebiscite?

An hon. MEMBER: It is everybody's.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is not my baby. On a matter of principle I prefer the direct approach rather than the indirect approach of hon. gentlemen opposite. I am prepared to stake my political life on any matter of principle, while hon. gentlemen opposite are seeking to hide and save their political skins behind a subterfuge, to do by the backdoor method something they do not dare to do at the front door. On the one hand their followers, like the premier of Quebec—I am not so sure about the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent); but at all events his political godfather the premier of Quebec—told the people of Quebec in the recent by-elections that the Prime Minister of this country had always been against conscription and always would be and there would be no compulsory military service—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): He did not say that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): —while the Sifton press that supports this government is assuring people in the west, to keep the boys in line, that if the plebiscite carries of course there will be compulsory military service. Heads I win, tails you lose; that is what this is.

On the question of the plebiscite itself, I was astonished to hear the Secretary of State say that the question to be asked would not be in the bill but would be a matter of proclamation. As to the time, it is of course obvious that you could not, if you want to hold this plebiscite within a reasonable time, fix a definite date, because nobody knows when the bill, if passed, will become law. But certainly the Prime Minister gave the categorical undertaking that a certain question would be put to the people of this country. Why should it be left to a proclamation which may be twiddled around by the government and we may not have that question put to the people? You might have something entirely different, or something which will have a shaded meaning, or something which will be different in principle, even, from what was stated not only in the speech from the throne but by the Prime Minister himself.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that I made the statement very clearly as to what the question would be. If my hon. friend has any doubt about my word in the matter certainly I would have no objection, as I do not think any of my colleagues would, to the question being inserted in the bill. I rather gathered from what the minister has said that it was assumed no one would question the word of the Prime Minister on a specific statement which related to a measure of this kind, and that the insertion of the question in the bill would therefore be superfluous.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am glad to have the Prime Minister make that statement, because I want some certainty. When I hear the Secretary of State say that it will

be the subject of proclamation, over which parliament will have no control but over which the government will have full control—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, no.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): —I may be pardoned if I appear a little suspicious that there is some change in plan, or that there may be some change. Of course the Prime Minister now has pledged his word that the question will not be altered—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Absolutely not.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): —and that, if necessary the question will be put in the bill. So that we have learned something this afternoon.

Mr. CRERAR: You had that statement before.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We had the statement, but that was all washed out when the Secretary of State said it would not be in the bill but would be in the proclamation.

Mr. McLARTY: But I stated that it would be identical with what the Prime Minister told this house.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I understood that the general scope of the question would be the same, but the Prime Minister categorically placed upon the records of this house the exact question that would be asked.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the one that will be given to the people.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): All right; now we certainly have got something definite on that point. I am glad I raised the question, because it left me, at all events, somewhat up in the air, if I might use the expression, as to what we could expect. Of course I had not seen the prepared statement of the Secretary of State. Hon. gentlemen opposite knew exactly what he was going to say.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I had never heard a word of it until this afternoon.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I had to gather what I could as it went along. But I do not recall that the Secretary of State used the word "identical", or said that the question would be identical with what the Prime Minister had stated.

Mr. McLARTY: Just to clear that up, what I said was this: "The Prime Minister has already announced in this house the question that will be submitted to the people." I do not know that I used the word "identical"; I assumed that the question he announced in the house was the one that was going to the people, and stated so.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not desire to get into any discussion, and I have never questioned the honour of the Prime Minister, as he knows. But I should just like to make this observation, that the Prime Minister's statement in the House of Commons cannot be read into a statute. I found that out in the course of some litigation; a statement made by Mr. Fielding, when he was Minister of Finance, did not receive much attention from the judges of the Supreme Court of Canada. One would like to remind courts of law what legislators had in mind when they passed legislation, in order to ascertain the meaning of that legislation; but the judges of this country, the judges of Britain and for aught I know the judges of the neighbouring republic, treat very cavalierly statements made by legislators during the passing of legislation. Certainly I had no intention of questioning the Prime Minister's bona fides. I am glad I raised the question, however, because it is now certain.

I do not want to say anything more on the question of the general principle. Apparently the government are adamant in their decision to proceed, adamant even though the enemy may be knocking at our door. That would seem to be a difficult thing to comprehend. We will hold a plebiscite to ascertain whether the Prime Minister is to be relieved from an election pledge, when Vancouver may be under assault by Japanese forces. Is that not a ridiculous position in which to place the people of this country, and for the government of this country to be placed in, during war time? I do not think I shall say anything more about it, but as the opportunity offers, while now registering my disapproval of the whole procedure, I shall seek to analyse the detailed proposals as judicially as possible, with a view to improving them if that can be done.

It is now almost six o'clock, Mr. Speaker. I really do not think I can finish this afternoon, therefore I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 5.58 p.m.

Monday, February 23, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that the clerk of the house has received from the chief electoral officer certificate of the election and return of the following member, viz.:

Of Hon. Humphrey Mitchell, for the electoral district of Welland.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED

Hon. Humphrey Mitchell, member for the electoral district of Welland, introduced by Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and Hon. C. W. G. Gibson.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

RECOGNITION OF SOVIET UNION

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. What decision has the government reached regarding the recognition of our present ally the U.S.S.R.?
2. If recognition has been decided upon, will the government exchange representatives with the Soviet Union?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Answered by a special statement of Prime Minister in House of Commons, February 5, 1942.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—MONTREAL TERMINAL

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. How much steel was used in the construction of the new Canadian National Railway station project in the city of Montreal during the years 1940 and 1941?
2. How many man-hours of skilled labour were used on this project during the years 1940 and 1941?
3. What has been the cost of this project to date?
4. What is the estimated cost of continuing this work for 1942?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. 1940, 1,903 tons; 1941, 1,614 tons.
2. Information not available as most of the work was performed under contract.
3. As required by the Canadian National Montreal Terminals Act, 1929, the railway authorities report to the Minister of Transport annually upon the nature and extent of the work on the said project. This report is tabled each session, and is expected shortly. It will contain the information called for by Questions 3 and 4.
4. See answer to question 3.

PORT ARTHUR TERMINAL ELEVATOR

Mr. PERLEY:

1. What amount of rental was paid to the government by McCabe Brothers Grain Company, Limited, for the rental of the government's terminal grain elevator at Port Arthur, during the years, 1939, 1940 and 1941?
2. What amount of storage fees were paid to the said McCabe Bros. Grain Company, Limited, for grain stored in the said elevator during the years, 1939, 1940 and 1941, and by whom was this amount paid?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1.

Crop year	Rent
	$
August 1, 1938 to July 31, 1939..	66,876.37
August 1, 1939 to July 31, 1940..	72,230.98
August 1, 1940 to July 31, 1941..	67,900.25

2. No information.

POSTAL SERVICE—BONUS TO CITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. FAIR:

1. What cost of living bonus is being paid to employees in city post offices?
2. Is this bonus limited to 5 per cent on postage commission in the case of revenue postmasters? If so, for what reason?
3. Why was payment deferred until the 1st of October, 1941?

Mr. MULOCK:

1. Eleven per cent of compensation earned, or $11.91 per month, according to conditions as outlined in the Order in Council of the 26th August, 1941, P.C. 6702, as amended and interpreted by the Treasury Board.

2. Yes. Revenue postmasters are not paid a fixed salary as in the case of employees of city post offices. Instead they receive a commission, the amount of which increases in ratio to the amount of postal business transacted at their post offices. Under present day conditions there has been a general increase in postal business throughout the country, which has resulted in increased commissions to revenue postmasters.

3. The decision to grant revenue postmasters a cost of living bonus was not reached until some time in September, 1941, and the bonus was, therefore, made effective from the next month, 1st October, 1941.

LEASE OF REGINA BUILDING

Mr. PERLEY:

1. Has the government acquired a leasehold or any other interest in the whole or any part of a building situated on Eleventh avenue, Regina, being lots 1, 2 and 3 in block 308?
2. If so, from whom was such interest acquired?
3. What were the terms of payment for such interest?

4. What amount, if any, has been or is to be spent by the government to make the building suitable for its purposes?

5. What was the assessed value of the said building and lot?

6. What valuation was placed on the building by the government officials, (a) before; (b) after the completion of the building?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. Yes.

2. David Silverman, Esq.

3. 72·84 cents per net square foot per annum for duration of war, plus six months with annual option to the crown of renewal at same rate thereafter.

4. Necessary partitioning, etc. for office accommodation will be installed by the government and removed by the government at conclusion of the lease.

5. Lot—$32,800; building—$16,930 (at 30% valuation).

6. New building not appraised for value by government officials. Such appraisal unnecessary for government purposes, but building appraised by city appraisal department for taxation purposes at $56,433.33.

FOREIGN EXCHANGE CONTROL—GRAPE FRUIT JUICE

Mr. LOCKHART:

What amount of foreign exchange will be required in connection with the importation of grape fruit juice in the year 1942?

Mr. ILSLEY: The answer to this question would involve an attempt to forecast the future and no such forecast can be made with any degree of accuracy.

*AIR RAID PRECAUTIONS—NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. ISNOR:

1. What air raid precaution equipment has been provided the province of Nova Scotia since January 1, 1940?

2. Have any complaints been received from the province of Nova Scotia or the city of Halifax, concerning (a) lack of A.R.P. equipment; (b) style, type, usefulness or uselessness of equipment received?

3. What further equipment, if any, will be sent to Nova Scotia within the next two or three months?

4. Has a report been received from the province of Nova Scotia concerning the disposition of equipment?

5. If so, to what centres was equipment sent, and what quantity to each?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer this question orally. The reply to questions 2 and 4 is no. It is not in the public interest to make public answers to the other questions, but I should be very glad to give the information privately to the hon. member or to any other hon. member of the house.

[Mr. Perley.]

QUEBEC CITY AIRMAIL SERVICE

Mr. PARENT:

1. Is the Postmaster General aware that there is a private air service between the cities of Quebec and Montreal?

2. Is the Postmaster General aware that there is no airmail service in the city of Quebec?

3. If so, will the minister establish an airmail service in Quebec city?

Mr. MULOCK:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Matter under consideration.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT BONUS PLAN

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. Is the dollar for dollar bonus for returned soldiers operating under the soldier settlement board still being paid?

2. If not, when was it discontinued and for what reason?

3. What consideration, if any, has the government given to the reestablishment of this bonus plan during the year 1942, and future years?

Mr. CRERAR:

1. No.

2. March 31, 1941, in accordance with amendment to the Soldier Settlement Act—2 George VI, Chapter 14, 1938, Subsection (1) of Section 73.

3. It has not been considered necessary to re-establish the "dollar for dollar" bonus provisions of the Act.

PUBLIC SERVICE—BILINGUAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. GOULET:

1. What was the total number of employees in the income tax division of the Department of National Revenue on May 15, 1941, (a) who speak one language only; (b) bilingual?

2. What was the total number of employees in the head office of the income tax division, on May 15, 1941, who (a) speak one language and are in receipt of less than $3,000 per annum; (b) bilingual and in receipt of less than $3,000 per annum; (c) speak one language and in receipt of $3,000 or more per annum; (d) bilingual and in receipt of $3,000 or more per annum?

Mr. GIBSON:

1. (a) 1,359; (b) 511.

2. (a) 176; (b) 40; (c) 31; (d) 5.

Mr. GOULET:

1. What are the names of the bilingual members of the following boards, (a) board of referees; (b) war contracts depreciation board; (c) succession duties?

2. What is the total number of employees employed in the head offices of such boards from September 1, 1939, to date, specifying, (a) those speaking one language only; (b) those who are bilingual?

Mr. GIBSON:

1. (a) The Honourable Mr. Justice W. H. Harrison.
(b) Nil.
(c) There is no board for administration of succession duties. This is dealt with by the Income Tax officials in general along with their other duties.

2. (a) (a) 15; (b) 4.
(b) (a) 6; (b) 1.

WARTIME PRICES AND TRADE BOARD—BONUSES TO MANUFACTURERS

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. Has any bonus been granted to the manufacturers of leather by the Wartime Prices and Trade Board?
2. Has the Wartime Prices and Trade Board granted a bonus to the manufacturer of any other commodity?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. No.
2. Yes, subsidies have been authorized for milk, leather footwear and coal.

IMPORTS OF TAPIOCA STARCH

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What was the amount of tapioca starch imported into Canada during each month of the year 1941?
2. What was the value of such tapioca starch imported during each of these months?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1 and 2. No information. Tapioca starch not separately classified for statistical purposes.

WOOL IMPORTS AND PRODUCTION

Mr. HATFIELD:

In view of wool imports from Australia being cut off, what is being done to stimulate the raising of sheep for wool production in Canada?

Mr. GARDINER: Some replacement of fine wool imported from Australia is made through fine wools produced in western Canada and some expansion has taken place in its production.

Ewes and rams have been imported from the United States by the Dominion Department of Agriculture and breeding flocks for flock improvement purposes have been established.

Wool grading has been introduced to improve the quality of wool generally and make it more suitable for Canadian requirements.

TURNIP, CARROT AND ONION SEEDS

Mr. HATFIELD:

Is any inducement being offered the farmers of Canada to raise more turnip, carrot and onion seeds, the import of which may be curtailed due to the war?

Mr. GARDINER: In cooperation with provincial departments of agriculture, arrangements have been made with respect to the growing of turnip seed under contracts.

Our requirements of onion and carrot seeds are largely produced in Canada and any shortage in particular varieties has been met by obtaining supplies from the United States to meet 1942 requirements.

NITRATE OF SODA

Mr. HATFIELD:

What provision has been made to secure a supply of nitrate of soda for use in Canada?

Mr. HOWE: Canada's requirements of nitrate of soda for 1942 have been provided for. Negotiations are now under way for an adequate supply for 1943 and no difficulty in this regard is anticipated.

AGREEMENTS UNDER WAR EXCHANGE CONSERVATION ACT

Mr. ROSS (Souris):

1. How many agreements have been concluded between his majesty and individuals or corporations pursuant to Part III of the War Exchange Conservation Act?

2. What is the estimated total value of the increase in Canadian exports which will result from such agreements?

3. What is the estimated present and future loss in revenue to the federal treasury due to the special credits and/or special allowances for depreciation or depletion which will result from such agreements?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. 29.

2. $27,793,000 (United States) annually when the additional facilities provided in the above agreements are in full operation.

3. These agreements have been drawn up in such a manner that the total tax revenues of the Dominion Government will not be less than they would have been in the absence of such agreements. The general principle followed has been that tax assistance given under these agreements should not be more than the additional profits resulting from the expansion programmes so that in general the taxes payable by these companies on their original operations are not reduced by the effect of the agreements. There is distinct probability that total tax revenues will be increased because of these agreements.

SYDNEY AND LOUISBURG RAILWAY COMPANY

Mr. GILLIS:

1. Is a subsidy paid the Sydney and Louisburg Railway Company?
2. If so, for what reason and on what basis?

3. What amount, if any, was paid by way of subsidy to the said railway company for the years 1940 and 1941?

4. What were the earnings for the years 1940 and 1941 of the said company?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Yes.

2. The Maritime Freight Rates Act, 1927, provides for a reduction of 20 per cent in ordinary tariff rates on railways operating in the Maritime area, the said Eastern lines to be reimbursed by the Dominion Government for the revenues thus denied them.

3. Fiscal year ended March 31, 1940—$192,457.19; Fiscal year ended March 31, 1941—$295,609.64.

4. Dominion Bureau of Statistics advise that this company reported earnings in 1940 (calendar year) as follows:

Gross revenues	$1,719,695
Operating expenses (including taxes)	1,127,805
Gross corporate income	591,890
Deduct non-operating expense	483,926
Net corporate income	$ 107,964

The operating figures for 1941 are not available as yet.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CAR FERRY SERVICE

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury):

1. On what date was the car ferry *Charlottetown* sunk?

2. Was she insured for the voyage during which she sank?

3. If so, has the insurance been paid?

4. If so, what is the total amount of the insurance paid?

5. Was payment made to the government or to the Canadian National Railways?

6. Have any attempts been made to salvage the vessel?

7. If so, what is the nature of such attempts?

8. If not, why not and what consideration has been given to attempting her salvage?

9. Did the Minister of Munitions and Supply recently express confidence that it is possible to salvage this vessel?

10. If so, was this confidence based upon reports made to him by officers of the Department of Transport and/or the Canadian National Railways?

11. When was the car ferry *Prince Edward Island* built?

12. When was she first placed in service between Borden and Cape Tormentine?

13. When was she retired from regular use on such service?

14. Before her retirement from such service were reports made by officials of the Department of Railways and Canals and/or the Canadian National Railways to the effect that she was inadequate for this service?

15. What is the tonnage of the car ferry *Prince Edward Island*?

16. What is the tonnage of the car ferry *Charlottetown*?

17. Has any consideration been given to the building of a new car ferry to replace the *Charlottetown*?

18. If so, what decision, if any, has been reached?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. June 18, 1941.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

4. $995,000.

5. Payment was made to Canadian National Railways in the first instance and then turned over to the Dominion Government, less an amount of $11,193.92 to reimburse the railway for capital expenditures on said vessel.

6. No.

7. See answer to question No. 6.

8. The following is an extract from the report of the Underwriter's Surveyer:

"The undersigned conferred with officials of the Canadian National Railways, also Maritime Towing & Salvage, Ltd., Halifax, and Messrs. Merritt, Chapman & Scott Corporation, New York, on the possibilities of salvage of the *Charlottetown*. The Salvage companies, after careful consideration of the vessel's location, and with the plans of the vessel at their disposal, consider the salvaging of the *Charlottetown* not practical. It is, therefore, recommended that no expense be incurred by attempting examination or salvage of the vessel."

This report was concurred in by Foundation Maritime Limited.

9. Not recently. Immediately following the loss of the vessel, hope was expressed generally that salvage would be possible. That hope was dispelled by the subsequent reports of the Underwriters' Surveyor, and Foundation Maritime Limited.

10. See answer to No. 9.

11. 1915.

12. 1917.

13. 1931.

14. The report of the royal commission on Maritime Claims (Duncan Report), dated September 23, 1926, page 27, reads as follows:—

"The present car ferry affords a much improved service as compared with that which the island formerly enjoyed, but in recent years traffic and freight have considerably increased, and will continue to increase, particularly at certain seasons of the year. When the present ferry steamer was constructed, it was not contemplated that there would be motor car traffic to be taken care of, and the arrangements at the piers are, from

the point of view of this traffic, very unsatisfactory. There have been many complaints by visitors and tourists. During the winter there are frequent calls made upon the present ferry steamer, by reason of other craft getting into difficulties and the steamer requiring to proceed to their aid; and at times when the ferry steamer is undergoing overhaul, the boat taking its place is unsuited for the purpose. Altogether the ferry boat service is unsatisfactory. The railway administration admitted that there was need for supplemental provision being made in the form either of a second ferry boat or a special freight boat. We recommend that the matter be gone into from the point of view of placing at the disposal of the island such satisfactory means of communication as will ensure as regular and complete a service as can reasonably be made".

15. 2795 gross tons—1100 net tons.

16. 5889 gross tons—3385 net tons.

17. Matter receiving consideration. The time occupied in the construction of the *Charlottetown* was fifteen months and the cost $2,320,000. To replace the lost vessel would entail the use of 3300 long tons of urgently required ship steel (including machinery); would occupy almost one million man-hours of labour and, under prevailing conditions, the cost of such a vessel would be increased from 65 per cent to 75 per cent. The diversion of so much steel and labour from wartime industry is a matter requiring most careful consideration at a time so critical as the present.

18. See answer to Question 17.

*COASTAL MOTOR BOATS

Mr. BRUCE:

1. How many coastal motor boats have been ordered?

2. How many were completed by October 31, 1941?

3. What was the total cost?

4. How many of these boats reached Halifax before the close of navigation?

5. How many of these boats are now in commission?

6. In what state of completion are the balance of the boats?

7. At what points are any boats, which did not reach Halifax before the close of navigation, tied up?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Mr. Speaker, if I may say so, I think this question should be dropped.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not know anything about the question, and as the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) is not here, perhaps the minister would allow the question to stand.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stand.

PENNFIELD RIDGE, N.B., AIRPORT

Mr. BRUCE:

1. Have any difficulties been found because of sea fogs and bad weather, in using the airport at Pennfield Ridge, New Brunswick?

2. Has it been found possible to use this airport for the training of pilots, or, have these had to be transported elsewhere for training?

3. On whose recommendation was this site chosen?

4. What is the total cost of building and equipping this airport?

Mr. POWER:

1. No difficulties have been found because of sea fogs and bad weather with respect to the use of the airport itself. The school originally allocated to this aerodrome was an air navigation school for the purpose of advanced training of air observers but the cloud layers in the surrounding district have been such as to make stellar sights and solar sights necessary for the teaching of air navigation difficult.

For this reason and reasons of economy it has been decided to amalgamate two air navigation schools in one, leaving the Pennfield Ridge site free to be used for the training of pilots in operations.

2. No pilot training has hitherto been attempted for the reasons mentioned in No. 1, but no difficulties are foreseen in the proposed change.

3. The Department of Transport and Aerodrome Development Committee recommended the siting of this school.

4. The following table shows the total cost of building and equipping this airport:

Construction of buildings, including heating contracts	$1,152,650 56
Services (water, sewers, roads, parade ground, fencing, etc.)	209,351 30
Railway siding	21,416 00
Total	$1,383,417 86

NORTH TORONTO BIBLE HOUSE—MAIL SERVICE

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. Has the Post Office Department restricted or cut off the mail service to and from the North Toronto Bible House, 2721 Yonge street, Toronto?

2. If so, when was such order made?

3. What procedure was followed by the post office authorities in arriving at the decision to prohibit such service?

4. Was an investigation taken before doing so?

5. If so, was evidence taken at such investigation, and what persons gave evidence?

6. If no evidence was taken, were representations received requesting that such order be made, and what are the names of those who made such or any representations?

Mr. MULOCK:

1. Yes.

2. September 15, 1941.

3. The attention of the department having been directed to the fact that the Canadian mails were being used for the distribution of printed literature advertising certain books, the literature in question was submitted to the Deputy Minister of Justice, who ruled that it was published for an illegal purpose within the meaning of the Canadian Postal Regulations, and that the posting of such literature was forbidden by the postal regulations. As a result of this ruling, the department, acting in accordance with the procedure followed by all administrations, withdrew Canadian mailing facilities from the Protestant Book House of Toledo, Ohio, U.S.A., and The North Toronto Bible House, Toronto, Ontario, the names of which organizations appeared on the literature as distributors.

4. In view of the ruling of the Deputy Minister of Justice, an investigation was not considered necessary, but, as a result of protests received from the proprietor of The North Toronto Bible House, the circumstances of the case were fully explained to him and he was informed that if he would furnish an assurance that he would not in future use the Canadian mails for the distribution of the literature declared illegal by the Deputy Minister of Justice, the prohibitory order against the North Toronto Bible House would be cancelled. Although the proprietor of the above organization has been afforded more than one opportunity of furnishing the department with such an assurance, he refuses to do so. In view of this refusal and the ruling of the Department of Justice that the literature in question is illegal, the department has no option but to maintain the prohibitory order in effect until such time as the assurance asked for is furnished.

5. See answer to number 4.

6. See answer to number 3.

ERECTION OF BUILDINGS FOR OTHER THAN WAR INDUSTRY

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many licences have been granted for the erection of buildings other than those required for war industry since construction control has been adopted?

2. How many buildings have been erected pursuant to the issue of such licences?

3. What is value and location of each such building?

4. What is the total amount and value of the steel that went into such buildings?

Mr. HOWE:

1. There have been issued up to February 5, 1942, a total of 3,150 licences for the erection of buildings. Records covering these do not differentiate between war and non-war industries. A clear line of demarcation is not possible.

2. The department has no knowledge of how many buildings which have been licensed have not been erected.

3. The controller of construction has not the necessary staff to compile the extensive data requested re the 3,150 licences granted.

4. Information re the amount and value of steel used in the buildings which have been licensed is not asked for on the application for licence forms, and except in isolated cases is not available.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

How many orders in council have been passed, (a) since the outbreak of war; (b) while parliament has been in actual session during the said period; (c) since the beginning of the present session on January 22, 1942?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

(a) 20,677 orders in council and 11,645 treasury board minutes from September 1, 1939 to February 6, 1942, both dates inclusive.

(b) 5,470 orders in council and 3,161 treasury board minutes while parliament was actually in session since September 1, 1939.

(c) 412 orders in council and 166 treasury board minutes since the beginning of the present session on January 22, 1942.

STRIKES IN CANADA

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

How many strikes have taken place in Canada and what is the number of man-hours that have been lost in consequence during each of the years 1939, 1940 and 1941?

Mr. MITCHELL:

	Number of strikes and lockouts in existence	Time loss in man working days
1939.....	122	224,588
1940.....	168	266,318
1941.....	211*	430,812*

* Preliminary figures.

Strikes and lockouts are not recorded separately. A dispute which is clearly a lockout is rare. The calculation of time loss is not carried to man-hours.

WHEAT ACREAGE REDUCTION BONUS

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. What amount was paid to farmers in each province, during the year 1941, under the wheat acreage reduction bonus?

2. What has been the cost of administration of this bonus?

3. What number of inspectors, supervisors and office staff have been employed in each province in connection with the administration of this bonus?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Manitoba, $2,931,908; Saskatchewan, $13,239,408; Alberta, $7,241,040.

2. To December 31, 1941—$644,015.03

3.

Province	Office Staff	Supervisors	Inspectors
Manitoba	62	10	43
Saskatchewan	133	16	307
Alberta	91	14	96

The above supervisors and inspectors also carry out the field work under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

CANADIAN ARMY—BADGES FOR DISCHARGED PERSONNEL

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has the government decided to issue a badge for discharged personnel?

2. If so, what instructions have been issued by the department to give effect to same?

3. Have such badges been issued or distributed to the various military districts?

Mr. RALSTON:

1. Yes.

2. Classification and regulations published in *Canada Gazette* dated December 13, 1941.

3. No. The badges will be issued direct from National Defence headquarters.

PURCHASE OF CHEESE FOR EXPORT

Mr. STOKES:

1. What is the name and address of each firm granted permission to buy cheese for export during the year 1941?

2. What is the name and address of each firm refused permission to buy cheese for export during the year 1941?

3. Was any limit placed on the amount which these firms were allowed to purchase during 1941?

4. Were all these firms in the cheese export business prior to 1941?

5. How much cheese was exported by each of these firms during 1941?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. The following firms were granted permission to export cheese to the British Ministry of Food, during the year 1941:

A. A. Ayer Company Ltd., 690 St. Paul street west, Montreal, Quebec; J. C. Edwards & Company, 701 St. Paul street, Montreal, Quebec; Cooperative Federee de Quebec, 130 St. Paul street east, Montreal; United Dairymen Limited, 748 St. Paul street west, Montreal, Quebec; Hodgson, Rowson & Company, 771 William street, Montreal, Quebec; Geo. Hodge & Son Limited, 166 King street, Montreal, Quebec; Lovell & Christmas (Canada) Ltd., 160 King street, Montreal, Quebec; P. W. McLagan Limited, 417 St. Peter street, Montreal, Quebec; Olive & Dorion Limited, 722 St. Paul street west, Montreal Quebec; Swift Canadian Co. Ltd., Union Stock Yards, Toronto, Ontario; Canada Packers Limited, Union Stock Yards, Toronto, Ontario; W. S. Cook & Son, Belleville, Ontario; Ingersoll Cream Cheese Co. Ltd., Ingersoll, Ontario; Belleville Cheddar Cheese Ltd., Belleville, Ontario; Jas. A. Sanderson, Oxford Station, Ontario; Whyte Packing Company Ltd., Stratford, Ontario; Flavelles Limited, Lindsay, Ontario.

2. Brantford Produce Co. Ltd., Brantford, Ontario, refused permission to export cheese to the British Ministry of Food during 1941. P. W. McLagan Ltd., Montreal, Quebec, was instructed to discontinue buying cheese on October 1, 1941. This instruction was rescinded with respect to cheese made after the 31st of October, 1941.

3. No.

4. Yes.

5. This information is considered confidential.

FORTH-ULLIN, ALTA., RAILWAY LINE

Mr. SHAW:

1. Has the board of transport commissioners for Canada handed down a decision regarding the application of the Canadian Pacific Railway to abandon the line of railway between Forth and Ullin in the province of Alberta?

2. What was the nature of the decision?

3. Has this decision been made public?

4. If so, when and by what method was it made public?

Mr. CARDIN: The board of transport commissioners advise that no decision has as yet been reached in the application referred to. Judgment is expected shortly.

POPULATION—ENGLISH AND FRENCH LANGUAGE

Mr. PARENT:

1. What is the English language population born in Canada?

2. What is the English language population resident in Canada and born in (a) England, (b) Scotland, (c) Ireland?

3. What is the French language population resident in Canada and born in France?

4. What is the population in Canada speaking French and born in Canada?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

Census of 1931

1. British Isles racial origin born in Canada—

English	1,920,259
Irish	1,053,449
Scotch	1,022,915
Other	36,384
	4,033,007

2. British Isles racial origin born in—	
England and Wales.....	738,020
Ireland.	107,259
Scotland.	278,777
Lesser Isles	4,814
	1,128,870
3. French racial origin born in France.	15,361
4. French mother tongue of persons born in Canada	2,762,142

We do not have any figures showing the number of persons born in Canada who can speak French.

INCOME TAX RETURNS IN ENGLISH AND FRENCH

Mr. WARD:

What was the total number of income tax returns received in the income tax division of the Department of National Revenue for the calendar year 1940, (a) English, (b) French?

Mr. GIBSON:

(a) English..	2,966,970
(b) French..	311,228
Total..	3,278,198

DEPENDENTS' ALLOWANCE BOARD—RED DEER

Mr. SHAW:

1. How many district representatives and temporary employees have been engaged by the dependents' allowance board in the Red Deer federal constituency since September 1, 1939?
2. What are the names and addresses of all such persons?
3. When was each appointed?
4. What rate of salary or wages and allowances are paid to each?
5. What amounts have been paid to date to each such person?

Mr. RALSTON:

1. None.
2, 3, 4 and 5. See answer to question 1.

CHARTERED BANKS—REMUNERATION FOR FEDERAL SERVICES—INTEREST

Mr. ISNOR:

1. Do chartered Canadian banks receive remuneration for any of the following services: (a) acting as agents of the foreign exchange control board, (b) agents or representatives for the custodian of enemy property, in respect to enemy assets, (c) raising of funds by government for its ordinary needs and the prosecution of the war, (d) acting as agents for deliveries and finalization of subscriptions to governmental issues, (e) agents for the sale and distribution of war savings stamps and certificates?
2. What rate of interest is charged the Canadian government on, (a) borrowed money, (b) overdrafts?

Mr. McLARTY:

1. (a) Yes. The Canadian chartered banks receive from the Foreign Exchange Control Board a commission of one-eighth of one per cent on purchases and sales of foreign exchange completed by such banks in their capacity as authorized agents for the board. (b) No. (c) and (d) In the case of issues sold to the public prior to 1941, the chartered banks received the usual selling commission (usually three-quarters of one per cent on long term bond issues and one-quarter or three-eighths of one per cent on medium term issues) allowed by the government on all sales. In such issues the banks did not receive any other remuneration for the handling of applications from subscribers and for the delivery of bonds to purchasers. In the case of the 1941 Victory Loan the chartered banks did not receive any commission on sales negotiated by their offices but a service fee was paid for services rendered in connection with the receiving and handling of applications to purchase bonds and in connection with the delivery of bonds to the purchasers (excluding bonds purchased by certain government departments or agencies) on the following basis: one-quarter of one per cent of the principal amount of all bonds delivered except bonds for which payment was made from deposit accounts on the books of trust and loan companies. The same service fee is being allowed in connection with the second victory loan. (e) No.

2. (a) Particulars of interest paid by the Dominion of Canada on all borrowings will be found in the appendix to the public accounts of Canada entitled "Interest on Public Debt." (See pages 72-75 of the public accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1941.) (b) Since the commencement of operations of the Bank of Canada in March, 1935, the Dominion of Canada has not had an overdraft with any chartered bank. Particulars of interest paid on short-term ways and means advances by the Bank of Canada will be found in the appendix to the public accounts of Canada entitled "Interest on Public Debt." (See pages 72-75 of the Public Accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1941.)

BANK OF INTERNATIONAL SETTLEMENTS

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. Is Canada a member of the Bank of International Settlements?
2. What transactions, if any, have taken place between the Bank of Canada and any other member of the Bank of International Settlements since the outbreak of war?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. The Bank of Canada is not a member of the Bank for International Settlements.
2. Transactions with other central banks which may be members of the Bank for International Settlements form a part of the

ordinary banking operations of the Bank of Canada and it is not considered in the public interest to disclose any information concerning such transactions.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—CANADA'S MARITIME PROVINCES

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax):

1. Did the Canadian National Railways distribute a booklet, *Canada's Maritime Provinces,* during the year 1941?
2. If so, how and where was this book distributed?
3. What was its total cost?
4. Was it prepared by Canadian National Railway officials in Montreal?
5. If not, who compiled the same?
6. Was the work supervised and checked by railway officials before acceptance?
7. If so, by whom?
8. What firm, or firms printed this booklet, and at what cost?
9. Were tenders called on this work?
10. Who supplied the picture of the four-masted schooner on page 14, labelled, Maritime Fishing Schooner?

Mr. CARDIN:

1. Yes.
2. Through passenger offices of Canadian National Railways in Canada and the United States.
3. $1,489.72.
4. Yes, in collaboration with departmental representatives in maritime provinces.
5. See answer to question 4.
6. Yes.
7. Answered by question No. 4.
8. Le Soleil Ltee. $1,069.78.
9. Yes.
10. Canadian National Railways' maritime province connections.

AIR RAID PRECAUTIONS—BLACK-OUT EQUIPMENT

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What equipment has been loaned or given to cities or to the provinces of central Canada, including Toronto, in connection with black-out?
2. What is the date of the next black-out in Toronto, what time will it begin and of what duration will it be?
3. Has any further direct home defence been afforded to municipalities since that set out in the return tabled last session, which sought by direct military aid from Canada to provide adequate local defence measures?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

1. It is not in the public interest to divulge information regarding quantities of equipment in any locality for air raid precautions.
2. No information since the authority to order black-outs in Toronto has been delegated to the attorney-general of the province of Ontario, who must obtain the approval of the senior defence officer in the area.
3. Question not understood.

*SOLDIER SETTLEMENT—SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. What is the number of soldier settlers who settled in Saskatchewan under the soldier settlement board?
2. What was the total original indebtedness of these settlers to the soldier settlement board?
3. How many of such original settlers are still on their land?
4. What was the original indebtedness of the settlers who are still on the land?
5. What are the total payments made by those who are still on the land?
6. What is the present indebtedness of those who are still on the land?

Mr. CRERAR: In regard to this question, there is a very great amount of work involved in preparing the answers to it in its present form. I suggest that the question be allowed to stand, and I would be glad if the hon. member who asked it would consult me about it, and perhaps we can reduce the amount of work required.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

COAL SUBVENTIONS

Mr. HANSELL:

1. What was the total amount paid in each province by the dominion government by way of subventions to assist in the movement of coal during each of the years 1939, 1940 and 1941?
2. What quantity of coal was moved in each province under these subventions during each of the above years?
3. To what companies, firms or individuals, and what amounts were paid under these subventions during each of the years 1939, 1940 and 1941?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. Subventions are not paid to the provinces but to the railways or to coal mine operators or distributors.

Subventions paid, calendar years as follows:

Province of origin of coal	1939	1940	1941
Nova Scotia	$2,988,403 66	$2,643,366 54	$2,188,364 52
New Brunswick	45,663 98	42,385 65	31,226 06
Alberta	592,376 12	1,083,436 70	1,578,258 96
Saskatchewan	37,592 44	25,949 43	21,840 05
British Columbia	428,363 06	520,451 51	669,539 46
Totals	$4,092,399 26	$4,315,589 83	$4,489,229 05

2. Quantity of coal moved, calendar years as follows:

Province of origin of coal	1939	1940	1941
Nova Scotia	2,420,694	1,940,570	2,015,829
New Brunswick	54,165	59,224	43,783
Alberta	368,107	553,426	802,351
Saskatchewan	159,340	41,256	22,677
British Columbia	401,275	413,814	434,328
Totals (net tons)	3,403,581	3,008,290	3,318,968

3. It is not considered in the public interest to provide details of payments to individual companies, firms or individuals.

IMPORTS OF COAL

Mr. HANSELL:

What was the total tonnage of foreign coal imported into Canada during the years 1938 to 1941 inclusive, and from what countries?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): Imports by countries of coal entered for consumption in Canada during the calendar years 1938 and 1939, and total imports of coal during the calendar years 1940 and 1941.

Countries	1938 Tons	1939 Tons	1940 Tons	1941 Tons
United Kingdom	1,257,887	1,099,419	....	....
Belgium	33,689	9,743	....	....
French East Indies	69,900	46,855	....	....
Germany	317,648	465,818	....	....
Japan	417	....	....	....
Morocco	15,442	4,204	....	....
Netherlands	21,185	15,230	....	....
Russia	22,792	....	....	....
United States	11,273,531	13,357,324	....	....
Alaska	....	52	....	....
Total imports	13,012,491	14,998,645	17,426,734	20,388,393

Countries for the years 1940 and 1941 not available.

AIR RAID PRECAUTIONS—BLACK-OUT REGULATIONS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Was the opinion of the Department of Justice obtained as to legality of the penalties imposed for breaches of black-out regulations?

2. What compensation is to be given in claims for damages to municipalities, or others, who sustain damage?

3. Have methods and plans in connection with various black-outs to be sanctioned by the government of Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

1. Yes.
2. No information.
3. No.

INTERNMENT OF ALIENS

Mrs. NIELSEN:

1. How many anti-Fascist and anti-Nazi internees sent from England still remain interned in Canada?

2. Where are they interned?

[Mr. Ilsley.]

3. What are the reasons for their continued detention?

4. Does the British government have to give its consent to their release?

Mr. McLARTY:

1. No person sent from England to Canada for internment came to Canada under the classification of "anti-Fascist" or "anti-Nazi". All civilians sent from England to Canada for internment were described as "civilian internees". Subsequent to the internment of the persons so sent, an official of the home office came to Canada and brought with him dossiers relating to individual cases. This official between November, 1940 and June 1941 investigated the cases of civilian internees and arranged for the return of some 700 of them to England. As a result of his investigations 1,542 of the remaining civilian internees were provisionally classified as refugees. On the 1st July, 1941, refugee camps were established under the supervision of a

commissioner of refugee camps. The administration of these camps is separate and apart from the administration of internment camps. The number presently in refugee camps is 1,179. Since the refugee camps were established some 166 have been returned to the United Kingdom, some 121 have been released in Canada, under sponsorship, to continue their education, and 35 have been released to engage in war industries.

2. The refugee camps are located at Sherbrooke, P.Q., and Ile-aux-Noix, P.Q.

3. Persons may only be released for residence in Canada under the Immigration Act and each case is considered on its merits.

4. In respect of all cases of release, communication is had with the Government of the United Kingdom, in order to ascertain that there does not appear reason, disclosed in the records available in the United Kingdom to question the bona fides of the person recommended for release.

WARTIME HOUSING—BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. REID:

1. How many houses have been constructed by Wartime Housing Limited in the province of British Columbia?

2. At what place or places were these constructed?

3. What has been the total cost of these houses, and the individual or average cost of each?

4. What valuation for sale has been placed on these houses, and does the price asked include the ground?

5. How many of these houses have been sold and on what terms?

6. Under whose direction were these houses constructed, and what firm or firms built them?

Mr. HOWE:

1. In process of construction—426.

2. North Vancouver—200. Prince Rupert—151. Esquimalt—75.

3. These projects are not completed and the following figures are estimates only. They include all accessory services such as sewers, water, walks, roadways, etc.

North Vancouver—Total, $599,395; average per house, $2,996.97.

Prince Rupert—Total, $516,468.75; average per house, $3,443.12.

Esquimalt—Total, $250,055; average per house, $3,334.06.

4. No valuation has been placed on the houses for sale.

5. None. The houses are not for sale.

6. Wartime Housing Limited, and the supervising architects for all projects are Messrs. McCarter & Nairne of Vancouver.

The houses are being built by: North Vancouver—Smith Bros. & Wilson of Vancouver; Prince Rupert—E. J. Ryan Construction Co. of Vancouver; Esquimalt—Bennet & White Construction Co. of Vancouver.

DISCONTINUANCE OF GOLD PRODUCTION

Mr. NICHOLSON:

Has the government negotiated with the governments of the United States and Great Britain with a view to discontinuing the production of gold for the duration of the war in order that men and materials now being used in gold production might be employed in other more essential industries?

Mr. McLARTY: No.

CANADIAN CONSUL AT ST. PIERRE-MIQUELON

Mr. LECLERC:

Does Mr. C. C. Eberts, Canadian consul at St. Pierre-Miquelon, speak French?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—EMPLOYMENT OF E. SAMPSON

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Was Mr. E. Sampson, Tuberose, Saskatchewan, employed under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act or the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, or in any capacity at any time, during the year 1941?

2. If so, how much salary, mileage and expenses was he paid in each or any of these employments?

3. Did he receive a crop failure bonus for the year 1941 on the south ½ of section 4, township 23, range 15, west of the 3M., or any other property?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Mr. E. Sampson was employed under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act from August 9th to December 31st, 1941, as an inspector.

2. Salary, $444.92; mileage, $425.74; Expenses, $83.60.

3. On the south ½ of section 4 and the southwest ¼ of section 9, township 23, range 15, west of the 3M., he received:

Under Prairie Farm Assistance Act....	$300
Under Prairie Farm Income.....	150
	$450

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—EMPLOYMENT OF R. WHALEN

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Was Mr. R. Whalen, Kyle, Saskatchewan, employed under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act or the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, or in any capacity at any time, during the year 1941?

2. If so, how much salary, mileage and expenses was he paid in each or any of these employments?

3. Did he receive a crop acreage bonus for the year 1941?

4. If so, how much?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Mr. R. H. Whelan, not R. Whalen, was employed under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act from April 17 to November 29, 1941, as an inspector.

2. Salary, $477.74; mileage, $414.90; expenses, $43.35.

3. Yes.

4.

Prairie Farm Assistance Act..	$196 50
Prairie Farm Income..	98 25
	$294 75

DECENNIAL CENSUS—EMPLOYMENT OF E. SAMPSON

Mr. COLDWELL:

1. Was Mr. E. Sampson, Tuberose, Saskatchewan, employed in taking the 1941 census?

2. If so, what total amount did he receive for this service?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. Yes.

2. $114.11.

GASOLINE PRICE INCREASE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. REID:

1. Was permission granted to the oil companies to raise the price of gasoline one cent per gallon in the province of British Columbia?

2. If so, what reasons were given for this increase at the present time, and in view of the fact that they were granted an increase in 1941?

3. Will part of this increase be passed on to the gas stations?

4. Have any applications been made by the oil companies for any increase in price on gasoline in any of the other provinces?

5. If not, what reasons were advanced by the oil companies for singling out British Columbia and compelling the people of that province to pay this further increase?

Mr. HOWE:

1. No permission has been granted to any oil company to raise the price of gasoline in the province of British Columbia since July 16, 1941. We have no information that the price has been raised. The increase of one cent per gallon of July 16, 1941, was common to every province in Canada.

2. There has been no increase granted since 1941.

3. Answered by 2.

4. No formal applications have been made in any of the other provinces for general increases in the price of gasoline since the price ceiling order of October 23, 1941.

5. Inasmuch as there has been no increase, the people of the province of British Columbia have not been singled out; on the contrary, there was an increase of one cent per gallon in October, 1941, in the provinces of Ontario, Quebec and the maritimes, but this increase did not apply to British Columbia or the prairie provinces.

SASKATCHEWAN AIR FIELDS—WATER SUPPLY

Mr. PERLEY:

1. What company, firm or individual had the contract or contracts for drilling wells and supplying water to the air fields and air training centres in the province of Saskatchewan?

2. What was the original price per foot for drilling wells and for gravel casings?

3. Was any of this work sub-let?

4. If so, to whom and at what price for such drilling and casing?

Mr. HOWE:

1. International Water Supply, Limited, London, Ontario. E. W. Rigsby, Regina, Sask. W. T. Cowley, Regina, Sask.

2. International Water Supply, Limited, not on the basis of a price per foot. The company was authorized to do preliminary test drilling at airports all through the prairie provinces. This work was done at a prearranged unit price of $2 per foot plus costs of transportation of drill-rigs and crews. On the basis of the results of test-drilling the contracts with International Water Supply were entered into with payment based on a unit price per gallon of water per minute actually produced. There were no unit prices per foot in their contracts. E. W. Rigsby, $15 per foot complete (for gravel wall well); W. T. Cowley, $18 per foot complete (for gravel wall well); E. W. Rigsby, $1.60 per foot (for 4-inch cased well).

3. Yes.

4. For test drilling only: H. D. Hadlund, $1.25 per foot; W. T. Cowley, $1.25 and $1.50; E. Rigsby, $1.25; R. E. Creelman, $1.25; Ward, $1.25.

The difference between the sub-contractors' rate and the contractor's rate is explained by the fact that the sub-contractors were supplied with well casing and miscellaneous equipment by the International Water Supply, Limited.

*"CAPTAINS OF THE CLOUDS"—VISIT OF MEMBERS OF R.C.A.F. TO NEW YORK

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. Who was responsible for the sending to New York recently of hundreds of members of the Royal Canadian Air Force to witness the premiere of a moving picture entitled Captains of the Clouds?

2. To what extent did the dominion treasury contribute to the cost of this expedition, including and covering the expenses of all other individuals who went from Ottawa to witness this premiere?

Mr. POWER: I should like to answer this question verbally. This picture, "Captains of the Clouds", deals largely with the joint air training scheme. It is a picture on which Warner Brothers have spent over $1,900,000. The Royal Canadian Air Force sent to the premiere in New York a band and a number of men who gave an exhibition in New York, partly in order to assist at the ceremonies of the premiere, but partly by way of reciprocity for what the United States government did in sending some hundreds of American troops here on a visit of friendship. All expenses were defrayed by Warner Brothers, with the exception of transportation to New York, which amounted to $5,739.04.

Mr. SPEAKER: Answered.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. PERLEY:

1. How many meetings were held by the advisory committee to the Canadian wheat board from July 1, 1941, to date?
2. Where were such meetings held and what subsistence allowances and travelling expenses were paid to each member attending these meetings?
3. Has the advisory committee made any recommendations to the wheat board with respect to prices and marketing 1942 crop?
4. If so, what are the said recommendations?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. Meetings held from July 31 to date—August 27, 1941; December 8 and 9, 1941; January 12, 13, and 14, 1942.
2. The August meeting was held in Calgary, and the other two meetings were held in Winnipeg.

	Honorarium	Subsistence	Travelling	Total
Campbell, D. A.	....	$140	$ 503 73	$ 643 73
Clendenning, F. H.	$150	150	121 90	421 90
Farnalls, Paul	160	160	169 20	489 20
Hutchinson, Lew	120	110	141 70	371 70
McCowan, J. A.	130	130	99 16	359 16
McKenzie, D. G.	30	30	50 45	110 45
Messier, R.	....	....	....	....
Pettypiece, Fred	150	150	354 35	654 35
Reece, R. C.	50	....	....	50 00
Reid, A. C.	....	30	90 30	120 30
Wesson, J. H.	80	80	119 85	279 85
	$870	$980	$1,650 64	$3,500 64

3 and 4. Matter of government policy, not considered in the public interest.

DECENNIAL CENSUS

Mr. HAZEN:

1. How much money has the government spent to date in taking the census?
2. How much money has the government spent to date in each province in taking the census?

Mr. MACKINNON (Edmonton West):

1. The amount spent to January 31, 1942, on account of 1941 census is $2,130,215.
2. No record of amount spent in each province.

STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIERE, QUE., FISHERIES SCHOOL

Mr. ROY:

1. Has the government received representations from the provincial government of Quebec, through the Minister of Fisheries or any other person, recommending the withdrawal of federal grant from the fisheries school at Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere?
2. If so, on what date were such representations received and what action has the government taken thereon?

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

LANCASTER MILITARY HOSPITAL

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What were the names of all employees, including medical and clerical staff, of Lancaster hospital, West Saint John, from the year 1919 to the year 1941?
2. What were their salaries per year and what were their pensions per year from 1919 to 1941?
3. Were any of these employees supplied with automobiles by the government? If so, how many and what are their names?
4. What were the prices of these automobiles?
5. What year were such automobiles purchased?
6. What was the cost of operating these cars from the date of purchase to the year 1941?
7. What year was Lancaster hospital opened as a military hospital?
8. What was the total cost of the Lancaster hospital since its opening as a military hospital to the year 1941?

9. What was the cost of all repairs to Lancaster hospital since its opening as a military hospital to the year 1941?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I regret that it is not possible to answer this question for the period it covers. I should be glad to notify my hon. friend in regard to all information available in the department.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Let it stand. The hon. member who asked the question is not here to-day, but he will be present to-morrow. I will draw his attention to the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

NEW BRUNSWICK PENSION TRIBUNAL

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What are the names of all the employees of the pension tribunal which was formed in New Brunswick in 1930 and abolished in 1933?

2. What were their expenses, including travelling expenses, from the time the tribunal was established until it was abolished?

3. What compensation was paid to the members and employees of this tribunal when it was abolished in 1933?

4. Who was the pension advocate and what were his educational qualifications and his previous experience?

5. What previous pension experience had the members of the pension tribunal?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

1. No pension tribunal was formed in New Brunswick; the pension tribunal constituted under the authority of an act to amend the Pension Act, chapter 35 of the statutes of 1930, heard applications at convenient places throughout Canada.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Two pensions advocates of the veterans' bureau, appointed to prepare and present applications for pension appeared before the pension tribunal in New Brunswick between 1930 and 1933, namely:

(1) Lt.-Col. George Alex. Gamblin, M.C., V.D. Educational qualifications: public school; business college; diploma in accounting—no previous pension experience

(2) Major C. R. Mersereau. Educational qualifications: Chatham grammar school; Chatham high school; Mount Allison University, one year Arts; King's College law school. B.C.L. (1922)—no previous pension experience.

5. Answered by No. 1.

NATIONAL WAR SERVICES—H.N.M. STANBURY

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. Is H. N. M. Stanbury in the employment of the Department of National War Services?

[Mr. Hatfield.]

2. If so, what is his salary, what are his duties and what was his former occupation?

Mr. THORSON:

1. Yes.

2. (a) $2,880 per annum.

(b) To promote salvage organizations in communities where they do not exist, and to stimulate the conservation and collection of secondary material throughout the maritime provinces.

(c) Last position—Manager of the Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation and the Canada Permanent Trust Company.

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY—DOUGLAS LORIMER

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. Is Douglas Lorimer an employee of the Department of Munitions and Supply?

2. If so, what is his salary, what are his duties and what was his former occupation?

Mr. HOWE:

1. Yes; appointed by order in council No. 4996, July 10, 1941.

2. (a) Mr. Douglas Lorimer is on loan to the department by his firm, and receives no salary from the department. He is paid his actual out-of-pocket travelling expenses incurred by him in the exercise of his powers or discharge of his duties as Controller of Chemicals.

(b) To control, restrict and regulate the production, sale, distribution, consumption and use of chemicals which are, or are likely to be, or may be, necessary or useful for, or in connection with, the production, storage, transportation, and/or supply of munitions of war, or necessary or useful for the needs of the government or of the community in war, with a view to conserving the financial, material and other resources of Canada and facilitating the production of munitions of war and supplies essential for fulfilling the present and potential needs of Canada and her allies.

(c) Mr. Lorimer, prior to his appointment, was vice-president and managing director of May and Baker (Canada) Limited, which is the Canadian house of the international chemical firm of May and Baker Limited, Dagenham, England. Mr. Lorimer has been in the chemical business 45 years.

EMBARGO ON EXPORT OF PULPWOOD

Mr. HATFIELD:

What consideration, if any, has the government given to the exemption from the pulpwood export embargo, of pulpwood cut by farmers on farm property?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): There is no embargo on the export of pulp-

wood cut by farmers on farm property. The export of pulpwood is, however, under export control. Where farmers regularly exported in the past, they are allowed to continue to export normal quantities to the United States.

SHIPMENTS OF CERTIFIED SEED POTATOES TO SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. Did the Department of Agriculture prohibit the issuing of certificates of health on shipments of certified seed potatoes to any country in South America during the month of December, 1941?

2. If so, for what reason?

Mr. GARDINER: 1 and 2. The Department of Agriculture issued instructions to withhold certificates of health to cover the export of potatoes to Uruguay pending an investigation of arrangements with regard to shipping space.

WARTIME HOUSING—FOUNDATIONS AND CELLARS

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. Of what construction are the foundations of the houses built by Wartime Housing Limited?

2. Are cellars provided in these houses?

Mr. HOWE:

1. The houses are built on posts—usually of concrete. Where the cost is too great, wood cedar posts are used.

2. No.

PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Who is the protecting power so far as Canadian prisoners of war in Germany and Italy are concerned, as successor to the United States of America?

2. Has the United States been thanked for the splendid work they did in Germany, Italy and the occupied countries, in aid of British prisoners of war?

3. What neutral countries are available for this work in the future, and what arrangements, if any, have been made by the government, through Great Britain or otherwise, with the governments of the enemy countries for looking after and safeguarding the interests of our prisoners of war?

4. What power, in lieu of America, is now acting as our protecting power for the inspection of enemy war camps and repatriation of prisoners?

5. What friendly country is at present the protecting power in the case of Japan and the Canadians there who are prisoners of war in the Pacific and Far East, and is there any inspection of Japanese internment camps by a protecting power?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. The protecting power for Canadian interests in Germany and Italy is Switzerland. The responsibility of the Swiss authorities for the protection of Canadian interests in these countries includes the protection of all members of the Canadian forces taken prisoner by Germany and Italy.

2. The Canadian minister at Washington has expressed to the department of state the gratitude of the Canadian government for services rendered by the United States as the protecting power for Canadian interests in Germany and Italy and in territories occupied by Germany and Italy.

3. It is not possible to say what neutral countries might be available to serve as protecting powers for Canadian interests should further occasion arise. The Canadian government is and has been taking parallel action with the governments of the United Kingdom and of the other dominions for the protection of members of the Canadian forces taken prisoner by the enemy through the protecting powers for Canadian interests and through the International Red Cross Committee at Geneva. The specific arrangements made are those provided for by the International Prisoner of War Convention of 1929.

4. As stated in reply to question 1 Switzerland has assumed the protection of Canadian interests in Germany and Italy and German and Italian occupied territories. This responsibility includes the inspection of prisoner of war camps where Canadians are held and making arrangements for the exchange of sick and wounded prisoners of war. Argentina as the protecting power for Canadian interests in Japan and Manchuria exercises a similar responsibility there.

5. Argentina is the protecting power for Canadian interests in Japan and Manchuria. Switzerland is the protecting power for Canadian interests in occupied China. Up to the present, no reports have been received of inspections by representatives of the protecting power of internment camps in Japan and China where Canadians are detained.

CAR FERRY "PRINCE EDWARD"

Mr. McCULLOCH:

1. Are the boilers of the ice-breaking car ferry, *Prince Edward,* to be converted from coal burning to oil burners?

2. If so, who authorized such change?

3. What is the purpose?

4. Is oil as economical as coal?

5. Is oil as easily obtainable as coal in the section in which the car ferry operates?

Mr. CARDIN.

The Canadian National management have replied to this inquiry as follows:

1. Yes.

2. The Oil Controller on the recommendation of the railway management.

3. To provide more reliable and efficient operation.

4. Yes.

5. No difficulty is being experienced.

REPRESENTATION OF CANADA ON INTER-ALLIED WAR BOARDS

Mrs. NIELSEN:

1. Is the government taking measures to have representatives of Canada take seats upon all inter-empire and inter-allied boards, charged with responsibility for the strategic direction of the war and the production and allocation of munitions and war materials?

2. If so, who will represent Canada upon (a) the Chiefs of Staff board in Washington, (b) the Munitions Assignment board in Washington, (c) the Pacific council in London?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. This is a matter for consideration with the governments of the other nations concerned. Many factors, such as scope, functions and responsibilities, must be taken into account in each case.

Canadian interests in these matters are being given the closest attention.

2. See answer to No. 1.

FRONTENAC CREAMERIES—COLD STORAGE

Mr. AYLESWORTH:

1. What financial support, if any, was given by the government to the Frontenac Creameries of Kingston for the purpose of cold storage?

2. What financial guarantee was given by the Frontenac Creameries to the project?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Paid: 1940, $2,100.83; 1941, $980.39. Amounts to be paid, 1942, $560.22; 1943, $280.11; 1944, $280.11.

2. No information.

*CANADIAN NAVY

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Of the 350 ships or more that comprised the Canadian navy at the beginning of this year, how many were: (a) battleships, (b) cruisers, (c) aircraft carriers, (d) submarines, (e) destroyers, (f) corvettes, (g) mine sweepers, (h) patrol boats, (i) motor torpedo boats, (j) sloops, trawlers and other craft.

2. What is the total tonnage of the Canadian navy?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): I would ask my hon. friend to allow the question to be dropped from the order paper.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): On what grounds?

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped

[Mr. Cardin.]

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, no. I am not questioning the decision, but there must be a reason assigned. The minister cannot arbitrarily say "Question dropped".

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Has my hon. friend the leader of the opposition read the question?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): Does he insist that it be answered?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I did not say that. What I did say was that a reason should be given, and it is not open to the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services arbitrarily to say that a question shall be dropped; that is not within his jurisdiction.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): It is as much within my jurisdiction to say that it should be dropped as it is for the hon. gentleman opposite to say that it should not be dropped.

Mr. HOMUTH: He did not say that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): All that I ask is that reasons be given.

Mr. HOMUTH: We in this house still have some rights.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Not many, but a few.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No. I object to that.

FERTILIZER BONUS

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. Is the government paying a bonus on the fertilizer used in the production of spring wheat in eastern Canada?

2. If so, why is the government paying such bonus and at the same time paying a bonus in western Canada for summer-fallow rather than wheat?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Yes.

2. Spring wheat in eastern Canada is largely used for feed purposes, the supply of which has not been adequate for requirements. Assistance provided for summer-fallow for 1941 in western Canada was limited to wheat acreage reduction which was summer-fallowed.

TRANSFERS FROM ARMY TO AIR FORCE

Mr. CORMAN:

1. Can a young man in training at Halifax, under the National Resources Mobilization Act, enlist at Hamilton, Ontario, in the Royal Canadian Air Force, when home on leave?

2. If not, why not?

3. Are there any arrangements for such transfers in different military districts?

Mr. RALSTON:

1. No, except he make arrangements with the commanding officer of his unit and air force authorities before going on leave.

2. On transfer from army to air force a man must be medically examined, his army pay adjusted, uniform and equipment turned in and deficiencies accounted for by the soldier, and formalities of discharge from the army, including discharge certificate, completed. There must be liaison between the commanding officer of the soldier's unit and the air force recruiting officer. To adjust these matters satisfactorily the man should be at his training centre or unit. These arrangements can be made at Halifax before the man leaves, however, in which event it is possible for him to enlist at Hamilton.

3. Yes, under arrangement between army and air force, instructions have been issued and have been in operation for many months.

Every National Resources Mobilization Act soldier cannot enlist in the air force. During his first two months at the basic training centre an "R recruit" may freely enlist, and air force officers then may recruit these men at the centres. While at the advanced training centre, or on home defence service, the man cannot enlist in the air force unless he has made application therefor before commencing basic training, and the district officer commanding consents. After the man is made into a trained soldier and has become an integral part of an army he would not be allowed to transfer to the air force unless there were special reasons why it should be done.

CANADIAN FLAG

Mr. ROY:

1. Has the government reached a decision on the subject of the adoption of a distinctive national flag for Canada?

2. If so, what is that decision?

3. If not, what is the reason that Canada has not her own flag?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. No.

2. Answered by no. 1.

3. Matter is one still under consideration.

Mr. ROY:

1. Has the government declared war with other countries in 1939, 1940 and 1941, in the name of Canada as an autonomous country and independent of England?

2. If so, are our armies fighting under a Canadian flag?

3. If not, why have they not their own flag?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. It is substantially correct to say that Canada declared war with other countries in 1939, 1940 and 1941 as an autonomous country and independently of the United Kingdom. It would, perhaps, be more correct to say that, following upon the decision of the parliament of Canada, advice was tendered to His Majesty the King by the Prime Minister of Canada. Pursuant to this advice, His Majesty approved the issuing of proclamations in Canada in his name declaring the existence of a state of war with Canada in the following cases: (a) Germany, September 10, 1939; (b) Italy, June 10, 1940; (c) Hungary, Roumania and Finland, December 7, 1941; (d) Japan, December 7, 1941.

2. The Canadian armies do not fight under a Canadian flag as a national colour, as there is no flag lawfully authorized for general use. There are, however, divisional flags, the use of which is authorized for special purposes.

3. See answer to No. 2.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

ENLISTMENTS—RECORDS BY MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Will any change be made in the keeping of the records of his majesty's forces so as to enable a municipality, as in the last war, to know the names of its citizens who enlist?

2. How many men in his majesty's forces have enlisted, (a) for home defence; (b) for service anywhere?

Mr. McLARTY: Return tabled.

USE OF ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. What has been the apparent consumption in Canada for each of the years 1937-1941 inclusive, of: (a) spirits, (b) malt liquors, (c) wines?

2. Did delegates of church and temperance representations wait on the government in October, 1941?

3. If so, did the government express approval or disapproval of the representations made by the delegation?

4. What is the amount of the appropriation made by the Department of National War Services for the purpose of educational work to discourage the use of alcoholic liquors?

Mr. McLARTY: Return tabled.

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN DOMINION AND MUNICIPALITIES RESPECTING MUNICIPAL SERVICES

Mr. WINKLER:

1. What agreements or contracts has the government with municipalities other than with the corporation of the city of Ottawa for services usually provided by municipalities?

2. What valuation is placed on government real estate and buildings in the corporation of Ottawa?
3. What relation or proportion does this figure bear toward the municipal assessment of the corporation of Ottawa?

GRANTS FOR CADET SERVICES

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Will the government consider reestablishing grants to school boards or boards of education for cadet services and towards the cost of uniforms and instructions?
2. What was the prior policy?
3. What is the present policy?
4. Will any changes be considered so as to aid recruiting for the reserve army?
5. Were any requests for such grants received by the government?
6. If so, what action will be taken?

PRICE CEILING

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. How many manufacturing plants in Canada, if any, have closed down due to there being a price ceiling on manufactured goods and no such restriction on raw materials?
2. Is an import bonus being paid by authority of the Wartime Prices and Trade Board on any articles of food or manufactured goods?
3. If so, upon how many articles and what are they?
4. Is a bonus being paid on certain articles in Canada in order to keep their cost to the consumer below the price ceiling?
5. If so, on how many and what are they?

Mr. ILSLEY: Return tabled.

GOLDEN BALL GARAGE BUILDING, SAINT JOHN, N.B.

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Has part of the building known as the Golden Ball Garage, on the corner of Sydney and Union streets, in the city of Saint John, New Brunswick, been rented to the government?
2. If so, what part, from whom and at what rental?
3. When was it rented and for how long a period?

Mr. McLARTY: Return tabled.

DOMINION ARSENALS—MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. ROY:

1. What is the name of the doctor in Quebec whose duty it is to examine employees of both sexes working in the dominion arsenals at Quebec and at Valcartier?
2. Since the beginning of the war what salary has been paid to him monthly for examinations, or for treatment of such employees in case of accidents?
3. What is the total amount paid to him for expenses, salary or honoraria of all kinds?

Mr. HOWE: Return tabled.

CANADIAN ARMY PENSIONS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many soldiers have been returned from overseas since the beginning of the present war, (a) unfit for service; (b) unlikely to make satisfactory soldiers?
2. Of this number how many are still serving in the Canadian army?
3. Of those returned, (a) how many have applied for pensions; (b) how many have been held entitled thereto; (c) how many appeals have been taken against refusals to award pensions; (d) of these, how many (i) have been finally determined; (ii) how many still remain to be heard; (iii) in how many cases to date have appeals been allowed?
4. What is the total amount paid to date and since the outbreak of the present war for pensions for services in the present war?

WAR SAVINGS CAMPAIGN

Mr. CHURCH:

What is the breakdown of the sum of $1,244,129.11, which was spent on the war savings campaign to the end of 1941 with respect to, (a) salaries, (b) travelling expenses, (c) hotel expenses, (d) dinners and banquets, (e) entertainment, (f) billboards, (g) newspaper and magazine advertising, (h) radio, (i) local advertising and entertainment, and other publicity, (j) remuneration paid to personnel?

CANADIAN ARMY—TRAINING FOR OFFICER RANK

Mr. WHITE:

1. Is it the rule of the Department of National Defence that a person who never served in any army or graduated from the Royal Military College, and who now desires to join the armed forces with officer rank, must first join up as a private and serve in the ranks as such for several months before he will be put in training for officer rank?
2. Are there any exceptions or exemptions to this rule; and if there are, when were the exceptions and exemptions set up, to what classes of persons do they apply, in what parts of Canada are they being made effective, and what is the nature of the exceptions and exemptions and why are they set up?
3. Are there boards to select prospective young Canadians both English and French to take officer training without first serving in the ranks?
4. If there are any such boards who are the members of the various boards, what are the military qualifications of each member, when were the boards set up, and where are they located?
5. How many young men (a) English speaking, (b) French speaking have been selected by these boards to take officer training without first serving in the ranks?

Mr. RALSTON: Return tabled.

WAR SAVINGS CAMPAIGN—REVENUE AND COSTS

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. What amounts have been raised in each of the years, 1939, 1940 and 1941, through the sale of war savings certificates and stamps?
2. What was the expenditure incurred in connection with the sale of war savings certificates and stamps in each of the above years for (a) advertising and sales promotion, (b) printing certificates and stamps, (c) compilation of

statistics, (d) expenses of war finance publicity committee, (e) administrative expenses of nation committee, (f) travelling expenses, (g) telephone and telegraph messages, (h) postage and sundries, (i) expenses of provincial committees, (j) travelling expenses, (k) telephone and telegraph messages, (l) postage, (m) sundries?

GRANTS OR BONUSES TO NOVA SCOTIA FISHERY PRODUCTS

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. What sums have been paid out or were earned in Nova Scotia in each of the calendar years 1937 to 1941, inclusive, as grants or bonuses on, (a) dry cod, (b) pickled cod, (c) pickled herring, (d) pickled mackerel, (e) vinegar-cured herring?

2. What are the names of the persons or firms to whom grants or bonuses have been paid, or who have made claims for such grants or bonuses on vinegar-cured herring in the calendar years 1937 to 1941, inclusive, stating the amount paid or claimed by each person or firm for each year, and the quantity of fish in each case?

NEW GLASGOW, N.S. MILITARY TRAINING CENTRE

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

1. Did the Department of National Defence purchase or lease lands and buildings from the Standard Clay Products Limited, at or near New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, for the purpose of a military training centre?

2. If so, what sums have been paid or are payable up to December 31, 1941, to the Standard Clay Products Limited for such lands and buildings as, (a) purchase price, (b) rentals?

3. What has been the total cost to December 31, 1941, on account of such training centre for, (a) improvements to grounds, (b) repairs or improvements to buildings, (c) new buildings, (d) equipment and installations in buildings and on premises, (e) total costs?

4. Did the department enter into contracts with the Eastern Woodworkers for buildings or supplies in connection with the military training centre at New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, in 1940 and 1941?

5. If so, of what nature and to what value?

6. Did the department purchase lumber from the Eastern Woodworkers for such centre?

7. If so, what quantity and at what cost, during the years 1940 and 1941?

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—MONTREAL TERMINAL

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What was the total expenditure to December 31, 1941, in connection with the new Canadian National Railways station at Montreal, including excavation, building construction, furniture, furnishings, equipment of whatsoever nature, and also including rearrangement of tracks, yards and all other items incidental to the establishment of the new terminal, specifying, (a) expenditures by the government of Canada, (b) expenditures by the Canadian National Railways and subsidiaries?

2. What further estimated sums are required to complete the project?

3. What is the estimated completion date?

4. What is, (a) tonnage of steel delivered to December 31, 1941, in connection with the project, (b) estimated tonnage of steel required to complete the project over and above tonnage delivered to December 31, 1941?

5. Have municipalities been refused steel for, (a) street cars, (b) use in needed betterments of municipal public utilities and other municipal services that cannot be postponed till after the war?

6. What is the policy involved and decided on?

7. What municipalities were refused needed equipment as aforesaid?

8. Is the Canadian National Railways, a public utility, building new cars and other equipment and betterments, and is it securing equipment denied to municipal public utilities?

UPLANDS AIRPORT RAILWAY EXTENSION

Mr. REID:

1. Was an application made to the Board of Transport Commissioners by the Canadian Pacific Railway for permission to link up with the Canadian National Railways within Uplands airport?

2. Was the request granted?

3. If not, what were the reasons given for refusing the application made by the Canadian Pacific Railway?

4. What reasons were advanced by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Board of Transport Commissioners showing the need for duplication of railway services to Uplands airport?

5. What number of tons of steel were used by the Canadian Pacific Railway in the construction of a line of track from Prescott to Uplands?

H.M. FORCES—SALUTES

Mr. CHURCH:

What regulations are now contemplated with regard to the abolition of salutes by members of his majesty's forces when not on parade?

Mr. McLARTY: Return tabled.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE—WHEAT ACREAGE BONUS

Mr. PERLEY:

1. How many claims were made to the Department of Agriculture for the wheat acreage reduction bonus prior to January 31, 1942, in each of the three prairie provinces?

2. How many of such claims were (a) paid in full, (b) partly paid, (c) refused?

3. What amount was paid in each of the three prairie provinces in connection with such claims?

4. How many cheques were issued on the wheat acreage reduction bonus for (a) $1,000 to $5,000, (b) $5,000 to $10,000, (c) over $10,000?

5. How many awards were made under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act in each of the three prairie provinces and what was the total amount paid in each province?

6. How many farmers received payment under the prairie farm income in each of the three prairie provinces and how much was paid on same prior to January 31, 1942?

TRACADIE, N.B., ARTILLERY RANGE

Mr. GILLIS:

1. How many parcels of land have been expropriated by the Department of National Defence for the artillery range at Tracadie, New Brunswick?
2. From whom have they been acquired?
3. What price was paid for each parcel?
4. How many have not yet been settled for?
5. What amount of taxes, both for schools and municipal tax, including road tax, was due on each parcel?
6. How were these taxes settled for?
7. What amount of money was paid to Clovis P. Richard, M.L.A. (agent solicitor) for the Department of Justice, in searching the title, attending to the execution of the title deed, etc., for each parcel, showing detailed statement?
8. What was the method used in arriving at a value of the various lots comprised within the area?
9. Has any protest been filed by any one regarding the methods used to induce the settlers to hand over their properties to the department?
10. Have any of the settlers protested against the adjustment of the amounts offered them in settlement for their lands? If so, what are their names?
11. Have any of these persons offered their lands gratis for the purpose for which they have been acquired, for the duration of the war, rather than accept the offer made by the department? If so, what are their names?
12. What settlement was made with those who were living on lots approved by the government of New Brunswick, but for which no grants had been issued, and what amounts were paid in each case and by whom were these amounts paid?
13. By whom were the several parcels of land appraised?
14. Is this area in a French speaking community?
15. Did the appraisers sent to make agreements with the people for the sale of their lands speak French? If not, how was conversation carried on between the adjuster and the settler or owner of the land, and who acted as interpreter?
16. What amount of money was paid to him and what are details of his account, both as interpreter and as taxi driver for the adjuster?
17. How many of these lots are in Northumberland county (if any) and have any adjustments been made with the people living there?
18. Is it the intention of the department to extend this range? If so, in what direction will it be extended?
19. What amount of money was paid by way of adjustment, or compensation, to the commission in charge of the estate of George Dignard, how was the amount arrived at and how many lots of land were involved?
20. Have any houses been destroyed on lands that have not yet been settled for? If so, whose?

STE. ANNE DE LA POCATIERE, FISHERIES SCHOOL

Mr. ROY:

1. Has the government paid any grant directly or through the medium of the provincial government of Quebec to the fisheries school at Ste. Anne la Pocatiere, Quebec?
2. If so, for what amount and for what years?

Mr. MICHAUD: Return tabled.

B.C. DOG-FISH LIVERS AND FISH LIVER OILS

Mr. REID:

1. Who is the controller of dog-fish livers and fish liver oils for the province of British Columbia?
2. Under what department of government does such controller operate?
3. What position did he occupy before appointment to this office?
4. What salary does he receive?
5. Has the Department of Fisheries any control or jurisdiction over such controller?
6. Is the Department of Fisheries consulted by the controller in matters pertaining to the prices set by him?
7. What is the maximum price allowed fishermen in British Columbia for dog-fish and other fish livers?
8. Is any maximum price fixed on the fish liver oils processed and sold to the buyers or public by the manufacturers of these fish oils?
9. What price is being paid to United States fishermen for dog-fish and other fish livers?
10. What price is being charged by processers of fish liver oils to buyers in the United States?

BREN GUN—JOHN INGLIS PLANT

Mr. BRUCE:

1. What was the total amount of money expended by the government in building the necessary additions and repairs to the original John Inglis boiler plant to provide accommodation for the manufacture of Bren guns?
2. What amount of money did the government spend in providing new equipment for this plant?
3. What was the value of the old equipment transferred to this plant?

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES LIMITED

Mr. MARSHALL:

What amounts have been paid in each of the years, 1936 to 1941, inclusive, to International Business Machines Limited, for rental of business and accounting machines by the various departments of the dominion government?

WARTIME HOUSING LIMITED

Mr. NICHOLSON:

1. At what places in Canada have housing units and staff houses been built by Wartime Housing Limited, and how many are being constructed at each place?
2. How many houses were occupied at each place on January 31, 1942?
3. How many were residing in each staff house on January 31, 1942?
4. How many were employed at each staff house during January, 1942?
5. What rent is being charged for each house by Wartime Housing Limited?
6. In what centres have Wartime Housing Limited completed building houses and providing the necessary services?

7. What was the average cost per unit, including all services?

8. What was the total amount paid for the administration of Wartime Housing Limited up to January 31, 1942?

9. What experience did Victor T. Goggin have as an architect or builder, prior to being appointed general manager of Wartime Housing Limited?

WHEAT ACREAGE REDUCTION REGULATIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

1. What is the total amount paid to date under the wheat acreage reduction regulations, and what amount is still to be paid?

2. What is the total number of acres taken out of wheat production, (a) summer-fallow, (b) sown to coarse grains?

3. What is the total cost of supervising and administering payment of this bonus?

4. What are the names and addresses of persons who acted as supervisors and inspectors in the administration and payment of this bonus, and what amounts were paid to each by way of (a) salary, (b) expenses?

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE ACT—SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

1. What is the total amount paid under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act for the crop year 1941-42?

2. What is the total amount still to be paid for the crop year 1941-42?

3. What amount has been paid under section 3 of the act, and what amount under section 4?

4. What amount was paid in each of the prairie provinces?

5. What was the total cost of administration of the said crop during the crop year 1941-42?

6. What was the total amount received from the one per cent levy under the said act for the crop year 1941-42?

7. What are the names and addresses of the persons employed as inspectors and supervisors under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act in the province of Saskatchewan, and what amount was paid to each in (a) salary, (b) expenses?

INDIANS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. HANSON (Skeena):

1. What was the total Indian population in British Columbia at the 1941 census, (a) male, (b) female?

2. How many Indian agencies are there in British Columbia and what are their names and locations?

3. How many Indian schools are there in British Columbia?

4. How many hospitals are assisted by the Indian department in British Columbia and what are their names and locations?

5. What was the total expenditure for 1941 of each agency?

CANADIAN ARMY—CHAPLAINS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. How many chaplains are there in the Canadian army, (a) in Canada, (b) overseas?

2. How many (a) in Canada, (b) overseas are (1) Protestant, (2) Roman Catholic; (3) Jewish?

3. What is the unit or numerical basis, if any, whereby entitlement of the said religious faiths to appointment of a chaplain is determined?

4. How many chaplains are there in each of the following religious denominations, (a) Anglican; (b) United; (c) Presbyterian; (d) Baptist?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

SOLDIERS' DEPENDENTS—COST OF LIVING BONUS

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the government of Canada or any officer thereof and any other person or persons relating to the paying of a high cost of living bonus to dependents of those serving in His Majesty's forces.

CANADIAN FORCES—RELIGIOUS AFFILIATIONS

Mr. CHURCH:

For a return showing the number of officers and men serving in the active service forces of the army, navy and air force, with their religious affiliations as set out on their attestation papers.

Mr. RALSTON: With regard to this motion, I should prefer to give the enlistments rather than men serving, for the reasons already indicated to the house, so far as the army is concerned. Secondly, I am not in a position to give completely the religious affiliations of all men in the service. A compilation was made up until March or April, 1941, and we got from that the percentages of different religious affiliations at that time. I think the only thing we could do would be to use those percentages and estimate the enlistments in the same proportions for each of the denominations. With these reservations I have no objection to the motion.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister suggests that there would be an immense amount of work involved in examining every one?

Mr. POWER: So far as air is concerned, I shall not be in a position to give numbers but percentages.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. MARSHALL:

For a copy of all recommendations made to the Canadian Wheat Board or the government by the advisory committee of the wheat board for the year 1941-42 and the year 1942-43.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): Inasmuch as the recommendations are confidential, interdepartmental documents, I suggest that the motion be dropped.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I ask the minister whether they are interdepart-

mental documents? The wheat board is a body corporate, set up under statute. It is a wholly owned corporation in that sense. It is not a department of government, therefore I do not think that the minister's answer covers the position. He may hide behind some other reason, but not that one. Perhaps I should not use the word "hide." I withdraw that and say, take shelter.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): I think the explanation given does cover the point, but another reason for asking that the motion be dropped is that they do deal with matters of government policy and as such are privileged.

Motion dropped.

DELEGATION OF MINISTERIAL AUTHORITY

Mr. TUSTIN:

For a copy of all instruments or other documents signed by any minister of the crown purporting to delegate authority vested in such minister by any act of parliament, or otherwise, to a deputy minister or person holding the rank of deputy minister or any other official of the government.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): With regard to this motion, having regard to the explanation given by the Secretary of State, and particularly in view of the provisions of the Interpretation Act, which I have not read for a good many years, this may be dropped. I understand that the hon. member has written a letter indicating the information he wants.

Motion dropped.

SYDNEY, N.S., WARTIME HOUSING

Mr. GILLIS:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and other documents exchanged between the government of Nova Scotia, the city of Sydney, Nova Scotia and the Department of Munitions and Supply or any other department of the federal government, on the question of the desirability of Wartime Housing Limited, carrying out an emergency programme of wartime housing to care for the needs of the city of Sydney, Nova Scotia.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT BOARD—DISMISSAL OF W. H. WHITESIDE

Mr. SHAW:

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and other documents passing between the civil service commission, the Soldier Settlement Board of Canada and any person or persons from April, 1941, to date, having to do with the appointment of William Henry Whiteside, of Innisfail, Alberta, as field supervisor, soldier settlement, grade 1, and his subsequent dismissal.

Mr. CRERAR: I think it quite probable that all this correspondence can be brought down in the order asked for. I should like however to make a reservation. There might possibly be some correspondence of an interdepartmental kind which would be privileged, but with that reservation I have no objection to the order passing.

BAY ST. LAWRENCE, N.S., PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BLACK (Cumberland):

For a copy of all payrolls and accounts in connection with construction or repairs by the Department of Public Works, during months of August, September, October and November, 1941, to pier, breakwater or other public work at Bay St. Lawrence, Victoria county, Nova Scotia.

1941 VICTORY LOAN

Mr. CHURCH:

For a return showing a breakdown of the details given in a return, November 12, 1941, in connection with the sale of the 1941 Victory Loan, as follows:

Preparation and distribution of bonds		$ 363,921 86
Administration expenses:		
Salaries	$149,881 67	
Travelling expenses	285,038 37	
Stationery and office supplies	160,673 25	
Rental of office space	29,006 77	
Sundry expenses, including postage, telephone, telegraph, etc.	145,226 24	
		769,826 30
Publicity expenses:		
Newspaper and magazine advertising	476,677 00	
Posters, including billboard posters and posting	79,565 83	
Radio advertising	86,618 17	
Local advertising	160,888 13	
Other publicity	254,319 85	
		1,058,068 98
Commissions to individual canvassers on general subscriptions		1,551,713 80
Remuneration to banks, trust and loan companies—service fee for handling and delivering bonds		1,750,000 00
Remuneration to investment dealers and stockbrokers re pooled subscriptions		3,293,040 00
Total		$8,786,570 94

The said return to show the details of each of the main items set out aforesaid.

Mr. ILSLEY: I suggest that this stand until the mover is here. I have a few observations to make on the motion.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There is no objection to its standing, but we should like to get the information if possible.

Mr. ILSLEY: I will argue that at the time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motion stands.

NEW BRUNSWICK FISHERY REGULATIONS

Mr. HAZEN:

For a copy of all correspondence, written representations and reports made to the government and/or the Department of Fisheries dealing with the netting of fish in the non-tidal waters of the Saint John river during the five years prior to the passing of an order in council, on May 9, 1940, which is now embodied in section 9 of the special fishing regulations for New Brunswick.

DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS—AIR RAID PRECAUTIONS

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all orders in council, reports and other documents in the possession of the government relative to the Defence of Canada Regulations. Also a copy of all correspondence exchanged with the provinces relative to the enforcement of blackouts, covered by section 35 of the Defence of Canada Rules and Regulations, as well as a copy of the order in council delegating this authority to provincial attorneys-general instead of to the district military authorities.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With respect to this motion, I think it will be recognized at once that to try to meet its request would involve an infinite amount of search in the departments for reports and documents and also much time and expense in copying the same. The motion asks "for a copy of all orders in council, reports and other documents in the possession of the government relative to the defence of Canada regulations." There is a very large amount of correspondence on that subject. The orders in council themselves have already been tabled. If the hon. member would indicate in a specific way the particular reports he has in mind, it might be possible to meet the request. As regards the rest of the order, I think it should be said that there may be some correspondence which it would not be in the public interest to disclose and in that event it would not be brought down. So far as the remainder of the correspondence is concerned, there can be no exception to bringing it down.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think there is a good deal in what the Prime Minister says, especially with reference to the first part. I suggest that the motion be allowed to stand. The hon. member will be here probably this afternoon and he will see what the Prime Minister has said.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motion stands.

CANADIAN ARMY (RESERVE)—ATTESTATIONS FOR OVERSEAS SERVICE

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West):

For a return showing the number of men called up for either 30-day or 4-month training pursuant to the National Resources Mobilization Act who enlisted and were attested for overseas service in any branch of the armed forces during each month since October, 1940.

WEYBURN, SASK., AIRPORT

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

For a copy of all contracts and agreements entered into by the Canadian government and any person or persons in connection with the acquiring of the site and the construction of the airport at Weyburn, Saskatchewan.

SHIPPEGAN, N.B., PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. HAZEN:

For a copy of all payrolls, vouchers and accounts in connection with construction and/or repairs by the Department of Public Works during the months of August to December, 1941, inclusive of (a) Shippegan wharf, and (b) Shippegan gully breakwater, in the county of Gloucester, New Brunswick.

INTERNMENTS

REPRESENTATIONS OF DELEGATION FROM CIVIL LIBERTIES ASSOCIATION

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to direct a question to the Prime Minister. According to a press report appearing in Saturday's papers a delegation from the Civil Liberties Association of Toronto—Toronto, of all places—headed by Mr. B. K. Sandwell, who was also designated as leading spokesman for the delegation, presented on Friday last to the Prime Minister and a group of cabinet ministers a memorandum urging, among other things, open trials in all cases for internees and those charged under the defence of Canada regulations, and that certain classes, I think including trade unions, be given representation on tribunals sitting on cases other than open trials. The report further states that Mr. Sandwell told newspaper men after the two hour hearing that the Prime Minister had expressed "entire sympathy" and given the delegation to understand that action would follow.

I now ask the Prime Minister if this report is in substance true; if he did express himself as being in "entire sympathy" with the request of this delegation, and what changes in policy have been promised, having in mind the statements of policy enunciated from time to time by the late Minister of Justice, based I think largely on the reports of the special committee of this house, and followed in practice up to this time.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The report is quite correct when it states that I was in entire sympathy with the representations made. Those representations will receive the consideration of

the Department of Justice. The extent to which they may be acted upon will be made known in due course.

TAXATION

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING AGREEMENTS WITH PROVINCES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I have a question I wish to ask the Minister of Finance. Will he be good enough to lay on the table of the house as soon as possible all correspondence with the provinces in regard to the dominion-provincial agreements? I recall that some months ago at my request some correspondence was tabled, but it was sparse and unimportant. Three weeks ago to-day, on February 2, an order for return requiring the production of all this correspondence was passed on the motion of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross). I understand that all the provinces with one exception have signed the appropriate agreement—

Mr. ILSLEY: No.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then I misunderstood the minister's statement. I am led to believe that there is a substantial volume of correspondence which in the public interest should be made public. At all events I request that such correspondence as has not already been brought down be tabled as soon as possible. May I add as an additional reason that validating legislation is now before the legislature of New Brunswick and it is important that the correspondence with that province at least should be made public immediately.

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I think I shall be able to lay that on the table to-morrow. Such at any rate is my intention.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

KIRKLAND LAKE MINERS—QUESTION OF DISCRIMINATION AND PRESERVATION OF SENIORITY RIGHTS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Labour. I sent a copy of it to the Secretary of State, not knowing that the Minister of Labour would be in his seat to-day. It arises out of a telegram received this morning from one of the officials of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers' union of Kirkland Lake, a copy of which I understand is in the hands of the Minister of Labour.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

My information is that a formula was worked out between the Department of Labour, the union and the operators, to the effect that on termination of the strike the men were to return to work without discrimination, and that the rule of seniority would be observed as far as possible. This understanding is not being lived up to by the operators. Rank discrimination is being practised, and an intolerable situation is developing. In view of the fact that the Department of Labour negotiated the return to work and is a party to that agreement, what is the Department of Labour doing to see that the terms of the agreement are being enforced?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The fact is that the strikers returned to work in greater numbers than could be absorbed by the mines. In view of the departure of several hundred miners from the area during the strike, and the consequent reduction in employment available for surface workers, the men returned unconditionally without intervention by the Department of Labour. A delegation of miners did wait on the Acting Minister of Labour (Mr. McLarty) and asked that the department should seek to have the men reemployed without discrimination. On February 14 the department sent the following telegram to Mr. Robert Bryce, president of Macassa Mines and chairman of the operators' committee:

> Minister of Labour has been asked to request the Kirkland Lake mining companies that as men return to work they be reemployed without discrimination and that seniority rights be respected. Minister would appreciate a statement in reply.

On February 16 Mr. Bryce sent the following telegram in reply:

> As the reopening of various sections of the mines permits the procedure outlined in your telegram to me being followed as closely as possible having due and proper regard for the efficiency and safety of the operations.

Representations contained in the telegram from Mr. James Rankin, vice-president of the Kirkland Lake local, have been referred by the departmental officials to the mining authorities, and when further information is available I shall be glad to give it to my hon. friend.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN AMHERST, N.S., FOR LACK OF REROLLING MATERIAL

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): On February 18 last I inquired of the Minister of Munitions and Supply as to the laying off of 150 men at the rolling mills of the Canada Car and Foundry company at

Amherst, Nova Scotia, owing to the shortage of material. At that time I was informed that there was material available. The minister's reply was to the effect that he did not have sufficient information to answer the question at the moment but would make further inquiries. Is the minister now in a position to give the house further information?

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): I made inquiries, Mr. Speaker, as I promised, and I find the situation is that the raw material for this mill is used rail from the railways. The fact of the matter is that the railways are so hard pressed for rail at the present time that they are not able to offer rail for sale; and so far as my officers are concerned, they know of no alternative source of supply.

AIRPORTS

USE OF CANADIAN FACILITIES IN FLYING UNITED STATES AIRCRAFT TO ALASKA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): I wish to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence for Air. I am sorry I was unable to send more promptly to his office notice of the purport of my question, but if he is not prepared to answer to-day it will be quite all right.

A few nights ago hon. members may have listened to a broadcast from Chicago during the course of which the broadcaster took strong exception to the remarks of the premier of Ontario with reference to the United States navy, and then asked a question. Apparently the broadcaster was unfamiliar with the political set-up of the provinces under which the provinces have separate jurisdiction and the dominion government has complete control over air transport. Not knowing that, he said, in effect: I ask Mr. Hepburn why his government prevents the flying of United States bombers via Edmonton, Grande Prairie, Fort St. John, Watson Lake and White Horse on their way to Fairbank, Alaska.

I was up there last year so I know something about some of these air fields. I would ask the minister if the broadcaster was correct in his statement. I understand the United States have authority to send their bombers by that route.

Hon. C. G. POWER (Minister of National Defence for Air): I am very glad to say that the United States army air force, and I think the navy air force, have been constantly, particularly within the last few weeks, sending bombers and other aircraft up to Alaska through the facilities built last year by the Canadian government.

QUESTION AS TO DEFENCE MEASURES IN STRATEGIC AREAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, on February 6 I asked the Minister of National Defence what steps if any were being taken to protect the airports in the Yukon and northern British Columbia. At that time the minister told me he would consult with the Minister of National Defence for Air. I repeated the question on February 11, and at that time the minister said, at page 499 of *Hansard:*

> My hon. friend knows, as I spoke to him personally, that the matter is at present under discussion between the Minister of National Defence for Air and myself and the chiefs of staff.

That was twelve days ago and we have heard nothing since. If there is any reason why the answer should not be given or why I should not know whether or not the airports are being defended, well and good; but I had a communication to-day from a resident of a town near one of these airports, perhaps the most important of them, who said that following a meeting of the citizens they had communicated with the officer commanding military district No. 11, which includes the Yukon, whose reply was that it had been ruled that the Yukon was not in the defence area. I do not know whether the Japanese would be kept out by that ruling; I doubt if they would. These airports certainly are worth defending, because the government has spent millions of dollars on them and they are being used both by Canada and by the United States. Many United States bombers are making use of those airports day in and day out, on their way north, and they should be protected.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): In the first place I can say to my hon. friend that the matter has been completely overlooked by me, or I would have called him up, as I did previously when I asked him to allow me to consult the chiefs of staff. I have not had a report as yet; but if I may anticipate the session to-morrow I can say to him now that already there is a blanket defence of these aerodromes. My hon. friend realizes that you do not always defend aerodromes by immediate local garrisons; but apart from that, I shall have a report from the chief of staff and will deal directly with my hon. friend.

WAR INDUSTRIES

WORKING HOURS IN PLANTS PRODUCING WAR SUPPLIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. E. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). I am sorry I did not send him in advance a copy of the question but I did not know that he was going to be in the house to-day.

On February 2, I asked the Acting Minister of Labour a question in regard to the working of our factories in Canada which are producing war supplies. I sought to find out how many factories were working full time and how many were working only part time. The acting minister at that time informed me in effect that he did not know but that there were negotiations being carried on between the dominion and the provinces to find out how many factories were really working full time. The office of the director of public information has released a publication, the weekly bulletin for the United States newspapers, of February 11 and 17, 1942, volume 2, No. 7, at page 3 of which I find the following:

> Every aircraft plant in Canada is booked solid at least until the end of 1943; some into 1944, and even 1945.

I should like the minister to tell me which of these statements is correct, and if he would kindly give me the correct answer to the question I asked the acting Minister of Labour on February 2. I should like to know if this statement is true.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The hon. gentleman, of course, said he did not give me notice of his question.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): That is right.

Mr. MITCHELL: It is a little too much to expect that at such short notice I should know how many factories are working on full time, how many on part time and how many on what is called short time, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that if the information can be obtained I will get it for him.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Is this statement true, as issued by the director of public information?

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): It is not true?

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not know; I have not read it.

[Mr. Ralston.]

AIRGRAPH SERVICE

POSSIBILITY OF EXTENSION OF DELIVERY TO OVERSEAS TROOPS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. W. P. MULOCK (Postmaster General): On Thursday last the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) asked a question with regard to the extension of airgraph service to our men serving in the middle east.

Representations have been made to the United Kingdom postal authorities respecting the use of the airgraph service from Canada to members of the armed forces in the middle east. Airgraph messages received, intended for the middle east, at present are sent on the original message form by air to the United Kingdom, where the messages are photographed and transmitted to destination through the medium of the British airgraph system.

When there are sufficient messages daily from Canada to the middle east to justify a separate film daily for the middle east, items will then be photographed in Canada and the film sent to destination via the United Kingdom or such other air route as may be more expeditious. Messages will be delivered at destination through the medium of the British airgraph system.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE WITH RESPECT TO HOLDING OF SECRET SESSION

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last the house decided that to-morrow a secret session would be held. At the time I made a brief announcement as to the procedure that it was intended we would follow at the secret session. One phase of that procedure would be the resolving of the house into committee of the whole in order to permit of greater freedom of discussion on the matters which may be before the house. In order that we may follow the regular procedure of the ordinary sittings of the house, I think it would be advisable that an item relating to war or defence should be before the committee. I think also that it would be more appropriate we should resolve ourselves into committee of supply in an open session, in order to have an item before the committee, than to reserve that procedure for to-morrow when proceedings will be in secret.

In the circumstances I was going to ask hon. members, seeing that I had not given notice on Friday of an intention to move the house into committee of supply to-day, if

they would agree to my calling the first item on the order paper to-day, in order that we may immediately resolve the house into committee of supply and, in committee, to have one item called. This would not be for the purpose of discussion of the item in committee but simply for the purpose of having before the committee at a later stage an item that might, with the consent of the committee, be regarded as broad enough to enable its members to discuss generally matters relating to the war.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I should think there could be no objection to the course indicated by the Prime Minister, and we shall be glad to consent.

Mr. COLDWELL: We have no objection to the Prime Minister's suggestion.

Mr. BLACKMORE: There is no objection on our part.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Fournier (Hull) in the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, looking through the items, I observe that all those relating to defence or war services are specified as "other than war appropriations." It will be recalled, of course, that the defence items appear in the war appropriation bill. In the circumstances I think the most appropriate item to call would be No. 206 under the Department of Pensions and National Health, at page 27 of the estimates, "European war pensions." The European war would be broad enough, I should think, to cover what we have in mind, though to-day the war has become a world war instead of a European war.

PENSIONS AND NATIONAL HEALTH

206. European war pensions, $38,000,000.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

PLEBISCITE ACT

PROVISION FOR TAKING OF VOTES ON ANY QUESTION SUBMITTED BY WAY PLEBISCITE

The house resumed from Friday, February 20, consideration of the motion of Mr. McLarty:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure respecting the taking of the votes of the qualified voters on any question submitted by way of plebiscite and for such purposes to make provision for the printing and publication of a plebiscite act and instructions issued thereunder, the preparation of voters' lists and other plebiscite documents, including forms and ballot papers, to provide for the fees, allowances, expenses or other remuneration of certain officials and employees.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, when the house adjourned on Friday last I had been speaking on the underlying principle of the resolution, and I then registered my firm opposition to it. I shall not repeat those observations to-day.

We, sitting on this side of Your Honour, while registering our firm disapproval, will now seek to analyse as judicially as possible the detailed proposals with a view to improving them. We shall examine the government's detailed proposals in as cool and dispassionate a manner as possible, and not as partisans. We shall seek to offer to the government that constructive criticism which has been our constant objective in all aspects of the war programme.

There are however a number of questions which I believe should be answered by the government at this stage of the discussion.

An hon. MEMBER: Louder.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Did I hear someone say "louder"?

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, I cannot face all parts of the house. I have only one face, and I believe I should speak to the Chair. However I shall do the best I can to have hon. members hear me.

I first ask the government to give the house and country a straightforward pronouncement indicating what action they will take if the plebiscite is decided in the affirmative. I think we have the right to know that, and I say the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) owes it to the country to tell it that much. Up to date he has studiously avoided giving any indication of the government's proposals. I tell him now, as I told him before, that that is not good enough, and that the people of Canada expect something more.

The Prime Minister has at his disposal all the facts of the situation. He is in a position to forecast the future requirements of our forces, and the means by which it will be necessary to raise them. We have not that information. We are entitled to those facts, and to a government pronouncement concerning them.

I therefore put this direct question to the Prime Minister: If and when he is released from his past commitments, what action has he in view? I request an answer to that

question. Surely he must be in a position to tell that to the house and country. Does he not think the people of Canada are entitled to know what his intentions are, before they vote on the plebiscite? Unless the people know his intentions they will be voting blindly, voting to give him a blank cheque. What direction or leadership is there in that procedure? What enlightenment have the people of Canada received from the Prime Minister as to why they should vote yea or nay?

Further, I believe the Prime Minister should tell the house and country what he will do if the result of the plebiscite is indecisive—that is, if there should be a very small majority in favour of releasing him from his commitments, or a small majority the other way. Will he take the attitude of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, at the time of the temperance plebiscite, and say that a small majority does not give him a mandate to proceed with his proposals, notwithstanding the fact that the enemy may be knocking at our doors?

Last night I listened to a radio broadcast. With some of it I agreed, and with some I did not agree. It was an address by Professor Thompson of Manitoba university. Among other things he said that the week Singapore fell was the blackest week in a whole century. I agreed with that. Yet here we are, twiddling about a plebiscite to release the Prime Minister.

I place this question before him: Suppose that only fifty per cent of the qualified electors cast a ballot on this plebiscite, and as a result only twenty-seven per cent or thirty per cent of the total electorate favour the release of the government from its past commitments—and that may well happen—what will the Prime Minister do? I have known of general elections in my own constituency where not more than sixty per cent of the people voted, and I fear that is what will happen in the present instance. How will the government interpret a vote of, we will say, twenty-seven per cent of the total electorate?

These are questions which naturally arise in the minds of all of us. Here is another situation which I can visualize, and which may very well happen—and I wonder if the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) would be good enough to lower his voice. If he is going to talk in this chamber while an hon. member is on his feet, then I suggest he should lower his voice, or leave the chamber. I cannot continue if the minister continues his talking too. Only one of us can talk at a time.

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

Mr. HOWE: I am talking to one of your supporters.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): My supporter is a very reasonable man, and usually the minister is too. But it is very disquieting to have to hear the minister, even if he is talking to a gentleman as high placed in my affections as the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Black), when I am trying to make a reasoned argument.

Here is another question I put to the Prime Minister: What will happen if the plebiscite carries by a large majority in seven or eight provinces, and is defeated in one or two? How will the Prime Minister interpret that result? Will he feel at liberty to proceed with his proposals—if he has any to make—or will those proposals be abandoned? That is something about which we should be informed. The house and country are entitled to know the answers to these questions.

Then, I put this further question to the Prime Minister: If there is a large majority, a substantial majority or, indeed, any majority, against the release of the Prime Minister from his commitments, what will he do then? Will he interpret this result to mean that his government has no mandate to defend Canada, the empire and the whole family of allied nations, to the last man and the last dollar?—and it may well come to that. Or will he interpret it to mean that his government has lost the confidence of the people? What will he do in these circumstances?

These are questions which are bothering the Canadian people and, I am sure, bothering hon. members in the house, even those who blindly follow the administration.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, some of them blindly follow the administration; and when I say that I do not believe I am putting the case too strongly.

Mr. HOMUTH: They never had their eyes opened.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If one were to recall the adulation heaped upon the Prime Minister by some of his followers in the country, one would think that he was omnipotent. I should think that the Prime Minister if he had any—I shall not use the word I might use—I should think he would be revolted by such adulation as I have heard coming from hon. members opposite. To me it would be most embarrassing. The Prime Minister would be the first man to admit that he is only human, and that he has as many

imperfections as most of us. I say that hon. members opposite blindly follow their leader, without any why or wherefore.

An hon. MEMBER: So do the people.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): So much the worse for the people, then.

Mr. ROWE: You have not talked to them all yet.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): A reasoned and informed public opinion in Canada is something that we want. I am afraid throughout the country there is too much blind complacency—the blind following the blind. There is a lot of it. Public opinion in Canada needs an awakening to the true position of affairs. They are beginning to awaken on the east coast. Where are the two members for Halifax? Where are they to-day? We may hear from them to-morrow. They have been called down by their constituents, and the question of the defence of the east coast is being put up to these two hon. gentlemen, not by any partisan committee, but by the people of Halifax, who know that it is not possible to guarantee the defence of their fair city. They are alarmed about it.

Mr. KINLEY: They are better off than in other parts of the province.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I daresay they are, but that does not mean much. I do not mean to be an alarmist. I do not believe the people of Halifax are in immediate danger of invasion. I should think that invasion of the east coast of Canada is one of the most remote possibilities, although the escape of the German battleships from Brest is a menace to the Atlantic coast. There is a certain amount of danger of a sporadic attack on the city of Halifax, as there is on the city of Vancouver.

An hon. MEMBER: And on Port Darwin.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Port Darwin is nearer to the Japanese forces. But a sporadic attack on our coasts is a possibility. Therefore I think the people of this country have a right to know what are the government's proposals in a given case. I have instanced three or four of them, and I ask the Prime Minister to tell, when he comes to speak on this resolution, if he does, what the government are going to do about these things. Will he tell the people what will be done in certain eventualities? Or are the people to be content to follow blindly, trusting in the Prime Minister—trusting in the Prime Minister whose aim, as long as I can remember, has been to assume and continue to hold political power. That has been the chief ambition of my right hon. friend all through his lifetime. If you do not believe me, I call to your attention a book which has recently appeared in this country, written by Mr. Bruce Hutchison. Read what he says—and he is not an unfriendly critic of the Prime Minister.

An hon. MEMBER: He is no authority.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not even know the gentleman except to see him, but I would think he is a student of public affairs and of Canadian political history. I commend to hon. gentlemen the reading of that book, and if I can help sell a few copies for him, so much the better.

There is another question I want to ask the government. What will be the attitude of the Prime Minister and of his cabinet colleagues while the plebiscite campaign is proceeding? Will they campaign for a favourable vote, or will they campaign against releasing the government from its obligations? Both questions are pertinent having regard to what must be the division in public opinion in certain quarters in this country.

An hon. MEMBER: What will the leader of the opposition do?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am going to tell you before I am through. I am not entitled to be put on the spot at this moment, but I am going to be frank. I am going to tell the people of this country and the Conservative party that they should vote yes, without any question. Then, if the Prime Minister and the government do not proceed, we will turn on the heat just as strong as we can, so that this country shall have an all-out war effort.

What will the government do while the plebiscite campaign is proceeding? I ask again these two questions: Will they campaign to release the government? Will they campaign to defeat the object of the plebiscite? What will the Minister of Transport (Mr. Cardin) do? I ask him now, where is he going to be on this plebiscite?

Mr. CARDIN: I have no hesitation in answering my hon. friend. I find it extraordinary that he should ask such a question of me. I am a member of the government and I stand with the government. If I were not taking that attitude I would not be entitled to the position I hold in the government.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have not understood yet what the minister's attitude is.

Mr. CARDIN: It is very clear.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If I interpret the minister correctly, he is going out to campaign to release the government from its pledge?

Mr. CARDIN: Certainly.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And then what will he do, if the government is released?

Mr. CARDIN: As much as my hon. friend will do.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): As much as I will do? The minister knows exactly where I stand in regard to releasing the government. I have stated my position. But if the government are released, then what? Where will the Minister of Transport be then?

Will the Prime Minister and his colleagues address meetings and give radio broadcasts during the campaign? What opportunity will be provided for leaders and representatives of other parties in this house, and other bodies of public opinion in this country, to express their views over the national radio network?

Mr. HOWE: Is the hon. member going to oppose it?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister evidently was not listening. He is not informed; he is not up to date. What opportunity, I ask, will be provided for the leaders of other parties in this country and other bodies of public opinion to express their views over the radio, free of charge, just as the government does? That is a pertinent question, and I desire to press it. What facilities will be afforded to me to tell the people of Canada over the radio, when the time arrives, what I think they ought to do? This is a question which I think should be answered while the resolution is still under discussion and before the bill is introduced. That is all I have to ask the Prime Minister at the moment, but some other questions may occur to me as I go along.

The Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty) estimated that the cost of the plebiscite would be one and a half million dollars. I am going to ask him to give us a break-down of that amount when we get into committee, and I give him notice now. I fear it will be very much more than a million and a half dollars—and it will be a million and a half dollars of the taxpayers' money which will be absolutely wasted unless we have some assurance that the government will act on the plebiscite vote.

When will the plebiscite be held? I think we ought to have more specific information on that point. Time, I suggest, is an all-important factor, and under conditions as they exist to-day, if the plebiscite must be taken, I urge that it be taken at the earliest possible day.

I welcome the announcement that all soldiers, including those who are under twenty-one years of age, will be allowed to vote. I ask the Secretary of State this question: I assume that the vote will be taken under the jurisdiction of his department?

Mr. McLARTY: Under the chief electoral officer.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): To whom does he report?

Mr. McLARTY: The Secretary of State is only a contact point between him and the government.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): He is the man to direct the vote. There must be somebody here as spokesman of the chief electoral officer, and I am taking it for granted that the Secretary of State is that spokesman; therefore I am asking him to give us some information as to how the vote will be taken in England. What arrangements will be made to take the votes of airmen and others who are in far distant theatres of war such as Libya and Burma? They are entitled to vote, just as much as a soldier in Newfoundland.

I come to another important proposition. If the plebiscite is carried in the affirmative, will the Prime Minister bring his detailed proposals, if any, for increased effort as regards the mobilization of man-power—I am for the moment limiting it to that, but it need not necessarily be so limited, it should probably cover the whole gamut of mobilization, not only of man-power but of wealth and material resources—to the House of Commons, where they may be passed upon, and where they ought to be passed upon? Or will he merely seek the repeal of section 3, the limiting clause of the mobilization act, and then institute his policies by order in council? If this is to be done by order in council, I object. Whatever may have been said of the Military Service Act of 1917, the proposals were brought down to parliament and they were debated here and they were improved here. That is the only democratic way of doing it. In other words, will the Prime Minister interpret an affirmative result as giving the government a free hand, or merely as giving parliament a free hand? There is a distinction between the two. In my view any proposals which may follow the plebiscite should be brought down to this house and passed in the form of legislation, so that the people's representatives may have something to say about them.

I believe there is a terrible sense of frustration on the part of private members of this house. They have not a word to say about this question of mobilizing man-power, wealth or material resources. Why, they are not even rubber stamps, because all these things are done by order in council, and they never know a word about anything—good, bad, or indifferent—until it is all over.

Mr. McDONALD (Pontiac): What a hero!

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, if the hon. member has courage enough to stand up and make his interjection, let him make it.

Mr. McDONALD (Pontiac): Quite a hero!

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, I never posed as a hero, but I have never been a rubber stamp, and I never will be.

I suggest to the Prime Minister that to institute by order in council any elaborate scheme of compulsory service of man-power or of mobilization of resources and wealth would be quite improper, no matter how extensive may be the powers of the governor in council in that respect.

I now desire to make a few brief observations on the concrete proposals as indicated by the Secretary of State.

The modus operandi is to be governed not so much by legislation as by the regulations authorized by the legislation. I believe that is a correct interpretation of what he had to say. Now our ordinary election law is fully covered by the Dominion Elections Act, and I want to point out to the minister and to hon. members that the regulations passed under that act, speaking generally, are interpretative, not legislative. Under this proposed act the regulations will not be interpretative; they will be legislative. Is that not a correct statement, and does it not accurately interpret the minister's position? If that be true, I think, it is wrong in principle and it is derogating from the powers of this parliament that we should delegate by this bill of ten sections power to legislate by order in council. God knows we have had enough of that in this country. This is not a war matter. It is not something which is being dealt with under the War Measures Act. It is being dealt with by parliament up to a limited point. Why should any legislative functions be left to the governor in council to be passed under regulation? I put that question to hon. gentlemen, and to the minister. Is it too much to ask that the policy of the law be changed to conform to that of the Dominion Elections Act? That is all I am asking for. It is a matter of principle. I ask the minister to take that into consideration. If, however, the government is to go on and legislate by regulation, then I do suggest to the members of this committee which is to be, that they will have to exercise the greatest possible care in framing the regulations, and I express the hope that the committee will examine them very carefully.

I was glad to learn—I think I am correct in this assumption—that the regulations as drafted to date are not immutable. I believe the minister used that very word. Otherwise there could not be any point in referring them to a committee. We have that assurance, that they are subject to review, and I hope that review will be given to them by this committee. But let not the Secretary of State lose sight for one moment of the point I have just raised, that under the elections act the regulations are interpretative, not legislative; under the proposed act they are legislative and not specially interpretative—and that, I think, is wrong. To my mind it is a defect in the bill.

Until we have the detailed provisions of the bill I do not wish to comment on the question of qualification and disqualification of voters. That is a matter which has often been the subject of debate in this house. There are particular situations which will have to be dealt with with great care; there are certain people who ought to vote, and certain people who ought not to vote. At this moment I am going to make just one suggestion to the minister in the utmost good faith, and based, I think, on principle. In August, 1940, we had a national registration, when our population, male and female, above the age of sixteen years were all required to register. By the way, that registration cost something like $900,000—quite a substantial sum. I wonder if we have had value received for it.

Mr. LOCKHART: The work was mostly voluntary.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And, a good deal of the work was done voluntarily, as I am reminded and as I happen to know from personal observation. However, I have often had doubt whether that registration was one hundred per cent complete. I do not know. Some estimate, I suppose, might be formed by the bureau of statistics, the people who had charge of the census and so on. But I would urge upon the government that it be a condition precedent, so far as the civilian vote in Canada is concerned, that every voter who presents himself for the ballot produce his registration certificate, and that unless he or she does so he or she shall not vote. I urge the government to adopt this suggestion. The reason is obvious. Anyone who has not registered and complied with the law may properly be classed as a shirker, and no shirker should be allowed to vote on this plebiscite.

In respect of the other aspects of disqualification I shall reserve further comment.

From the minister's statement, I observe that a new electoral list is to be compiled. From something I saw in the newspapers a while back I was very fearful that the government were contemplating using the lists of the 1940 elections, and I called attention to it at that time. I was told that the matter had not been considered, or something to that effect. These lists of course are two years old and they would be most unsuitable, and for the reason that the minister gave. I desire to correct myself on the question of statistics. I had in mind just the males coming of age. I find that in the year 1941 approximately 107,000 males attained the age of 21, and 106,000 females, making a total of 213,000, or in two years 426,000. The ten year average it stated to be 204,000 per annum, so that since the 1940 lists were made up nearly half a million voters have come of age. That is a large number and they are undoubtedly entitled to vote.

Then there is the question of change in the location of population, to which the Secretary of State made reference. All these considerations make it imperative that a new list should be compiled, and I commend the government for that decision.

On the question of open or closed lists, there are two views. I have always favoured open lists for rural areas, where everyone knows everybody else and where there is not a chance, not one in a thousand, of any electoral fraud. But with respect to urban areas, I am of a contrary opinion. I think there ought to be closed lists there, even if there is to be a revision. There is no danger in the rural areas, but there is a very grave danger in certain urban localities. One has but to follow the history of elections in one of the great cities of this country to visualize what will happen if the principle of open lists is to be followed in all the large urban areas, and I do beg the government to reconsider this aspect even if it should involve the cost of revision in urban areas and some little delay and expense.

There are one or two other things that have bothered me about the plebiscite. Who is to man the polls and see that the law is complied with, and that people do not vote who are not entitled to vote? I do not know whether consideration has been given to this question. Then there is another question. How in winter or in early spring are the voters to be drawn to the polls? I know the answer will be that there is no provision in the law now, and I do not suggest that there should be. But let us not delude ourselves. I have run seven or eight elections myself. Hon. gentlemen opposite and around me have all run elections, and they know that the biggest problem is getting the people to the polls.

Mr. REID: Most of them will be walking at that time.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): They will not walk; that is just the point. I remember sending a horse and buggy once for a woman to come to the poll and she absolutely refused to come unless she could be brought in a fine motor car. That is the attitude of people. They do not want to come and vote. Who is to get them out? I do not suggest that the government should arrange to have them driven to the polls. It is against the law now, I believe. But that is a provision of the law that is more honoured in the breach than the observance, and we all know it in our hearts. Why continue it in the statute? I suggest, however, that some provision should be made with regard to scrutineers. That would not cost a great deal. I have nothing further to offer on that line at the moment, but I do know that it is important.

My learned and hon. friend the member for Regina city (Mr. McNiven) rather anticipated in his question what I am about to say now. Since this whole proposal was mooted I have given serious and rather continuous thought to the attitude that I should take with regard to the matter. One's first reaction is to say, "to Hades with the thing," but that will not do. It is too serious. A responsibility rests upon me not only as a citizen of the country but as a member of this parliament occupying this position for the time being. I cannot ignore that responsibility. I just cannot do it. I have given consideration to what I should do. On Friday last the hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Kirk), who does not often take part in the debates in this house, suggested that I should go out and make the result decisive. Well, that is beyond my power, but I know what the hon. member meant, and he was well-intentioned. Then I asked him this question: Does the hon. member say that it is any responsibility of mine to go out and ask the people to vote for this plebiscite? I put it to him and he replied, I think, in the affirmative; and right off the bat, without stopping to consider and think as one ought to do, I said, "It is not my baby." Now, I do not wish anyone to infer that, because I am opposed to the holding of a plebiscite and do not wish to father it, I consider that to be the end of my responsibility. I do not.

Briefly, what is the position? The government is asking the people for a release from its pledge, given gratuitously and voluntarily,

and that it be allowed to take whatever course it desires. If the plebiscite is defeated the government will construe that position as indicating that it should not be released from its commitment—it may take that view. If the plebiscite carries we have no undertaking or guarantee that anything will be done. That appears to me to leave us all in an impossible position. I have a sense of frustration. The only person who wins anything in that is the Prime Minister. He is freed. Heads I win, tails you lose—or to put it in the reverse, heads he wins, tails I lose and the rest of us lose.

We ought not to be put in that position, but we are; and after the most mature reflection I cannot take the responsibility of advising anyone to vote no, because that would not only tie the hands of the government but would make it impossible for any further steps to be taken with regard to extending the man-power of the country for service beyond the territorial limitations of Canada. That I think is an impossible position for this country to occupy at this critical time. It should not be in that position.

On the other hand, if the vote carries we have absolutely no guarantee that anything will be done, and that brings to me a feeling of frustration. Neither of these positions is acceptable, but on the theory that if one has to make a decision and choose between the lesser of two evils, I am going to ask the people of the country to vote to release the government, and I now do so. I call upon the adherents of the Conservative party in Canada to go to the polls and vote yes on this plebiscite. That is the loyal and patriotic course. That is the course which may make possible the achievement of the objectives we have as a party.

As to what course I shall pursue to that end myself during the campaign on the plebiscite, I have not finally determined. I had thought of going to my own constituency, calling a public meeting, at my own expense, advertising it, asking the people to come, presenting to them the facts of the position as judicially as I could, and urging them to go to the polls and vote in the affirmative, in order that the government may be freed. If the government does not then act I notify them that the fight of the loyal people of this country will just be beginning.

I do not propose to speak at any greater length at this time. In committee and during the various stages of the bill ample opportunity will be afforded for full discussion of the detailed proposals of the government. But I reiterate that I believe we should have at this stage of the resolution a full statement from the Prime Minister in reply to the various questions I have asked.

Mr. J. W. NOSEWORTHY (York South): In these my first remarks in this house I want to thank all hon. members for the very warm welcome which was accorded me on the occasion of my introduction. I want also to thank the many members of parties other than my own for the assistance they have given me in the first few days of my presence here, assistance which helped to make my first days here much more pleasurable and less terrifying than they otherwise would have been.

I wish to make a few remarks on the resolution now before the house. I want to make these remarks now because, as hon. members know, I was absent, not being a member of the house, at the time the plebiscite was so fully discussed in connection with the address in reply to the speech from the throne.

During our recent campaign in York South the question of conscription of man-power for overseas service and of the plebiscite became a vital issue. My opponent in that campaign, the Right Hon. Arthur Meighen, went to bat first with a radio broadcast that concerned itself almost entirely with the question of conscription for overseas service. That was followed next day by the full-page advertisement of the total war committee. In that advertisement there were many definite references to conscription for overseas service, but in only one phrase in one line of that page was there anything definite about conscription of anything other than man-power. We, in our campaign, countered that move of our opponents by insisting that conscription of man-power for overseas service was only one phase, and not by any means the most important phase, of a total war effort. One issue that we kept before the electors constantly was the need for the mobilization of everything necessary to win the war. From my experience in that campaign I am confident that the people of York South and—if they are representative, as I think they are, of the rest of Canada—the people of Canada will not by any means be satisfied with conscription of man-power only. Judging by letters which I have received both during my campaign and since the election from every province in Canada, from Liberals and Conservatives of long standing as well as from members of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, from office workers, professional men and women, labourers and farmers, labour organizations, and numerous other organizations, I am quite confident that this country is to-day ready for a much greater and much

more far-reaching war effort than anything that this government has undertaken or even envisioned.

During the latter weeks of our campaign I was constantly questioned regarding my stand on the plebiscite issue. My opponent chose, as the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) in this house has chosen, to oppose the taking of the plebiscite. At no time during the campaign did I take occasion to criticize the action of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and his associates for the taking of that plebiscite. Nor did I find at any time in that constituency, apart from the pro-conscriptionist press, any great indignation against the taking of the plebiscite. I found no such indignation expressed among the rank and file of the voters as I have heard expressed in this house by the leader of the official opposition. The people of York South—and I think they are representative of the people of Canada—are not nearly as much astounded at the phenomenon of the Prime Minister keeping his pledge to the electors as the opposition in this house appears to be.

What these people are really concerned about, and what they really want, is that all parties and all members of all parties should devote their combined intelligence and their combined energy to getting on with the business of winning the war. That is the business foremost in the minds of the people of the constituency from which I have just come.

I am personally convinced that the Prime Minister should be relieved of his electoral pledge. Furthermore, I am convinced that the only decent course he can follow is to appeal to the people of the country as he has chosen to do. As a matter of fact, the feeling of the people of York South on that point was so clear that my opponent was obliged to dissociate himself from his party or from the pledge that his party had given in the 1940 election that there would be no conscription introduced if they were in power, that statement having been given during the election campaign. There was no criticism then. As a matter of fact, my opponent was challenged with the question, "Had not his party and its erstwhile leader of that period given the same pledge to the people of Canada?"

I should like to see a great and overwhelming majority given to the government on the plebiscite. I feel confident that the government will receive that majority provided they are prepared to give to the people of this country, before the plebiscite is taken, a pledge in some form that they propose to embark upon a genuine all-out war effort that will include a much greater mobilization of wealth than anything yet undertaken.

Mr. HOMUTH: Why do hon. members on the government side not applaud that?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Such a pledge to gain the confidence and support of the Canadian people should, in my opinion, envision also a bold policy for the mobilization of industry.

The only fear as to the plebiscite that I ever heard expressed among the electors of my constituency was that a favourable vote would give the government the right to conscript man-power for farm, factory and the armed forces—and that power, I agree, they should possess in this crisis—but that it would leave the government free to carry on its present policy, which I term a policy of appeasement, with regard to wealth and industry.

I have read in the press that my opposition in the York South by-election are drawing some comfort from the myth that that election was directed by the government from Ottawa. I am amused by the fact that the official opposition place such confidence in the efficiency of that government direction. I am amused that they can accept that myth as an explanation of their loss of five thousand Conservative votes in the working class areas of that riding. The Prime Minister and his associates must, I am sure, feel quite elated over this compliment paid them by the official opposition.

Quite seriously, Mr. Speaker, that is not the answer to what happened in York South. The only intelligent answer is that the people of that constituency want an honest-to-goodness, all-out war effort. They are serious-minded people. They are deeply concerned, as all Canadians are concerned, about the winning of the war. They want more than a conscription bill which will enable the government to send men wherever they choose to send them. The working-class people of this country have already shown that they are ready to endure any sacrifice required of them in order to win this war; but they are sufficiently intelligent to know that something more is needed to win the war than the conscription of men for overseas service. I am fearful of the results of the plebiscite unless a pledge in some form can be given to indicate what other steps the government proposes to take in addition to the conscription of man-power. If the government wants the workers and farmers to give it a blank cheque—and I do not borrow that word from the leader of the opposition—that will enable it to use our man-power as

the government sees fit, then you must first create in the minds of the people a confidence that such power will never be used to exploit the working-class people of this country in the interests of any powerful group. You must convince the people that there is to be a much greater degree of equality of sacrifice than anything that has prevailed up to the present. You must also give the people the assurance that all industry is to be utilized for the war, regardless of the demand for private profit.

I should like to call attention for a moment, on this point, to a few statements reported in the Ottawa *Morning Journal* of to-day, from the recent radio broadcast by Sir Stafford Cripps. Speaking to the people who are unable to enlist for service, he is reported as having said:

> . . . that those who "for age or other reasons" could not give their lives for their country "owe an obligation of service and devotion to the last ounce of our strength and the last dollar of our wealth."

Later, speaking of the situation in England, he said:

> Personal interests are being allowed to obtrude themselves where the country's interest should be supreme, selfishness and the desire for petty profits sometimes taking the place of that all-embracing patriotism which leads our young men and women to give their lives for their country and its cause.

Then, speaking to Canadians, he asked this question:

> But have you considered whether you in your country have yet realized how total must be the effort it required if the axis is to be conquered?

These words, I feel, express the wish and desire of the great majority of the Canadian people to-day. I can assure this house that across this country there is a seething dissatisfaction regarding our war effort. Not only have I met with it in my own riding; I have found it in hundreds of letters that I have received from every province since my election. That dissatisfaction does not rest on the failure of the government to secure enlistment for active service. Much of that sort of dissatisfaction I feel has been engendered in Canada by a pro-conscriptionist press.

The real dissatisfaction which exists in the minds of the people and which is wide-spread throughout this country, is the feeling that industry has not yet been geared to a maximum production for war purposes. I am told, for instance, that although we are in our third year of war we are not producing a single aeroplane engine for use in the planes that are to be used to defend our shores. That may or may not be correct. If it is correct, then I say it is a deplorable and regrettable situation. There are to-day hundreds of industrial plants in and around Toronto alone which could and should be utilized for war production but which are still producing consumer goods for profit. I have received complaints from workers "by the dozen", if I may use a famous phrase, that they are obliged by force of circumstances to "rest on their oars" in the matter of war production. I am told that the present cost-plus profit system that prevails in some of our war industries does not give opportunity to the workers to put forth their maximum effort. Men and foremen from munition and war industry plants around Toronto came to me in numbers during the election campaign, complaining that they were sick and tired of being forced to loaf on the job of war production in which they were engaged. There is a situation which demands investigation and clearing up, before we shall convince the Canadian people that we are engaged in an all-out war effort. It is because I know that it is in this field of our war effort, particularly, that this discontent exists, that I urge the government to give to the electors some knowledge of what steps it proposes to take for the mobilization of wealth and industry, before it asks the voters for a blank cheque for the mobilization of manpower.

Let me repeat that the government need have no fear of the plebiscite vote, provided it is prepared to adopt a bolder and much more far-reaching policy in regard to wealth and industry. The people of Canada to-day are clamouring loudly for bold government leadership, leadership which will give us the only policy worthy of our cause, a policy which will mobilize everything we have for the winning of the war.

Mr. W. A. TUCKER (Rosthern): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended saying anything in the debate at this point, but there were some observations by the Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty) which I felt called for some comment, before I see passage of the resolution.

Before dealing with the subject in hand, however, I should like to extend to the hon. member who last spoke my sincere congratulations upon the ability he has shown as a parliamentarian. Certainly one can see that his election means a distinct acquisition to the debating power of the house as a whole, and I am sure the party to which he belongs have every reason to feel great satisfaction at his accession to their group.

I hope I have misunderstood some of the words used by the Secretary of State in explaining the provisions of the measure. It seems to me that in Canada we have not gone as far

as we should have by this time in building up a distinct sense of Canadian nationality and citizenship. There has been far too much emphasis laid upon racial origin of people who have come to our country in past generations, and who have shown their desire to be good citizens. Indeed I think far too much emphasis has been laid upon the suggestion that we have two great races in Canada because, from what I can see, the French race in Canada is, after all, very closely related to the English race in Canada. I doubt very much whether we have in fact two distinct races in Canada, and it is my belief that we of those two races are closely united in racial origin. If we were to get away from that idea of thinking so much of racial origin, it would be better for Canada as a whole.

I hope, as I have said, that I misunderstood the Secretary of State when I thought I heard him say that any person resident in Canada whose racial origin was that of a country at war with Canada, and who was disfranchised by a law of any legislature in Canada, would not be permitted to vote on the plebiscite anywhere. I hope I am mistaken in my understanding, because I can see tremendous repercussions from such a provision in the law. We may know now what provisions there may be in the provincial laws; but, as I understand it, once we legislate that way, if at any time before the voting takes place any provincial legislature chooses to disfranchise the people whose racial origin is that of any country with which we are at war—no matter how long those people may have lived in Canada, or how many generations they may have lived here—they would be disfranchised by this particular section.

We should go very slowly when writing any such provision into the statutes of our country. I am prepared to trust the government of Canada, but I am not prepared to trust what any single legislature in Canada might do, driven on by some of the leadership which at times they have displayed. Just to show the danger of that kind of legislation, let me put this to the house: Let us suppose—and God forbid that it should happen—that before the voting takes place Hitler drives Vichy France to war against us. Let us suppose, further, that some legislature in Canada passes an act stipulating that no person of enemy origin shall have any right to vote on the plebiscite. Under such circumstances, in what position would this parliament be placed?

There is no suggestion as to how far back we should go, in tracing racial origin. Are we to go back one generation, two generations, five generations or ten? I protest against the division of Canadians into groups having certain racial origins.

[Mr. Tucker.]

There are in Canada many hundreds of thousands of people of German origin, who are just as loyal to Canada as any member of the house. What would happen if some legislature passed an act whereby a person of German origin were not permitted to vote? Under the explanation given by the Secretary of State those people, whose sons may be serving in the army, whose husbands may be in the army, would be disfranchised by an act of this parliament.

I do not wish it to be understood that I am becoming hysterical about such legislation, but I cannot help thinking about the tremendous amount of harm done in 1917 by similar legislation. People who were loyal citizens of Canada felt tremendously hurt when they were not permitted to exercise the ordinary duties and rights of citizenship at the time of the war-time election. Before the bill is placed before the house by a Liberal government, I urge that any discrimination on racial grounds should be stricken from it.

I know of dozens of people within my own constituency who undoubtedly are of German racial origin, and who are serving in the armed forces of this dominion. Are we to say that their fathers or their brothers are not to have the right to vote, the same as any other person in the country? I know there are many people who will vote either in favour of or against the plebiscite, when the time comes, who will know there will be no chance of their being conscripted. Why make any discrimination on racial grounds? If a man is a good citizen of Canada, if he has done no harm, and if he is expected to discharge the obligations of citizenship, then I submit he should be given all the rights connected therewith. Under the National Resources Mobilization Act there is no discrimination as to racial origin. Young men of German origin are expected to serve their country the same as people of other origins. Thank God that, so far as that measure was concerned, there was no discrimination against people of different racial origins. If they are good Canadians, we treat them as such.

In the present instance are we to say to people of German origin, "Yes, you are good citizens; we expect you to defend the country; we expect you to obey the call and to offer your lives, if necessary, in its defence; but we will not give you the right to vote on a problem like this." I suggest that our government should not introduce an act which might do such a thing.

Then there is the vexed question respecting conscientious objectors—a most difficult question. But I know, too, that many of our Mennonite groups have suggested to the government that they are quite ready to enter

the armed services, provided they are permitted to do non-combatant work. They are willing to go into the ambulance service, the hospital service, labour battalions and so on, as long as they will not have to go against their conscientious beliefs and actually fight or kill their fellowmen. The attitude has been taken that there is no such thing as a non-combatant in this war and that, therefore, unless a man is willing to go and kill his fellowmen, he shall not be permitted to enter the armed forces. He cannot go and be a stretcher-bearer or do hospital work; he must go on the basis of being prepared to do anything he is ordered to do in the way of killing.

In passing I suggest, with all deference to our own military leaders, that this has not been the attitude of the great President of the United States. I saw myself an order which he signed, that conscientious objectors who are willing to serve their country, could do so in non-combatant branches of the armed services of the United States. I saw a copy of an order signed by the chief of staff of the United States stating what branches these conscientious objectors would be able to serve in. But we are saying that conscientious objectors who are willing to go into the armed services of the crown and risk their lives in those armed services, just because they are not willing to go in on terms whereby they may be required to fight and kill, shall not have the right to vote on this question. I know dozens of good young friends of mine, who belong to the Mennonite faith, who have gone into Red Cross work in the army, trusting that they will not be asked to bear arms. Many have gone into the Royal Canadian Air Force. By this very measure—and I ask every member of the house to consider what we are doing—the relatives of these young men will be prevented from voting unless they say they are ready to go into the armed forces and be prepared to go and kill, against their religious beliefs.

The reason why I have spoken at this particular stage is that I want the government to reconsider the question of introducing a bill with any provisions like that in it. I call back to memory the shades of great leaders of Liberalism who fought against similar provisions in the War-time Elections Act of 1917. I cannot begin to echo, with anything like their eloquence, the sentiments which they voiced in support of the principle that when you give a man citizenship you should not deprive him of the rights of citizenship. I hold in my hand the *Hansard* in which those great speeches were made, and I ask this government in all sincerity, and in the hope that it will not embarrass them in any way, that before they introduce in the house a bill embodying any such provision, they reconsider the matter and refrain from taking a step which I think, on more mature consideration, and especially in the light of the teachings of Liberalism, they would consider inconsistent with those great teachings.

Mr. C. E. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I wish to say a few words on the resolution before it passes, but before I refer to the resolution itself, may I extend my congratulations to the hon. member for York South (Mr. Noseworthy) who took his seat in the house for the first time on Wednesday last. I think he made a good job of his speech, and I do not believe he will need assistance from others so far as his work in this house is concerned. He seems quite able to take care of himself.

As regards the general principle of going to the country on a plebiscite, we have no objection when it involves a matter of policy or principle; but I certainly have an objection to this particular plebiscite because it is most evasive, and I cannot see any good result that will come from it. I have heard over and over again in this house the statement that the government was asking to be released from its commitment. That is not right. The government is not asking to be released from a commitment. Let us see what it asks? The plebiscite is worded thus:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

That is an entirely different matter. It is asking people if they are in favour of releasing the government; but the government is not asking to be released. There is quite a distinction there, a great difference. It simply puts the government in this position, that if the people express their desire of releasing the government from its commitments, the government can sit right down and do nothing. It is not asking to be released, and in that regard the government is perfectly within its rights to go on and do exactly as it has done in the past. I spoke on this particular question before, and it is my considered opinion that the government does not intend to change its policy. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) told us that in his speech when he first spoke in this house. I referred to the remarks of the late Minister of Justice, Mr. Lapointe; I also referred to the remarks of the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cardin) and to the Minister of National Defence for Air (Mr. Power). When the late Mr. Lapointe, then Minister of Justice, was

speaking in this house, he told the people of Quebec and the members of the house, in no uncertain terms, that there would never, never, never be conscription; and the Minister of Public Works was one of those to whom he referred. The hon. gentleman is sitting in his place now and I ask him to correct me if I am wrong. Mr. Lapointe said: "I speak for Mr. Cardin and I speak for Mr. Power; we will leave the government before there will be any conscription put into effect in this dominion."

I should like to hear the Minister of Public Works contradict that statement if I am wrong. I sincerely believe I am right in this. In my opinion it is a wrong attitude for the government to take, and that is why I will oppose this particular plebiscite. If they can convince me that they really intend to do something on this thing, then it is an entirely different matter.

Mr. CRERAR: Does the hon. member object to putting the government in a position where it could do something if it considered it necessary?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): The government, under the mobilization act, can do anything it likes. If the question were put in a positive way on this plebiscite, then there would be some sense in it. But the government is definitely not doing that. It will be recalled that when I was speaking before, I pointed out that there were two sides to the question of the plebiscite—one was meant for the French-speaking people of Quebec and the other for the English-speaking people of the other provinces. I do not think anything could be done that would create greater disunity in the country than that very thing. If the French people of Quebec and the English-speaking people of the rest of Canada were given clearly to understand our situation, clearly to understand that this government intended to go all-out, that it intended to mobilize completely finance and material resources, right to the last man and the last dollar, I believe that the people of Quebec—because I have spoken in that province many times, and I know them—would agree for an all-out war effort.

An hon. MEMBER: You have not made much impression.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Well, you have not made such a hot impression either. I am sure that the people of Quebec would be just as enthusiastically behind an all-out war effort as those of any other province. I do not blame the people of Quebec for being a little cautious as to the promises which this government has given, because the rest of us elsewhere in Canada have sound reasons for being a little suspicious of its promises.

This whole question is not one which has come up overnight. When I hear some hon. members speaking in this chamber I am almost led to believe that in their opinion this issue has risen rather rapidly. Let us make no mistake; this is a political trick; it was begun in 1940; and I am amazed at the shortness of the memory of some hon. members, who cannot even think back to 1939. I well recall the occasion in this house when the party with which I am associated asked for an all-out war effort. Some of us were told that we were committing political suicide, and in fact we lost seven of our members.

Mr. HANSELL: But we were right.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): We were right, yes, and every member in this house realizes it now. We had to take a lot of abuse because of our stand on behalf of the unity of Canada. Then this question came up in 1940, when the issue of conscription of man-power was fought on every political platform. We of this group advocated first of all a complete mobilization—conscription, if you like—of the financial institutions, so that we would be able, if I may use the Prime Minister's own words, to issue currency and credit in terms of public need. But when we put that resolution before the house everyone outside our party voted against it. Those who did so may have been sincere, and I am not going to say they were not, but I do affirm that it showed a decided lack of leadership in that critical time, in 1940, when the issue was being discussed.

The government is now trying to have the people say whether they wish to release it, but the government is not asking for release. To my mind it is another political trick, and shows very poor leadership; nothing indeed is more calculated to disunite the country. If the government has misjudged the necessities of the case, and can do nothing better than ask the people if they would like to release it, I say we have no time for such fooling around as that. If the Prime Minister, with all due respect to his ability as a leader, has not sufficient vision, foresight and leadership to conduct Canada through this most critical time in its history, then I humbly say to you, Mr. Speaker, that he should resign and make way for someone else who can. We know that a man is not necessarily to be blamed for mistakes he may make, but certainly you cannot expect a country to put its trust in a person who continually makes mistakes, and this government is notorious for the mistakes it has

made since this war broke out. I do not believe there is another government in the whole world which has made such colossal mistakes as this particular government has.

An hon. MEMBER: The Alberta government.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Let me tell the hon. member that no government in any province has done more for this war effort than the government of Alberta. I challenge hon. members to cite one instance wherein that government has not given wholehearted support to the war effort of the dominion.

Mr. HANSELL: It bought a million dollars' worth of war bonds the other day.

Mr. BRADETTE: What about Alberta's debt to the city of Ottawa!

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Let me say to the hon. member that if he wants me to refer back to some of the remarks he made in 1939, I shall do so with pleasure.

Mr. BRADETTE: Do you want to go ahead now?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): It might be a little embarrassing to the hon. member, but it would be a pleasure to do it. When this question of unity comes up, some hon. members should, I think, sit rather quietly in their seats; the less said, the less they will have to account for.

Mr. BRADETTE: What a man!

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): What a member! I believe this country will have to adopt the principles which we have advocated. I challenge anyone to say that we were wrong in the stand we took in 1939, let him rise in his place now and say that we should not have an all-out war effort, with total conscription of finance and material resources before there is any further conscription of man-power. I should like to see the hon. member who interrupted me a moment ago make his stand with regard to that.

Mr. FAIR: He won't. He sits.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): That is all he has done since this session began.

Mr. BRADETTE: What wonderful members you have over there!

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): At least we do not have to go back on the promises we made in 1939.

Mr. BRADETTE: Bring your social dividend along.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Yes. The people will get that, too. But the thing with which we are primarily concerned, and have been ever since this war started, is an all-out war effort. We have not been concerned so much with political tricks as my hon. friends across the floor who are interrupting just now. That is the sort of thing which creates disunity. It leads to the sort of disorganization of which we have evidence in the laying off of five hundred men from an Ottawa plant. Were we wrong when we asked for complete mobilization of the natural and industrial resources of this country? All over Canada industrial capacity and industrial workers are standing idle, although those concerned are only too anxious to get to work. Just the day before yesterday I got a letter from an important executive of one of the aircraft factories. The situation he pointed out to me is appalling. He stated that in his factory a large number of men were laid off. Nearly all of them were expert mechanics, who have been working on the production of war supplies for the last year or two. It was pointed out to me that these men are now either enlisting in the army or seeking other jobs, and that when this company is asked to return to full production it will not be able to do so, because it will not have the experienced men. Yet we are supposed to be engaged in an all-out war effort. One of our greatest deficiencies is in the matter of production. I heard the Prime Minister say the other day that we shall probably not be permitted to discuss this subject in the secret session. Yet to me it is a matter of more concern than any other. I am not going to question the judgment of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) as to whether Bren guns should be sent to Singapore, or to Australia, or should be kept here. He is a military man, and in that I will accept his judgment. But the thing I am concerned about is this: Let us get the guns made. To say that we are manufacturing 4,500 Bren guns a month is not the point at all, because if we are manufacturing 4,500 Bren guns a month and we can bring that production up to 9,000 or 90,000 Bren guns a month, or whatever the figure may be—if we can double the present output, that is what we should be doing. If we are building a certain number of corvettes within a given time, and we could with proper organization build twice that number within the same time, that is what we should be doing.

Mr. HANSELL: Or even one more.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Yes, as my hon. friend the member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) says, if we could put out even one more a month, that is what we should be doing. Then we would at least be endeavouring to have an all-out war effort. Can you

envisage, Mr. Speaker, the government telling us that they do not even now know how many factories are working full-time? I think it is unpardonable that a government should be in such a position after almost three years of war organization, that they do not know yet how many factories are working full-time and how many are working only part-time. That is the greatest criticism I have to offer of the government at the moment.

In submitting the plebiscite, I cannot see why the government does not make it a positive question rather than a negative one. Certainly they should seek direction, and direct direction, from the people, so that the people will know without question what is going to happen. Why in the world cannot the government be honest about this matter and say to the people: We want you to release us from this pledge so that we can have conscription for overseas if necessary? But that has never been said yet. I have not found it in the Prime Minister's address. The question submitted seems to evade that. Or, if we are not going to have conscription, let us be honest and say so. I do not think there is any danger of frightening the people to such an extent that they are going to become panicky and run away from the enemy if we tell them the truth. I do not mean that they should be told military secrets such as the transport of troops and matters of that kind. But tell them the exact situation in other matters and you will find out that the people are right behind you. They are behind you now, pushing so hard that you do not know where to go. That is the trouble—they are pushing you too much.

Mr. GRANT: Did you tell the people the truth the last time?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Do not make any mistake about that.

Mr. GRANT: The hon. member did not answer my question.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): If the hon. member wants to speak, he should rise in his place and speak when I am through, and we will analyse his speech.

I do not think this is any time to be fooling around with this plebiscite. I believe we could spend our time much more usefully in organizing our war effort. Just imagine, there are thousands of unemployed right across Canada! In every province of this dominion there are hundreds and hundreds of unemployed. I think that is a shame. These people want to work. It is not a case of their trying to evade responsibility. They are coming to the government and to industry to enlist in the war effort, but they are being turned away. I think that is a great waste of man-hours, a great waste of time.

An hon. MEMBER: You are wasting plenty now.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): You are not doing so hot either. If some of those fellows—

Mr. HOMUTH: Hon. members.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): If some of those hon. members would rise in their places and say what they had to say in 1939, it would be interesting to hear it to-day.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the plebiscite is a waste of money at this time. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) said that it would cost about one and a half million dollars.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty) said one and a half million dollars and I questioned that.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): And I do not know whether he means that amount.

Mr. McLARTY: I can assure the hon. member that I do mean it.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I am sure that the minister has made an estimate and tried to be as reasonable as he could, but if we get this plebiscite taken for a million and a half dollars, I think the Secretary of State will be the most surprised man in the house. We do not need to spend a great deal of money in taking this vote. Why should we not use the services of the different organizations set up all over Canada to take this vote? There is the teachers' organization, for example, which offered to work gratis in the national registration, and there is a board of trade in every town across the country. Municipal councils could also be of assistance in this work. Chambers of commerce and various other organizations would be only too willing to help.

Mr. HOMUTH: There would be no work for any friends then.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): You cannot start out by paying some officials a nice fat salary and then expect others to work for nothing. They just won't do it. If this is a political dodge to build up a political party, that is a sad state of affairs at this particular time.

I think the plebiscite is not necessary. I have stated my objections to it, and therefore I am now going to move that the Speaker do

not now leave the chair and that the house do now consider the following amendment to the resolution:

That all the words after "papers" in the fifth line of this resolution be struck out and the following be added: Be it further resolved that the said act be so designed as to,

First, provide that all plebiscites be taken without expense to the dominion treasury, except such expenditures required for necessary printing.

Second, provide that definite direction be sought from the people on all national issues submitted to them under the terms and provisions of this proposed Plebiscite Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriate moment at which to raise a point of order which has been in my mind in the course of this debate. I direct the attention of the house to the fact that the present motion is one necessitated by the fact that a bill is about to be introduced which will place a charge upon the public revenue. Being a bill of that nature it is recommended to the house in the first instance by His Excellency the Governor General. Being recommended by his excellency in the form in which it appears, the motion cannot be amended. That is the first point I wish to make, namely, that the amendment is entirely out of order for the reason given.

Not being capable of amendment, it is, I think, sound constitutional procedure that the motion should not be debatable. Debate on a motion of this nature, unless there is some other governing factor, is, or ought to be, out of order at the present time.

I would direct the attention of hon. members to standing order 60 on page 161 of Beauchesne:

Motion imposing public aid or charge.

If any motion be made in the house for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned till such further day as the house thinks fit to appoint; and then it shall be referred to a committee of the whole house, before any resolution or vote of the house do pass thereupon.

Standing order 60 certainly would rule out the debate that has thus far taken place upon this resolution, and it illustrates in the best manner possible why a rule of this kind should be construed literally. Most of the discussion that has taken place thus far I think I am right in saying has been a repetition of what took place in the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne. I do not think there has been a single point raised in the speeches thus far made on this matter which was not raised in one form or another in the debate on the address.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I should not like to agree to that. I had some new matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, I will except from that general statement some of the things my hon. friend has said. But he and I alike I think are interested in seeing that the rules of the house are strictly construed, and particularly those placed there with a view to expediting the business of parliament. There is the strongest of reasons in connection with the very matter we are debating at the moment, namely, the wording of a plebiscite, why the matter should be decided by this house as quickly as possible. We have been told over and over again in the course of the debate that every moment's delay in getting the plebiscite before the people may occasion great concern at the end and is to be very much regretted. There will be an opportunity to debate all phases of the plebiscite question on the bill when it is before the house, and there will be opportunity when the resolution has been passed to ask questions on the resolution when the house is in committee of the whole. I do submit that the time to expect answers to questions on a resolution of this kind is not in the course of debate on the resolution itself, but only when the resolution is before the committee of the whole house.

I raise the point at this stage because, while I am free to say that I think the house in past years has frequently ignored this standing order, there has come to be almost a custom, when a motion of the kind preceding a money bill is introduced, of having a debate on the resolution itself. I think the intention of the rule was to avoid anything of the kind; that the whole purpose of a resolution is to secure time for hon. members to see the importance of the matter to be dealt with involving expenditure of public moneys, and to be afforded opportunity in committee to raise questions and receive answers before the bill is introduced. But the debate on the subject of the bill should take place on the bill itself rather than on a resolution preceding its introduction.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Prime Minister has raised two questions under his point of order with respect to the legality of the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston). With respect to the first point I am in agreement, inasmuch as the bill is a money bill. On that I shall not elaborate. But on the second point I take distinct issue with the Prime Minister. He is reading into standing order 60 something that is not there. Unless he reads something into it that is not there, there is no point or force in his argument. I am astonished that the question has been raised here to-day, because I cannot recall a point of order like this having been taken on a money resolution pre-

ceding a bill in the last twenty years. I should be astonished if the Prime Minister can find a single precedent. Certainly there is nothing in the standing order which says there shall be no debate. What it says is that:

If any motion be made in the house for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon . . .

That is, you cannot enter upon it without notice from the governor general, as I understand the implications of that. But that having been given, then the motion is moved and debate ensues thereon. The question of referring it to the committee follows after that debate has taken place and the motion carried.

It is a debatable motion; it cannot be anything else. Surely for the last twenty years, and I should think a long time before that, this house has not been going wrong on a matter of this kind.

I think the first point taken is a proper point of order and this amendment must fail on that ground, but certainly not on the second ground. I would be astonished if that were the proper interpretation of the rule. You cannot construe a statute strictly by reading something into it, and a rule of the House of Commons is by analogy in the nature of a statute. On the other hand I think it ought to be construed liberally, and certainly this debate is in order and should go on.

I understand, of course, that that is not the primary reason for the Prime Minister rising at this time; he has risen because of the intervention of this proposed amendment. I think he is right on his first ground, but on the second ground I most respectfully dissent from him.

Mr. MacINNIS: May I add a word in support of what the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) has said? In reference to standing order 60, paragraph 542 is quoted from the British house standing orders, and I think is germane to the point at issue. That paragraph reads as follows:

If any motion be made in the house for any aid, grant or charge upon the public revenue, whether payable out of the consolidated fund, or out of money to be provided by parliament, or for any charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof shall not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned till such further day as the house shall think fit to appoint. . . .

All that paragraph says, I think, and what is also said in standing order 60, is that the discussion shall not be presently entered upon; but it does not say that there shall be no debate. Surely we are allowed to debate resolutions brought up in this house. Always since I have been here debate has been allowed, and I am satisfied that a correct reading of standing order 60 and the supporting paragraphs do not imply that there shall be no debate on a resolution except in committee. It merely says there shall be none at the time it is introduced.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, if other hon. members have concluded what they wish to say, I should like to direct attention to the point just raised by my hon. friend. I noticed that both he and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) did not read the whole order, but stopped short at the early part of it. Let me read standing order 60 again:

If any motion be made in the house for any public aid or charge upon the people—

That is what this present motion is.

—the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon—

As I understand the English language that means that the house cannot at that time, when that motion is introduced, begin to discuss it; that it is not debatable.

—but shall be adjourned till such further day as the house thinks fit to appoint—

Then see what follows:

—and then it shall be referred to a committee of the whole house, before any resolution or vote of the house do pass thereupon.

The only thing that is debatable at the moment is whether the house should go into committee to consider the resolution. That is all. The resolution is considered in committee, where any questions may be asked; but the motion itself is not debatable and cannot be amended, for the reasons mentioned.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): With the consent of the house I should like to add just one word. I think some regard has to be given the punctuation of this order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is an important factor in construing it. My hon. friend may laugh, but he laughs out of ignorance, not out of wisdom; let me tell him that.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Thank you very much. May I say I think I know the rules as well as my hon. friend knows them.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Probably the hon. gentleman knows them better than I do.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): May I also point out to my hon. friend that he cannot know the rules, or he would know that the word "ignorance" is not parliamentary.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If my hon. friend does not like that word, I will withdraw it, because I would not hurt his feelings for a moment.

Mr. GARDINER: We are trying to be agreeable.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, if all the chatter is not over, or if my hon. friends do not want to hear me, I will sit down. I should like to point out that the punctuation is important. There is a semicolon before the last clause; and if you read the first part of this clause it presupposes a debate before going into committee. I think that is a fair interpretation of this order. If we are right to-day, we are making a little parliamentary history, but I submit that we cannot have been wrong for twenty years, with much better students of the rule than I am, and students at least as good as the hon. member for Vancouver Centre.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): If I may say one word, in giving notice of this motion the Secretary of State moves that this house, at its next sitting, shall resolve itself into committee of the whole to consider the resolution standing in his name on the order paper.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): He did that.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes, I am just analysing the significance of this for the benefit of my hon. friend. Then to-day we are dealing with that resolution, which received the consent of the house when my hon. friend the Secretary of State moved the antecedent or preliminary notice the other day in this house; and the point before us now is not the merits or demerits of the resolution itself. The only point is whether this house shall immediately and forthwith go into committee to consider the resolution of which notice was given by the Secretary of State.

Mr. STIRLING: On which debate has arisen.

Mr. MacINNIS: May I ask a question of the Prime Minister or the Minister of Pensions and National Health. The Prime Minister said that the question was whether we should go into committee on the resolution. How are we going to debate whether we shall go into committee on the resolution if we are not allowed to debate the resolution itself?

Mr. SPEAKER: Having heard the viewpoints of so many experienced parliamentarians, I think the matter is of sufficient importance to merit further consideration, and at eight o'clock I will give a ruling.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: During the dinner hour I have been considering the point of order raised to-day on the amendment before the house. The only question before the house is that the Speaker leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole on the following resolution:

> That it is expedient to introduce a measure respecting the taking of the votes of the qualified voters on any question submitted by way of plebiscites and for such purposes to make provision for the printing and publication of a Plebiscite Act and instructions issued thereunder, the preparation of voters' lists and other plebiscite documents, including forms and ballot papers, to provide for the fees, allowances, expenses or other remuneration of certain officials and employees.

To that question has been moved the following amendment by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston):

> That all the words after "papers" in the fifth line of this resolution be struck out and the following be added: Be it further resolved that the said act be so designed as to,
>
> First, provide that all plebiscites be taken without expense to the dominion treasury, except such expenditures required for necessary printing.
>
> Second, provide that definite direction be sought from the people on all national issues submitted to them under the terms and provisions of this proposed Plebiscite Act.

With regard to the first part of the amendment, section 54 of the British North America Act provides as follows:

> It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address, or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to that house by message of the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.

It follows that the standing orders of the house regulate the procedure, and standing order 60 so provides. It reads as follows:

> If any motion be made in the house for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned till such further day as the house thinks fit to appoint; and then it shall be referred to a committee of the whole house, before any resolution or vote of the house do pass thereupon.

I would direct the attention of the house to the word "vote" in the last line. That means

a vote of a sum of money, and is used as in the first column of the estimates now before the house.

It is clear, therefore, that the resolution must be transmitted to the committee of the whole in the terms recommended to the house by the message of the governor general, and the amendment proposed is therefore out of order; and I so rule.

The next question is that raised by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) who quoted standing order 60 and submitted that the resolution before the house is not debatable. With this standing order, however, must be read standing order 38, which provides, *inter alia:*

(1) The following motions are debatable:
Every motion
(a) standing on the order of proceedings for the day.

The resolution is on the order of proceedings for the day. I would point out that standing order 60 was passed in 1867, while standing order 38 was passed on March 22, 1927. In other words, standing order 38 is remedial to standing order 60, and I must conclude that standing order 38 must rule, and decide that the resolution before the house is debatable.

What extent may be allowed in the debate is a much more difficult problem. All that is asked of the house is that the Speaker leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole.

The debate, therefore, must be directed to the negative of that motion, that the resolution should not be submitted to the committee of the whole, for, as I have pointed out, no amendment at this stage can be in order.

In my judgment the debate should be general, with no reference to details, all of which can be discussed in committee, and on the bill which follows the resolution.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Fournier (Hull) in the chair.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fournier, Hull): Shall the resolution carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. HANSELL: No; I do not believe the resolution should carry quite so soon. There are one or two questions I should like to ask the minister in this connection.

First, we have been very much concerned with respect to the amount of money the plebiscite may cost. Could the minister give a break-down of the suggested amount of $1,500,000? If he can give a break-down, will he tell us to what extent he thinks it will be possible to obtain voluntary help in taking the plebiscite?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. McLARTY: Mr. Chairman, I am having prepared by the chief electoral officer a definite break-down of the estimated cost of taking the plebiscite. The figure I gave on Friday, that of $1,500,000, was a general approximation. At that time I said that the government would welcome such voluntary effort as would be applied to it, and such voluntary effort would of course reduce the cost. For budgeting purposes, however, it is thought unwise to make an estimate of the amount of voluntary work which will be applied to the taking of the plebiscite. For that reason it was deemed desirable to give a maximum figure; such amount of work as is done voluntarily will of course effect a reduction in such figure.

When we are in committee on the bill I shall be glad to give a definite break-down of the approximate cost.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Will the returning officers be appointed on a patronage basis, as is done at the time of general elections?

Mr. McLARTY: I would have no objection to answering that question, but I believe it would be more properly asked when we are in committee on the bill. The intention is that the returning officers appointed under the 1938 election act will continue—unless under the provisions of that act they are changed. While I have no objection to giving the committee all available information, I am of opinion that these matters relate to detail and might better be discussed when the house is in committee on the bill.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I had some further questions, but I shall leave them until the bill is in committee.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. McLarty thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 10, respecting the taking of a plebiscite in every electoral district in Canada and the taking of the votes at such plebiscite of Canadian service voters stationed within and without Canada.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT

VETERANS OF PRESENT WAR—APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health) moved the following resolution:

That a select committee be set up to which shall be referred all matters relating to the settlement of veterans of the present war on the land in Canada; and

That the said committee be empowered to send for persons, papers and records; to examine witnesses for evidence; to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the committee for the use of the committee and members of the house; and to report from time to time; and

That the committee shall consist of Messrs. Blanchette, Dupuis, Hatfield, Macdonald (Brantford), Macdonald (Halifax), MacKenzie (Neepawa), Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre), McLean (Simcoe East), MacMillan, Quelch, Ross (Souris), Senn, Sissons, Tucker, Wright.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Might I ask if it is the intention of the government to have the proceedings of this committee printed or merely a memorandum kept of the daily proceedings?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It is the intention, subject to the will of the committee itself, to have the proceedings printed and given to every member of the house.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Including the evidence?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Oh, yes, certainly, the same as last year.

Motion agreed to.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO SETTLERS—APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS AND OTHER EMPLOYEES

Hon. IAN MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to make provision for the settlement on the land of veterans of the present war, to prescribe the terms of such settlement and to grant a measure of financial assistance to such settlers, and further for the appointment of a director, of officers and other employees in connection therewith.

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.

Motion agreed to.

CITY OF OTTAWA AGREEMENT

AUTHORIZATION OF PAYMENT OF $100,000 FOR THE YEAR ENDING JULY 1, 1942

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Public Works) moved that the house go into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure to authorize the Minister of Public Works on behalf of His Majesty to enter into an agreement to pay to the corporation of the city of Ottawa the sum of $100,000 for the year ending July 1, 1942.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Fournier (Hull) in the chair.

Mr. CARDIN: Mr. Chairman, this is the resolution preceding the introduction of a bill for payment to the city of Ottawa of the sum of $100,000 as the result of an agreement which was reached between the city of Ottawa and the federal government a number of years ago in settlement of claims which had been put forward by the city for compensation for loss of revenue on properties which the federal government had acquired, and which left the city of Ottawa short of a certain amount of tax revenue. The claim of the city of Ottawa, as I stated last year and the house will remember, was for a very much larger amount than this, but as a result of discussions between the Department of Public Works and representatives of the city of Ottawa an agreement was reached that all parties concerned would be satisfied with a payment by the federal government to the city of Ottawa of $100,000 a year. This agreement has been renewed, if my memory serves me aright, for ten or fifteen years. I might add that representations have been made by the city of Ottawa that we should increase the amount, but in view of the war it was thought advisable to leave the situation as it is and not to undertake negotiations for a new agreement in place of the original agreement authorized in 1920 at $75,000 and which ran from July 1, 1919, to July 1, 1924, was renewed for one year to 1925, renewed for a period of five years from 1925 to 1930 at $100,000, and has been renewed year by year since 1930 at $100,000.

Mr. BOUCHER: Has the minister not taken into consideration the vast expansion in the services rendered by the city of Ottawa and the large number of buildings and properties taken over by the federal government, which make a very great change indeed in the services rendered by the city to the government? I think this agreement was first entered into approximately twenty years ago, when the services rendered by the city of Ottawa to the dominion government, and the city property acquired by the government were very much less than now. The situation has changed vastly since the agreement was first entered into, and in fact within the last year or two the water supply situation, in view of the services rendered by the city of Ottawa, is critical, calling for an expansion of the water service. It is a matter that should be given much more than perfunctory consideration in order that an equitable agreement may be arrived at between the dominion government and the city of Ottawa in view of the revenue-producing properties to the city which

have been taken over by the government and the very much greater services rendered by the corporation. In view of these factors I think it would only be fair to the city of Ottawa that serious consideration be given by the federal government to making an equitable adjustment at this time. The excuse that we are at war and that economy is demanded surely does not apply to a situation such as prevails in this capital city of Canada. I would ask the Minister of Public Works to give the committee a few more particulars, showing the changes between the services rendered twenty or twenty-five years ago when this agreement was first entered into, and the services rendered to-day.

Mr. CARDIN: I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat that the situation has somewhat changed, but some people might argue that it has changed on both sides. I am not prepared at the moment to enter into any argument along that line.

So far as the water service is concerned, I may say for the information of the committee that the federal government pays for all the water consumed in the federal public buildings in addition to the amount allowed under this agreement. The main consideration, if I remember correctly, which was in the minds of those making recommendations on behalf of the city of Ottawa was that the city was losing a large amount of taxation which had formerly been imposed on the properties taken over by the federal government. It was this loss of revenue which was the main consideration presented on behalf of the city, although there were other minor factors. Taking everything into consideration, however, I think it is fair that we should wait until the war is over before making an adjustment in the light of all the circumstances. I promise my hon. friend that I shall have no objection to treating the city of Ottawa as well as circumstances will permit.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I intended to make some remarks, not at this stage of the proceedings, but possibly on the second reading of the bill, in connection with this matter. They will relate particularly to the loss which the city of Ottawa has sustained by reason of the tremendous inroads which have been made on the city assessment roll because of the large amount of property which has been taken over by the government, by expropriation and by purchase, since the war began, and, I may say, before that. It would be well if the minister in the meantime would get some data on just what this amounts to, and if he would also arrange to tell the committee and the house what sums the government pays to the corporation of the city of Ottawa in addition to this sum of $100,000.

The minister has spoken about the amount of water used in the public buildings. I think that what my colleague had to say was about the increased water supply which is necessary for fire protection in the city, due to the erection on Wellington street of a number of very inflammable wooden buildings, which constitute, in my judgment, a serious fire hazard and a menace to the safety of the city. I am not criticizing the government for having built wooden buildings there; everything had to be done hastily. The Department of Munitions and Supply grew up overnight, as it were, and had to have accommodation, and no doubt wooden accommodation was the easiest and most quickly available method. Nevertheless, it constitutes a grave fire hazard to the city of Ottawa.

But that is not the main factor to which, I think, he should direct his attention; it is the direct loss sustained by the city treasury by reason of such buildings as, let us say, the Jackson building, which has been expropriated by the government, and which, as I understand the law, automatically comes off the assessment roll; and by the expropriation of the Brading brewery building at the lower end of Wellington street. I do not suggest that the city of Ottawa has lost a great deal on the assessment roll by reason of the Brading property being taken over, because the assessment on the building, land, and appurtenances was very moderate compared with the sum this government paid. I know the answer will be that that was an exchequer court judgment. I wonder whether hon. members know just how the amount was arrived at. I believe the sum paid was $550,000 on the basis of the exchequer court award. But it was a sham battle; the government offered in the expropriation proceedings to pay the $550,000 odd; the company in filing its defence accepted the offer, and there never was a jot or tittle of evidence taken to support the claim, one way or the other. It was a cloak behind which the government may shelter itself if it desires to justify the payment of so huge a sum for—what shall I term it?—that hole in the ground down there on Wellington street. I am going to have something more to say about that later on. It ought to have been said long ago.

Mr. CARDIN: I think my hon. friend is a little too severe, and that when the facts are brought before the committee of the house the picture will not be so black as he painted it a moment ago.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Black enough.

Mr. CARDIN: It will be established that the price offered by the federal government was tendered after three firms of competent and reliable valuators had passed on the property and had given the public works department the necessary information as to the real value of the property.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What was the assessed value?

Mr. CARDIN: I regret very much that at the moment I am not in a position to say, but I promise my hon. friend that when we reach the second reading of the bill I shall have all the particulars before me, and we can clear up that situation as well as any other relating to properties which have been taken over by the federal government since the beginning of the war.

Mr. BOUCHER: I do not think the Minister of Public Works is quite fair to the city of Ottawa as far as the statement about water is concerned. As my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has said, the amount of water supplied by the city for fire protection, the police protection, and other services rendered by Ottawa have increased many ways by virtue of the new additions to government-held property and government services. All these matters are of immense importance to the taxpayers of the city of Ottawa, and should, I believe, be given immediate consideration, without having the matter continued ad infinitum, or for years and years, without some proper basis of adjustment as between the dominion government and the corporation of the city of Ottawa.

Mr. McIVOR: Why is it that, when you want to rent a house or an apartment in the city of Ottawa, you can get neither a house nor an apartment? Has not this greatly increased demand come about because of the war activities which centre in Ottawa, and if the city are losing in one way, are they not gaining in another? I know that in the great city of Fort William we do not derive a cent of taxes from the public buildings which are located there. I think the government has treated the city of Ottawa well. Go to the front of this building and look at the lighting we have. I know there is a black-out but the other night, when I saw a lady tripping over her feet, I thought to myself, when this subject comes up we should ask to have lights over these steps; it would not cost very much.

As I have said, Ottawa is enjoying a good deal of compensation; every last house is rented. I think Ottawa should provide better accommodation for the population which is flowing into the city.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Cardin thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 11, to authorize an agreement between His Majesty the King and the corporation of the city of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRECIOUS METALS MARKING ACT

AMENDMENT WITH RESPECT TO GOLD CONTENT OF MANUFACTURED ARTICLES

Hon. JAMES A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the second reading of Bill No. 4, an act to amend the Precious Metals Marking Act.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have not even seen this bill, and I think that before the second reading is carried there should be some slight explanation of it by the minister. This Precious Metals Marking Act deals with a very technical subject. I remember having made some years ago a study of it, and I recall further that when the late member for Renfrew South was minister, he undertook to amend this bill, and he got into a heap of trouble over the technicalities of it. Would the minister say what is the nature of the amendment? I have not had a chance to read the bill.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): I outlined the purpose of the bill on its introduction. It is only a small matter, the object being to bring into line with United States regulations, as imposed by the bureau of standards, with regard to the marking of precious metals, the Precious Metals Marking Act of Canada. A large part of the spectacleware used in Canada is imported from the United States, and complications have arisen owing to the fact that a slightly different requirement is called for in the imported article compared with the domestic product. At the request of the jewellers' association of Canada, comprising all manufacturers as well as retailers, and with only one dissenting voice, this legislation is being introduced to make uniform the regulations so that there will be no conflict in the checking that is done by the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): What will be the effect from the consumer's point of view? The difference between 10 per cent and 5 per

cent represents a considerable leeway. Is there a possibility of there being less gold in the alloy?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): The effect is trifling. As regards the protection of the general public, there will be no difficulty.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): They are doubling the leeway. Will it have an effect on the cost of spectacles?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): No effect at all.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Fournier (Hull) in the chair.

On section 1—"Gold." "Gold filled."

Mr. HANSELL: I am not a goldsmith, and I do not understand very much of the discussion that has gone on so far; but while the minister may say that the effect upon the consumer is trifling, it does seem to me that if the consumer is purchasing a certain article of gold, or containing gold, he may pay just the same price for a less valuable product. If I am right in that, I should like to know. What is the effect of the price ceiling on such commodities? I was in a furniture store the other day talking to the salesman, and he asked me if I wanted a nice chesterfield. He said, "You had better buy now." I said that I did not see what difference it made whether I bought then or six months from now, because the price would be just the same. I must admit that in that conversation I was patting the government on the back a little. He replied, "Don't fool yourself there. In six months' time you may come back and pay the same price, but it will not be the same chesterfield." Are we to understand that something like that may result from a bill of this kind? It is all very well to say that it is only trivial; but if a person buys an article for $100 and gets something with less gold in it than he thinks he is getting, it is the thin end of the wedge to encourage the giving of less value for the same money, even though there is a price ceiling. I wish the minister would make a statement along that line.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): Possibly the hon. member did not follow my statement. When I said the matter was trifling I was referring to spectacleware, there being only a slight difference in the gold content of the Canadian article in comparison with the gold content of the imported commodity. About 75 per cent of the spectacleware affected, used in Canada, is imported from the United States.

[Mr. T. C. Douglas.]

Mr. HANSELL: It applies only to spectacles?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): Just spectacles.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

APPOINTMENT OF GEORGE A. TOUCHE AND COMPANY AS AUDITORS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): A day or two ago my hon. friend, referring to Bill No. 9, respecting the appointment of auditors for national railways, raised some objection to going on with the bill until he had a statement from the Minister of Transport (Mr. Cardin). I believe the minister is in a position to make a statement at the moment. Whether he is ready to proceed with the bill, I cannot say.

Hon. P. J. A. CARDIN (Minister of Transport) moved the second reading of Bill No. 9, respecting the appointment of auditors for national railways.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have an idea that this bill should not be proceeded with until we get the accounts of the railways, and I would ask the minister not to go on with it. I am willing to expedite business but I do not think the bill ought to be gone on with until we see the accounts for last year. We should have the reports of these same auditors.

Mr. CARDIN: My hon. friend made that observation the other day in my absence, and the Prime Minister promised to refer the question to me. The report of the Canadian National as well as the report of the auditors will not be ready before late in the month of March, as was the case last year. Since this bill provides only for the appointment of the auditors, it is a mere formality, and it would not matter very much if we dispose of this bill appointing the auditors, or delay the bill until the reports are in. I have been informed by the officials of the Canadian National Railways that they will have their reports ready before the end of March; as my hon. friend indicated the other day, on account of the great amount of work that has been done by the railway, the report might be delayed a little longer than last year. Therefore it may be the end of March before we are in a position to proceed with this bill if we have to wait until the report of the Canadian National Railways is ready.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Are these auditors appointed for the calendar year or for the fiscal year of the railway, which may be the calendar year for all I know?

Mr. CARDIN: Yes; the fiscal year is the calendar year.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): These auditors are acting already, it is a continuous audit; they are never off the job so to speak, and it does not make much difference whether they are appointed to-day or in March, but I do think there is a reason why we should postpone it.

On motion of Mr. Cardin the debate was adjourned.

PETROLEUM

REPEAL OF PETROLEUM AND NAPHTHA INSPECTION ACT

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (for the Minister of National Revenue) moved the second reading of Bill No. 2, to repeal the Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act.

Mr. HOMUTH: Explain.

Mr. CRERAR: This bill stands, it will be observed, in the name of the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Gibson), but unfortunately my colleague is indisposed this evening, and in order to facilitate the business of the house I am undertaking this task. I must confess, however, that I really do not know a great deal about the bill. The explanatory note reveals the purpose of the measure. It is a repeal measure entirely. Apparently the original act was passed in 1877, which provided for certain forms of inspection. I am not able to give the house the details, but I presume, inspection of wells producing petroleum and naphtha, and also of factories or industrial establishments processing the same. Apparently the inspection has passed out of usage. I judge from the explanatory note that the regulations of municipal and provincial bodies regarding this inspection have superseded the inspection requirements contemplated under the act of 1877, and therefore there is no need of retaining that measure on the statute books. So this bill is introduced to repeal it.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I have some observations to make on this bill. I recall that in introducing the bill the minister gave a brief explanation in which he laid it down as a principle that the provisions of the act were obsolete and outmoded. That, I think, is largely true, but there are one or two things in that act which ought to be retained, and when I call attention to them, and the department and the minister give consideration to them, I believe their retention will be found desirable.

A word on the drafting of the bill. It is a repealing section. It is declaratory, and I suggest the insertion of the word "hereby"—"is hereby repealed". I do not know that that is important, but it is better drafting.

The explanatory note reads:

> Practically all the operative provisions of this act have been superseded by other acts and regulations of municipal, provincial or federal origin. . . .

Anyone who reviews the whole act, as I took occasion to do the other day, will agree that many sections were designed to meet conditions existing when the act was passed, away back before I was born, and owing to changes in these conditions the majority of the sections have not much if any importance to-day. But it occurs to me in reading the act that there are three or four sections which are still of importance, and which, so far as I am aware, are not duplicated by any other act of the federal parliament. I believe the minister should examine some of these sections and explain why it is not proposed to retain them.

Take, for example, section 3:

> 3. The governor in council may, from time to time, make such regulations respecting the storage and possession of petroleum and naphtha as he deems necessary for the public safety, and may make special regulations as to the importation or possession of naphtha and as to the sale thereof and use for illuminating purposes;

Then sections 4 and 5 seem to me worthy of retention:

> 4. The governor in council may, from time to time, designate places at which petroleum may be imported in tank cars and in tank ships respectively. . . .
>
> 5. The department may make regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, with respect to the transportation, shipment or sale of imported or domestic petroleum or naphtha.

I assume that both sections have been operative in the past. Powers similar to those contained in these sections are now, I believe, vested in the oil controller under an order in council passed pursuant to the War Measures Act. But I point out to the house and to the Minister of National Revenue that these powers of the oil controller are of a transitory nature, and that at the close of the war and upon the disappearance of the War Measures Act these powers will disappear. Should there not rest in some governmental body some power to regulate the storage and possession of petroleum, which power would continue in peace time? If you repeal this statute there is no power. This deals with

dangerous inflammable substances. In municipal communities, we try to keep these things away outside the city limits. I do not know under just what authority that is done; I know that in my own community we try to keep them as far away from the residential district as possible in order to keep down the fire hazard. But if sections 3, 4 and 5 are repealed, there will then be no one authority charged with the responsibility of making regulations about the conditions of storage of this most inflammable material. I do not think such an authority is necessary. At the moment it is not necessary, because I believe the order in council passed under the War Measures Act gives the oil controller full control over all these matters; but if you repeal this statute, at the conclusion of the war there will be no governmental body responsible for this sort of thing. If we have jurisdiction now to pass the legislation which was passed and which is now sought to be repealed, then of course the jurisdiction is not with the provinces. I am just assuming that; I have not looked up the constitutional aspect. But I do suggest—and I offer this suggestion in the utmost good faith —that this power of control over storage and all the other things to which these sections refer should be retained in the post-war period. I think I have only to mention that to bring home to the minister the advisability of its being done. Somebody ought to have that authority. Perhaps there is some other authority; I do not know. At the moment the only authority I know of is the oil controller; and I do suggest to the minister—and this is a concrete suggestion to which I hope he will direct his colleague's attention—that these sections should be retained and perhaps redrafted to meet modern conditions.

I can give the minister an additional reason, from a local point of view. Some time ago there was drawn to my attention what was stated to be a serious situation in connection with the storage of petroleum products in Vancouver. I was told that this situation constituted a serious hazard to the people of that city, particularly in the event of air raids. I do not know what may have been done to rectify the situation, but what I have in mind is that there should be an act of this parliament which would empower the federal government to take direct steps in an instance of the kind to which I have referred, which might threaten the safety of a large number of people. I spoke of that before.

Then a question of some importance arises from the fact that this act was actually suspended by order in council P.C. 4-5204, passed on July 16, 1941, under the provisions of the War Measures Act. I assume it was found necessary to do so because of the, shall I say, somewhat obsolete provisions of the act, which are essentially of a peace-time nature. It would appear by every criterion that it was an abuse of the War Measures Act to use it in order to suspend the operations of a peace-time act of parliament. The conditions which led the governor in council to approve passage of the order in council of July 16 last surely must have been evident when parliament was in session last year, since adjournment did not take place until June 14.

I think the position ought to be reviewed, and I believe the minister will see that there is merit in the statute if these three sections are re-drafted and brought up to date. May I make one further appeal; that there be a cessation of the use of the War Measures Act for purposes essentially of a peace-time nature. The act never was so intended and cannot properly be so construed.

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): I should like to say a word on this bill. When the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Gibson) spoke on the matter previously he said that the bill was being brought down in order to stop the adulteration of petroleum and naphtha. To-day it is not a question of adulteration; the refineries are stepping up the gasoline so high that it is really dangerous, and we need an act to protect us. The Germans and Japanese are using gasoline with an octane rating of about 87. Canada and the United States are using gasoline with an octane rating of about 100. In order to step it up not only do they refine the gasoline to a higher degree; they put in propanes and other substances which bring it up to an anti-knock rating, and higher. These propanes have a freezing point of about 45 degrees below zero. That is all right when they are used in an aeroplane or an automobile, because the gases from the propane will sink to the bottom; but if this gasoline is used in a fishing boat, or any other boat, those gases will stay in the hull and cause explosions. This law should protect the fishermen from the danger of explosions caused by the use of propane in our gasoline. Therefore I believe this act ought to be revised all the way through, to take care of the sort of gasoline we are using to-day.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Fournier (Hull) in the chair.

On section 1—Act repealed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I hardly expected that the minister would allow the observations I made to go by without some comment. I was quite serious in what I had

to say. I do not want to impede the passage of this legislation, but I suggest to the minister that there is some merit in what I said and that he should ask this committee to rise and report progress in order that his colleague may become conversant with what I said, and consult his officers. They may have a very good answer to my statements; I do not know enough about the matter to say. But these were thoughts I had about it, and I believe there is something in them. I am not quite certain that there is any other controlling factor to-day than the oil controller, and obviously that is a war-time authority that will cease when peace comes. Then there will be nothing. I suggest that the minister should have the committee report progress and let this matter stand until the minister, and particularly the technical men of his department who no doubt are advising him in the matter, may consider the representations which have been made. I cannot add anything to what I have already said, but I have offered the suggestions in good faith, and I think there is something in them.

Mr. CRERAR: That will be quite agreeable to the government. I might, however, make an observation or two on the comments offered by the leader of the opposition before we went into committee. Let me say at once that I am not familiar with the provisions of this measure—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I realize that.

Mr. CRERAR: —that I have not studied it, and consequently what I have to say must be considered in view of that fact. But I think it will be found that matters concerning the inspection of oil wells, and everything having to do with them, come under provincial jurisdiction. I happen to know, for instance, that in Alberta, where in recent years there has been a substantial oil development, the provincial government does pass regulations regarding storage, transportation within the province, and like matters. I fancy these come within their jurisdiction, probably wholly so. When, however, it comes to matters of transportation in interprovincial trade, and so on, then the federal authority would have some jurisdiction. But I assume—and I may be wrong—that provisions necessarily governing the transportation are provided for in other measures probably enacted subsequently to 1877, and that that is the reason for asking the repeal in this instance.

I have just one other comment to make, and that is with regard to the observations by the leader of the opposition in invoking the War Measures Act to pass certain regulations to set aside provisions of an act which was very largely, if not entirely, obsolete. I do not think, on reflection, that any hon. member would dispute that it is necessary to have direct control, through the oil controller, over the movement of oil and gasoline when we are at war. It is quite true, as my hon. friend has said, that the provisions of that measure will lapse with the declaration of peace. But I do not believe his criticism was altogether deserved when he found fault with the government for taking steps under the War Measures Act to bring about a proper regulation of this matter in war time, and not proceeding by way of an amending act in the house.

Sometimes I am concerned with the extent of the powers which have to be used arbitrarily by the executive in war time. But we are in a war, and decisions frequently have to be made with a great deal of celerity. Time will not wait. I can assure my hon. friend and the committee that the government always has in mind the exercising of these powers in the public interest; and our good faith in that respect will have to be the justification for our actions.

Section stands.

Progress reported.

CANADIAN FORCES

REINSTATEMENT IN CIVIL EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONS WHO ENLIST IN HIS MAJESTY'S FORCES

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour) moved the second reading of Bill No. 5, to provide for the reinstatement in civil employment of individuals who enlist for service in his majesty's forces or who perform essential war employment.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill replaces an order in council similar in content to the bill now before the house. The bill, in turn, is similar to legislation now existing in Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia and the United States, although it follows more closely the legislation in Great Britain.

This bill provides for the orderly reinstatement, at the conclusion of hostilities, of men who have served in the forces on sea, on land or in the air. It also provides penalties for breaches of the provisions. It also provides that where agreements exist between employers and employees, on a mutual basis, provided those agreements are not less advantageous than the act itself, they shall be permitted to remain in effect.

In my opinion the measure will provide for the orderly reinstatement of tens of thousands of men who will leave the fighting forces at

the conclusion of the war, a provision which, I believe, we will all agree is somewhat in advance of the condition that existed at the conclusion of the last war. I played some part in the drafting of the original order in council, and in my opinion this is legislation which the people in Canada will approve. It is beneficial to the men to whom it is intended to apply, and I believe the house will approve the principle of the bill placed before it.

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): Mr. Speaker, may I add something to the observations of my colleague the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell). The order in council in question was applied on June 27, 1941, and was numbered P.C. 4758. It was passed on the recommendation of the general advisory committee on demobilization and rehabilitation, and an interdepartmental committee on labour coordination.

The order in council was passed, and I believe the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) asked the then Minister of Labour if he would supplement the order in council by legislation in parliament.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What is the date of the order in council?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): It is order in council P.C. 4758, and it is dated June 27, 1941. Then, by agreement the house came to the conclusion it would not bring down legislation at the last session, but would do so early in the next, or present one. Consequent upon the undertaking then given to the leader of the opposition, the present legislation is identical with that order in council, which was drafted by my colleague the Minister of Labour. The regulations in connection therewith are appended to the order in council and will be found at page 204 of volume 4 of the proclamations and orders in council relating to the war.

I think my hon. friend is desirous of adjourning the debate. The matter is non-contentious. It was considered by a parliamentary committee on pensions last year, and the Canadian Legion and other organizations have recommended that the government take action along these lines—first of all by way of order in council, as I have explained, and now by the bill actually before the house. I am sure all hon. members will be in agreement with the general principle of the legislation. The members who sat on the committee last year so expressed themselves. That is the only explanation I can give at the present time.

Mr. HOMUTH: Does it mean anything?

[Mr. Mitchell.]

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes; may I interrupt my hon. friend. In my experience in the administration of the department we have replaced, by compulsory methods, several ex-service men, within the last two or three months, under the provisions of the order in council I have recited.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to the minister for reminding me of the circumstances under which the bill has been brought down. I recall them now perfectly. I regret, however, that I have not had time to study the bill. My colleague the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) wishes to say a few words about it, and I am going to give way to him. I understand it will be agreeable if he moves the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes. Does the hon. member wish to speak on second reading, or in committee?

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): I should like to adjourn the debate.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We will not hold it up.

Mr. MacNICOL: If I may adjourn the debate, I should like to do so. The other night I spoke to the Prime Minister, and it was understood that the bill would not be before us this week. I am in accord with some of the principles contained in the measure, but I should like to point out some aspects which should be clarified.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has been kind enough to remind me of the conversation we had together. I would remind him that the night he wanted off was Friday—not to-night. I am, however, prepared to abide by the wishes of the house.

On motion of Mr. MacNicol the debate was adjourned.

SUPPLY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved that the house go into committee of supply.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Fournier (Hull) in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

1. Agriculture—departmental administration, $125,558.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 9.12 p.m.

Tuesday, February 24, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

SECRET SESSION OF THE HOUSE

The house, in conformity with a resolution, agreed to on motion of the right hon. the Prime Minister on Friday, the 20th day of February instant, went into secret session, until the house should otherwise order.

At the conclusion of the secret session, the following report of its proceedings was issued under the authority of Mr. Speaker.

"A secret session of the House of Commons was held at 3 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday the 24th February, 1942.

"The sitting was devoted to the question of the defence of Canada in its widest qualification. Statements were made by the Honourable Messrs. Ralston, Power and Macdonald, the ministers in charge of National Defence. A variety of questions dealing with different aspects of the war were asked and answered. Many details were given the members of the house.

J. Allison Glen,
Speaker."

It being twenty minutes after eleven o'clock, the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Wednesday, February 25, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS

PROTECTED AREAS—JAPANESE NATIONALS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—MEASURES FOR SECURITY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I wish to lay on the table a copy of an order in council which was passed yesterday amending the defence of Canada regulations and giving the Minister of Justice increased powers to require persons to leave "protected areas." It might be of service to the house if I were to table at this time a number of orders in council that have been passed which have a special relation to conditions as they exist in the province of British Columbia as a result of situations arising out of Japan's declaration of war.

The order in council which I have just tabled, P.C. 1486, amends the defence of Canada regulations so as to provide authority for the Minister of Justice to require any or all persons to leave a protected area as defined by order of the Minister of National Defence and to impose restrictions in respect of their employment, business, movement or places of residence. Under this authority the Minister of Justice may also prohibit or restrict the possession or use by any or all persons in the protected area of any specified articles and require their delivery to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. In short, the defence of Canada regulations as now amended give the Minister of Justice full power to take any required security measures with regard to any person if in the protected area. The protected area in British Columbia has already been defined by the Minister of National Defence as the coastal area between the Cascade mountains and the sea, including all the islands off the coast of British Columbia.

In addition to the above mentioned order in council, the following orders have previously been passed relating to security on the Pacific coast:

P.C. 9591, December 7, 1941 and P.C. 9760, December 16, 1941, respecting compulsory registration of all persons of Japanese race. That has already been tabled.

P.C. 9761, December 16, 1941, providing for control of vessels used or operated by persons of Japanese race.

P.C. 251 of January 13, 1942, prohibiting the issuance of fishing licences to persons of Japanese race, and prohibiting such persons from serving on fishing vessels. That has also been tabled.

P.C. 365, January 16, 1942, amending the Defence of Canada regulations so as to authorize the Minister of National Defence, with the concurrence of the Minister of Justice to declare any area in Canada a protected area, or if it appears necessary or expedient so to do, and in the public interest, and in respect of such areas conferring certain powers with regard to the persons and property of any enemy aliens.

P.C. 1271, February 17, 1942, providing for the establishment of a Canadian-Japanese construction corps, to be formed by Canadian nationals of Japanese racial origin, and establishing conditions of enrolment and terms of service for the said corps.

P.C. 1348, February 19, 1942, authorizing the establishment of work camps for male enemy aliens including Japanese nationals, on projects outside protected areas.

P.C. 1365 of February 19, 1942, prohibiting the possession of fire-arms or explosives by persons of Japanese race.

P.C. 1457 of February 24, 1942, regulating the acquisition of land or any interest therein, or the growing of crops in Canada by persons of Japanese race and by Japanese controlled companies.

In order to complete the record of the principal orders in council in this connection, copies of the following orders in council (in addition to P.C. 1486 of February 24, 1942), are tabled herewith:

P.C. 365 of January 16, 1942; P.C. 1271 of February 17, 1942; P.C. 1348 of February 19, 1942; P.C. 1365 of February 19, 1942; and P.C. 1457 of February 24, 1942.

Mr. NEILL: Would it be possible to have these orders in council included in *Votes and Proceedings?* It would save a good deal of copying, and we should like to have access to them.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It would be very convenient.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I see no reason why they should not be included in the *Votes and Proceedings* if the house is agreeable. The clerk might be so instructed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If I appreciated aright what the Prime Minister said, that this order in council, which was passed on February 24, probably at the time we were in secret session yesterday—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, it was passed before the session.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, I am just suggesting that we did observe three cabinet ministers hurry to leave the chamber last night and come back again, and I have a right to draw some conclusions.

Mr. CRERAR: Three cabinet ministers cannot pass an order in council.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, I may be wrong in my deduction. If I apprehended aright what the Prime Minister said, the order is not mandatory on the Minister of Justice; it is merely enabling, is it not?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If it were made mandatory in its broad terms, I am afraid the Minister of Justice would have a very large order because it gives him power over any person in a protected area to take any step that the security of the people of British Columbia would seem to necessitate.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The answer is, it is merely enabling.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, it is an all-enabling order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, that is a good way to put it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps I should give to the house a statement I gave to the press this morning. I would have made it to the house first but I thought it was in the interest of law and order out on the Pacific coast that this communication should reach British Columbia without delay.

The statement was to the effect that power had been given to the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) to exclude any or all persons, regardless of their citizenship, from protected areas as defined under the defence of Canada regulations.

The new regulation corresponds very closely to the proclamation issued by the President of the United States on Friday.

Under the amended order the Minister of Justice may require any or all persons, whether British subjects or not, to leave a protected area. He is further authorized to impose such restrictions as he may specify in respect of their employment, business, movements or places of residence. He can prohibit or restrict the possession or use by any or all persons in the protected area of any specified articles and can require the delivery of such articles to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. In short, the defence of Canada regulations as now amended give the Minister of Justice full power to take any required security measure within the protected area with regard to any person within that area.

The protected area in British Columbia in which the new order will apply has been defined by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) as the coastal belt between the Cascade mountains and the sea, including all the islands off the coast of British Columbia.

It is the policy of the government to use the powers of this order to take all necessary security measures to safeguard the defences of the Pacific coast of Canada.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

COASTAL MOTOR BOATS

Mr. BRUCE:

1. How many coastal motor boats have been ordered?
2. How many were completed by October 31, 1941?
3. What was the total cost?
4. How many of these boats reached Halifax before the close of navigation?
5. How many of these boats are now in commission?
6. In what state of completion are the balance of the boats?
7. At what points are any boats, which did not reach Halifax before the close of navigation, tied up?

Mr. MACDONALD (Kingston City): This question was brought up the other day, and I answered it to my hon. friend privately. I hope he will be ready to drop it from the order paper.

Mr. BRUCE: That is satisfactory to me, Mr. Speaker.

Question dropped.

JAPANESE NATIONALS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. NEILL:

1. Did the government, on January 14, last, issue a statement of policy regarding Japanese in British Columbia?
2. Did one of the items state that Japanese nationals will be forbidden to possess or use short wave radio receiving sets, radio transmitters and cameras?
3. Was such prohibition enforced by order in council, and, if so, what was the number of such order?
4. Were instructions given to any military or police authorities to enforce the said order in council?
5. If so, when and to whom?
6. How many of the receiving sets, transmitters and cameras have been surrendered or seized up to date?
7. Why was the restriction confined to Japanese nationals and not extended to those born in Japan and since 1922 naturalized in Canada?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Order-in-council P.C. 365 January 15, 1942, gives the minister the power to make such prohibition from time to time, and he has made an order dated February 5, 1942.
4. Yes.
5. February 5, 1942. Commissioner, R.C.M. Police.
6. No information as yet.
7. The restriction is not now confined to Japanese nationals.

PENITENTIARIES COMMISSION

Mr. CHURCH:

1. When was the royal commission on prisons appointed, and who were its members?
2. What was the total cost of this commission, including fees, salaries, travelling expenses and all other emoluments?
3. When was the report received?
4. Have any of its recommendations been carried out?
5. When will the penitentiary commission be appointed?
6. What is the reason for the delay?
7. Who are the present chief heads operating this branch of the service, and what training have they for work of this nature?
8. Will consideration be given to giving effect to the Borstal system?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. February 27, 1936. Hon. Mr. Justice Joseph Archambault, R. W. Craig, K.C., J. C. McRuer, K.C.
2. $108,719.70.
3. Tabled June 14, 1938.
4. Yes.
5. This involves a question of policy.
6. See answer to question 5.
7. (a) P. M. Anderson, K.C., senior advisory counsel, acting for the deputy minister of justice with respect to penitentiary matters. Mr. Anderson has been so acting for the last four years.

(b) Acting Superintendent G. L. Sauvant, Bachelor of Arts, university of Montreal; translator and proof reader, 1915, clerk of the crown in chancery; war service with French forces, graduate of St. Cyr Military Academy, wounded, 1917, served as interpreter during convalescence, instructor in bayonet fighting and grenade throwing; appointed second lieutenant in March, 1919; decorations, Croix de Guerre, Verdun medal; agent for Dominion Publishing Company; contributor to Revue Jeanne d'Arc of Ottawa; appointed instructor in French at Royal Military College, Kingston, Ontario, 1924; appointed librarian school teacher, St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, March 5, 1928, to November 19, 1929; promoted warden's clerk, 1st August, 1929; promoted inspector of penitentiaries, July 16, 1934; sent to St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary as acting warden, October 1, 1937; appointed acting superintendent of penitentiaries, July 27, 1938; (Coronation medal).

(c) Inspector E. L. O'Leary, O.A.S.: education received at Richibucto, N.B., and St. Dunstan's college, Charlottetown (commercial course); 1910-13, Royal Bank of Canada; 1914, bookkeeper, R. Sullivan & Co., St. John, N.B.; 1914-19, with C.E.F. and R.A.F.; granted commission C.F.A., 1916, awarded military cross, 1918; 1920-23, with Soldier Settlement Board in Edmonton; 1923-27, accountant with Abitibi Power and Paper Co.; 1927, assistant paymaster with Lake St. John Power and Paper Co. Ltd.; 1928, office manager, power plant, with P. Lyall and Sons Construction Co. Ltd.; 1930-32, chief accountant, Seigniory Club, Quebec; 1933, accountant, Watson Jack & Co. Ltd.; 1934, accountant, Benzolene Corp. Ltd.; 1935, appointed inspector of penitentiaries; 1940, granted leave of absence, without pay, for purpose of enlistment in Royal Canadian Air Force.

(d) Inspector G. E. Shortt: Bachelor of Arts (Queen's); B.L.S. (McGill); Ph.D. (university of Michigan, Ann Arbor); 1915-17, service with C.E.F. conducting officer, troop transports, north Atlantic; 1917-18 English civil service (seed oat control, England and Wales); three years business administration, including two years as executive General Motors Acceptance Corporation; five and one-half years, investigator under Combines Investigation Act; one year with royal commission to investigate the penal system of

Canada (conferences with leading prison administrators and investigation of foreign prisons); appointed inspector and auditor of penitentiaries, July 13, 1938; Canadian civil service employment 15 years.

8. This involves a question of policy.

Mr. MAYHEW:

Which, if any, of the recommendations of the royal commission on the penal system of Canada in its report of April, 1938, have already been, or are about to be, acted upon?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. (a) A convict at present earns remission as from the date of admission instead of the seventh month of sentence as was the case previously.

(b) Remission is now allowed for holidays and also for periods of sickness.

(c) For purposes of remission, overlapping terms are considered as one.

2. A thorough inspection of penitentiary industries has been made.

3. Shaving and bathing of convicts have been made more frequent.

4. In each case recommended by wardens, convicts who are to be rearrested on discharge, or deported, have been allowed their remuneration earned during their sentences.

5. Arrangements are being made to have some penitentiary farm vegetables canned commercially for own use.

6. Wardens are now more fully consulted with regard to the advisability of improvements in connection with their work.

7. More liberal visiting and writing privileges have been accorded to deserving convicts.

8. Improved cell lighting has been installed wherever possible.

9. Kitchens have been renovated and special ranges installed in practically every institution. Cleanliness and preparation of food are receiving careful attention.

10. Contributions of convicts to the radio entertainment fund have been discontinued.

11. In several penitentiaries, young convicts are now trained in the motor mechanic trade, notwithstanding that they are still segregated from adult class. In one institution, a new shoe shop has been opened and young convicts only are employed therein.

12. Practically all vegetables required in the penitentiary service are now produced on the penitentiary farms. Surpluses of over one million pounds were diverted to army and other government departments in 1941.

13. A dairy herd has been established in one of the penitentiaries not previously so equipped.

14. Wardens were authorized to use waste material for demonstrational purposes in convict training.

15. Many more officers have been made permanent within the limitations placed by the treasury board:

	1938-39	1939-40	1940-41	1941-42	Total
Kingston	30	20	Nil	Nil	50
St. Vincent de Paul	39	15	Nil	Nil	54
Dorchester	26	11	Nil	Nil	37
Manitoba	15	15	Nil	Nil	30
British Columbia	27	13	Nil	Nil	40
Saskatchewan	10	20	Nil	Nil	30
Collin's Bay	24	15	Nil	Nil	39
	171	109			280

16. Certain officers were selected to proceed to the training school, Wakefield, England, for a course of instruction. The first draft proceeded in 1939, but subsequent drafts were cancelled in September of the same year on account of the war.

17. Poultry raising has been started in one penitentiary.

18. Convicts are provided with lighters; convicts pay for flints only.

19. More convicts are being employed in industrial labour.

20. Officers' private cars now may be repaired by convict labour.

21. More schooling is provided for young convicts at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary.

22. Recommendations regarding the keeping of stores have been followed as far as possible and are the general practice to be observed in the future.

23. Authority for expenditures by wardens has been increased, thereby reducing the number of requests and correspondence for minor expenditures of maintenance and other routine matters.

24. In several penitentiaries, showers have been installed in the cell blocks.

INCOME WAR TAX ACT—APPEALS

Mr. STOKES:

1. How many appeals from assessment under the Income War Tax Act were made (a) by corporations, (b) by individuals, during each of the fiscal years ending March 31, 1939, 1940 and 1941?

2. How many of such appeals were determined personally by the Minister of National Revenue?

3. How many of such appeals were determined by the commissioner of income tax or by other official pursuant to authority purported to be vested in such official by the minister?

4. How many of such appeals are still pending?

5. How many of such appeals were determined in favour of (a) the appellant, (b) the crown?

6. In how many cases did the appellant serve notice of dissatisfaction with the decision and appeal to the exchequer court?

7. How many of such cases were determined by the exchequer court in favour of (a) the appellant, (b) the crown?

Mr. GIBSON:

1. (a) 1939, 163; 1940, 176; 1941, 137. (b) 1939, 175; 1940, 146; 1941, 149.

2. No records available.

3. No records available.

4. (a) 1939, 7; 1940, 18; 1941, 43. (b) 1939, 15; 1940, 15; 1941, 49.

5. (a) Corporations: 1939, 65; 1940, 43; 1941, 26. Individuals: 1939, 70; 1940, 40; 1941, 31. (b) Corporations: 1939, 91; 1940, 115; 1941, 68. Individuals: 1939, 90; 1940, 91; 1941, 69.

6. Corporations: 1939, 5.

7. (a) 1; (b) 4.

DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS—INTERNMENTS

Mr. STOKES:

1. How many advisory committees have been appointed under regulation 22 of the defence of Canada regulations?

2. What are the names of the members of each such committee?

3. When was each such committee appointed?

4. How many objections to internment have been heard by each such committee?

5. In how many cases has each committee recommended (a) the release of an internee, (b) the continued detention of an internee?

Mr. ST. LAURENT:

1. Under regulation 22 of the defence of Canada regulations (consolidation), 1941—two.

2. (1) Daniel O'Connell, K.C., former county court judge; Robert Taschereau, K.C., William M. Dickson.

(2) His Honour Judge J. C. A. Cameron, Arthur Gagne, K.C., Robert Forsyth, K.C.

3. (1) June 26, 1941. (2) July 14, 1941.

4. (1) 83. (2) 136.

5. (1) (a) 43 releases; (b) 40 continued detention.

(2) (a) 76 releases; (b) 60 continued detention.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC INFORMATION—TOURIST AND TRAVEL BUREAUX

Mr. ISNOR:

1. What salary, remuneration or allowance do members of the tourist development committee receive from any department of the government?

2. What members of the tourist development committee, bureau of public information or Canadian travel bureau hail from the maritime provinces?

3. What is the scope of authority of the bureau of public information?

4. Does the said bureau deal with naval and military matters?

5. If so, in what manner?

6. How does the bureau distribute its material?

Mr. THORSON:

1. None.

2. (a) None; largely an interdepartmental committee. We have no record of the birthplace of members of the committee; representation thereon is not on a geographical basis.

(b) Miss Muriel Ann Mosley, secretary to the director of public information; Mr. E. A. Corbett, speakers' division, public information.

(c) Mr. D. Leo Dolan, chief, Canadian travel bureau. Mr. H. A. McCallum, assistant chief, Canadian travel bureau.

3. To collect and disseminate to the public, information concerning the various phases of the war effort of the Canadian people and the activities of the government in relation thereto, and generally to coordinate the existing public information services of the government and originate or employ other means in order that the same may be used in the most efficient way for the obtaining of the utmost aid from the people of Canada in the national emergency which has arisen.

4. Only to the extent of distributing material provided by those departments and the printing of booklets and posters specifically requested by them.

5. See answer to No. 4.

6. Through the news services; photographic services; press gallery; by direct mail; through clubs, societies and other organizations; members of parliament; by radio and on the motion picture screen. Poster material is distributed through factories, firms, government offices and individuals, et cetera.

*LANCASTER MILITARY HOSPITAL—WEST ST. JOHN

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What were the names of all employees, including medical and clerical staff, of Lancaster hospital, West Saint John, from the year 1919 to the year 1941?

2. What were their salaries per year and what were their pensions per year from 1919 to 1941?

3. Were any of these employees supplied with automobiles by the government? If so, how many and what are their names?

4. What were the prices of these automobiles?

5. What year were such automobiles purchased?

6. What was the cost of operating these cars from the date of purchase to the year 1941?

7. What year was Lancaster hospital opened as a military hospital?

8. What was the total cost of the Lancaster hospital since its opening as a military hospital to the year 1941?

9. What was the cost of all repairs to Lancaster hospital since its opening as a military hospital to the year 1941?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): The other day I informed my hon. friend that some of this information was not available. If he will consult me or some of my officers, we shall be glad to make available what information we have.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It was a question of lessening the time. I undertook to see the hon. member but did not. The question can stand in the meantime.

Question stands.

SUCCESSION DUTY

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. What is the total amount of succession duty under the Dominion Succession Duty Act that has been (a) assessed, (b) collected since the said act was assented to on the 14th of June, 1941?

2. How many persons deceased since the said date have left estates with a gross valuation of $500,000 or over?

3. (a) What were the names and addresses of such persons; (b) what was the aggregate value of, and amount of succession duty assessed or levied against each of said estates?

Mr. GIBSON:

1. (a) $477,218.40. (b) $3,836,890.64 as at January 31, 1942.

2. Records not available because of six months period for filing after the death of deceased; however, the number filed is 17.

3. It is not deemed in the public interest to give the individual particulars requested in this question.

EAST AND WEST BLOCKS, OTTAWA—FIRE PROTECTION

Mr. WINKLER:

1. Are precautions contemplated or have they been taken, to prevent destruction by fire of the historic east and west blocks in the group of government buildings at Ottawa?

2. Has an estimate been made of the cost of installing a sprinkler system in those buildings?

3. If so, what is the amount?

[Mr. Hatfield.]

Mr. CARDIN:

1. The east and west blocks are protected by the May-Oatway fire detector system which is connected to the city fire alarm system. In addition there are stand pipes with hose racks, fire pumps and also portable chemical fire extinguishers.

2. No.

3. Answered by No. 2.

1941 VICTORY LOAN

Mr. QUELCH:

1. What amount was loaned by the chartered banks to individuals and corporations for the purchase of victory bonds in 1941?

2. What amount has been loaned to individuals and corporations on the security of Victory bonds purchased in 1941?

3. What rate of interest was charged on these loans?

Mr. ILSLEY:

1. It is understood that loans made by the chartered banks to finance the purchase of victory loan bonds by individuals, corporations and other bodies, totalled $135,978,539 on June 30, 1941.

2. No information other than given in No. 1.

3. For a period of six months subsequent to June 15, 1941, the rate of interest charged on such loans was equal to the coupon rate received in the victory bonds.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE—ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. McGREGOR:

1. On what date did the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police complete the annual report of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police for the year ended March 31 1941?

2. On what date was the said report transmitted by the Minister of Justice to His Excellency the Governor General?

3. On what date was the said report sent to the king's printer for printing?

4. On what date was the printing and binding of the said report completed?

5. On what date was the said report laid on the table of the House of Commons?

Mr. St. LAURENT:

1. On account of pressure of other work, the report was not completed until August 16, 1941.

2. This action is not usually taken.

3. English edition, August 18, 1941. French edition, October 20, 1941.

4. English edition, October 16, 1941. French edition, December 19, 1941.

5. February 12, 1942, both editions.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

NATIONAL RESOURCES MOBILIZATION ACT—
MEDICAL BOARDS

Mr. PARENT:

What is the number of young men of 21, 22, 23 and 24 years of age who were called before a medical board under the provisions of the National Resources Mobilization Act, 1940, in the following districts: (a) London, (b) Toronto, (c) Kingston, (d) head of the lakes, (e) Montreal, (f) Quebec, (g) Halifax, (h) New Brunswick, (i) Prince Edward Island, (j) Manitoba, (k) British Columbia, (l) Saskatchewan, (m) Alberta?

WEYBURN, SASK., AIRPORT

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

1. What is the total amount for which commitments have been made in respect to the construction of the airport at Weyburn, Saskatchewan?
2. What is the total estimated cost of this project?
3. From what person or persons was the land purchased as a site for said airport?
4. What is the legal description of each piece of land purchased or leased and how much was paid for each parcel of land?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

1941 VICTORY LOAN

Mr. CHURCH:

For a return showing a breakdown of the details given in a return, November 12, 1941, in connection with the sale of the 1941 victory loan, as follows:—

Preparation and distribution of bonds		$ 363,921 86
Administration expenses:		
Salaries	$149,881 67	
Travelling expenses	285,038 37	
Stationery and office supplies	160,673 25	
Rental of office space	29,006 77	
Sundry expenses, including postage, telephone, telegraph, etc.	145,226 24	
		769,826 30
Publicity expenses:		
Newspaper and magazine advertising	476,677 00	
Posters, including billboard posters and posting	79,565 83	
Radio advertising	86,618 17	
Local advertising	160,888 13	
Other publicity	254,319 85	
		1,058,068 98
Commissions to individual canvassers on general subscriptions		1,551,713 80
Remuneration to banks, trust and loan companies—service fee for handling and delivering bonds		1,750,000 00
Remuneration to investment dealers and stockbrokers re pooled subscriptions		3,293,040 00
Total		$8,786,570 94

The said return to show the details of each of the main items set out aforesaid.

Mr. ILSLEY: The hon. gentleman has written me about this notice and has kindly consented to allow me some discretion as to the items which will be broken down. I am quite content to have it passed on the understanding that information which it has never been considered in accord with the public interest to disclose shall not be disclosed. That applies to some of the items.

Mr. CHURCH: I have no idea of interfering with anything. This motion was called three times when I was away. Perhaps I might say a few words about it.

My idea in bringing this up last November was in regard to past loans. I thought the chartered banks, the Bank of Canada, the post offices and other departments could effect a great economy. I think the government might well pass it, and break it down after, if that is satisfactory. If not, it can be dropped, and I will bring it up again after the present loan is over.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I assume that the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) did not hear the statement of the Minister of Finance. Could not a return be brought down subject to the reservation stated by the minister? I have an idea that the hon. member thinks the introduction of this question at the moment, and the bringing down of a return based thereon, might be detrimental to the present loan, and of course he would like to avoid that. However, I should like to see some of this information brought down, though certainly I would not want it done at the expense of the present loan, if the minister thinks it might have that effect. But could it not be passed, with the understanding that the minister will use his own discretion as to what he shall bring down?

Mr. ILSLEY: It seemed to be the feeling of some of my colleagues at least that it would be undesirable to pass this motion now, and the hon. gentleman offered to let it drop. If he wants to put it on the order paper again, however, I can give him some of this information. Some of it I cannot give; some it would be most undesirable to give. For instance, there were some seventeen thousand canvassers in the last loan, and it would be an impossible task, and undesirable, to say what each one of them received.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I agree.

Mr. ILSLEY: I think it would be desirable to let the motion drop now. In the meantime I will confer with the hon. member, and perhaps he and I can frame a motion that will bring down the information he desires.

DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS—AIR RAID PRECAUTIONS

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all orders in council, reports and other documents in the possession of the government relative to the defence of Canada regulations. Also a copy of all correspondence exchanged with the provinces relative to the enforcement of blackouts, covered by section 35 of the defence of Canada rules and regulations, as well as a copy of the order in council delegating this authority to provincial attorneys general instead of to the district military authorities.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): This motion refers to an order in council delegating authority to provincial attorneys general instead of to district military authorities. There is no such order in council. There is an instrument of delegation which I can table immediately. The correspondence will be somewhat voluminous, and to produce it may take some time.

Motion agreed to.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FERRY

INQUIRY AS TO SERVICE BETWEEN ISLAND AND MAINLAND

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of Transport, who I am sorry is not in his seat, to the situation which has arisen in connection with the car ferry service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I ask the house to bear with me while I give a brief recital of the present position as I see it.

On the 23rd instant, the day before yesterday, the ferry *Prince Edward Island* was held up at Borden with a leaky boiler, and there is now no conveyance by boat between the mainland and the island. All freight and passenger movement are held up, and the only chance to get on and off the island is by air. Just how long it will take to repair the boiler is not known. I am advised that last week there were over one hundred carloads of freight at Tormentine awaiting shipment to the island, and in addition to the ordinary shipments of live stock moving off the island, over two hundred reefer cars were required to ship potatoes to the United States. These potatoes represent a value to the farmers of approximately $1,000 per car, and if the situation does not improve very shortly a very severe loss will be sustained. I understand that the transportation committee of the Charlottetown board of trade met on the 23rd instant and passed a resolution, which was telegraphed to the Prime Minister, but so far as I know no answer has yet been received.

I placed some questions about this matter on the order paper for the purpose of eliciting some information, but the answers brought down on Monday last indicate that nothing is being done to improve the situation. Of course, when these questions were placed on the order paper the present ferry was not out of commission. I am also advised that if an order had been given in the United States for a new ferry within a reasonable time after the *Charlottetown* was lost, that order could have been filled, since they are filling orders over there for icebreakers and so on for the great lakes.

Will the Prime Minister, or the Minister of Transport, or in his absence the Minister of Munitions and Supply, who has had perhaps more to do with this matter than anyone else, indicate what is intended to be done to cope with the present situation, which is rapidly going from bad to worse, perhaps through no fault on the part of anyone in particular but because of delay in dealing with the situation.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): This matter has been giving the government a great deal of concern. I assume that the Department of Munitions and Supply is the bottleneck. The position is that in order to rebuild this ferry we would have to give up a berth in one of our shipyards for a period of some fifteen months. We would have to divert sufficient steel to build probably two or three twin screw corvettes, which are badly needed; and considering the urgency of our naval requirements and of shipbuilding generally, we have not thought it advisable to do this.

My hon. friend is quite mistaken as to the possibility of having the ferry built in the United States. That possibility was explored immediately after the sinking. We scoured the second-hand market there, and looked into the position of the shipyards. At that time every shipyard was controlled by the government, and it was quite impossible to get a berth.

The service is carried on at the moment by a car ferry which handled the service until 1929, I think, and which is a perfectly good ferry. There are two car ferries on the run, but at present only one operates; and it is not unusual for the present ferry to carry on the service for six weeks or two months at this time of year. That ferry is operating. There was a short delay while a boiler was overhauled or repaired, but these things do occur when there is only one boat in operation, causing a temporary tie-up of cars. But unless this service has changed tremendously

since earlier years the present car ferry should be able to handle the traffic with reasonable satisfaction to the people on the island. At this time of year, when the floe ice is heavy, the service always has been subject to short interruptions. It is not unusual to have a ferry go out to sea and be away for thirty-six hours before being able to dock on the other side; at least that has occurred more than once. In the meantime I would remind hon. members that a second service has been inaugurated between Wood island and Pictou, which I believe will relieve the situation considerably during the summer months.

I can assure every hon. member that the government is exceedingly anxious to rectify this situation, but at the moment that could be done only at great cost to our war effort. We are organized in one set of yards to build cargo boats, which we are launching every two months from every berth. It would perhaps mean losing eight or ten cargo vessels if we built a new ferry or, alternatively, losing two or three corvettes. In this period of war we must weigh the relative urgency of the needs in both directions, and that we have been doing. The moment we think we can spare a berth of any sort that can build a successor to the *Charlottetown,* the boat will be built. In the meantime a ferry has been found, I think in San Francisco or Los Angeles, which may be of some service as a stand-by boat. This is being examined very closely, and if it is found at all satisfactory it will be brought around and put on the service for such assistance as it is able to render.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

LEAVE FOR FARMERS' SONS—LENGTH OF DEFERMENT OF SERVICE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence, arising out of a very large number of communications I have been receiving from farmers located all across Canada, asking whether or not in view of the pronounced labour shortage which now exists on the farms it is the intention of the government to enable farmers' sons or others qualified to do farm work to go on leave, so that the spring work may be properly completed.

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I can say that just at this instant I have not in mind any special or new policy with regard to that matter. It has each year been taken into consideration, having regard to the requirements of various units, and where they were placed. I may say that with respect to certain units in certain locations it was impossible to make any substantial break in the ranks by the granting of leave. In other locations, and with respect to other units that was possible, and it has been done.

As I say, I have not at present in mind any general principle which could govern uniformly across Canada. But I assure my hon. friend the matter will have every study, and the very best possible will be done in order to make men available where they can be made available for the important work to which the hon. member has referred.

Mr. N. J. M. LOCKHART (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, further to the question asked by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), I will not attempt to read or to refer to the many communications I have received, but I should like to ask a further question of the minister, indicated in several of the communications I have received. Is there any possibility of the extension of the term of exemption to, say, one year, in connection with farmers' sons? I have some very urgent cases I could show the minister, and I shall be glad to do so. But could that term be extended so that it will cover the whole year?

An hon. MEMBER: What about conscription?

Mr. RALSTON: My hon. friend is referring to regulations made by the Department of National War Services rather than by the Department of National Defence. Furthermore, he will realize that what he is asking for is, in effect, direct exemption for one year for a certain class. That does not fit in very well with all that has been said with respect to the necessity for the utilization of man-power, and the effort for total war.

In so far as my department can be of service in working out any more equitable situation with respect to those on the farm, I shall be glad to see that its services are available, and that conferences and consultations are held. But I cannot say anything further than that. One cannot offhand and without due consideration indicate a new policy or draft a new regulation.

Mr. LOCKHART: I am not asking that extended exemption be given in general; that is not my point at all. But there are extreme cases. For instance, may farmers about to do their spring work be assured that they will have a continuance of at least a short exemption?

Mr. RALSTON: That is a matter, first, of regulation. The regulations provide that the period of exemption shall be six months. There

is only one deferment granted at one time, but there is nothing which makes it positive that another deferment will not be granted. Secondly, it is a matter for the board to decide whether or not the case is one of emergency, and of the kind my hon. friend has in mind.

Mr. CHURCH: What about those in the cities who want exemptions?

Mr. T. C. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, following up the questions already asked with reference to farmers' sons in training being given leave to help with spring seeding, I would ask the Minister of National Defence this question. Such cases as I have had come to my attention I have referred to the Deputy Minister of National Defence, who has been very considerate and suggested that if the men will make application to their commanding officer consideration will be given to such applications. But most of these men do not know that, and the result is that scores of letters on the subject are coming to almost every member representing a rural constituency. Would the minister give consideration to having a statement printed in army orders to the effect that where men are needed at home on the farm and can be spared, leave can be had by applying to the commanding officer?

Mr. RALSTON: I would not want to have a statement made in quite that way, but I will see if some statement can be prepared with regard to the procedure in cases of the kind. Very recently we have made a rule which I think will be made uniform, that where men are actually in the army—not just those who have been called up and have not yet actually reported—we are referring such cases of men actually in the army, at least in the early stages of their training, to these boards. We are asking the Minister of National War Services to request his boards to look into these cases so that they may be dealt with on a uniform basis, and not on the basis of what one commanding officer may think in one place and another may think in another. This will help to get a set of principles laid down with respect to these men being entitled to deferment if deferment seems to be required.

DEFERMENT OF SERVICE OF FOURTH SON FOR BUSINESS REASONS

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence which arises out of the question asked by the hon. member for Lincoln. A widow has three sons who have enlisted voluntarily for service in England and she wants to have a fourth son kept home for business reasons, but the tribunal ruled against her. There should not be conscription in some homes and not in others. Are any instructions issued to the tribunals in these matters?

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): If I understand my hon. friend aright his question is: are any instructions issued with regard to business men?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): To the tribunals.

Mr. RALSTON: That question is really one which ought to be referred to my colleague, the Minister of National War Services. No instructions are issued to tribunals by my department in that respect.

[*Later:*]

Mr. CHURCH: Can the Minister of National War Services give me an answer to the question I asked a few moments ago?

POSTPONEMENT FOR FIFTH SON

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): I should like to ask any of the war ministers or the Minister of National War Services if a man who has four sons who have enlisted voluntarily in the army can secure an indefinite postponement of training for the fifth son?

Hon. J. T. THORSON (Minister of National War Services): The matter is covered by the national war services regulations which are administered by divisional boards. It is within the discretion of the board to grant a postponement, but each postponement is confined to a limit of six months. There is nothing to prevent a board from granting either one or more extensions of such postponement.

SECOND VICTORY LOAN

RETURNS FROM ONTARIO—VILLAGE OF OMEMEE AND TOWNSHIP OF EMILY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. BRUCE McNEVIN (Victoria, Ont.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I note in this morning's *Globe and Mail* a report with regard to those Ontario municipalities which were first in reaching their allotments in connection with the victory loan. I have not the slightest desire in any way to detract from the splendid record of these municipalities. However, in order that the record may be clear, may I say that the village of Omemee and the township of Emily exceeded their objective of $65,000, by six and one-half per cent within fifteen minutes after the victory loan offices opened on the morning of Monday, February 16. I believe there should be a word of commendation for the

joint chairmen of these municipalities, Rev. R. M. Patterson of Omemee and Rev. Father McFadden of Downeyville. The canvassers Messrs. D. Weir, A. Carroll and A. McQuade are still going strong and have exceeded the sum of $100,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe that is not a question of privilege.

RETURNS FROM QUEBEC—MEGANTIC COUNTY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JOSEPH LAFONTAINE (Megantic-Frontenac): I should like to read a telegram which I received yesterday, reading as follows:

We take pleasure in advising you that Megantic county has to-day obtained and passed its objective of one million and four hundred thousand dollars. We understand this is the first county in the province of Quebec to reach its objective.

A. S. Johnson,
J. A. Forand,
Joint Chairmen, victory loan committee, county Megantic

PRIVILEGE—Mr. KINLEY

OTTAWA HOUSING CONDITIONS—COMMENT OF MAYOR LEWIS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. J. KINLEY (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of the house an article appearing in to-day's issue of the Ottawa *Morning Journal*. It stands as the chief item of news on the front page, and refers to a statement made by his worship the Mayor of Ottawa. The news item is as follows:

Mayor Tells M.P's to Go Home
Make Room for War Workers

"Some of these M.P.'s who are wasting their time around Ottawa should go home so that their offices could be used by war workers," Mayor Lewis declared at Board of Control on Tuesday.

Then what appears to be the motive follows:

Mr. Lewis made his remarks after the board had endorsed the stand taken by G. Russell Boucher, M.P. for Carleton county, in the House of Commons on Monday night for an upward revision of the $100,000 granted annually to the city in lieu of taxes.

Then the article goes on to say:

Controllers Geldert and Pickering agreed with Mayor Lewis that the government had created the serious housing situation in the capital and was doing nothing to relieve the shortage of accommodation.

May I bring to the attention of the Prime Minister certain press dispatches which indicate that in Washington, where there is a similar condition, some departments of government are being moved to other cities. It might be a splendid idea, for instance, to remove the naval department to the coast.

Some hon. MEMBERS: East coast.

Some hon. MEMBERS: West coast.

Mr. KINLEY: And the Department of Agriculture to Winnipeg. Then, with respect to the personal affront indicated in the article, may I point out that most members of parliament are proud of the national capital, and naturally we are chagrined by the discourteous remark of the chief magistrate of the city of Ottawa.

Mr. HOMUTH: He knows only the Liberal members.

Mr. KINLEY: Most of us would be busy at home. But that is one of the tests people usually apply before sending us here.

It seems to me that the criticisms about members of parliament are hard to understand, especially in war time. If a debate continues for a long time in the house, we are accused of wasting the country's time. On the other hand, if hon. members do not speak, it is said that they are dumb. So far as I am concerned, practical business is usually run in a harmonious and quiet manner. To my mind that is the most effective kind of business. But it seems that sections of the press and some people across the country want us to put on a show.

Mr. PINARD: On a point of order, my hon. friend is complaining about the city of Ottawa.

Mr. KINLEY: I have the floor.

Mr. PINARD: Sit down, please. The hon. member says that he is speaking to a question of privilege. I am speaking to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Kinley) has introduced a question of privilege concerning an item appearing in a newspaper. He has extended his observations as far as he should, in the circumstances.

Mr. KINLEY: I should like to say just a word more, because this article is an affront to members of the house.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should confine his remarks to the question of privilege.

Mr. KINLEY: Most of the criticism of members of parliament seems to be by people who do not understand just what we do. Some seem to think that the whole performance of a member is spread upon *Hansard*.

That is contrary to the fact and contrary to responsible government. Hon. members, especially those supporting the government, do their work most effectively and use their influence before the legislation ever comes into the House of Commons.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. KINLEY: I subscribe to the sentiment expressed in the Scripture:

Should a wise man utter vain knowledge, and fill his belly with the east wind?

NATIONAL HEALTH

QUESTION AS TO INTRODUCTION THIS SESSION OF HEALTH INSURANCE SCHEME

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Pensions and National Health. Would the minister care to comment on the prevalent rumour that the government proposes this session to introduce legislation designed to provide a national scheme of health insurance?

Hon. IAN A. MACKENZIE (Minister of Pensions and National Health): The answer to the question is in the negative. However, there were certain discussions departmentally last June on the question of national health, as a result of which certain departmental proposals have been canvassed thoroughly with the Canadian medical association, the dental profession, the nursing association and the hospitals of Canada. On the outcome of this canvassing the departmental policy will be determined.

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

PROBLEMS OF THE FARMER—SUBMISSION OF CANADIAN FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it proposed to convene at once the standing committee on agriculture and, if so, will an opportunity be afforded in that committee, or in a special committee, for a comprehensive consideration and exhaustive review of the more pressing problems facing the Canadian farmer at the moment?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): It is intended to have the committee on agriculture convene just as soon as possible and there are certain matters which I, as Minister of Agriculture, intend to refer to that committee. These do not necessarily include the matters referred to. If there is no other opportunity provided during the session, there is always opportunity when the estimates are being discussed of obtaining whatever information can be given by the department with regard to different matters.

Mr. GRAYDON: I was wondering if the minister had in mind referring to the committee any of the problems which were raised in the submission of the Canadian federation of agriculture which met the Prime Minister and members of the government in January?

Mr. GARDINER: I have not given consideration to that, but I shall give consideration to it.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

KIRKLAND LAKE STRIKE—PROTECTION OF TRADE UNIONISTS

On the orders of the day:

Mrs. DORISE W. NIELSEN (North Battleford): I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour, of which I have given him notice. It arises from a telegram received this morning from Sudbury, which reads as follows:

Forest Emmerson, international representative, and Jack Whelehan, international organizer, have been brutally and viciously assaulted in union office. Organizers in hospital. Union office completely demolished. Thugs demanded list of union membership. We believe this direct reaction of government policy in Kirkland Lake strike. Incessant anti-union campaign conducted by Sudbury *Star*. A committee of Sudbury miners request this to the attention of our government.

A. K. Smith,
J. McCool,
W. Cavanough,
J. Navalkoski.

Has the minister any information in regard to this matter and, if so, would he please make a statement to the house?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): My answer to the first question is no. My answer to the second question is that, as no doubt my hon. friend knows, the responsibility for the maintenance of law and order is primarily that of the municipalities and provincial governments.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): I should like to address a question to the Minister of Justice which arises out of a telegram similar to the one just read by the hon. member for North Battleford. One of the organizers who is now in hospital, due to the assault described in the telegram read by the hon. member, is a United States cititzen legally admitted to this country as a representative of organized labour. I should like to ask what protection the Royal Canadian Mounted Police gives to officials who are endeavouring to

carry out instructions issued by the government as contained in order in council P.C. 2685. Can the minister give the house an assurance that there will be a thorough investigation into the complaint contained in the telegram read by the hon. member for North Battleford?

Hon. L. S. St. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): The only answer I could give to the hon. member would be similar to that given already by the Minister of Labour. The hon. member was good enough to address a letter to me containing a copy of the telegram, and I made inquiries from the Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. He told me that he had no information and wished to point out that the responsibility for maintaining order there was upon the municipal police of Sudbury and the provincial police of Ontario.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice following the question raised by the hon. member for Cape Breton South. This is a very serious situation, and I do not think it should be passed over as lightly as it was by both the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Labour. If labour causes any disturbance in any area—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Put the question.

Mr. MacINNIS: Just a moment, now. Parliament cannot afford to ignore this matter. I am saying that if labour causes any disturbance in any area the government would very soon send in the mounted police, and I think that at the present moment the government should give every assurance that these people will be protected. What protection are trade unionists going to have in this matter?

Mr. HOMUTH: The marriage is not so happy after all.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It seems to be dissolved already.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I should like to point out that the practice is becoming prevalent of putting supplementary questions following original questions submitted to the ministry. That means almost a general debate on questions that have been put to the ministry, who have given an answer to the original question. Furthermore, in the asking of questions, expressions of opinion are being given and statements of fact made. These are not questions addressed to the ministry, and I would ask hon. members to remember that on questions put to the ministry on the orders of the day there can be no general debate, and supplementary questions should be prohibited.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Speaker, I have been very careful not to make speeches in asking questions, but we cannot afford to leave this matter to the gorillas who are at the present time running the province of Ontario.

Mr. HOMUTH: I rise to a point of order. While I have no brief for the premier of Ontario, and I do not think he particularly needs any defence, I submit that hon. members of this house ought to show respect for the premier of any province of the Dominion of Canada, and under the rules of the house, the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) had no right, I submit, to use the term he did with reference to Premier Hepburn, when he called him a gorilla. I think he ought to withdraw that remark.

I should like a ruling on my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not understand that the hon. member had asked for a ruling. An hon. member must take responsibility for any statement he makes with respect to somebody who is not a member of the house. If it were a member of the house it would be a different matter.

[*Later:*]

Mr. SPEAKER: With reference to the point raised by the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth), citation 294 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms reads:

> If a member should say nothing disrespectful to the house or the chair, or personally opprobrious to other members, or in violation of other rules of the house he may state whatever he thinks fit in debate, however offensive it may be to the feelings, or injurious to the character, of individuals; and he is protected by his privilege from any action for libel, as well as from any other question or molestation.

WHEAT

LEGISLATION RESPECTING 1942 CROP—RECOMMENDATIONS OF POOL DELEGATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. E. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): I wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce two questions. This question follows one asked by the hon. member for Lake Centre. The farmers of the west are anxious to know just what will be required of them this spring, whether there is to be any reduction in seeding, and so on, and what is going to happen with respect to price and marketing. Would the minister inform the house, first, when he will be prepared to bring down legislation dealing with the price for the 1942 crop and its marketing? My second question is prompted by the statement of the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Kinley)

that government members of the house do their best work, not on the floor of the house, but, consulting with the cabinet before they ever come into the house. I would ask what success the minister is having with the western Liberals, what suggestions he is getting from them, and what assistance in framing the wheat legislation and carrying out the recommendations of the pool delegation?

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): In reply to the first question asked by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, I wish to say that those advising the cabinet on matters of wheat and farm policy, and those members of the cabinet who are particularly responsible for policy along that line, and the cabinet generally, have been holding practically continuous meetings on this question for a long time. In the last few days, for instance, we spent all Saturday afternoon, Sunday afternoon, Monday and last night until twelve o'clock, considering this subject and endeavouring to arrive at unanimity on a question of such great importance to western Canada and Canada at large. Most sympathetic and anxious attention is being given to the problem, and I can assure the hon. member that a decision will be brought down at the earliest possible moment.

I do not think the hon. member really expects an answer to his second question.

Mr. PERLEY: I think it would be very interesting to have one.

STANDING ORDERS

ENFORCEMENT OF RULE WITH RESPECT TO READING OF SPEECHES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. K. BLAIR (Wellington North): Now that the speech from the throne is disposed of, I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, if the rule that prohibits members from reading their speeches will be enforced from now until the end of the session?

Mr. SPEAKER: The rules of the house are there and will have to be enforced.

HONG KONG

STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO CANADIAN CASUALTIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. L. RALSTON (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, to-day the government has received the first official information from which any definite conclusion can be arrived at with respect to the number of casualties at Hong Kong. A message has been received from the Canadian Minister at Buenos Aires transmitting a message which was received from the Argentine embassy—I take it to be the Argentine embassy at Tokyo. The message is very meagre. It gives figures, and that is all. The statement is that "Japanese government officially communicate figures for prisoners of war Hong Kong, Canadians, 1,689." Hon. members will remember that the number who embarked was 1,985. That means, on the basis of those figures, I most sincerely regret to say, that, at least without further information, 296 would be regarded as either dead or missing.

SUGAR

INQUIRY AS TO RATIONING AND CONSERVATION OF FOREIGN EXCHANGE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. S. ROY (Gaspé): Will the Minister of Finance inform the house whether the government's policy with respect to the conservation of foreign exchange has anything to do with the rationing of sugar?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the reason for the rationing of sugar was the action taken by the United States and the fact that there was a possible prospective shortage of sugar. It had no relation whatever to the conservation of exchange.

PLEBISCITE ACT

PROVISION FOR TAKING OF VOTES ON ANY QUESTION SUBMITTED BY WAY OF PLEBISCITE

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State) moved the second reading of Bill No. 10, respecting the taking of a plebiscite in every electoral district in Canada and the taking of the votes of such plebiscite of Canadian service voters stationed within and without Canada.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The bill which is now before the house for its second reading is, as the Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty), who introduced it, announced a few days ago, in the nature of a general plebiscite act; that is to say, it makes provision for the taking of a plebiscite which ordinarily would be as applicable to a plebiscite on one subject as another. The intention, however, is that the bill should be for one plebiscite only, and that the plebiscite when taken, shall have reference to only one question. That question has already been made clear to the members of the house and the public, but I will take occasion at once to bring again to the attention of the house its exact wording.

It will be recalled that in the speech from the throne it was announced, as part of government policy, that a plebiscite would be taken on the question of removing a certain limitation which now is imposed upon the government with respect to the enlistment of men for service overseas. The question which it is intended to ask the public in the plebiscite is the following:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

As I said, at the time of speaking on the address, the question is very simple in its language and meaning and is a straightforward one. I do not think it is capable of any more than one interpretation. It asks the people of Canada whether they are willing to release the government from a certain limitation which arises out of past commitments with respect to the enlistment of men for overseas. If the answer is in the affirmative it will mean that the government, according to the opinion expressed by the people, has been released from commitments that have been made; if it is in the negative it will mean that the majority of the electors are of the opinion that the government should continue to be governed by the commitment that was made at the time of the last general election and on previous occasions, and on subsequent occasions as well.

The subject of the plebiscite has been debated at such length that it would perhaps seem unnecessary to discuss it further. My purpose this afternoon is not so much to attempt to add to what has been said but rather, if possible, to clear away some of the confusion that has arisen out of the discussion that has already taken place.

To that end, let me first of all make quite clear the purpose of the plebiscite. As I have said, the purpose is to give the government—I put it in general terms—a perfectly free hand to deal with all matters affecting the war in the manner which, in its judgment, is most in the national interest.

There is a distinction to be made between the legal powers which the government has and the moral authority which it possesses. With respect to the legal power, there can be no question whatever that this parliament has full power to do whatever it may decide to do with respect to the management of matters pertaining to the war. The one limitation which exists on that power so far as this parliament is concerned is not a legal limitation but a moral obligation.

There may be some who take the view that, in matters of government, in time of war, moral obligations count for nothing. May I say that, in my opinion, moral obligations, especially where they relate to a specific measure, a concrete matter related to the war on which the government of the country itself has given a pledge, are as binding as any obligation could possibly be. To say that the parliament of Canada, which derives its powers from the people, after a solemn pledge has been given to the people on a matter which is of deep concern to them, is released from this pledge the moment the people have elected it, is simply for parliament itself to create a precedent which would be subversive of parliamentary institutions.

Let me ask first of all how this limitation arose. It arose out of a situation that existed several years ago in this country. That of itself is significant as indicating how long the public memory is with respect to matters which affect the people themselves. I would pause here to say that the public memory is going to be long in the matter of how this parliament views its moral obligations as well as its legal powers. It is because I feel very strongly that the people of Canada will wish to have their present and their future governments pay the utmost regard to pledges given to the electorate that I feel it all important that this matter of past commitments should be presented to the people in the form of a question which will secure their opinion, before the time comes when the government may be called upon to consider whether further action than it is empowered now to take, should or should not become necessary later on.

During the last war the question of conscription came up near the end of the conflict. I will not go into what took place at the time except to remind hon. members of the fact that nothing in the political history of Canada since Confederation has given rise to so much bitterness, so much ill feeling, or has done so much in the way of dividing the peoples of this country, setting one lot against another, as did the conscription issue at that particular time, and the manner in which it was dealt with by the government of the day. Now it was because of that fact that, when the government of the day saw looming on the horizon the possibility of a future war, it was recognized that this question of conscription would present itself immediately. It was of importance therefore to national unity that a position should be taken and stated by the administration which would prevent any of the kind of controversy and bitterness which had previously arisen, and would maintain the unity of the country at a time when the situation might be most critical. Having that in mind, the government of the day—this was before the present war began—and, not merely

the government, but members of the opposition and members of all parties in this House of Commons, expressed very frankly and emphatically on the floor of this parliament their view that, if another war came, and it became necessary to consider the sending of men overseas to participate in what was then thought might be a war confined to Europe alone, the only method that would be resorted to for overseas would be the one of voluntary enlistment—there would be no compulsion, no conscription. I think I am right when I say that that was the view which was generally expressed before the war by all parties in this house. It was expressed for the one reason that it was felt that it was absolutely necessary to maintain, as far as that might be possible, the unity of the country at a time when it might be faced with the great crisis of war.

But let me go a step further. When the war came in Europe and this parliament met to decide whether Canada would enter the war or not, a declaration was made by the government of the day that, if Canada did enter the war, there would not be compulsory service for overseas, but that service for overseas would be by voluntary enlistment. That declaration was made when this house was deciding whether Canada should go into the war or not. And that statement was made not by the government to hon. members of parliament only but by members of parliament of all parties speaking to the people of the country, and assuring them of the position that would be taken. I submit that no more solemn undertaking could possibly have been given to the people of Canada than that which was given to them by their representatives in the House of Commons at that time.

What was the effect of giving that declaration? The effect was that, when Canada decided to go into the war, this House of Commons, I think to a man—there may have been an exception, but practically to a man—decided that Canada should participate in the war at Britain's side. We were told beforehand that it was all nonsense to ask parliament to decide whether the country should go into the war, we were told—I am speaking now of what the government was told by its opponents—that the government should decide that question; not leave it to the people's representatives in parliament to decide what they should do. I took the position very strongly at the time that parliament would decide, and I suppose no one received more abuse and criticism from certain sections of the press and public speakers than I did for taking that stand; I took the position that Canada would not go automatically into war just because one part of the empire might be at war, but that we would decide on the merits of the case as the situation was known, and would take our own action by the vote of the people's representatives in parliament.

Having given the assurance that conscription would not be resorted to in connection with enlistment for service overseas, this parliament voted practically unanimously to enter the war. But that was not the only occasion on which the position was asserted.

We also had a general election in 1940 to decide what administration was to carry on the affairs of the country during the period of war. At that time from one end of Canada to the other members of the government renewed to the people of Canada the undertaking which I have just cited, as the one which would be followed in time of war. Hon. members opposite have been referring to this pledge or commitment as "Mr. King's commitment", "to relieve Mr. King of his commitment", "relieve the Prime Minister of his commitment". May I say that the commitment was not a commitment of myself alone. To begin with, it was a commitment on the part of all my colleagues in the government, it had been made in this House of Commons in the presence of every one of them; it was a commitment made in the name of the entire party which supports the administration; and, may I say, a commitment quite as broad, quite as emphatic, was made by the leader of the opposition of that day on behalf of the Conservative party in this house. The very same commitment was made on behalf of the Conservative party of Canada in this House of Commons by its then leader, it was made also on the platforms of this country by its leader in terms just as emphatic as anyone on this side of the house could have made it.

So that there will be no misunderstanding of this, let me give hon. members exactly what the then leader of the Conservative party, and of the official opposition, Doctor Manion said, speaking in this House of Commons on March 30, 1939; as reported in *Hansard* at page 2440:

> In the last war the conscription of men to go to the front caused violent racial antagonisms, much disharmony, bitterness and misunderstanding—conditions from which as yet we have not wholly recovered, and on top of that I believe I am expressing the opinion of authorities when I say that it was of no real military value so far as the empire was concerned.

He stated that as far as he could ascertain only some ten thousand men at the most got into the fighting line as a result of conscription. Then he went on to say:

> The policy that I suggest is the one which I gave three days ago in an interview: first,

that there should be no conscription of Canadians to serve outside the borders of Canada; second, that we should have full cooperation with the British empire short of the conscription of men to serve outside our borders.

That was the statement Doctor Manion as leader of the official opposition, and of the Conservative party, made to parliament. But he also made similar statements on the public platforms during the campaign of 1940. Here is what Doctor Manion said at Quebec, speaking in the name of his party:

I stated on March 30, 1939, just about a year ago, in the House of Commons, that I was opposed to conscription because of its failure in the last war, and because it had stirred up misunderstanding and strife in our country, when the duty of our public men is to hold this country together, rather than to break it up. I have not waited until I came to the province of Quebec to make this statement. I made it a month ago at Brockville in the opening speech of my campaign. I have made it more than twenty times, since then, in almost every speech which I have delivered as far west as Victoria, B.C. Thus I have set forth my attitude in five provinces of Canada before coming to Quebec, and I state here again to-night that I am against conscription and that a national government such as I propose will not put in conscription.

Now there is the statement made by the leader of the Conservative party who was asking the country to support his party—not, it is true, under its old name of the Conservative party, but under the new name which it was taking for the purpose of the election —national government party—a pledge that if a national government party were returned they would not put conscription into force.

Now let me assume for a moment that a national government party had been returned. I ask my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, if he had been a member of that government, or Doctor Manion's successor in that government, whether he would have felt that he had no obligation whatever to see that that particular undertaking was lived up to? Would he have taken the position that although he had been returned to power on a specific pledge solemnly given to the people in the different provinces at a time of war, in a general election when they were being asked to return his administration rather than another, that having been returned to this parliament would he then immediately thereafter have turned around and said, "I recognize no obligation in this matter to those who elected the administration, I am going to proceed without any reference to the people at all?" I do not believe my hon. friend would have done that, and I am surprised that he criticizes me for wishing to have the people pass on this question in order that the government may be freed of all limitations upon its authority to act, except its responsibility to parliament, and through parliament to the people.

It is true that my hon. friend has said to me, "I think what you should have done was come to the House of Commons and ask the house to release you, and I am sure the house would have done so readily." But may I say to my hon. friend that my undertaking in this matter, as Prime Minister of the country, was not given to this House of Commons; it was given to the people of Canada. It was given, just as the pledge of his leader of that day was given, not to the House of Commons but to the people. It is true that a statement to the same effect was made to the house before the recent general elections, and before the war, but it was not a statement to the members of the house so much as a statement of what we and our parties and followers would do if we were faced with a situation which demanded the question being decided one way or the other. The pledge was given later direct to the people, to the electorate themselves; it was a pledge made between the leaders of two great political parties in Canada and the electorate of this country in regard to the most solemn question that could have been put before them at that particular time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I see it either we are going to destroy the faith of the people of Canada in their public men and in the responsibility of parliament to the people themselves, if we ignore these pledges, or we are going to maintain that faith by making it perfectly clear to the people that we regard such power as we have as coming from the people themselves and that we intend to be ever mindful of this, and that if we have given a solemn pledge to them we intend to carry out that pledge. If, after situations have arisen which did not exist at the time a pledge was made, we believe in their own interests we should be released from that pledge and we take the necessary steps to that end, by consulting the people first, then I say we are helping to keep the faith of the people in their public men and in their parliament.

That is why to my mind this question is fundamental. It goes to the very roots of government itself, the very source from which power is derived by a parliament. Has my hon. friend any authority other than that which comes from the people? Have I any power except that which comes from the people? Is that power changed the moment I get into parliament? Being returned by the votes of the people themselves, I have constantly to keep in mind, as I think every

member of parliament must, that obligation, which is an abiding obligation with respect to membership in any House of Commons worthy of the name.

Well, now, that being the purpose of the plebiscite, let me state the present position. The position is that the government has full power with respect to everything, excepting one thing; and that one thing is that commitment, that obligation, with respect to the enlisting of men for overseas service. There the government is not free. You may ask why the government should come forward at the present time and ask to be made free. First of all may I make it clear that it is not because of any situation that exists at the moment. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) has made it perfectly clear that with respect to voluntary enlistment we are obtaining men for overseas service at the present time as rapidly as we can train them. For our programme this year, and up to March, 1943, there is an honest belief on the part of the government that we will be able to get the men by voluntary enlistment for service overseas, and will not have to resort to conscription. But no one can say how long this war is going to last. No one can say what particular turn it is going to take. None of us knows what the conditions are going to be a few months hence, or several months hence, or a year or two hence. What we all know is this, that every month of this war has made it apparent to every member of this House of Commons, and I think should have made it apparent to every citizen of Canada, that a government cannot possess too much in the way of freedom to take the course that may be demanded in the national interest at a time like the present. It is because of this we want to have perfect freedom of action as an administration, to have all the right to do what is in the public interest at the time the situation may demand it, and we feel we ought to be given this freedom as quickly as possible. The reason we want it, as I have stated already, is to be free to act in the manner which will best serve the interests of the people of Canada; the manner that will make Canada's war effort the most effective. That is the sole reason, and that is all that is involved in this plebiscite. Hon. members have been talking about conscription, about no conscription and the like. That is not the issue in this plebiscite. This is the issue: Is the government of Canada, in time of war, to have freedom to take whatever action it thinks most advisable with respect to the furtherance of Canada's war effort?

That is the only question, and I am amazed that any person who has to do with the moulding of public opinion in Canada, with the making of its laws or who has to do with any political institution, could for a moment hesitate to give immediate support to a request of the kind. What argument can be urged against giving to a ministry the right to have full power in time of war to deal with any question, just as in time of peace it has full power to deal with any question that may come before it?

But there is another point I wish to bring out in connection with the special need for the plebiscite at this time, and it is this. First of all, the government is being put in an entirely wrong position before the people of this country and before the world just because we have not that full power. I ask hon. members to reflect upon that. I have said that the public has a long memory. Other countries, other nations have memories as well. To-day we are in a great partnership with a large number of nations, who are helping us as we are helping them. It is important that our position should be perfectly clear. It is being represented to the people of this country, and it is being represented to the people of Britain, the people of the United States and the people of all the allied nations, that this government is not seeking to have an all out war effort. Why? Because it is precluded, under a commitment which it has given and to which it is adhering, from resorting to conscription for men for service overseas. In other words the all out war effort is being identified with that one single thing, namely the commitment against having conscription for overseas service whether that should ever become necessary or not.

That is putting the government in an entirely false position. Let us take the position as it is to-day. Would anyone say that we have not been working as hard as we possibly could toward a full out war effort? Will anyone say that at the present time, if we had that full power, we would be resorting to conscription for overseas service? No one will say that, because it is not necessary, has not become necessary, and may never become necessary. Nevertheless as long as that commitment is there we are being represented to the people of our own and other countries as a government unwilling to go the lengths other countries are willing to go, even should necessity for so doing become clearly manifest. That is a false position and a very wrong one in which to have the government placed.

Moreover, the present position in regard to that one commitment places the parliament of Canada, as well, in a false position. Suppose the question of conscription were urgent at this time, and we wished to discuss it on the

floor of the house, could we have a free discussion of conscription on its merits, with that commitment binding many hon. members at the present time? The very minute the subject were brought up, one hon. member after another, if it suited his purpose, would rise in his place in the house and say, "I cannot discuss this question, because the government is committed not even to raise it." So long as that commitment is there, no matter how the war may develop, there can be no discussion of the merits of the question of compulsory service for overseas. I say that that is putting parliament in a wrong position before the people of Canada.

I have not any fear, personally, that parliament will not take the right course with respect to any phase of the war effort, once it is debated on its merits. I have faith in the judgment of the House of Commons to do what is the wisest and the right thing, having respect to the merits of the case. But in existing circumstances I do not want to see this parliament placed longer in a position where it cannot even discuss the merits of an all-important question with regard to Canada's war effort. And so I say to those who are taking exception to the course which the government is pursuing that they are only helping to place their own parliament in a position in which no parliament should be placed in a time of war.

I would say further, that not only is it putting the government in a false position to have its hands tied at this time, in the manner indicated, and that it is putting parliament in a false position, but it is also putting Canada in a false position, before all countries of the world, including her allies in the war.

We have seen in communciations which have appeared from time to time, and we have heard in the public addresses, what has been said recently about the position of the United States vis-a-vis Canada. Notwithstanding the fact that for over two years Canada has been sending thousands of men across the seas, we have in the last month or two heard it said that Canada's war effort is not as fine as that of the United States, and why, forsooth, not that they have sent large numbers of men overseas, not that the United States have thousands of men, men who have been in the war for two years, but solely because there are alleged limitations on our war effort since we are not able to send a man overseas under compulsion, regardless of the fact that up to the present we have been and may continue to be able to get all we require under the voluntary system.

I do not believe Canada should be placed in that false position. We should not be placed in that position before the United States. We should not be placed in that false position before Great Britain and, not only before our allies, but also before the enemy. It must be remembered that, as some are only too anxious to do in this country, the enemy will construe this commitment as a limitation on the war effort of Canada.

I say on these grounds, Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly the time has come when that limitation should be removed, and when the government should be given the utmost freedom to deal with any phase of the war effort as it thinks best subject always to its responsibility to parliament.

I have said that this is not a question of conscription. Hon. members opposite have been saying, "Why do you not have a referendum, and refer the question of conscription itself to the people?"

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Who said that?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: You never said that?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am delighted to hear it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: You never have said it?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Who said it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, I can show my hon. friend several papers supporting his opposition—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh, well—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say this, then—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I did not say it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then I understand that my hon. friend now says they are not in favour of a referendum.

Mr. MacNICOL: They never said anything else.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What are they in favour of, then? They are in favour simply of calling parliament and enforcing conscription without reference to the people, either by plebiscite or referendum! There we have the difference between the two parties. Notwithstanding their position in the House of Commons, and the solemn undertaking given by their leader at the time of the last general election—which they did not denounce, but which they supported—they say to the people of Canada to-day, "We

will not give you even a referendum. We will not give you a plebiscite; but we will take it into our own hands to do the very thing which our leader said he would not do, or we would not do if our party were returned to power."

Mr. STIRLING: On a question of privilege, may I interrupt the Prime Minister? I have stated in the house this session that the course I consider should be adopted by the government is that of submitting a resolution to the elected members of the House of Commons as to whether they should be freed from the commitments under which they placed themselves.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In other words, if I understand my hon. friend correctly he suggests that we ought to decide among ourselves, without any reference to the people at all.

Mr. STIRLING: The 245 representatives of the people, elected at an election at which this was not an issue.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And that is where I entirely disagree with my hon. friend. If it was not an issue it was because the leaders of all parties took similar positions, and the position so adopted was that there would be no question of conscription. But that makes the obligation all the greater on every hon. member sitting in the house to see that, before that question is so much as discussed, he should be released from any commitment which may have been made.

In reference to whether the plebiscite is to be in reality a referendum, there is a question which is being asked now which changes the plebiscite into a referendum—and I believe my hon. friend asked this question only a day or two ago—it is, "What are you going to do if the decision is such-and-such?" He wishes me to say that I am going to do so-and-so. If I were to give him an undertaking at this time, and that undertaking is before the people when the question is put before them, is that not a referendum? That is, I commit myself to one course or to the other, and the people then are being asked to decide whether the government should take it or not. In other words I throw on the people of this country the onus of making a political and military decision, when the only body by which such decision should be taken on a question of this kind is the government which is responsible for such decision, advised by its military advisers, and taking all other relevant facts into consideration and debating its decisions on the floor of parliament, thereby making itself responsible to parliament for the decisions it makes.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

That brings me to the question of evading responsibility. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) used some language the other day to which I thought I might raise objection when he spoke. I decided, however, to refer to it later on. He described as a subterfuge the course the government is taking. I believe the term "subterfuge" as applied to government policy in a matter of this kind is one which you, Mr. Speaker, might properly have ruled out of order.

He also said the government lacked courage, and stated later in his remarks that the course we were adopting was an evasive one. Let us see how far it has been evasive. What are we doing in the matter of responsible government? With respect to responsible government, at the present time we have not full powers. Our powers are limited. We cannot have fully responsible government until there are no limitations upon our powers. What we are asking the people in this plebiscite is to give us perfect freedom, to give us full responsibility. We are not asking the people to relieve us of responsibility, we are not asking the people to make a decision for us, we are asking them to give us full responsibility. We will take it and we will exercise it in the light of our responsibility to their representatives in the House of Commons. Where is the evasion of responsible government in that?

Let me go back to the course my hon. friends propose to adopt, if I understand them aright. They say, "ignore the people; we are here now, we will decide this thing in this House of Commons without reference to the people at all". Well, I say that that is irresponsible government. Because we are here with a mandate which the people have given us, which is full in all particulars but one. They say with regard to that one particular, "we will ignore it altogether, we will pay no attention to it one way or another". Talk about being courageous, I do not see anything courageous about that. Courage comes when you face the people, not when you run away from them. That runaway course is the one my hon. friends opposite have been advocating right along.

When this government decided during the course of the war that it was going to hold to the constitution of this country by appealing to the people before the end of a five-year term to elect a new House of Commons, we were told we were doing the wrong thing, that we ought to stay here, that we ought to extend our term and theirs as members at the same time. "Don't face the people, that is wrong." I think the people showed that they were not ready to give much support to those who were not prepared to trust them

but who wanted to have power without recognizing the source from which political power comes. I hope I have made it clear that the government is not seeking to evade any responsibility. It wants full responsibility. When it has that responsibility, it will come here, not sheltering behind commitments, but with full authority to inform this house of the course it feels should be taken. It will stand or fall by the decision which it makes.

My hon. friend has said that the taking of this plebiscite means that it will delay matters in a time of war. What is it going to delay? Is it going to delay the production of munitions or equipment of war, or of ships? Is it going to delay the sending of airmen overseas? Is it going to delay the enlistment of men in the navy? Is it going to delay the enlistment of men in the army, either for service in Canada or overseas? I say it is not, not by one minute. More men are offering themselves for training to-day than the administration is able to train, and that will be so for some time to come. Is it delaying the production of food? Is it delaying contributions to the war loan? Some people recently said they ought to cut out contributions altogether because the government was seeking to recognize its obligations to the people. There is no delay anywhere. But there is a pause sufficiently long to allow the people to express their own views with respect to the future freedom of action that the government of this country should have the right to take.

Something has been said about the cost. I assume that it will cost something to take the plebiscite and I regret that it will be as long as it will be before the vote itself can be taken. But we are spending a good many billions of dollars at the present time and those billions of dollars are coming from the people. When this house undertakes to put through estimates amounting to something like three billion dollars in a year, I think the people of this country will be relieved to know that the government submitting those estimates wants to be perfectly sure of their confidence in everything that it does; that it is prepared to trust them by going before them for increased powers when it feels that these increased powers are necessary in the public interest. I do not think that the plebiscite should cost very much. I believe that many of those who will serve as enumerators or who will perform other duties in connection with the taking of the plebiscite will be patriotic enough to realize that in this time of war this is one method whereby they can render a war service that will be a real contribution to the country at the present time. I should be surprised if many of them do not return to the public treasury the small amounts that will be paid to them for the discharge of their important duties. I do not think the additional amount that will be required will be very great.

The taking of this plebiscite will not be using up war materials except perhaps the paper that will be necessary for the instructions, the ballots and the like. That is the only material that I can see that is going to be used. Such other incidental expenses as may be necessary will I hope be met to a considerable extent in the way I have indicated. May I say that I feel very strongly that as this expense is one which the government is asking the people to incur at this time in the people's own interest, the people themselves will be quite willing that it should be incurred.

The last day upon which we discussed this question my hon. friend said that he was going to ask his party to vote "yes" on the plebiscite, that he was going to ask the country to vote "yes." Why did he not do that during the debate on the address? Why did he not come out when we were debating the address and say that he thought that every good Conservative in this country ought to support the government's proposal for a plebiscite? There is only one reason I can think of, and that is the one that was in the minds of newspaper editors, public speakers and others who came out so violently against the suggestion made in the speech from the throne. Four by-elections were due in this country and these patriotic gentlemen were going to have an issue at all costs. They were going to make an issue of something that had created all sorts of division in this country before. They were going to do this notwithstanding that it was war time and notwithstanding the fact that this government needed the services of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Labour perhaps as they had never been needed before since the war commenced. They were prepared to create this issue, they were determined to have these by-elections carried on in the manner of elections of past years when the question of conscription was the most controversial thing which had been raised in the history of Canada.

Where it suited them in Welland, and where they thought it was going to suit them in Toronto, the ground was put forward that the people were for conscription but that the present administration was opposed to conscription. Their candidate came out for conscription first and foremost. If we are going to judge from what took place, it is pretty clear that so far as Welland and Toronto are concerned, the people were in favour of the plebiscite.

Mr. MacNICOL: There was no vote in Toronto.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: York South. The vote may not have been in Toronto, but most of the ammunition came from there. Quite the opposite campaign was waged against the government in another province in Canada. I have no complaint to make about the results. I think that so far as they signify anything with reference to the plebiscite itself, it is that so far as it has been possible for the people to speak on this matter we have had an expression favourable to our consulting them on this particular question.

During these campaigns every effort was made to becloud the war record of the government. That is one of the reasons this issue was raised. In every possible way it was sought to confuse the public mind rather than to clear it with respect to the issues themselves and with respect to the government's record in prosecuting the war. As I have said, the outcome has shown already the unwisdom of the course which was followed, by the government's opponents, the unwisdom of those tactics and the wisdom of the course which the government itself is taking at this time.

My hon. friend the other day asked me a number of questions with respect to the plebiscite. He said that he would like to know before the question was put to the people what the government was going to do in certain eventualities. Let me answer the question first of all in a broad way. The government is asking the people for a free hand in order that it may do in the circumstances as they may arise what is most in the interests of the people of Canada. We wish to make Canada's war effort as effective as it can possibly be made. What we shall do at any particular time will depend upon the course which we think at that time is necessary and advisable and most effective in Canada's war effort. That decision is not going to be made in the light of any one factor. It is going to be made in the light of all conditions as they exist and as they are known to the government at the time that it has to assume responsibility for any policy or any change of policy which it may deem advisable. Surely that is the only right position for an administration to have or to take.

My hon. friend says: Will you tell us, first of all, if the plebiscite is decided in the affirmative by a large majority, what you are doing to do? Then he asks: If it is decided by a very small majority, what are you going to do? Then next: If it is decided by say only thirty-seven per cent in favour, and the rest against, what are you going to do? Then I think his next query was: If several provinces are in favour, and one or two others are not in favour, what are you going to do? I think he had one other question: Yes, it was, if the vote is indecisive, what are you going to do?

Why did he not go on and ask several other questions? Why did he confine himself to thirty-seven per cent? Why did he not ask what we would do if only twenty-seven per cent or thirty-eight or thirty-nine per cent was in favour?

He submits to me a sort of political catechism and expects me to give an answer to every hypothetical question he can imagine. Why did he not ask: What are you going to do if the United States take such and such a course? Why did he not ask several other hypothetical questions? He asked enough to reveal his intention to embarrass the government, but I can assure him that he has not embarrassed me nor the administration in the least. The government will do in this matter as it has done, and as he himself would be doing to-day if he were in office. He would be saying this same thing to me if asked a similar question. The government will make its policy known at the time when it is essential to have it made known—and not before. All government policies should be made known at the right and proper time. This is not the right or the proper time to make any pronouncement as to what the government is going to do as a result of this vote, other than the pronouncement which I have already made, and made very clearly, that the government is going to do the thing that it believes is going to further to the uttermost Canada's war effort, all circumstances considered. May I say that when I say "all circumstances considered" I have in mind the conditions as they may exist in respect to the war in different theatres and the conditions that may exist in Canada itself.

We have heard on the floor of the house within the last few days suggestions made that we should send more men overseas to Britain. We have had other suggestions made that we should not send more men over to Britain but send men over to the Orient in larger numbers.

Mr. HOMUTH: Secret session.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Who said: "secret session"? My hon. friend may be giving away some facts which I can assure him, if he thinks they are secret, he should not give away. But what I am stating now has been said here in this parliament in open session since parliament opened. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) suggested that we should send an expedition to Australia. I have understood the hon. member who has just interrupted is in

favour of sending more men to Britain. We also have had suggested in this house in open session that we ought to be keeping our men here and not sending them across either the Atlantic or the Pacific. May I recall the words my hon. friend the leader of the opposition addressed to me when he was waxing eloquent over this matter? He said: With the enemy knocking at our very doors you are going to take this plebiscite. If the enemy is knocking at our very doors, I do not think there will be very much demand in this country to send men overseas. We shall in that eventuality be keeping all the men we can put at our very doors where they can do the most effective work. I believe myself that the most effective way to defeat the enemy is to defeat him away from our shores altogether so that he will never get near our shores. But I do say that if he ever comes battering on the shores of this country, public feeling in this country will be so strong that any government, no matter what its view might be, will have to think twice before it adds to the number of men that are being sent out of Canada.

I mention these things because they help to illustrate how impossible it is for the government to give a decision here and now as to what it is going to do next September or October or November or December, or in 1943 or 1944. We cannot make any decision at the present time as to what we are going to do then, and we would be foolish if we led anyone to believe that we were going to be governed other than by all the facts that exist at the time this matter is under further consideration.

There is another matter. My hon. friend says that I ought to tell the people this and that. And yet he—perhaps not he, but several of those who sit around him hope that I shall not be here very long. The one thing they wish above everything else is that I should be out of office instead of in office.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I thought the right hon. gentleman was going to say that we wished him dead. We have never gone that far.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend and I are too good friends for that. I say that, politically speaking, most hon. gentlemen immediately opposite would be thoroughly pleased, and their friends as well, if I were not in the position I am in at the present time.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is there anything wrong about that?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The only thing that is wrong about it is that they won't tell us who they are going to put in my place.

Mr. SLAGHT: Thirty-eight Barkises, and they are all willing.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend the leader of the opposition ought to have a very kindly feeling towards myself on that particular question because he has seen efforts that have been made to have someone else take his place. They have not succeeded, and may I say to him sincerely that I think the country is much better off having him there to-day. I can tell him I am saying that not only on behalf of my own supporters but on behalf of a good many of his supporters as well. But I wish to make this clear. The present government, as I think my colleagues will bear me out, is not a one-man government. We are not imitating dictators; we are trying to remain the government of a democracy and to get as far away from dictatorship as we possibly can in all our actions. Any decision that is going to be made with respect to what will be done in a matter of future policy is not going to be made by any one member of the government or any two members; it is going to be made by all the members that sit in the government. Every member in the government will have his voice in the shaping of policy, and those who cannot accept the policy of the majority will find it convenient to retire, and a government will remain in office which will stand as one with respect to policy.

I could not if I wished, therefore, undertake to tell the people of Canada to-day what was going to be done some months hence by a government of which I might not be a member, or with respect to which different views might be entertained from those which I have, or which other of the present members of the administration may have. These facts are elementary. They should appeal to everyone who has to do with parliamentary procedure and government. Perhaps I can give an illustration that will help to make clear the wisdom of not indicating at the present time just what decision may be reached a little later on in certain circumstances.

In order to carry on war men are necessary, money is necessary. Both have to be raised, one in large numbers and the other in large quantities. With respect to the men that are being raised at the present time we have two methods. They are not ends in themselves but methods, and we are taking the method which we believe will be most effective and serviceable to Canada's war effort when we resort to the one or to the other. We have two methods of raising men for the army. Some of them are raised by compulsion; they are serving within the territorial limits of

Canada. Others are being raised by voluntary enlistment, some of them also are serving in Canada. But all that are going overseas are being raised by the voluntary enlistment system, which has proved effective up to the present.

Now with respect to the raising of money, we are using the same two methods. We are raising money by compulsion, under taxation in its different forms; and we are raising money voluntarily by the loan system which is in progress at the present time, and which the people of the country are supporting splendidly, and, I believe, will continue to support. Supposing my hon. friend were to ask me, "What are you going to do if the voluntary system fails in the matter of the loan? Will you tell the people that now?" Could I tell them that? Would it be wise to tell them that? But a decision will have to be made if the voluntary system in the matter of loans should fail to produce the results which it is necessary should be produced in the securing of an amount of money requisite for the purpose. Under such circumstances I think probably there would be resort to the conscription of wealth. I do not see any other alternative than for the government just to come along and take the wealth that exists, if the required sums cannot be raised voluntarily.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What about the ideas of our friends down below—to make money by the bank?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That might not be found sufficiently effective. However, I do not wish to be diverted from what I am saying because it is wholly pertinent. I wish to make it very clear, because through the next couple of weeks or months the people will be saying, "Why did not the Prime Minister state his position as to what he would do if this plebiscite did not carry or if it did carry?" I wish to have this parallel kept in mind. What the government is going to do when the voluntary method fails in the matter of loans it will decide when the time comes; and it will do exactly the same thing as respects the matter of raising men. When we find that we cannot raise the required numbers of men for enlistment overseas by the voluntary method, and it is absolutely necessary to raise more men by other methods, then we will make our decision, present it to parliament and have it discussed on its merits. I am putting this forward now so that the public may understand quite clearly why it is impossible to give any immediate decision. And may I say this: I think the people of the country will see to it that both things are linked pretty closely together if one or the other becomes necessary.

My hon. friend says we are asking that the government be given a blank cheque. What does he mean by a blank cheque? A blank cheque for what? Not a blank cheque to ignore parliament. The blank cheque is simply the cheque the government has with respect to all matters excepting this one thing, of the choice of method for raising men for overseas service. With respect to all other matters the government to-day has full power and authority. That may be the blank cheque If that is what he means by blank cheque, I say, let us have a complete blank cheque so that we can take whatever action we wish. But when he speaks of a blank cheque, what he is trying to infer is that the government is seeking to exercise some power independent of parliament. That is not what we are asking for in this plebiscite. We are simply asking to be given freedom to make an untrammelled decision and to come to parliament with that decision. Let my hon. friends keep that in mind, that before any measure can be passed in this parliament, no matter what it relates to, conscription or anything else, it has to get the support of a majority of the House of Commons, and the ministry has to consider very carefully every aspect of the question which will bear upon the situation in presenting any measure to parliament.

As to the conduct of the campaign, my hon. friend asked a word or two about that. I should hope that the campaign would be made an educational campaign which would help to impress upon the people the necessity of giving the government full power in time of war. I think it can be made that. My hon. friend and I are to-day agreed that the government ought to have this power and we are agreed for the same reason. And the leaders of the other parties are agreed. I know that the Social Credit party feels that something ought to be added, but at least I take it that they are not unwilling to give the government the freedom that is needed to act in such a way as will best serve the interests of the country. So that we are all pretty well agreed in this parliament that the government ought to have that power. But could we do anything better to serve the national interests of this country than, as representatives of all shades of opinion in this House of Commons, to go out to the people of Canada and tell them that this is a time when the war situation is so serious that no power should be withheld from the government in the administration of public affairs? I hope that course will be taken.

My hon. friend asks me what the government's attitude on the plebiscite will be. I took care to state that at the time I was speaking on the address, and I should like to read this one word in conclusion, from page 51 of *Hansard* of January 26:

> In the presentation of the plebiscite to the electorate the desire of the administration to possess complete freedom of action will of course, receive the vigorous and wholehearted support of all members of the government. It will, I hope receive the support of every member of parliament, and will, I believe, receive the support of the Canadian people.

There is nothing half-hearted about our purpose in this. I do not believe it will be possible for an administration to carry on, in a time like this, with the sense it ought to have of complete authority without being given complete power. It should not be put perpetually in a false position just because of some obligation necessary at an earlier time, but which, as I explained in the debate on the address, is having an effect quite different from that originally intended in its relation to the state of affairs that exists at the present moment. I have not gone into that this afternoon, because I spoke on it at length in the debate on the address. The reasons which to-day would actuate the people in respect of the powers being given to a government when we have war all over the world, on every continent and every ocean, are surely vastly different from what they were when we were contemplating a war which was expected to be limited to the confines of Europe. I think that almost all the people realize that it is in their interest to give to the government, in time of world-wide war the utmost powers that can possibly be given, realizing of course, that these powers can only be exercised in the light of its responsibility to parliament and that the government must receive the support of the majority in parliament before any measures can be given effect to.

Mr. STIRLING: Will the Prime Minister permit a question?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. STIRLING: Would he care to say a word in regard to the grave difficulty I foresee in respect of getting the vote out?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In regard to that I have this feeling. The people themselves will realize that the government would not ask for this full power unless it was in the interest of the people themselves that it should be given to the government. This matter is one that affects their lives. The situation is different from a general election; it is not a general election to decide between one party and another, but it is a matter that affects the home of every individual, that may affect the life of every individual in the country, certainly will affect the future of every individual, and will determine to what extent every man, woman and child in this country is to be half slave and half free or wholly slave or wholly free. If the people understand that and if hon. members will present the case to their constituents, pointing out the seriousness of the war and the state of the world at the present time and how it is to the people's own interests that they give the government full power, I think the people will come out and vote.

Also there is no reason why voluntary organizations should not be furthered to the utmost. Those who feel deeply—and I think that includes most of the people in this country—should organize themselves into voluntary groups to bring the people out. Let me make this perfectly clear so that there can be no mistake about it; if the vote should be overwhelmingly in support of the question asked in the plebiscite I shall not for one moment claim that it is a vote of confidence in this particular government in the carrying on of the war, but that it is a vote by the people of this country to give to any government the right to have and to feel it has the full power and authority which a government should have under conditions such as exist at this time of war.

Let me make this very clear, because it has been said that the government will claim a large majority as a great victory for itself, we are past the time when anyone can afford to talk in terms of party politics. We have in the recent by-elections had one illustration of the folly and baneful effect of doing that sort of thing through the amount of controversy to which they gave rise. Let us seek to unite ourselves, and here is the ground on which we can be united, to tell the people the situation, a situation so serious that they must show to the country at large that they are prepared to give to the government all the possible power needed to deal with it.

One other point. A great deal has been said in different parts of the world, and in our own country, about the New Order that is to come when this war is over. I have said on two or three occasions, I feel it very deeply, that unless that new order emerges and asserts itself before the war is over we shall see very little of any new order when the war is over.

What is the old order that is to give place to something new? The old order, the order which has brought on this war, is an order which attaches no value whatever to any treaty, to any contract, to any pledge, to any obligation, to anything that is honourable, but which says that no matter how deceitful, how

crooked, how wrong, whatever will get results through might and force, is the order that should be followed in the world. In other words, its supporters seek to build a totalitarian world on deceit, and betrayal, doing away with free institutions, doing away with democratic government, doing away altogether with any real relationship between the people and their governing institutions. Does anyone in this assembly believe that Hitler would ever have been permitted or able to go to war if a free parliament had been maintained in Germany? Does anyone believe that Mussolini if he had not worked into the position that he did of complete control himself over his people and above them would ever have had the freedom to bring that country into the war? The thing the people are going to demand in the new order is that all relationships, so far as it is possible to have them so, between a government and a people shall be maintained on the highest grounds on which they can be maintained. They will insist on public honour in the transaction of public business, and they will insist above everything else that the government that is carrying on the affairs of their country shall be responsive to the will of the people and see that it is administering that will and no other.

A good deal has been said about leadership and lack of leadership. The question of individual leadership is a small matter, men come and men go and they are soon forgotten. But the history of nations continues to be remembered through generations. Canada has taken a great place in this war. Canada's war effort, I believe, is something that when the war is over and we get through with political controversy the people of this country will be more proud of than any other thing in the history of this Dominion; because it has been, in Mr. Churchill's own words, a magnificent effort and all of us should seek to have it known as such. And as I have said over and over again, it is not the effort of the government, it is the effort of the people of Canada. What the government has been able to do has been done only by virtue of what the people have been prepared to allow them to do. In connection with the new order of things which is to control the future, I say that this country apart from its war effort in the aspects we have been discussing here has in some other particulars set a noble example to every nation. And they are particulars which relate to the future of democracy, and to the question of whether democracy is possible or not. We were told that it was not possible for a people to decide in their own free parliament whether they should go to war or not; that that decision had to be made for them by some government before they were assembled together. Well, this country has proved the opposite, Canada has shown the world that the representatives of the people brought together from all parts of the dominion in a free parliament are able to decide, and to decide promptly the position which they will take with regard to participation in war. That is a great gain for democracy.

Another thing which Canada has done has been to show the world that it is possible for a democracy to see that the people's voice continues to govern in its affairs even in a time of war; that those clauses in its constitution which have been framed for the purpose of preserving the rights of the people in their own affairs of government can be exercised in times of war as well as in times of peace. Some of us were told that we could not have an election in war time, that it was all wrong, would create confusion and the like. Well, the government did not view it in that way, the people of Canada did not view it in that way. We had our election in war time; and we are able to say, as Lincoln said at the time of the civil war, "The whole purpose of the people's concern in the war itself would have been lost, if the people had to be deprived of the fundamental rights which were reserved to them by their constitution." We have not usurped the constitution of this country. We have held to it; and I view with a good deal of concern this business of assemblies perpetuating their own existence for indefinite periods of time without allowing the people to have any voice in the matter, regardless of what their constitution may be. I think the people are able to look after themselves in these matters if they are given an opportunity to do so.

There are two outstanding achievements, in the nature of a national example. I put third, although perhaps most important of all, that the government of a country should have a sense of its moral obligations as well as a sense of its legal obligations. There has been very little said in the recent past about moral obligations on the part of nations, but unless I am greatly mistaken there is nothing that is going to mean as much in the future of mankind. If we are going to rule out of our public life the honour of public men and of parliament; if we are going to rule out those things which above all else we have been taught all our lives to regard as most sacred, namely the promise, the word that is better than the bond, the contract expressed or implied that has been made between a government and its people, the treaties between nations—if these things are to be ruled out of our public life then public life will become chaos indeed. But if we allow the people to

see that when we do give a pledge, when we do assume power at their instance, we are continually reminded of the source from which that power comes; that we are going to honour their rights as we seek to honour our own conscience, so we shall be laying the foundation of the kind of order that will be enduring through the years to come.

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): Naturally, Mr. Speaker, I cannot begin to follow the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in all the arguments that he has advanced. As I listened to the termination of his speech and the plea for a new order, I could not but agree with his words. If only that plea had been made in the beginning of his address, for a new order in Canada at this time, a new order free from political partisanship and with only one thing in mind —the desire to be guided in what we do by the opportunity and the challenge that is ours —it would have been something to inspire this country at this time.

The Prime Minister says, "Trust the people." Yet, Mr. Speaker, does he trust the people when he fails to place before them the question they will be required to answer? They are not told what is going to happen after this question is answered. I thought, as the right hon. gentleman spoke, that he would have told the people of Canada, in language that would be unmistakable, of the challenge to this country at this time; of the need for action; of the necessity, if you will, that he be relieved of his responsibilities incident to this commitment, and of what he would do, and the leadership he would give, if Canada should release him from that commitment. Five or six weeks have gone by in this session; the question has been asked over and over again of the government and the Prime Minister: What are you going to do? That is what the people of Canada want to know to-day.

Mr. SLAGHT: You have been told.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The hon. gentleman says we have been told.

Mr. SLAGHT: Of course you have.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: In one province we have been told that there will be nothing done; in other parts of Canada we have been told that selective service will be brought into effect. We do not know.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend says the people have been told these things. Will he tell us by what authoritative source that has been said? Will he cite one case of anyone with any authority to speak in the matter who has made any such statement?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the by-election campaigns just concluded were characterized in one province by the stand taken by the premier of that province that no action is contemplated, which was clear and unequivocal, and in other parts of Canada the stand taken was that there would be action. Yet to-day, when events are taking place the like of which this empire has never seen; with Java being attacked, with the Malay states overrun and with Singapore fallen, the Prime Minister of Canada says things are not yet serious enough to demand further action in the matter of man-power. Singapore, it is said, fell partly because of the lack of man-power. But the answer by the Prime Minister as to what action will be taken is that he cannot tell the people at this time and that it will remain his secret, a secret that time and circumstance alone may reveal.

I have in my hand a copy of the bill. Why does it not incorporate the question to be asked of the people? This bill as placed before parliament will have but one result. It will change the constitutional history of this dominion, in that it will permit the Prime Minister at any time from this day on to submit a plebiscite on any matter whatsoever to the people of Canada, with the authority of this parliament. It is so worded, Mr. Speaker, that it is operative beyond the war. It is so worded that the Prime Minister can continue to submit plebiscites at any time and without restriction. Let me ask this question. Why was not the method followed this time similar to that adopted in submitting the plebiscite of 1898? In my opinion this bill represents a milestone along the way that will destroy responsible government. The Prime Minister has said in effect that a great harm was done to the principle of responsible government in 1940 when he promised that there would never be conscription for overseas service, and now in effect wishes to undo the harm so that responsible government may be restored again.

I am not dealing to-day with the arguments that have been advanced against the taking of a plebiscite containing these words: "Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligations arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for overseas service?" I repeat, and this epitomizes my viewpoint on this subject, that the submission of this plebiscite in those words without the people of Canada knowing in advance what the government intends to do, or without even a suggestion as to what the government intends to do, is going to divide the people of this country as never before; that it is the repudiation of governmental

responsibility, and just one more step along the road that leads to derision of parliament and of parliamentary institutions generally.

The Prime Minister for years—in fact during all his political life—has stood for the principle of the supremacy of parliament, and he has stressed that position since 1935. But what is the record? This legislation falls in line with his attitude toward parliament since 1935. I realize that during war time there is a necessity for orders in council incident to the carrying on of the war, but that does not excuse the issuing of orders in council in ever-increasing manner with respect to peacetime measures as well. There is no justification for that at all.

Only yesterday it was revealed that since the outbreak of war 20,677 orders in council had been issued, and that of that number 5,470 had been passed while parliament was in session. Yes, even since parliament has been in session in the last five weeks 412 orders in council have been passed. So general has this situation become that when I asked a question in the house as to how many statutes of parliament had been changed or suspended by orders in council the Prime Minister of Canada could give me no particulars. He said in effect that there were too many of them, and that it would be difficult if not impossible to give the information. The answer he made on May 19, 1941, is reported at page 2912 of *Hansard,* in reply to the question whether any orders in council purporting to change or suspend the operation of the provisions of any dominion statute, either in whole or in part, had been passed since the outbreak of war. He said:

I might reply orally to this question. To the first part the answer is yes.

Then the Prime Minister continued:

As to the second—

A question, by the way, which asked for details—and surely the people of Canada have a right to know what statutes passed by parliament have been suspended or amended by order in council—

—I am informed by the clerk of the council that there is no separate index of orders in council which amend statutes, and that it would require a great deal of research to discover the different orders which might have that effect and also to reply to the question as to the operative effect of the respective orders so passed.

That answer means that while this parliament is supreme, the government is unable to tell what statutes have been amended or suspended by order in council.

What of the supremacy of parliament now? Almost every day, regulations with all the force of law are passed by the governor in council, by ministers of the crown, by heads of departments and by government agencies and boards, until we have reached the position where seventy-five per cent, if not more, of the laws put into effect since the war began, and which affect the lives of every citizen in Canada, have been passed not by this parliament but by this indirect method. Parliament is constantly receding in importance as the trend continues unabated.

We have before us in this bill the latest step. This measure was drafted by exceptionally able legal draftsmen, and in my opinion the omissions are not unintentional.

I am not now opposing the plebiscite to release the government from its pledge. I am not here for the purpose of adopting an attitude of obstruction and I may point out that while this parliament has been in session for more than five weeks at the most serious time in the history of the British empire, any delays which have arisen have not been caused by the official opposition. Less than one-fifth of the time in debate has been taken up by us. We placed our views before parliament, in opposition to the submission of this plebiscite, but the majority in this house have decided that a plebiscite should be submitted to the people of Canada, and we must abide by that decision. A plebiscite is to be taken regardless of the fact that in the long history of Great Britain, with all the constitutional changes which have taken place, no government has ever submitted any matter to the people by way of plebiscite. In Canada such procedure is a departure, excepting, as was mentioned by the Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty), in the case of the liquor plebiscite submitted to the people in 1898.

To illustrate the difference I should point out that under the measure as it now appears before parliament the Prime Minister and his government do not have to submit any questions to the people, whereas under the plebiscite of 1898 the question to be asked was in the statute. The other major difference is that the government may submit as many questions as they choose when they choose. They may place a plebiscite on any question before the people at any time in the future. There is no control whatsoever—and I intend to refer to those sections which have particular reference to that situation. The statute of 1898 allowed for only one submission. Mr. Speaker, while the empire fights, Canada plebiscites.

When the statute was passed in 1898 there was nothing evasive in the attitude of the government. The question was put in the statute. The regulations as to voting were contained in the statute. The elections act,

with the necessary changes, was incorporated in that statute. The act is chapter 51 of the statutes for 1898. Section 3 is as follows:

There shall be submitted to vote of electors hereinafter declared entitled to vote thereon the following question:

Are you in favour of an act prohibiting the importation and manufacture or sale of spirits, wine, ale, beer, cider and all other alcoholic liquors for use as beverages?

It even states how the ballot paper is to be worded, and what question is to be placed on it.

What about the measure now before us? If I am correct—and I believe anyone reading the bill will conclude that I am—this bill is plebiscite legislation, and by the authority of this parliament if passed it will establish in Canada the right to govern by way of plebiscite. Unless the bill is restricted in its scope, from now on the government of Canada may continue to submit questions, without any control whatsoever.

The Prime Minister has spoken about responsible government. Is it not the principle of responsible government that the elected representatives of the people shall legislate for the safety and welfare of the state, and that the government shall continue in office so long as it has the support of the majority in parliament? When that support is lost, an election follows where no person or group can command the support of the majority.

As I listened to the Prime Minister terminate his remarks to-day I wondered whether they were not in fact a prelude to an election regardless of the outcome of the plebiscite. His speech indicated that possibility to me. Here is the bill as it has been submitted to this house, and I am going to refer to it in some detail. Section 1 reads:

This act may be cited as the Dominion Plebiscite Act, 1942.

That is general enough. Then the bill goes on to define the various persons who are entitled to vote, and it defines plebiscite as follows:

(d) "plebiscite" or "dominion plebiscite" means the taking of a vote on the question set out in a proclamation of the governor in council issued under section three of this act.

If the Prime Minister, under section 3 of the bill, had set out the question to be asked, then there would be no doubt that this bill contemplated only one plebiscite for a definite purpose.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but may I say that I did make it quite clear to the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) when he referred to the same matter that I could see no reason whatever why the question itself should not be inserted in the bill. I hope it will be by the committee.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Why not make this a special bill?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is all it was intended to be.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Apparently the Prime Minister did not get his ideas across to the draftsman of the bill. If this bill becomes law, if it is passed in its present form, we are going to have in Canada government by plebiscite, not by responsible government.

Mr. McLARTY: The insertion of the particular question would avoid any possibility of that.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: But this is the bill upon which we are asked to vote. If we pass this bill we allow the government to submit a plebiscite at its will, at any time and on any matter whatsoever, and against that I protest. Let me read section 3:

3. (1) The governor in council may by proclamation order the taking of a plebiscite under the provisions of this act.

(2) The proclamation shall state fully the question to be submitted to the voters at the plebiscite in the same words and form as it will appear on the ballot papers to be used at the plebiscite.

It becomes perfectly clear that unless the members of this house, representing as we do the people of Canada, demand that the question to be asked be embodied in the bill, we are giving to the government, not a blank cheque but the right to submit any matter they choose to the people of Canada at any time. There is nowhere any limitation on so doing. Section 5 reads:

Any person who shall have voted at a plebiscite taken under the provisions of this act during the present war shall thereafter be ineligible—

"During the present war." Why the insertion of the provision that these people shall be ineligible when they have voted at a plebiscite during the present war if only one plebiscite is to be submitted? These significant words reveal the situation exactly. The statute will continue in effect beyond the termination of this war, but the only disqualification of exemption from military service of conscientious objectors would be in connection with anyone who had voted during the period of the war. This shows the danger of legislation such as this unless it is strictly limited within the ambit of the question that the Prime Minister says will be submitted to the people of Canada.

The leader of the opposition gave the government warning on Friday last of what our attitude would be in this regard and of

our wish to have the question included in the bill, but it has persisted in placing this bill before parliament in this form. Therefore, we feel that we have the duty to move an amendment to ensure the inclusion of the question in clear and unmistakable language. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth):

That the bill be not now read a second time but that this house is of the opinion that the use of the powers conferred thereby be restricted to the submission thereunder of one plebiscite only.

I intend now to make a few suggestions with regard to the bill. I repeat that I think the government should have told the country what it is going to do after the vote has been taken. To-day it is Janus-faced; in one part of Canada it looks one way, in another part it looks another way. The Prime Minister says that he thinks the people will give an all-out vote. I hope they do, because there would be nothing more tragic if this plebiscite were defeated. We on this side of the house have asked the Prime Minister to tell the people of Canada just how serious he regards the situation, but without avail and the only conclusion that can be taken from the speech of the Prime Minister is that conditions are not serious, for he has stated clearly that he would not think of asking for more man-power under the selective system as conditions are at this time.

I should like to see a one hundred per cent vote on this matter. I do not believe in a compulsory system of getting out votes, but I do ask the Prime Minister and the government to shake themselves out of the lethargy they are in and tell the people of the gravity of the empire's position and of the imperative need of action. Many people are going to fail to vote because they believe that this is a vote of confidence in the government. The Prime Minister has said that he would not interpret a favourable vote as a vote of confidence. I do not care how it is interpreted. Time is running against us and he should act. "Wait and see" is apparently to be the policy of this government, even to-day as we listened to the casualties in Hong Kong.

I repeat that the people have a right to know at this time what the government intends to do. I am not one to advocate a sit-down strike as far as voting on this matter is concerned for such action would be reprehensible. The government asks us over here to be Willkies, but I ask the Prime Minister to be a Roosevelt from now on, and to refer to the war effort of this nation not as the governments' war effort but as the war effort of Canada.

Mr. SLAGHT: You did hear him say that, my friend.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: That was after he had referred several times with exultation to the results of the campaign that recently took place. In the last paragraph of his address he did ask the Canadian people to regard this as a Canadian war effort. Why wait ten weeks for a vote on this matter? The ordinary routine peace-time election procedure should not apply to-day. We should shorten up that period. Where shall we be in ten weeks? Only on Thursday last we read in the press that if Java falls and Australia be attacked, the next places on the Japanese time-table to be attacked are Hawaii and Alaska in April.

Voluntary workers should be asked for over the radio. Why were not great patriotic organizations in this country asked to take over this work? But they will not do it enthusiastically, Mr. Speaker, unless they know that in getting out and working to the end that this government may be empowered to do something, the government, when it gets the power is actually going to act and without delay.

I have had complaint after complaint over the suggestion that men are going to be sent overseas for the purpose of taking the vote. In my opinion such a course is unnecessary. Send the ballots over to Canadian general headquarters in Great Britain, have them distributed to the divisions and battalions, and set out in military orders the date of the voting, have the voting take place at battalion headquarters. What does the government intend to do in regard to the counting of the soldiers' votes?

I commend the government and am glad that it has stood firm against those who would have had all the votes in Canada thrown into one common container. That would have done away with initiative in every province and every constituency of this dominion. I commend the Prime Minister for the course he has adopted of letting each province and each constituency know just how it stands on this question.

But so far as the voting overseas is concerned I do think this, that the men who to-day are serving this country know what they want, and I would not divide their votes among the constituencies. I suggest that their votes be counted without regard to constituency so that we can have the message of the men overseas in a united voice as to what they think the government should be doing at this time.

I have nothing more to say, Mr. Speaker, except again to point out the necessity of having the bill as it now stands amended at once as I have suggested, and with that in mind I have moved an amendment. To do otherwise would be for us to pass another milestone in this dominion beyond the point we have

reached to-day in the decline of responsible government. Parliament is being emasculated as a result of the creation of administrative boards of all kinds and order in council government. This act unless amended may well be just another milestone towards the destruction of that which we are fighting to preserve in these days of war—our free parliamentary institutions characterized by the principle of responsible government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I submit that the amendment is out of order, and I raise the point now in order that your honour may have an opportunity to consider the matter. The amendment tends to amend the bill, which I do not think is right, and the amendment does not object to the principle of the bill.

On motion of Mr. Veniot the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Thursday, February 26, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADIAN FORCES—SEPARATION ALLOWANCES TO WIVES OF PROFESSIONAL ENLISTED MEN, CARRYING ON PRIVATE PRACTICE

Mr. WINKLER:

1. Is separation allowance paid to wives of any enlisted men who besides their military duties carry on a private practice in their civilian profession?

2. If so, in what professions and how many in each?

Mr. RALSTON:

1. (a) There is no record of any enlisted men on active service who, besides their military duties, carry on a private practice in their civilian professions.

(b) In so far as officers are concerned, there are no records to show that any officers on active service practise a private profession in addition to their military duties. Certain medical officers who are members of the reserve army are called up from time to time for periodic employment with standing medical boards and the wives of such officers are entitled to receive dependents' allowance for the number of days in each month in which their husbands perform military duties. These officers are not members of the active forces and are, in fact, civilian practitioners. It is reasonable, therefore, to expect that they would continue to maintain their private practices during those hours when not actually employed on military duties.

2. See answer to question No. 1.

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION—RECOMMENDATIONS OF LEAGUE OF NATIONS ECONOMIC SECTION

Mr. MARSHALL:

1. Has the economic committee of the cabinet set up for the purpose of formulating plans for the post-war reconstruction period invited suggestions from the economic section of the League of Nations?

2. If so, what is the nature of such recommendations received thus far from this body?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre):

1. The committee on reconstruction, through its chairman, Dr. F. Cyril James, has had contact with Mr. Loveday, economic section of the League of Nations.

2. No recommendations have been received as yet.

GASPÉ PETROLEUM PRODUCTS*

Mr. ROY:

1. Has the government taken any steps or made representations, since 1940, to any private company or public body to engage in prospecting the petroleum deposits of Gaspe?

2. If so, with what results?

Mr. HOWE: The answer is no.

YOUTH TRAINING PROGRAMME

Mr. SHAW:

1. How many vocational schools and special training centres have been organized to date in each of the nine provinces under the war emergency programme (youth training programme)?

2. How many applications for training were received from each of the nine provinces between July 1, 1941, and January 31, 1942?

3. How many such applicants were accepted for training?

4. How many applicants were rejected, (a) by reason of failure to meet physical requirements, (b) by reason of lack of training facilities?

5. How many trainees, in each of the nine provinces, completed their training during the period July 1, 1941, and January 31, 1942?

6. Out of those graduating, how many, by provinces, (a) secured work in war industres; (b) enlisted in the army, navy, air force; (c) were drafted for home defence under the provisions of the National Resources Mobilization Act; (d) secured employment in peacetime industry; (e) are at present unemployed?

7. Have any advanced training schools been established in Canada to give advanced or specialized traning to graduates under the war emergency programme? If so, how many, and where?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. Training under the war emergency training programme was carried on during January,

1942, at the following number of centres: Nova Scotia, 5; New Brunswick, 10; Quebec, 22; Ontario, 33; Manitoba, 6; Saskatchewan, 8; Alberta, 11; British Columbia, 17—Total, 112.

2. The selection of trainees is made locally and information as to the number of applications received is not a matter of record with the Department of Labour at Ottawa.

3. During the period July 1, 1941, to January 31, 1942, the following numbers of trainees were admitted to war emergency training classes in the various provinces. These figures do not include the numbers which were in training on July 1, 1941.

Nova Scotia—Industrial pre-employment classes, 379; R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes, 34; Navy and Army classes (enlisted men), 471 —Total 884.

New Brunswick	
Industrial pre-employment classes..	272
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	451
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men).....	734
Total.....	1,457
Quebec	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes.....	3,537
Part-time classes for employed persons.....	111
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	739
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men).....	1,194
Total.....	5,581
Ontario	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes.....	10,908
Part-time classes for employed persons.....	1,343
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	2,615
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men).....	3,852
Total.....	18,718
Manitoba	
Industrial pre-employment classes..	341
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	590
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men).....	1,074
Total.....	2,005
Saskatchewan	
Industrial pre-employment classes..	609
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	1,427
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men).....	543
Total.....	2,579
Alberta	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes.....	918
Part-time classes for employed persons.....	49
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	1,218
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men).....	1,098
Total.....	3,283
British Columbia	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes.....	1,057
Part-time classes for employed persons.....	567
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	1,288
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men).....	1,576
Total.....	4,488
Dominion totals	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes.....	18,021
Part-time classes for employed persons.....	2,070
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	8,362
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men).....	10,542
Total.....	38,995

4. For the reason explained in 2 above the number of applicants rejected is not a matter of record at Ottawa. It is known however that no trainees have been rejected by reason of lack of training facilities.

5. The numbers which completed training from July 1, 1941, to January 31, 1942, are as follows:

Novia Scotia	
Industrial pre-employment classes..	363
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	2
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men).....	322
Total	687
New Brunswick	
Industrial pre-employment classes..	232
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	294
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	394
Total	920
Quebec	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes.....	2,484
Part-time classes for employed persons	..
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	278
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	729
Total	3,491

Ontario	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes	8,688
Part-time classes for employed persons	374
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes	1,590
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	2,663
Total	13,315
Manitoba	
Industrial pre-employment classes	279
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes	316
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	781
Total	1,376
Saskatchewan	
Industrial pre-employment classes	420
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes	975
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	213
Total	1,608
Alberta	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes	692
Part-time classes for employed persons	..
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes	747
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men	616
Total	2,055
British Columbia	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes	818
Part-time classes for employed persons	211
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes	767
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men	1,069
Total	2,865
Dominion totals	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes	13,976
Part-time classes for employed persons	585
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes	4,969
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	6,787
Total	26,317

6. (a).

Nova Scotia	
Industrial pre-employment classes	358
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes	....
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	....
Total	358
New Brunswick	
Industrial pre-employment classes	228
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes	....
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	....
Total	228
Quebec	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes	1,863
Part-time classes for employed persons	....
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes	....
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	....
Total	1,863
Ontario	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes	8,824
Part-time classes for employed persons	....
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes	17
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	..
Total	8,841
Manitoba	
Industrial pre-employment classes	264
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes	1
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	....
Total	265
Saskatchewan	
Industrial pre-employment classes	322
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes	14
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	....
Total	336
Alberta	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes	573
Part-time classes for employed persons	....
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes	16
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	....
Total	589
British Columbia	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes	918
Part-time classes for employed persons	....
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes	1
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	....
Total	919

Dominion totals
Industrial
Pre-employment classes..... 13,350
Part-time classes for employed persons..... ....
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes..... 49
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)..... ....
Total..... 13,399

6. (b)

Nova Scotia
Industrial pre-employment classes.. 5
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes..... 2
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)..... ....
Total..... 7

New Brunswick
Industrial pre-employment classes.. 2
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes..... 286
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)..... ....
Total..... 288

Quebec
Industrial
Pre-employment classes..... 17
Part-time classes for employed persons..... ....
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes..... 231
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)..... ....
Total..... 248

Ontario
Industrial
Pre-employment classes..... 163
Part-time classes for employed persons..... ....
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes..... 1,538
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)..... ....
Total..... 1,701

Manitoba
Industrial pre-employment classes.. 4
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes..... 319
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)..... ....
Total..... 323

Saskatchewan
Industrial pre-employment classes.. 15
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes..... 961
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)..... ....
Total..... 976

Alberta
Industrial
Pre-employment classes..... 64
Part-time classes for employed persons..... ....
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes..... 704
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)..... ....
Total..... 768

British Columbia
Industrial
Pre-employment classes..... 15
Part-time classes for employed persons..... ....
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes..... 759
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)..... ....
Total..... 774

Dominion totals
Industrial
Pre-employment classes..... 285
Part-time classes for employed persons..... ....
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes..... 4,800
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)..... ....
Total..... 5,085

6. (c) All enlistments reported by the provinces are shown in 6 (b). Men within the compulsory military training age group are not admitted to the industrial classes unless they have been rejected by the military authorities or are otherwise ineligible for compulsory military service.

6. (d) The industrial training given under the war emergency training programme is only for industries engaged on war production work except in the case of rehabilitation training of discharged soldiers. The latter training has only recently been commenced and no reports as to placements have as yet been received.

6. (e) The following number of trainees were reported as having completed their training between July 1, 1941 and January 31, 1942, there being no record of their having been placed in employment. A follow-up of trainees reported as unplaced is carried on by placement officers and it is known that the majority of them have either secured employment or will be placed after a short interval.

Nova Scotia
Industrial pre-employment classes.. ..
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes..... ..
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)..... ..
Total..... ..

New Brunswick	
Industrial pre-employment classes..	2
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	8
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	..
Total	10
Quebec	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes.....	604
Part-time classes for employed persons	..
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	47
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	..
Total	651
Ontario	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes.....	259
Part-time classes for employed persons	..
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	35
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	..
Total	294
Manitoba	
Industrial pre-employment classes..	35
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	7
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	..
Total	42
Saskatchewan	
Industrial pre-employment classes..	83
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	..
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	..
Total	83
Alberta	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes.....	55
Part-time classes for employed persons	..
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	18
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	..
Total	73
British Columbia	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes.....	66
Part-time classes for employed persons	..
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	7
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	..
Total	73

44561—54½

Dominion totals	
Industrial	
Pre-employment classes.....	1,104
Part-time classes for employed persons	..
R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes.....	122
Navy and Army classes (enlisted men)	..
Total	1,226

The number placed includes some trainees who graduated prior to July 1, 1941 but who were placed in employment after July 1, 1941.

7. Under the war emergency training programme special classes for tool room improvers are carried on at the Westdale Technical School, Hamilton, Ontario, the Montreal Technical School and Quebec Technical School. A special class for instrument makers has also been carried on at Halifax.

NOTE.—At January 31, 1942 there were still 15,120 in the classes, this total being made up of:—industrial pre-employment classes 5,052; industrial part-time classes for employed persons 1,484; R.C.A.F. pre-enlistment classes 4,705; navy and army classes 3,879.

BACON AGREEMENTS

Mr. BOUCHER:

1. What was the amount of money collected by the bacon board as deductions from payments realized by the board for pork products shipped to Great Britain during the period of the first bacon agreement between the government of Canada and British authorities?

2. In whose custody were these funds held?

3. What disposition of this sum, if any, has been made?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. $2,258,760.63.

2. Receiver General.

3. U.S. freight and exchange, $29,559.36; storage charges, $640,065.58; British Ministry of Food 5 shilling rebate on 22,400,000 lb. (estimated), $221,500; British Ministry of Food deductions for shrink loss, salt bags and adjustment account, $24,886.30; storage charges on cured product, $18,592.60; miscellaneous charges, $4,334.43; difference in the amount received from the British Ministry of Food for bacon purchased by the board during the period October 14 to November 16, 1940 for shipment on and after November 1, 1940, under the new contract and the amount paid for such bacon by the board pending completion of the new agreement, $923,663.14; balance with Receiver General, $395,939.22—Total, $2,258,760.63.

INCOME TAX—ALBERTA

Mr. HANSELL:

1. What was the number of farmers in Alberta who paid dominion income tax in each of the years 1936 to 1940, inclusive?
2. What was the total amount of dominion income tax paid by Alberta farmers for each of the years 1936 to 1940, inclusive?
3. What was the total amount of dominion income tax paid by all residents of Alberta for each of the years 1936 to 1940, inclusive?
4. What was the total number of those residents of Alberta who paid income tax for each of the years 1936 to 1940, inclusive?

Mr. GIBSON:

		Number
1.	1936	220
	1937	344
	1938	285
	1939	474
	1940	644
		Amount
2.	1936	$17,417 65
	1937	30,161 95
	1938	22,236 86
	1939	50,698 57
	1940	61,648 84
		Amount
3.	1936	$1,599,510 90
	1937	1,850,704 94
	1938	1,922,627 97
	1939	2,273,272 28
	1940	2,930,837 89
		Number
4.	1936	10,532
	1937	11,732
	1938	12,201
	1939	13,426
	1940	14,522

CHEESE

Mr. STOKES:

1. What amount of cheddar cheese was manufactured in each province of Canada in 1941?
2. What amount of money was paid by way of bonus to encourage improvement in the quality of cheese during 1941 by provinces?
3. What amount of money was paid by way of assistance to improve cheese factories in 1941 by provinces?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Amount of cheddar cheese manufactured in each province in Canada in 1941:

Province	Lbs.
Prince Edward Island	691,246
Nova Scotia	—
New Brunswick	763,037
Quebec	36,769,053
Ontario	102,764,534
Manitoba	3,672,287
Saskatchewan	390,931
Alberta	3,140,978
British Columbia	721,217
Total	148,913,283

2. Amount of money paid by way of bonus to encourage improvement in the quality of cheese during 1941, by provinces:

	Paid	Amount due factories not yet paid
Prince Edward Island	$ 107 95	$ 1,236 82
Nova Scotia	—	—
New Brunswick	1,820 68	488 71
Quebec	290,127 37	10,440 03
Ontario	1,084,261 27	53,394 93
Manitoba	8,334 35	1,058 05
Saskatchewan	921 09	166 43
Alberta	5,222 57	2,270 59
British Columbia	4,173 26	1,430 36
Total	$1,394,968 54	$70,485 92
Grand Total	$1,465,454 46	

3. Amount of money paid by way of assistance to improve cheese factories in 1941, by provinces:

April 1, 1941, to February 25, 1942	
Prince Edward Island	$ 92 00
New Brunswick	131 50
Quebec	122,409 10
Ontario	41,019 91
Manitoba	—
Saskatchewan	—
Alberta	415 17
British Columbia	—
Total	$164,067 68

Mr. BOUCHER:

1. What was the total amount of cheddar cheese manufactured in Ontario in 1941?
2. What amount of money was paid to cheese producers in Ontario by the provincial government by way of bonus during the year 1941?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. 102,764,534 pounds.
2. No information.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY—GOVERNMENT-OWNED CORPORATIONS

Mr. DIEFENBAKER:

1. What is the total of the expenditures (a) actually incurred; (b) to which the government has been committed, by each of the government-owned corporations created under the Department of Munitions and Supply Act?
2. What advances or other payments have been made to each such government-owned corporation?

LANCASTER MILITARY HOSPITAL—WEST SAINT JOHN

Mr. HATFIELD:

1. What were the names of all employees, including medical and clerical staff, of Lancaster hospital, West Saint John, from the year 1919 to the year 1941?

2. What were their salaries per year and what were their pensions per year from 1919 to 1941?

3. Were any of these employees supplied with automobiles by the government? If so, how many and what are their names?

4. What were the prices of these automobiles?

5. What year were such automobiles purchased?

6. What was the cost of operating these cars from the date of purchase to the year 1941?

7. What year was Lancaster hospital opened as a military hospital?

8. What was the total cost of the Lancaster hospital since its opening as a military hospital to the year 1941?

9. What was the cost of all repairs to Lancaster hospital since its opening as a military hospital to the year 1941?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): With reservations already made.

GASPE PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. ROY:

1. In view of recent military developments, has the government given any consideration to the fuel oil problem?

2. If so, what consideration has been given to the possibilities of exploiting the petroleum deposits of Gaspe?

Mr. HOWE: Return tabled.

CANADIAN ARMY (RESERVE)—THIRTY DAYS' TRAINING

Mr. WHITE:

1. What is the strength of the reserve army as of 1st February, 1942?

2. How many men were called for 30 days' training?

3. How many men called for 30 days' training enlisted in the active force?

4. What further training have the men called for 30 days' training received to date?

5. How many men were called for four months' training or for service for the duration of the war?

6. How many men called for four months' training or for the duration enlisted in the active force?

7. What is the strength of the reserve force units that train at local headquarters, and what is the date of the return of strength of these reserve force units?

8. Are the men who received 30 days' training and then attached on paper to reserve force units included in this total?

9. How many days will reserve force units train in 1942?

DEPENDENTS' ALLOWANCE ACT—RED DEER CONSTITUENCY

Mr. SHAW:

1. How many district representatives, temporary employees or others have been engaged by the Department of National Defence or any other department of government, since September 1, 1939, in connection with the administration of the Dependents' Allowance Act as far as it has been made to apply to the Red Deer federal constituency?

2. What are the names and addresses of all such persons?

3. When was each appointed?

4. What rate of salary and/or allowances are paid to each?

5. What amounts have been paid to each such person to date?

DOMINION LOANS

QUESTION AS TO FINANCING THROUGH U.S. RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANTHONY HLYNKA (Vegreville): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Is it true that the Canadian government is contemplating the negotiation of a loan of something in the neighbourhood of five hundred million dollars from some such agency as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the United States? If so, would the minister care to give the house some information about the proposed terms of the loan, and would he also give the house the reasons for incurring such a debt at the present time?

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): I never heard of such a proposal.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE

INQUIRY AS TO PAYMENTS—ACREAGE BONUS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. VICTOR QUELCH (Acadia): Last night I received a letter franked by the Clerk of the House. Inclosed in it was a letter addressed to "Members of Parliament." This letter had been opened, and apparently it was decided to send it to me by reason of the fact that the writer lives in my constituency. I wish to ask a question based upon this letter, and as it is very short I will read it and then address my question to the Minister of Agriculture. The letter reads:

Members of Parliament,
Ottawa.

Dear Sirs—

Why isn't the wheat insurance money paid? There are some people who have received cheques but there are many who have not, and what do you think we are living on in the meantime? It should be paid. You don't seem

to realize what trouble and havoc is being caused, but I could tell you. I wish we of the western prairies could tell you face to face.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Donald Sutherland

In view of the fact that many western members have received similar letters, what is holding up the payment under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act? Secondly, will it be possible after March 1 to include the second payment with the first where the first payment has not already been made?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): I am not in a position to state with regard to any individual case what is holding it up, without making inquiry at the Edmonton office so far as Alberta is concerned and the Regina office so far as Saskatchewan is concerned. But I would say that a very considerable part of the payment has been made, and there is some reason for delay wherever there has been delay. Some $7,500,000 of the amount payable in Saskatchewan had passed through the prairie farm assistance office in Regina on January 8, when I was there, and a considerable part of those payments had gone out before that time.

Mr. QUELCH: How much has been paid in Alberta?

Mr. GARDINER: I am not in a position to say offhand, but a return was brought down the other day in answer to a question, which indicates fairly closely what the amount would be. As far as the last part of the question is concerned, I was informed more than a week ago that all payments now being made are for the full amounts. That has been done for the past week or so; and all payments now going out are not for the sixty per cent that was earned up to December but for the whole one hundred per cent.

Mr. QUELCH: Do the payments include the bonus of 75 cents an acre?

Mr. GARDINER: Yes, wherever there was prairie farm assistance paid; but where there is no prairie farm assistance that goes out separately.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

BRITISH COLUMBIA WOODWORKERS—COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour based upon some information received from the International Woodworkers of America, British Columbia section. My information is to the effect that since last September they have been endeavouring to get certain of the logging companies, engaged largely, I believe, in producing aeroplane spruce, to enter into a collective bargaining agreement. Last January they called in the western representative of the Department of Labour, Mr. Harrison. Did Mr. Harrison make a report to the department on this dispute, and is the department still endeavouring to bring about a collective bargaining agreement in this industry?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I believe my hon. friend is referring to Mr. Pritchett's organization.

Mr. MacINNIS: They did not tell me who owned it, but it is the International Woodworkers of America, British Columbia section.

Mr. MITCHELL: A report has been received from Mr. Harrison in connection with the dispute. The question of wages has been referred to the regional war labour board in British Columbia. It will be necessary for the question of union recognition to be referred to a board under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. The hon. member may rest assured that the federal Department of Labour will give all possible cooperation in the amicable settlement of the dispute.

BRUCE COAL COMPANY

INVESTIGATION BY ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE—A. E. BRADFIELD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): As a private Liberal member of this honourable house may I ask the Minister of Munitions and Supply if there have been any new developments with regard to the matter of the Bruce Coal Company, which sold the same coal three times, not on government contracts but on contracts that were not signed. My second question is whether the secretary of that company is at present in the employ of the government, in the Department of Munitions and Supply.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Speaker, the matter of the Bruce Coal Company was referred by my department to the Department of Justice, and I understand that appropriate action is being taken or has been taken. With regard to the employment of the secretary of the company in my department, I have no knowledge; but if the hon. member will give me his name I will make inquiries.

Mr. POULIOT: His name is A. E. Bradfield.

PLEBISCITE ACT

PROVISION FOR TAKING OF VOTE ON ANY QUESTION SUBMITTED BY WAY OF PLEBISCITE

The house resumed from Wednesday, February 25, consideration of the motion of Mr. McLarty for the second reading of Bill No. 10, respecting the taking of a plebiscite in every electoral district in Canada and the taking of the votes of such plebiscite of Canadian service voters stationed within and without Canada, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Diefenbaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Last evening an amendment was moved by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) to which exception was taken by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). Does any hon. member wish to speak to the point of order raised?

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Last evening, just before six o'clock, and after the hon. member for Lake Centre had moved his amendment, the Prime Minister raised a point of order, submitting that the amendment was out of order. He further added, at page 839 of *Hansard:*

> . . . I raise the point now in order that your honour may have an opportunity to consider the matter.

Then he briefly stated the point of order:

> The amendment tends to amend the bill, which I do not think is right, and the amendment does not object to the principle of the bill.

In that connection, as I recall it, the right hon. gentleman cited one of the rules of this house, though that is not incorporated in the objection which he made. If I apprehend his position aright, however, it was standing order 75 to which he alluded. Is that correct?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Standing order 75 appears at page 216, of *Beauchesne* and reads:

> Every public bill shall be read twice in the house before committal or amendment.

I have a legal argument to make; it may take me some little time, and I crave the indulgence of the house while I do so. I should like to say that I have not had the opportunity to prepare a thorough brief on the matter, but what I have I should like to give to the house without interruption, if I may.

I have just read standing order 75, and I ask hon. members to note the date: 1867. Now I propose to read the amendment of the hon. member for Lake Centre, appearing at page 838 of *Hansard*

> That the bill be not now read a second time but that this house is of the opinion that the use of the powers conferred thereby be restricted to the submission thereunder of one plebiscite only.

Even at first blush, on reading standing order 75, I submit there is nothing in this amendment which is contrary to the provisions of that order, unless something is read into it. But we have been able to find at least four cases since 1867 where what is now proposed has been done in parliament. I want to cite a number of authorities. The first to which I direct Your Honour's attention is a ruling given by the Speaker of the British House of Commons on the Anglo-German agreement bill, in which it was laid down in *Hansard* debates, 1890, third series, 347, at page 743:

> It is competent for any hon. member to move a resolution superseding the motion for the second reading, but it is not competent to add words to the motion "that the bill be now read a second time."

That is a statement of principle, and that is what is sought to be done here. The amendment offered by the hon. member for Lake Centre does not propose to add to the motion that the bill be now read a second time. It proposes to supersede that motion entirely. I therefore submit that under the rule which I have quoted it is competent for him to move such a motion.

The amendment in question proposes that the bill be not now read a second time, and then proceeds to assert a principle. The important word in the first part of the amendment is the word "now", where it is stated that it be not now read a second time. That does not mean "never". The amendment does not mean that the bill will never be read a second time. If the proposed amendment is passed in the affirmative the Secretary of State would be entirely within his rights to move again without notice the main motion, that the bill be now read a second time. That is clear from the statement appearing in May, thirteenth edition, page 392, as follows:

> It must be borne in mind, however, that the resolution, if agreed to—

And in this instance I would use the word "amendment",—

> —does not arrest the progress of the bill, the second reading of which may be moved on another occasion. The effect of such an amendment is merely to supersede the question for now reading the bill a second time; and the

bill is left in the same position as if the question for now reading the bill a second time had been simply negatived or superseded by the previous question.

The result is that if the amendment is carried in the affirmative the bill may, at a later stage, be read the second time; but in the meantime the house will have asserted an important principle in connection with the operation of the bill, namely,—

—that this house is of the opinion that the use of the powers conferred thereby be restricted to the submission thereunder of one plebiscite only.

These are the words of the amendment. I could quote to Your Honour a large number of precedents, both in the British House of Commons and in this house, showing that it is possible for an amendment to be made on the second reading of a bill, provided that such amendment does not seek to add words to the motion that the bill be now read a second time, but on the contrary proposes to supersede it.

At pages 390 and 391 of May, thirteenth edition, this is made quite clear.

Mr. SLAGHT: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, but I had asked not to be interrupted. However, go ahead.

Mr. SLAGHT: Do I understand the hon. member to suggest that this proposed amendment is not an amendment to dispense with the second reading of the bill, but merely to delay this house in dealing with it until a future occasion?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The question is not germane to the point at issue, and I do not propose to answer it. I am dealing with a very technical question of parliamentary law and practice, and notwithstanding the erudition of which I know the hon. member is possessed, I would ask him to possess his soul in patience. I do not mean anything offensive in that, but I must point out that in my opinion the interruption was not pertinent.

When the hon. member spoke I was proceeding to refer Your Honour to pages 390 and 391 of May, thirteenth edition; and with your permission I shall read this citation, one which I believe makes my submission quite clear;

It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move, as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from the principles, policy or provisions of the bill; or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its progress; or seeking further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence, or, in the Lords, the opinions of the judges.

On page 391 it is stated that an amendment must not "attach conditions to the second reading of the bill". This merely means that an amendment must not seek to add words to the motion "that the bill now be read a second time", but that if it supersedes the motion entirely and asserts a principle, it is entirely in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. May I point out to the house that I have to listen to the hon. member, because I have to reply to him. But because of the noise I cannot hear him.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am obliged to Your Honour, although I am not sure that I like the way you have put it—that you have to listen to me. I suggest it may be a pleasure to listen to me.

I have in my hand a number of precedents where such amendments have been moved both in the British House of Commons and in the Canadian House of Commons. Then, in addition to those I have before me, reference may be made to an amendment moved to the second reading of a bill respecting the northwest territories. I refer Your Honour to the Journals of the House of Commons for 1890, pages 86 and 102. I shall submit those references without reading the full subject matter. However those are complete cases, similar to this one. And, mind you, they arose after the passage of standing order 75.

The second case is an amendment to the second reading of a bill to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, and that reference is found in the Journals of the House of Commons for 1882, pages 410 and 412. These references are entirely applicable here. I refer them to Your Honour without reading them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should be obliged if the hon. member would read them.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Very well. The citation from the Journals of 1882 is as follows:

The question being again proposed that the bill be now read a second time—

That was the main motion before the house—

—Mr. Mills moved, in amendment, seconded by Mr. Rymal, that all the words after "that" to the end of the question be left out, and the words, "in readjusting the representation of the people in parliament, there should be no needless interference with existing arrangements, and the principle of justice and fair

play toward both political parties should be observed; that the bill contains numerous needless changes, and is framed with a view to concentrate large bodies of the Liberal voters in a few electoral districts, and to add Conservative voters to, or remove Liberal voters from, many electoral districts, and thus to weaken the effective strength of the Liberal party, and to pack the constituencies of Ontario in favour of the Conservatives" inserted instead thereof.

That amendment, I must say, has a familiar ring to it. That question was in order, was put, and was defeated.

Then, if Your Honour will refer to the Journals of the British House of Commons, volume 146, for the years 1890 and 1891, you will find this, at page 303:

The order of the day being read for the second reading of the Newfoundland Fisheries bill;

And a motion being made, and the question being proposed, that the bill be now read a second time: And a debate arising thereupon;

An amendment was proposed to be made to the question by leaving out from the word "that", to the end of the question, in order to add the words "this house, having been informed that a satisfactory act has now passed the legislature of Newfoundland, and declaring its readiness to support the government in taking all measures necessary for carrying out the treaty obligations of this country, and the arrangements for arbitration made with the government of France in this matter, does not now proceed to the second reading of the bill," instead thereof. And the question being put, that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question:—It passed in the negative.

And the question being put, that the words "this house, having been informed that a satisfactory act has now passed the legislature of Newfoundland, and declaring its readiness to support the government in taking all measures necessary for carrying out the treaty obligations of this country, and the arrangements for arbitration made with the government of France in this matter, does not now proceed to the second reading of the bill" be added to the word "That" in the original question: It was resolved in the affirmative.

And the main question, so amended, being put;

Resolved, that this house, having been informed that a satisfactory act has now passed the legislature of Newfoundland, and declaring its readiness to support the government in taking all measures necessary for carrying out the treaty obligations of this country, and the arrangements for arbitration made with the government of France in this matter, does not now proceed to the second reading of the bill.

That, surely, is some authority. Then I quote from the Journals of the British House of Commons of 1859:

The order of the day being read, for the second reading of the Representation of the People Bill;

And a motion being made, and the question being proposed, that the bill be now read a second time;

An amendment was proposed to be made to the question, by leaving out from the word "That" to the end of the question, in order to add the words "this house is of opinion, that it is neither just nor politic to interfere, in the manner proposed in this bill, with the freehold franchise as hitherto exercised in the counties in England and Wales; and that no readjustment of the franchise will satisfy this house or the country, which does not provide for a greater extension of the suffrage in cities and boroughs than is contemplated in the present measure," instead thereof.

I would refer Your Honour to two specific precedents in Canada. I refer first to the Journals of the House of Commons, volume 19, 1885, pages 308 and 309, April 16 and 17, 1885:

The order of the day being read for the second reading of the bill respecting the electoral franchise:

And the question being proposed, that the bill be now read a second time;

Sir Richard J. Cartwright moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Mackenzie, that all the words after "That", to the end of the question, be left out, and the words "in the opinion of this house, it is not possible at this late stage of the session, and having regard to the present condition of the public business, to discuss the said bill satisfactorily," inserted instead thereof;

And a debate arising thereupon;

And the house having continued to sit till after twelve of the clock on Friday morning;

And the question being put on the amendment; the house divided: and the names being called for they were taken down, as follows.

So it passed in the negative.

It was quite in order to do that, and in principle this is the same as that.

I refer Your Honour to the Journals of this house, volume 19, 1885, pages 93 and 94, February 19, 1885:

The order of the day being read, for the second reading of the bill to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court;

Mr. Landry (Montmagny) moved, seconded by Mr. McMillan (Vaudreuil), and the question being proposed, that the bill be now read a second time;

Mr. Ouimet moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Dupont, that all the words after "That" to the end of the question, be left out, and the words, "there are in our judicial system too great a number of tribunals having an appeal jurisdiction; that an humble address be presented to His Excellency, the Governor General in Council, praying him to communicate with the several provincial governments, with the object of arranging a judicial system which will diminish the number of appeal jurisdctions, whilst guaranteeing an efficient administration of justice equally satisfactory to all the provinces", inserted instead thereof.

And the question being put on the amendment; the house divided:—and it passed in the negative.

There are at least four Canadian precedents for the course which we are seeking to pursue under the amendment moved by the hon. member for Lake Centre. I suggest that the

amendment does not come within the ambit of the principle enunicated by the Prime Minister, and therefore it is in order. I do not wish to labour the point. In my mind at least, and I hope in the minds of legal gentlemen of the house, the point is clear. I could hardly expect that laymen would be quite so appreciative of the technicalities of the situation.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not one of that enlightened company, the members of the legal profession, to which my hon. friend has alluded, and to which he belongs, but I am a humble member of this house and like him I have perused the Journals of the House of Commons. I notice that my hon. friend has given us several citations from the Journals which run back a good many years, some of them fifty or more. Perhaps as a member of the legal profession as well as a member of this house he will be inclined to place more importance upon the more recent rulings given by former Speakers. Therefore, I would direct Your Honour's attention to rulings which have been made by the Speaker of the House of Commons in regard to similar motions and which support entirely the point of order which I raised at the time the hon. member introduced his amendment.

I would refer the house and Your Honour to the Journals of the House of Commons of Thursday, March 8, 1934, at page 156 as follows:

The order being read for the second reading of Bill No. 19, an act to incorporate the Bank of Canada;

Mr. Rhodes moved,—That the said bill be now read the second time.

And a debate arising thereon;

Mr. Coote, seconded by Mr. Irvine, moved in amendment thereto: That all the words after "That" in the main motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"in the opinion of this house the government should give further consideration to the matter of providing that the stock of the proposed central bank should be owned by the government, and that the governor and directors of said bank should be appointed by the governor in council."

And a debate arising thereon;

Mr. Rhodes raised a point of order that the proposed amendment of the honourable member was out of order for the reason that it anticipated amendments embodying the principle which may be submitted in committee on the bill.

After debate thereon;

Mr. Speaker declared the said proposed amendment out of order for the reason that it deals with the provisions of the bill upon which it is moved in that it provides that stock in the bank should be owned by the government, whereas the bill by section 16 provides that the stock shall be allotted to the public with certain restrictions in regard to chartered banks and foreigners. The amendment proposes that the governor and directors should be appointed by the governor in council, whereas the bill by sections 8 and 9 provides that the directors be appointed by the shareholders. This is an amendment which may be moved in committee and not such an amendment as can be moved on a motion to read the bill a second time. Further, the amendment attaches conditions to the second reading of the bill in that it calls for further consideration of the matter set forth in the amendment before the bill is given second reading.

The debate on the second reading of said bill was then resumed.

That is precisely the position we are in at the moment with respect to the amendment of the hon. member for Lake Centre. I have taken exception to it on the score that while it is an amendment which may be moved in committee, it is not such an amendment as may be moved on a motion to read the bill a second time. Further, the amendment attaches conditions to the second reading of the bill in that it calls for further consideration of the matter set forth in the amendment before the bill is given second reading. That is one ruling of a former Speaker of this house.

There is another ruling which perhaps I have even stronger reasons for recalling in that apparently while in opposition I had managed to get into the same box as my hon. friend and had moved an amendment which related to clauses in a bill which should instead have been considered when the bill was in committee. I had not taken exception to the principle of the bill and His Honour the Speaker ruled my amendment out of order in the following terms—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): When was that?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was on April 24, 1934. The record will be found at page 271 of the Journals of the House, and if it is necessary to emphasize the authority, particularly to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I would say that the ruling on that occasion was given by his friend and my friend the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black) when he was occupying the chair of the speakership of this house. I quote from page 271:

The order being read for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Weir (Melfort), for the second reading of Bill No. 51, An Act to improve the methods and practices of marketing of national products in Canada and in export trade, and to make further provision in connection therewith, and the proposed motion of Mr. Mackenzie King in amendment thereto;

And a point of order having been raised;

Then comes the quotation of Mr. Speaker's ruling:

Mr. Speaker: "It having been moved that Bill 51, An Act to improve the methods and practices of marketing of natural products in Canada and in export trade and to make further provision in connection therewith, be now read a second time, the Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King moved in amendment: 'That all the words after the first word "That" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

this house, while prepared to support legislation for assisting the orderly marketing of natural products, is unalterably opposed to the enactment of any compulsory measure which delegates to unnamed and undetermined individuals, groups or organizations, sweeping powers over the production and trade and commerce of the nation, and which confers upon a minister of the crown, and upon the governor in council unprecedented authority and unusual powers to restrict production, and interprovincial, inter-imperial and foreign trade as regards both exports and imports, as well as other autocratic powers.'

"Hon. Mr. Stevens raised the point of order as to whether the said amendment is in order inasmuch as it constitutes what might be termed a declaration of policy instead of offering reasons why consideration of the bill should not be proceeded with or should be postponed or proposing something else germane to the actual motion before the house.

"The Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King in moving the amendment quoted paragraph 755 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, which paragraph is published as a quotation from May, 13th Edition at page 390, which is repeated by Bourinot at page 509:

"'It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from the principles, policy or provisions of the bill.'

"This rule is subject to certain limitations.

His Honour the Speaker continues:

If the right hon. member had continued to quote from May, he would have found the following reference to an amendment to a motion for second reading of a bill—'Nor may such an amendment deal with the provisions of the bill upon which it is moved, nor anticipate amendments thereto which may be moved in committee.'

That is from May, thirteenth edition, page 91, and the precedent as cited in May in support of this from 188 Parliamentary Debates, 4th series, column 76, "The Education (Scotland) Bill" reads:

"'Mr. Speaker: I have to rule that the amendment standing in the name of the hon. member for Glasgow and Aberdeen universities —to the effect that the house while welcoming educational legislation for Scotland regrets that the present measure does not propose change in the educational areas, which is urgently required in the interests of efficient administration—is not technically in order, because it does not challenge the principle of the bill. The question raised can be decided by an amendment to the bill itself. If the hon. member wants to object to the second reading, he should move that the bill be read this day six months.'

Then His Honour the Speaker continued with his ruling:

"The amendment moved by the right hon. leader of the opposition does not challenge the principle of Bill 51, and it anticipates the committee stage. It declares that the 'house is prepared to support legislation for assisting the orderly marketing of natural products' and the bill is intituled: 'An Act to improve the methods and practices of marketing of natural products.' There is so much similarity between those two propositions that one cannot be moved as a reason to reject the second reading of a bill enunciating the other. The bill deals with powers and methods which may be altered in committee.

"The objection to the enactment of any compulsory measure which delegates to unnamed and undetermined individuals, groups or organizations, sweeping powers over the production and trade and commerce of the nation can be decided by amendments when the committee of the whole is considering section 3 of the bill which establishes the Dominion marketing board and section 4 which defines the powers of the board. The action to be taken by the governor in council and the minister in administering the act is described in almost every section of the bill and may be strengthened or weakened by amendment when the bill is in committee.

"The objections raised in the proposed amendment cannot be looked upon as reasons why bill 51 should not now be proceeded with and, moreover, they may be considered after the bill has been read a second time.

"For these reasons, I find the proposed amendment to be out of order."

I think, Mr. Speaker, you will agree and that hon. members will also agree that the parallel is perfect with respect to the relevancy of the amendment which I had sought to introduce in 1934, and which was ruled out of order, and the amendment which the hon. member for Lake Centre has introduced, and which I believe will also be ruled out of order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I was going to ask if the right hon. gentleman agreed with the ruling at that time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was not a matter of choice; it was a case of having to, and having to, I have remembered it from that day to this. I wish to draw attention in particular to these words in the Speaker's ruling:

The amendment moved by the right hon. leader of the opposition does not challenge the principle of Bill 51, and it anticipates the committee stage.

Those were the two points I raised in speaking last night just before the house adjourned as the ones which I felt Your

Honour would wish to consider in deciding whether the present amendment was in order or not.

May I say to my hon. friend the mover of the amendment, so that if His Honour the Speaker should rule against him he will not feel too much overcome, that the purpose which he has in mind will be admirably served by the course which I have already suggested to the leader of the opposition and which I am prepared to state now on behalf of the government, namely, that while the bill as it stands is in the nature of a general plebiscite bill, it may be an instruction to the committee to which the bill is to be referred to insert a clause which will confine the bill to the one single question which I formulated and stated in speaking on the address, and which will be the question to be submitted to the electorate at such time as it may be presented to the people.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has been very frank on that point and much more explicit I think than he has been at any other time. May I be permitted to suggest to him, having regard to the declaration he has just made and the declarations he made on the twenty-sixth of January, and again yesterday, as well as the implications in the speech from the throne and in the speech of the Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty), that the predication of my remarks on the occasions on which I have spoken on this question was that we should have an enabling bill confined to this one question and that we would not be importing into our constitutional practice a brand new theory for the future. Would the Prime Minister not think it the wiser course, in order to facilitate its passage, to withdraw this bill, redraft it along the lines of the bill of 1898, and reintroduce it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the wisest course to adopt is the one which will get us through the business in the quickest possible time. In order to expedite the passage of the measure and avoid unnecessary discussion in the house the government has agreed in advance that when the bill passes its second reading it will be referred at once to a special committee, which will have power to deal with this matter of changes in any of the provisions that may be desirable and which will, I am perfectly sure, incorporate the specific change which my hon. friend wishes to have incorporated.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the present debate on the second reading of Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting the taking of a plebiscite in every electoral district in Canada and the taking of the votes at such plebiscite of Canadian service voters stationed within and without Canada," Mr. Diefenbaker moved an amendment:

> That the bill be not read a second time but that this house is of the opinion that the use of the powers conferred thereby be restricted to the submission thereunder of one plebiscite only.

I have listened very carefully to the cases which were cited by the leader of the opposition, but I did not find in any of them, that they related to amendments—I include those instances which were discussed in the British House of Commons and also in our own—which were not dealing with the principle of a bill. I have had occasion to see and to read the cases which were cited by the Prime Minister, and I think they are on all fours and entirely apposite to the position we are in to-day.

In Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, standing order 75, page 217, citation number 753, it is stated:

> The second reading of a bill is that stage when it is proper to enter into a discussion and propose a motion relative to the principle of the measure.

It is very necessary to state that it is the principle of the measure which is being discussed on the second reading. That is so clear and so distinct that there can be no misunderstanding of the intention of that citation. Further, citation 755 of standing order 75 states:

> It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction, or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its progress; or seeking further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence or the opinion of judges.

And there is a reference to May, thirteenth edition, page 357, and Bourinot, fourth edition, page 509.

A motion opposing the second reading of a bill must not anticipate amendments which may be moved in committee, and alterations which may be effected by amending the clauses of the bill cannot be moved in the second reading, as decided by the Speaker in the two cases quoted by the Prime Minister. I may point out that in the latter case, that of the 24th April, 1934, a division took place on an appeal from the Speaker's decision, and this house sustained the Speaker in ruling the amendment out of order.

The amendment now moved does not challenge the principle of the bill; in fact it agrees with the principle of the bill for the taking of a plebiscite; and I would again read the terms of the amendment:

That the bill be not now read a second time but that this house is of the opinion that the use of the powers conferred thereby be restricted to the submission thereunder of one plebiscite only.

Therefore in the amendment there is an agreement with the principle of the bill, namely, the taking of a plebiscite, but it states that the powers therein conferred should be restricted to the submission thereunder of one plebiscite only. The amendment also anticipates the committee stage of the bill; and the hon. member would serve his purpose by moving amendments to those clauses in committee on the bill.

For these reasons I rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. C. J. VENIOT (Gloucester): As the first member on this side of the house to take part in to-day's debate, I wish to extend congratulations to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) upon his statesmanlike and masterful address of yesterday, wherein he expressed without equivocation his views and those of his associates in the cabinet on the subject under debate at the present time. He clarified many points, and expressed his continued desire to maintain throughout the nation peace and harmony—a condition which is just as important to-day as the manufacturing of tanks and guns. What a difference there would be in the situation of Canada if we had had as head of the government a man whose character was synonymous with intolerance, narrowness of views, rapier-like thrusts, and vituperation. I feel certain that long ago this country would have been subjected to a great number of disturbances, perhaps to the point of riot and revolution, if certain ideas which are advocated to-day had been carried out sooner. With all the fervour in my heart I say, let Canada thank the Almighty for having at its head today a man of the steadfastness, the equanimity and the balance of the present Prime Minister of Canada.

Before approaching the subjects with which I desire to deal, I should like to take a minute or two to consider certain statements made yesterday by the brilliant young member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), in which he upbraided the cabinet for what he termed its abuse of government by order in council. I wish to refer to historical facts of the last war as contained in a book which I have already mentioned, "The Crisis of Quebec, 1914-18," by E. H. Armstrong, page 54, in which it is stated:

The Canadian War Book, analogous to the British one, provided not only for the eventual raising of troops, but also for the issuance of orders in council and proclamations dealing with such wartime measures as the censorship of cables and the prohibition of certain exports.

On page 65:

What came to be known in 1918 as 'order in council government, comprising such unpopular measures as the wholesale cancellation of draft exemptions by a mere decree of the governor general in council, was legalized by the wide powers granted under the War Measures Act of 1914. At that time it met with scarcely any opposition.

On page 232, referring to the same subject:

. . . as time went on and dissatisfaction with the Military service Act, the cancellation of exemptions, and the so-called "order in council government" pervaded the dominion and led to riots elsewhere, the Quebec riots took on much less of a distinctively French-Canadian character and were seen to be parts of a nation-wide movement of resistance to conscription.

And on page 236 the author, referring to this same subject of orders in council, says:

There were many members, English as well as French-Canadians, who protested against the government's use of the order in council to enforce its wishes, especially in the administration of military service. There was considerable feeling that legislation by order in council constituted an abuse of the executive power, being no more nor less than government by ordinance issued by the federal cabinet.

The Prime Minister, when he rose to uphold the government's mode of action in the Quebec riots, immediately defended the use of the order in council. He stated that the right to use this form of legislation had been granted very extensively by the War Measures Act of 1914, that in the war emergencies it was often necessary to act quickly, and that the delay of an appeal to parliament might on occasion be disastrous.

So much for that. I now come to the theme of my discourse.

Since the beginning of this session, I have received, as no doubt many other hon. members have, letters requesting information concerning the definite object of the plebiscite. Some view the measure as containing the germ of conscription; others expect conscription to follow immediately on the conclusion of the plebiscite. So far as I can see, the official opposition seem to entertain the wishful hope that this will take place, in order to bring about what they conceive as the ideal measure of an all-out war effort. Others —and to this group I belong—see in the plebiscite an indication of the desire of the government, in case the nation is confronted with a supreme danger, to be free by the

will of the people to take whatever measures it deems necessary in order to protect the nation and the allied cause, even if we must have recourse to a certain measure of conscription for overseas.

What I cannot conceive is that this government, even if we arrive at the point where the nation is confronted with supreme danger, would endeavour to enforce conscription, any measure of conscription, in the odious way in which it was carried out in 1917, for instance, when troops from Ontario were sent into the province of Quebec to track down evaders; and the same condition of affairs occurred in New Brunswick. I have already expressed myself as willing to accept a certain measure of compulsion for service overseas, provided that I can be shown the absolute failure of voluntary enlistment. But I wish to remind the house and the government that it is a very dangerous policy to ask a nation or a people to make the supreme sacrifice until this nation or people is convinced of the need for such supreme sacrifice. In my estimation the hour has not yet arrived when such a necessity exists. We have before us the gigantic task of educating our people as to the seriousness of the situation. You, sir, and I, see the danger; but the great majority of the people do not entertain the same view. For reasons which already have been submitted to this house I repeat that this country is far from being ripe for the acceptance of any form of compulsion for overseas service. In this opinion may I say that I have the concurrence of a newspaper which is not in great favour with the opposition party, but which nevertheless expresses practically the same view; I refer to the Winnipeg *Free Press*. In a recent editorial it stated:

> The *Free Press* is published a long way from the province of Quebec, but it knew that the state of opinion in that province was such that any attempt to impose conscription for overseas service by arbitrary, high-handed courses would result in an explosion that would destroy for the duration of the war, and for long after, national unity in Canada. It therefore opposed this policy of coercion and urged more politic and moderate measures. That the *Free Press* was right in its estimate of the state of public opinion in Quebec can no longer be denied.

May I continue a quotation from this same editorial indicating the trend in favour of imposing conscription on Canada, in spite of the fact that the country is not ripe for such a measure. The editorial continues:

> Their hope—
>
> The hope of the Toronto junta which decided some four months ago that they would take charge of the affairs of Canada—
>
> —was that by exploiting demands for national government and for conscription, they could disrupt the dominion government; drive Mr. King from the premiership; make it impossible for the French ministers to remain in office; make possible the coming into office of a government which would be exclusively English-speaking with a parliamentary support similarly exclusive. This may look like a wild statement, but nevertheless it is true. The French were to be put in their place; a government more agreeable to reactionaries in financial and political circles was to come into office; there was to be considerably less "truck and trade with the Yankees". In short the clock was to be put back and a government created with policies that would meet with the approval of all those folk who agree with the contributor of the current issue of *Saturday Night*, who tells us that "the essence of French-Canadian outlook" is "an unwillingness to concede the battle of the plains of Abraham". It is startling that such unspeakable idiocy should command some measure of support; but unfortunately it does. A quite prominent member of the Toronto group has given expression to this very view in recent years.

I ask the leader of the opposition what he thinks of such dangerous and provocative utterances coming from some of his supporters in the holy city. Is it not a strange coincidence that the intensification of the clamour for conscription occurred last fall precisely at the moment when it became known that the bulwark against conscription, that giant Canadian statesman, the late Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, was about to disappear from the political scene? Is it not a coincidence that it happened when it was definitely realized that his mighty voice defending Canadian liberties and privileges was about to be silenced by the pall of death? His passing was the signal, as everyone knows, of a sudden blitzkrieg of forces aimed at splitting the Liberal party by renewing with accrued vigour the sudden cry for conscription which reached even the ranks of the Liberal party.

Not so very long ago I was castigated for having made what was termed a most dangerous speech, when I characterized conscription as having been transformed into a racial issue. No doubt the ire of the hon. gentleman who so characterized me was aroused by the fact that I placed this child on the doorstep of the Conservative party which directed the affairs of Canada in 1917. Hon. members from New Brunswick, although we have personal regard for the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) as a gentleman, know his habit of viewing certain questions by the light of a small tallow candle instead of by the radiance of God's own sunshine. At the first opportunity he tried to convey to certain sections of this country the idea that I entertained the determination to make conscription a racial issue. I wish to state that there was no such determination on my part. That determination was

made by the fathers of conscription, who conceived that child in 1917 and fostered it ever since. That determination was made rather by the gentlemen from Toronto to whom the Winnipeg *Free Press* referred in the editorial I quoted a few minutes ago. I wonder if the leader of the opposition listened carefully yesterday to the quotations made by the Prime Minister from speeches delivered in this house by the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, by the leader of the opposition in March, 1939, and by these gentlemen during the last campaign. I wondered also, as the Prime Minister said yesterday, why the hon. gentleman did not denounce the words of his leader of that time as being dangerous, because his utterances then dealt with the racial nature of conscription, the dangerous elements which it contained, and the possibility that it would develop strife and division throughout the dominion.

Of course I realize with regret that the hon. gentleman's knowledge of French does not permit him to understand all the speeches made by my fellow Canadians from the province of Quebec concerning the question of conscription. I realize also that he may not have had time at his disposal to read the English translations of those speeches which appeared in *Hansard;* and I realize also that he may not have time in the next two or three years to read certain books which treat very forcefully this same question of conscription, and throw a great deal of light on the nature of the issue.

All the speeches and books I have mentioned contain the same thoughts that have been expressed in this house in recent days, except that they have been couched in different language. My crime has been that of stripping conscription of the hypocrisy with which it has been surrounded for the past twenty-five years; of pulling it out of the odious pussyfooting and beating around the bush to which it has been subjected by, I may say, all political parties since the last war. Let us call things by their true names. A rose by any other name still smells as sweet. Dynamite by any other appellation contains just as much destructive power. Pussyfooting about conscription is just as dangerous as so many tons of TNT under the foundations of national unity in this country. It is potentially fraught with just as great disaster and dissension when it is called by the sweet sounding name of selective service for overseas.

To explain my position on this issue may I be permitted, though it is rather disagreeable to me to do so, to speak of my background. Within the last two weeks I have been pointed out as a French fanatic, though I regret to use that term. Let me say that my father, one time premier of New Brunswick, and one time postmaster general in this House of Commons, devoted his entire life, as every hon. member of this house knows, to fostering and promoting bonne entente, harmony and union between the two great races of this country. I will admit that between my father and the leader of the opposition there did exist political animosity; but I also know, as the hon. gentleman knows, that there existed between them a certain amount of personal friendship.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Right.

Mr. VENIOT: And there is that same personal friendship between us at the present time. We may hold different political opinions, but as individuals we leave those things aside, no matter what bitter enemies we may be in politics. My father endeavoured to instil into me and the other members of the family that same desire to foster a better feeling between the two races. As a physician and a public man I have endeavoured in every way to follow in my father's footsteps in that regard. The dearest and truest friends I have, in and out of my profession, are of English-speaking descent, and the great majority of them are Protestants. I can also say that in my active professional practice the great majority of my clients were non-Catholics, and the same thing applies to my large drug business in the town of Bathurst. My three daughters—I am going all the way—were educated and received their university degrees at an English institution in the city of Halifax. Why? Because I desired them to have the broad English view as well as the French view, so that they might be better Canadians. My only son is a third year medical student, not at the French university of Laval, for which I have a great deal of respect, nor at the university of Montreal, but at the English Protestant Dalhousie university, for the same reason.

I ask this house: Is such a background conducive to fanatical expressions in this house with regard to race? I deny that in toto. My sole endeavour has been and will continue to be to enlighten my fellow-Canadians as much as I possibly can as to the factual, historical, political and racial significance of conscription as I have studied the question, and to point out the explosive dangers to the nation of any such measure. I realize that I have not much time at my disposal, though I did not take note of the time I started to speak; but I propose to indicate certain facts concerning conscription which are found in a book which I think it very important that every hon. member of

this house should read, a book to which I referred a few moments ago. This book contains all the historical facts, for which all the references are indicated. It was written by a person who lives outside Canada, a former New Yorker but now a Washingtonian. That may be disagreeable to some hon. members in this house who formerly preached the slogan, "No truck or trade with the United States." The author of this book is a disinterested outsider who has no axe to grind for the province of Quebec or any other province of this dominion; for conscriptionists or anti-conscriptionists; a person who spent six months practically without interruption in the library of this House of Commons, as can be verified by consulting our librarians, and in the archives of the government, gathering material for this very valuable work.

The first chapter of this book is concerned with the roots of French-Canadianism; it indicates the struggles which took place from the conquest of New France by England up to the beginning of the last war. The second chapter deals with the trials of French-Canadian nationality. The third chapter indicates French-Canadian nationalism at the outbreak of the war. The fourth and fifth chapters, which should interest this house, show the united Canada of 1914 and the revival of national conflict with French Canada on the defensive in 1916. May I be permitted, as time allows, to read a few quotations from this work, the first from page 55:

Britain entered the war on August 4. . . On the same day the governor general telegraphed the king that "Canada stands united from the Pacific to the Atlantic in her determination to uphold the honour and traditions of our empire."

Then, in the next paragraph:

The most striking phenomenon in the first months of the war was the practical unanimity of all shades of Canadian opinion.

And a few lines further down:

But in 1914 Canadians of both races and all religions were bound in a sort of *union sacrée* . . . throughout the length and breadth of the province of Quebec there were demonstrations of popular acclaim for the cause of Britain and her allies.

And on page 56:

In Quebec, the old capital of Canada, there were enthusiastic pro-war demonstrations in which English, Irish, and French Canadians joined.

And in the next paragraph:

With a unanimity that is all the more striking when the bitter divisions of the later years of the war are considered, the representatives of every shade of French-Canadian political opinion, Liberals, Conservatives and even Nationalists seemed to vie with each other in expressions of enthusiasm for the allied cause and for Canadian participation. . . . From the very beginning of the European conflict, the official leader of French-Canadian thought—

Sir Wilfrid Laurier—

—ranged himself on the side of an active Canadian participation in the war.

Then, on page 57:

Laurier appealed to his own countrymen in eloquent terms to enlist.

And on page 58:

That the Catholic leaders did not at this time shirk from envisaging a whole-hearted Canadian cooperation in the empire's war effort is proved by Archbishop Bruchesi's supplementary statement—

Then the statement follows. And further:

Laurier . . . admonished the French Canadians among the soldiers to remember that "England has protected our liberties and our faith. Under her flag we have found peace, and now in appreciation of what England has done, you go as French Canadians to do your utmost to keep the Union Jack flying in honour to the breeze."

And at page 59:

Pastoral letters . . . have been at times of great influence in keeping the French Canadians in the path of obedience and loyalty to the mother country.

And further down the page:

The bishops did not hesitate to assert that because England was engaged in the war, it was clear that the fate of all parts of the empire was linked to the success of her arms.

I could go on quoting endlessly to show that in those days the most perfect harmony and unity existed among Canadians of all races, all creeds and all nationalities.

Then, at page 64:

On the Liberal as much as on the Conservative side of the House of Commons it seemed to be the consensus of opinion that the government should be given carte blanche to help win the war.

And at page 67:

There was absolutely no difference of opinion on the righteousness of the cause of the allies or of the necessity of Canada's coming to the help of the mother country in the great emergency.

I now pass to the next chapter, in order to save time. At page 83 I find this:

It was only natural that there arose at that time a widely supported movement for the formation of a battalion to be exclusively composed of French Canadians.

There was an insistent demand for a French-Canadian unit.

French Canadians were sometimes assigned to units predominantly English-speaking and protestant, where the atmosphere was decidedly uncongenial to them.

And further down:

They were further annoyed by the lack of French-Canadian instructors and by the refusal of the authorities to allow more than one French-Canadian company under French-Canadian officers in the first contingent. . . . The consequent desire for a unit in which French Canadians would be assured of a sympathetic milieu for the free exercise of their religion and customs was very strong. Meanwhile French-Canadian leaders of both parties had given their support to the scheme for a French-Canadian unit. . . .

The consequent authorization on September 30 for the formation of a battalion to be known as the Royal 22nd French Canadians was hailed with patriotic satisfaction throughout the province of Quebec. Conservative and Liberal editors of rural and city newspapers alike united in cordial approval of the scheme. . . .

With the formation of a French-Canadian battalion and the recruiting campaign, of which the Parc Sohmer meeting was an outstanding event, it seemed that French Canada's war effort had been given exactly the proper impetus and that it would only be necessary to keep it going.

Immediately following are these words:

Unfortunately, the government and particularly the recruiting authorities failed to do just that. The Conservative government of Sir Robert Borden was severely handicapped throughout the war by the fact that its French-Canadian members represented a minority instead of a majority of their compatriots.

And the further quotation at page 90:

The year 1915 was marked not only by a magnificent expansion of Canada's war effort, but also by the revival of racial conflict and a decided break in the unanimity of French- and English-speaking Canadians for the successful prosecution of the war. . . .

Underneath this seeming unanimity, there were forces, currents of emotion and counter-emotion that were destined seriously to impede Canada's war effort and practically to destroy the 1914 enthusiasm of French Canadians for active participation in the European war.

And on the following page:

It was most unfortunate for the cause of national solidarity that the controversy over the teaching of French in the Ontario schools should have come to a head at this moment to strengthen those forces of disunion. . . . The agitation over the Ontario bilingual schools . . . results in growing bitterness between the races until the average French Canadian lost a good deal of his enthusiasm for fighting England's battles.

And on page 92:

As a result of this instinctive feeling, it was not surprising to see French Canada's war effort become less enthusiastic as the Ontario schools controversy progressed.

And further down on the same page:

The bitterness aroused by the dispute over the Ontario bilingual schools was responsible more than anything else for the gradual slowing up of the war effort of French Canada.

And at page 93:

To have such an issue raised at a moment when mutual tolerance and cooperation were essential to a successful prosecution of the war was unfortunate in the highest degree.

I realize the time at my disposal has practically elapsed. In conclusion I would ask every hon. member to take cognizance of this work, if he sincerely desires to be posted on the exact significance of conscription as a menace to the unity of the Canadian people.

May I terminate my observations by quoting from a letter received only a few days ago from a friend:

What are we going to do about conscription, after the plebiscite? Why hold conscription like a red rag in front of a bull? Let us bear in mind its true significance, and drop it like a curse. Let us direct all our efforts toward any other method of raising the manpower required for the outside defence of Canada. Let us eliminate from our vocabularies this element of national discord and cleavage, and get together on some common ground where susceptibilities are not smouldering at red heat. Let us act and talk more like brothers under the skin, which we really are. Let us consolidate our forces, not divide them, bearing in mind the tremendous task which we all have of winning this war at the side of our sister nations of the commonwealth.

To indicate that there are no hard feelings in my heart toward any hon. member who may have criticized me, and particularly toward the leader of the opposition, may I, through you, sir, and with my compliments, offer a gift of this book to the leader of the opposition so that he may have an opportunity of studying it and conveying some of its contents to his fellow members.

Mr. KARL K. HOMUTH (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to follow the arguments of the last speaker except to make reference to some of the statements which he made. He referred to the question of conscription. This question of conscription has been raised so often in this house that one would think we did not have conscription in Canada. We have conscription in Canada; let us face the fact. The only difference is that we have not conscription for overseas service. Boys are being taken away from the farms and factories of this country and conscripted into the Canadian army. I think we should make that perfectly clear and get away from this nonsense of intimating that we have not conscription in this country. Furthermore, I should have thought that the last speaker in his eloquent pleading for national unity would have committed himself as to where he stands on this question of the plebiscite and what active part he intends to

take to try to get the people of Canada to vote "yes" to relieve the government of restrictions.

Mr. VENIOT: May I point out to the hon. gentleman that I have done so already.

Mr. HOMUTH: I am glad to hear it, because the hon. member's speech this afternoon did anything but help to create unity in this country. I think the address of the hon. gentleman will do more to create disunity in Canada than any other thing.

I do not intend to deal with the general question of the plebiscite, because that has been dealt with already. The house has passed on the matter and we are going to have a plebiscite. I had thought that the discussion on the second reading of the bill was limited to a discussion of its principle. My own opinion is that the hon. member who has just spoken was entirely out of order. In fact, I think the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was out of order yesterday because there was very little discussion of the principle of the bill. What I want to deal with is the principle and the proponents of the bill.

I have listened carefully to the arguments which have been advanced for and against the plebiscite during the debate on the resolution and so far on the bill itself. I listened carefully to the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, which was practically all on the question of holding a plebiscite. This bill and those speeches must revive in the mind of the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar) some fond memories of his political career, and also of some of the speeches the Prime Minister has made in the past. I can imagine the Minister of Mines and Resources sitting in his seat and every once in a while giving a little squirm when some criticism of the War-time Elections Act and of Union government crossed the floor of the house, evidently aimed at the Conservative party but sometimes hitting him in passing. I can hear him saying, "Ouch, that hurts," when some of those barbs struck him. The Minister of Mines and Resources was first elected to the Canadian House of Commons under the War-time Elections Act, 1917, and his mind must have gone back to those days. I have here a few extracts from some of the speeches which the Minister of Mines and Resources made during that campaign. They are interesting when compared with his attitude to-day on this question and his very loyal—I think that is the best term to use—support which he gives the present Prime Minister.

Speaking at Carman, Manitoba, on December 3, 1917, the Minister of Mines and Resources, who was then a Union government candidate, said:

> Conscript wealth as well as flesh and blood. [Mr. Homuth.]

He offered hearty congratulations to the Liberals who because of their loyalty and sincerity had joined the Union government and deserted Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Then on December 13, 1917, he said:

> Compulsory military service, as the Honourable Arthur Meighen has said, is the rock upon which Union government is built.

At that time he was a strong supporter of Right Hon. Arthur Meighen. He followed his every speech and he watched his every gesture; he considered him one of the great Canadians. He then went on to say:

> There is no chance of a referendum if this Union government is defeated on Monday next. Canada will then be committed to a policy which will bring shame to her.

Sir Wilfrid had proposed a referendum. On December 14, 1917, there was a tremendous crowd in Grace church, Winnipeg. Speaking at that meeting the Minister of Mines and Resources said:

> I do not question Sir Wilfrid Laurier's loyalty, but I do question the loyalty of those who are standing behind him in Quebec. The very best element in the Liberal party is in support of this Union government.

This Liberal party is now supported by all members, whether they come from other provinces or from the province of Quebec. Needless to say his leader, the present Prime Minister of Canada, was not in that group in 1917. The minister said:

> When the boys go over the top there is no question as to whether they are Liberal or Conservative. Cannot we too stand united and go over the top on December 17?

The Prime Minister has talked a good deal about national unity. I should like to refer to a speech which he made in 1940 as it relates to the bill now before the house. Referring to national unity, the Prime Minister said:

> Least of all was it brought about by pledges to extend the life of parliament in a time of war without any reference to the people, or to form a so-called "national" government that might enforce conscription or disfranchise many classes of Canadian citizens. The memories of those experiences in the last war are still bitter in the minds of the Canadian people.

In dealing with the present bill, we can only do so perhaps by comparing it with the War-time Elections Act of 1917. The government has found that the country is at war and that it is necessary during this war to take a vote on a certain question. In arranging to take that vote they find that they have to present to the house a bill which will provide for those who may or may not be able to vote. They have a problem on their hands which to my mind they will find it difficult to solve. We must remember that in the county of Waterloo, in some of the neighbouring counties and in many other

places throughout Canada, whenever it has been found useful to use it since 1917, the old War-time Elections Act has been dragged out of the closet and waved before the eyes of electors to whom it might mean something. And so this bill is presented to the house. I think I am not unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, when I say that this bill contains more political trickery than any other piece of legislation that has ever been introduced into the House of Commons.

Mr. CLEAVER: Is the hon. member supporting or opposing it?

Mr. HOMUTH: I shall tell my hon. friend all about that. But first I want to compare this bill with the Wartime Elections Act of 1917.

The act of 1917 contains clauses with which I thoroughly disagree, clauses which in my opinion were unfair and should never have been embodied in an election act. But this bill contains clauses which are or might be just as vicious. By the act of 1917 the franchise was extended to certain classes of women in this country. There was no women's franchise in Canada in 1917. The first time the franchise was extended to women was in Ontario in the elections of 1919. But in the act of 1917 the franchise was given to the wives and mothers of men who were overseas, and after all, I know of no one who was more interested in the war than the wives and mothers who were waiting patiently and anxiously for husband or son to come home, waiting perhaps only to receive a telegram saying they would never be home again.

Mr. McLARTY: Surely the hon. gentleman is not suggesting that they are disfranchised under this bill?

Mr. HOMUTH: I am not suggesting that at all. I am comparing some of the clauses of the act of 1917 with some of the terms of this bill, which certainly are not clear to me, and unless they are very much modified, will not be clear to the electors.

The hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) the other day referred to paragraph (c) of subsection 2 of section 4 of this bill, which deals with those who are barred from voting on the plebiscite through being barred in the province in which they live. He made an eloquent plea that the great Liberal party should never do a thing like this; he appealed to the great principles of Liberalism in urging that this provision should be struck out of the bill. So far as pleading for the principles of Liberalism is concerned, he was pleading for something that is deader than a mackerel. Nevertheless he made the statement, and I reiterate it, that this clause is one of the most dangerous that could be put in any election act. Suppose a German warship should be able to approach, let us say, some town in Prince Edward Island, and it was feared that German fifth columnists in Prince Edward Island might become active, and that therefore the legislature immediately met and decided to intern many of them and deprive them of their right to vote in a provincial election. That would mean that everyone of German origin throughout Canada would be debarred from voting on the plebiscite, and that might happen two days before the plebiscite vote was taken. People of German origin throughout Canada would be debarred from voting on the plebiscite, thousands of mothers and fathers whose sons went overseas in the last war and died for this country—families who have been settled here for a hundred and twenty to a hundred and fifty years and have played their part in every war in which Canada and the empire have been engaged. That disqualification might apply to other races. Why the clause is in there at all I do not know unless the government was given to understand that it applies to the Japanese because of the situation in British Columbia. If that be so, let us be frank and put it in the bill that the Japanese are barred from voting. But why should the bill contain such a general clause as this?

The hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) made a point yesterday which I think was well taken—that this bill would bring about a complete change in our constitutional set-up and system of government in Canada. He made that so clear that the point needs no labouring. But I go further. I remember what happened when the National Resources Mobilization Act was before the house, and the national registration. We had a meeting in the railway committee room at which Mr. Justice Davis and the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), who was then also Minister of National War Services, discussed this whole matter with the members of this house. At that time they said there would be no exemptions whatsoever under the National Resources Mobilization Act. They did provide, however, for indefinite postponements for members of two religious creeds, the Doukhobors and the Mennonites. But for fear there would be resentment among the other peoples of this country because the Doukhobors and the Mennonites were being granted an indefinite postponement the government decided to establish and did establish work camps, and the boys of those two faiths were taken from their homes, from the farms of this country, and sent into those camps to build useless roads that some tourists may drive over years hence. But in western Canada the Doukhobors, I understand, refused to

go into these camps, and so they were taken before the courts and sentenced, some of them to serve time in gaol, some to pay a fine; and in the event of not paying the fine they had to serve an extra month in gaol. Now they are free. I doubt whether the government will call them and fine them and gaol them again, because they have purchased their freedom by serving two months in gaol and paying a fine of $200, or serving three months in gaol. From a casual reading of this bill one would think that these people were denied the right to vote on the plebiscite, or that if they did vote on it they would be subject to military service. That is the general impression one gets from a first reading of the bill. But as a matter of fact it does not deny to them the right to vote on the plebiscite. The conscientious objectors, the Mennonites and the Doukhobors, can vote on this plebiscite, and that is part of the trickery that is in this bill. The government should make it abundantly clear to the people of this country whether or not these people are going to be allowed to vote on the plebiscite. It is not clear now.

Take the case of a Mennonite or a Doukhobor family, consisting of the father, the mother, three daughters over twenty-one and therefore old enough to vote, and a son of military age. If the son votes he is liable to military service, but the father, the mother and the three daughters can vote, knowing that they will not be required to serve; the son refrains from voting and is not liable to military service; and there are five votes in that family against the plebiscite. That is according to a provision of this bill. The government is in the position of saying that while on the face of it it looks as though these people dare not vote, in a very subtle way we have arranged that they can vote, because the only one who is debarred from voting is the son of military age. These people do not have to fight for their country or serve in any capacity, and five out of a family of six will be permitted to vote against the plebiscite. Surely that is not the type of legislation we want.

Mr. ROEBUCK: What does the hon. member suggest?

Mr. HOMUTH: What do I suggest? I suggest that the government come out honestly and say where they stand on this matter, whether these people have or have not the right to vote. So far as I am concerned, let me tell my hon. friend that any citizens of this country who, while enjoying the freedom, the opportunities and the protection which this country and this empire give them, are not prepared to serve in the military forces or the non-combatant forces to the very limits of which they are capable, are not fit to be called Canadians. That is my opinion, and I have no hesitation in expressing it. The Mennonites are not averse to serving; they are prepared to do anything they can in support of our war effort so long as they do not have to bear arms and kill, because to do so is against the principles of their religion. But there are many things which they could do, and do much better than they are being done to-day, without dragging them off their farms and putting them in camps.

Let me say further that this bill does not jibe with the war service act, because, while these provisions are in the bill, these people are subject to being taken out and put in those camps. I wonder whether the Secretary of State drew up this bill. I do not know, but I should not be surprised if he did, because it is just about as double-barrelled as many of the orders in council which came from the Labour department when he was in charge of it, and the meaning of which half the time we did not know.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there is no provision to get out the vote. The Prime Minister called yesterday for national unity; he asked hon. members to go home, organize their ridings, engage the help of service clubs and other people to serve as returning officers, scrutineers, and so forth, for no compensation. I believe many people can be persuaded to do it. But when he calls for national unity, the place for him to start, so far as this plebiscite is concerned, is within the ranks of his own party; because the only people in this house who have said that they would refuse to release the government from its promise to the people are members within his own ranks, and the only organizations in respect of this plebiscite in Canada to-day are those which are opposed to it. To judge by some of the speeches delivered in this chamber, and by a meeting which was held in Montreal and ended in a riot, a tremendous organization is going on against releasing the government from its promise. Now, what does the government intend to do in order to ensure that there is an equally strong, strenuous and active organization to see that there is a sufficient vote to release it from its promise? It has a tremendous responsibility. I am fearful of the position of this country in the eyes not only of our own people but of the other nations of the world, if this plebiscite should be adverse to releasing the government. It would be a tragedy were such a thing to occur.

Mr. CLEAVER: Well, then, why not support it?

Mr. HOMUTH: I am supporting it. Who said I am not?

Mr. CLEAVER: I have not heard any word of support so far, and I have been listening.

Mr. HOMUTH: The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Cleaver) is continually interjecting remarks on things he knows nothing about. He is like the famous Topsy; he doesn't know where he came from and he doesn't know where he is going—politically.

Mr. CLEAVER: I have not boxed the compass yet, though.

Mr. HOMUTH: Now, Mr. Speaker, I say this, and in all seriousness. The Prime Minister has a tremendous job on his hands. He has first of all to close up his own ranks, to see to it that his own supporters in this house get out and do the job which he is asking us to do. He need have no fears about what we are going to do. He need have no doubt about the stand which the opposition will take. Our leader has made it abundantly plain. But if this plebiscite results in a negative vote, Canada will stand in a very serious position.

This week we had a secret session of the house to get information on our war effort. In May we are going to take a plebiscite; the people are to be asked to relieve the government of a promise. Yet they have no such knowledge as we have of the war situation. It is time that the Prime Minister and the members of his cabinet told them plainly just what that situation is, and how great a danger it holds for Canada and for everything we hold dear. Rather than see the plebiscite defeated I would endorse action by the government to withdraw the whole thing from this house and forget the matter entirely. Unfortunately the government, in its effort not to promote national unity but to play with this question, has grabbed a wild cat by the tail.

Mr. MacNICOL: It dare not let go.

Mr. HOMUTH: It is afraid to hang on and it dare not let go. In my opinion it would be better to let go and take a few scratches rather than, by hanging on, to endanger very seriously Canada's war effort.

Mr. A. W. ROEBUCK (Trinity): The hon. gentleman who just sat down stated that the government has a wild cat by the tail and cannot let go. Possibly the illustration is unfortunate from his point of view, because hon. gentlemen opposite did have that wild cat by the tail and have now let go.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth). It is notable for what it does not say rather than for what it says. The argument against the plebiscite was riding high, wide and handsome until a few days ago, when the opposition observed that they had a wild cat by the tail. I note that to-day they no longer oppose the plebiscite—it is too much like a wild cat to hold by the tail; they limit themselves to making attacks on small details of the bill which no doubt will be settled in committee in a way satisfactory to all concerned.

For instance there was the attack by the hon. gentleman from Waterloo South (Mr. Homuth) on section 5 of the bill, which is directed possibly towards the Mennonite or Doukhobor vote of the west. That section provides that those who vote on the plebiscite may not later claim exemption from military service. The hon. gentleman worked himself up into a great heat and fury about some Mennonite family who might all vote with the exception only of those liable for military service. I asked him what he suggested and he went into a heated reply but did not answer the question. A friend at my side handed me a book in which he pointed to a quotation from some philosopher of old who said "in politics heat is in inverse proportion to knowledge". I thought it applicable and timely because, although the hon. gentleman got very warm, he did not give me any knowledge as to what he proposed to do. What would hon. members do under these circumstances, granted the picture is correct as he has presented it? Would they disfranchise all the Mennonites and all the Doukhobors? Would they not make those who vote liable to military service? It seems to me that a practical viewpoint rather than a condition of heat is required when one is discussing the details of a bill. Is not the bill as it stands probably the best solution that could be obtained under the circumstances? It provides that young men capable of military service may not vote on the question and later claim exemption.

I am inclined to compliment the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) upon his attack on section 3 of the bill. There are before the house at the moment two principles involved in this bill. One is the principle of giving to the executive the power to have general plebiscites on any question and at all times. That is what is expressed in the bill. But we now have the intimation by the government that this will later be changed in committee. Were the bill to stand as it now reads, I would approach it with a great deal of doubt; I do not like these general powers given to an executive unless there is a distinct understanding as to how they are to be used.

We have the illustration of the War Measures Act passed in the early days of this parliament—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Not this parliament. I would say it was at the time of the last war.

Mr. ROEBUCK: I accept the correction. It was before this parliament was elected but after the war was declared.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No, it was passed in 1914—in the former war; it was dormant in the interval until this war.

Mr. ROEBUCK: Then it became active and was re-used during this parliament.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It was revived.

Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes; I thank my hon. friend for the correction. When that measure was revived—I do not remember that there was a vote in the house, but, at that time, I suppose no hon. member, whether in the executive or out of it, anticipated that by this time there would be some twenty thousand orders in council passed. I suppose there was no one who anticipated that these orders in council would go into such broad measures as the limitation of prices, the regulation of wages and other such matters of a civil nature. When you hand over power to an executive you must look to it that the limitations are such that the executive will not go further than you would yourself. I have looked with regret on the limitation of the activities of parliament and the absorption of so much power by the executive, so I would hesitate to give to the executive the power to hold general plebiscites on any question. I compliment the hon. member for Lake Centre for having objected while this only was before us. But with the assurance that we now have from the government I think we may assume that what is before us is a plebiscite on the question:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

That is the matter before us now.

I did not speak in the debate on the address in reply. It was very largely given up to the discussion of the pros and cons of conscription. I did not speak because I felt that practically every veiwpoint was covered and because I felt that very little was to be gained by much talking on that most contentious problem; that the more one spoke on it, the more angry one became, the further the disputants drew apart, and the more difficult became the situation presented to the Canadian people. There would be very little difficulty indeed, were hon. members on this side of the house left free from the influence of stirred-up public opinion abroad, in arranging some reasonable solution of that question. The whole difficulty arises from much talk and perhaps a too partisan attitude on the question.

I did not take part in the argument. Yet I feel that for the sake of my own constituents I should not allow this opportunity to go by to put on record where I stand on this question.

I am neither a conscriptionist nor an anti-conscriptionist. There are two main arguments on the matter. There is first the desire which I and many others have for a voluntary army rather than a conscript army, because we believe that the volunteer army is better. I can go back in my own memory to the time when we used to hold almost in contempt the conscript armies of Europe, and used to look with pride on the British armies of those days which were raised by voluntary enlistment. I am reinforced in my opinion by the remarks of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston), who said it was most important that our present splendid volunteer army be reinforced by volunteers and not by conscripts. I am satisfied that one of the prime requisites—or perhaps that is a little too strongly stated; that one of the best qualifications for joining the armed forces of Canada is willingness to serve. It is a most important factor; and I cannot see, as some people argue, that anything is to be gained, as far as the army is concerned, by abolishing voluntary service and replacing it with some kind of compulsion. So I am not in favour of compulsion for compulsion's sake.

On the other hand, I have before me a comment made by Mr. Winston Churchill in one of his speeches, published in his recent book, which I should like to read to the house. He was speaking about the conscription act that was introduced into the British house during this war, and said:

At the beginning of the war of 1914 we soon had a million volunteers on our hands, for the bulk of whom no weapons were available. Ultimately over two million men demanded to be led to the front. But after that the limits of voluntary recruitment were exhausted. The war continued and the armies could not be maintained. Then we had the hateful spectacle of volunteers who had been wounded twice or even thrice being sent back to the trenches, and of regular soldiers who had served two whole years in the front line being deprived of their right to claim expiry of their contract. This proved intolerable to the national sense of justice. Moreover, two million households and families whose menfolk had borne the whole burden were infuriated by the fact that there were very large numbers of perfectly fit men remaining at home, filling at higher wages

the jobs of those who had volunteered. It was this sense of wrong and injustice, which spread through the country in the spring and summer of 1916, that alone carried the conscription bill.

So you have these two conflicting ideas: the value of a volunteer army on the one hand, and the utter unfairness of voluntary service on the other; the unfairness of having in the army only those whose public spirit is sufficiently great to induce them to enlist, and the unfairness of allowing those whose public spirit is insufficient to remain in the safety and comfort of their homes. Those two arguments are irreconcilable; the longer you talk about them, the more they clash. So you come to the point where you must make practical decisions, rather than an out-and-out choice between the two.

The time has not yet arrived in Canada, as it did in Great Britain, when people are outraged at the unfairness of the situation. If the war continues; if casualties increase; if there are published in the press long lists of names of those who have been lost; if many months of arduous service go by, that feeling will become overwhelming in this country, the unfairness of keeping the public-spirited men in the front lines while the loafers, the shirkers, sit comfortably at home. Therefore the desire for the fairness of selective service will overcome our desire for a volunteer army. We must put ourselves in a position to do what is right under the circumstances as they exist from time to time.

For that reason I am heartily in accord with the bill now before the house. The opposition to it is perhaps uninformed; perhaps it refuses actually to see or consider the points involved. May I lay before the house a resolution which I recently received from the clerk of the city council of Toronto. Mr. J. W. Somers, city clerk, wrote me as follows:

Pursuant to instruction, I forward herewith, a copy of a resolution which was adopted by the city council, at its meeting on February 9, 1942, as follows:

"Whereas, it is the proposed intention of the federal government to hold a plebiscite on the general question of conscription and whereas the cost of the same has been estimated to be well over one million dollars, and whereas, at this time, leadership is needed to be given, more than ever, by the elected government at Ottawa, and whereas the holding of such a plebiscite will tend to harm rather than help Canada's war effort;

"Be it resolved: that this city council petitions the federal government to reconsider its decision on a plebiscite of this nature being placed before the peoples of this country at this most critical time, and further, a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Prime Minister of Canada and his cabinet and to all federal representatives of this city."

I received that resolution, and it may be of some interest if I may be permitted to read my reply. I wrote the city clerk in part as follows:

I am glad to know the view of the city council in respect to this matter, and thank you for your letter.

It strikes me, however, that the resolution is incomplete, and I would like a little more information. I am of opinion that our selective service law requires amendment, and I think the council agrees with me on this. It does not make clear, however, how the government is to free itself of the pledge given to the public, if a plebiscite is not held. I am sure that the council does not suggest that the government violate or disregard its pledge, and I am also fairly confident that it does not advocate that the government carry on indefinitely as we are. As the act now stands, we could not send draftees across the international border into the United States, nor could we, for instance, hold the Aleutian islands against the Japanese with drafted men.

I value the thought and wisdom of the city council and I would like to know what it is they actually propose.

That letter was dated February 16, and so far I have not received a reply. In private discussions of the matter I have found that when you bring somebody right up against the question: "Do you advocate that we stay as we are, or do you advocate that the government violate a pledge?" you seldom obtain an answer, certainly not from a partisan. I think many people have not really realized what the attack on the plebicsite means.

Yesterday the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling) advised that all 245 members of this house join together and adopt a resolution releasing ourselves from the pledge. The hon. member seemed to think we might then in honour proceed to deal with the matter as we saw fit.

I spoke in the city of Toronto on Sunday evening on this question, to a very considerable audience. I told them that I personally, in that very hall, and from that very platform had told those very people that if the government was returned to power, the government led by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) they would not have conscription. I was justified in that statement because I had the pledge of the Prime Minister, and I also pointed out in that speech that I also had the pledge of the then leader of the opposition, Doctor Manion. Therefore, no matter which party won, there would not be conscription in Canada during this war, until another general election took place.

I told these people that I personally did not stand for broken pledges and that I would not be a party to making the breaking of pledges a principle of political action. That

is my view, and that is where I hold myself right now. I will not take part in the breaking of these pledges; and, Mr. Speaker, I do not see how, if I joined with the hon. member for New Westminster, (Mr. Reid), and the two of us concocted something, I would in any way relieve myself from the pledge. Nor if I added all the gentlemen around me would I relieve myself from it. Nor indeed would I help myself in any way if I joined with the hon. member for Yale and the leader of the opposition.

There is an old story to the effect that when thieves fall out, honest men get their due. It is when thieves join together that honest men must beware. One cannot recover from a pledge solemnly given to the public by joining in some kind of conspiracy to get our own way without their consent. We would not increase by one iota the morality of our action by each severally violating his pledge, in association with all other members of parliament who were violating theirs.

Therefore in my judgment, so far as I can see, there is no way of handling the practical needs of the situation other than by taking a plebiscite and asking for a release. That is the honest way, the decent way; it is needed; it is necessary.

The hon. member for Waterloo South was most anxious about the vote, whether it was or was not going to carry. He complained that we should throw obligation on hon. members of the oposition to have it carried. His question was: What is the government going to do? Well, I throw back the question. I can tell him what I will do, because I have already done it. I advocate voting "yes" on the plebiscite. What are you going to do? There is no doubt about what the great majority, at least 95 per cent, of hon. members on this side of the house will do. Now, what will the opposition do?

There is no lack of money, no lack of organization on the Conservative side. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Veniot) referred to the junta which recently met in Toronto to stimulate an all-out war effort, a junta which spent thousands of dollars upon advertising in the public press.

Mr. JACKMAN: They were all Liberals.

Mr. ROEBUCK: The same gentlemen, in association with my hon. friends across the aisle, can still spend their money, and get up a campaign of that kind. I hope they will be more successful than they were with the last one. But still they may do it; they may advocate it.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): What is the basis for the use of the term "in association with"? The hon. gentleman used the expression "in association with my hon. friends across the aisle".

Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): What is the basis for that suggestion?

Mr. ROEBUCK: The basis for that statement?

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): Yes.

Mr. ROEBUCK: Why, the basis lies in the fact that the junta which gathered in the roof garden of the Royal York hotel played to the extent of their ability the Conservative hand in the by-election.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): That is just your opinion.

Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, just my opinion—and it is supported by the facts. Furthermore, the results of the by-elections also support my statement that their action was attended with a minimum of success.

Perhaps the house would be interested in my own experience in connection with that advertising, and the junta's work. You know, I come from Toronto, and I am proud of that fact. I am proud of it, notwithstanding the fact that public opinion of Toronto is so often misrepresented by wealthy Conservatives. There are two cities of Toronto: there is the great mass of the people, and there are those highly respectable gentlemen who so often assume to speak on their behalf.

Perhaps the house would be interested to know the extent of the success of the so-called all-out war campaign. I represent a constituency in the centre of Toronto, a city which is looked upon as imperialistic, Tory and hide-bound. It is a field in which the three great provincial newspapers circulate—and there can be no question about the circulation, because the advertising these gentlemen paid for was published in all the newspapers. There were pages of it, day after day, column upon column of exhortation to the electors in my riding to write to me and tell me what I should do. There was column after column of exhortation. I read in one of the newspapers that one man is reported to have telephoned to seven hundred people, asking them to write to their member urging conscription, all-out war or something of the kind.

That campaign continued for days. My name was given as the representative in my constituency, and my address was furnished. Under those circumstances, knowing the power of the press, knowing the influence of advertising, how many replies, Mr. Speaker, do

you suppose I received? I represent a constituency of between 60,000 and 100,000 people. How many truckloads of letters do you suppose I received? It will be recalled that not only were the people directed to send letters, but they were told to cut copies of the advertisement from the newspapers, place them in envelopes and mail them to their representatives.

Mr. REID: No postage was required.

Mr. ROEBUCK: No postage was required, and my address had been given. Remember, I represent about 60,000 people right in the middle of this hide-bound city of Toronto. How many truckloads did I get?

Mr. JACKMAN: About three hundred?

Mr. ROEBUCK: About three hundred? The hon. member for one of the Toronto ridings suggests that I received three hundred truckloads. Well, ladies and—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ROEBUCK: It was the beauty to my right that caused me to make the mistake. Hon. members may be interested when I tell them that I received less than one hundred letters.

Mr. HARRIS (Danforth): They knew to whom they were writing.

Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, they did. The explanation was that the people in my constituency had no reason to suppose that they were any more patriotic than I am, or that they had any more knowledge of what was right in the circumstances than I had. They refused to be stampeded by newspaper advertising, or by wealthy people who gathered at sumptuous dinners in the Royal York hotel.

There are two cities of Toronto. There are the broad-minded people of that city. I join with the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) when he said a few days ago that Toronto was not a narrow city, but rather that it was broad-minded.

Mr. MARTIN: It has narrow streets.

Mr. ROEBUCK: It has wide and beautiful streets—and a few narrow ones, too. And some back lanes, shall I say?

Mr. MARTIN: Well, I would not know that.

Mr. ROEBUCK: Yes, both in thought and in physical fact. The unfortunate part is that the narrow lanes are the ones too often seen, and the people who live in narrow lanes of thought, the ones too often heard, while the great mass of the people of the city of Toronto are inarticulate but thinking all the time.

I want my riding to understand that I am going to vote "yes" for this bill, that I am going to urge them to vote "yes" on the plebiscite.

There are two phases to this question. One phase has been dealt with so thoroughly by the Prime Minister that there is practically nothing left to be said on the question. His magnificent speech yesterday was conclusive, but one thing sticks in my mind.

We have been dealing with the question of how we can raise men, whether by voluntary enlistment or by conscription. There is, however, a second phase which has not been mentioned but which is just about as important. It occurs after these men have been raised; and a considerable number have been raised by the selective system. As I stated in my letter to the city council of Toronto, we are not in a position to use these men if it is necessary to cross the international border between ourselves and the United States, or in order to protect the islands on the Pacific coast. It is most unlikely, but it might happen that an enemy expeditionary force be landed on the Pacific coast and that it hold the passes of the Rockies against us. Our only hope of dislodging such a force would be by sending men to the south and bringing them up along the coast. As things stand now, we could not do that. We cannot raise men for service overseas by selective call. And having so raised men, we cannot use them on any expedition which takes them across our borders or beyond the three-mile limit.

So I submit that, whether you are a conscriptionist or an anti-conscriptionist, the necessity for the correction of this situation is such that you should vote "yes" on the plebiscite.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to follow the previous speaker, but I was interested in the reference he made to the two cities in the good city of Toronto. That is a situation which applies and has applied everywhere for many years. Lord Beaconsfield, at one time Prime Minister of Great Britain, wrote a book about the two nations, the two Englands. He wrote about the England of the rich, the wealthy and the aristocrats, and the England of the toiling masses, the mud sills upon which the other England rested. He made a very good job of it too.

There are one or two points in connection with this bill upon which I should like to comment. One has been cleared up to some extent by the speech of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) yesterday. It is to be regretted that his speech of yesterday was not made during the debate on the address. It

would appear that he was speaking then with the by-elections in mind, while his speech yesterday quite properly had the plebiscite in mind. As the discussion went on during the debate on the address I was at a loss to know whether the proposed plebiscite was being introduced because the cabinet felt that it was desirable to have this additional power or because of the slings and arrows of the "committee of two hundred". The speeches of hon. members opposite throughout the address debate stressed two things, criticism of the "committee of two hundred" and satisfaction with the voluntary system. This was true to such an extent that I felt somewhat concerned about the fate of the plebiscite.

If we are going to have a plebiscite—and evidently we are—it is absolutely necessary that it should carry. Neither the government nor the country can afford to have the plebiscite defeated, or carried without strong support. It seems to me that the government will be in a bad position, both for its own sake and for the sake of the country's war effort if the vote is indecisive, that is, if there is only a small majority in favour of the plebiscite, or if there is a majority in favour of it in one part of the country and against it in another, even though there be an over-all majority. I am going to indicate to the government where the danger of the plebiscite being defeated lies, if it is going to be submitted as it now reads.

In both the speech from the throne and the speech by the deputy governor general upon the prorogation of parliament there is given in unmistakable language the reasons which the government should put forward as to why the plebiscite must carry. Speaking at the prorogation of parliament on January 21 last, the deputy governor general said:

> Since the present session opened, we have witnessed the extension of war until, to-day, it encompasses the globe. As aggression has succeeded aggression, the active resistance of free peoples everywhere has risen to meet it. The myth of national isolation has vanished from the earth. It is now recognized that the freedom of each nation is bound up in the freedom of all.

I agree with that, but what has been said by hon. members opposite since parliament opened on January 22 to bring home to the people of Canada, to bring home to the isolationists of Canada, that Canada's cause is one with the cause of every free nation in the world? A similar statement is made in the speech from the throne. The very first paragraph reads:

> There no longer can be any question as to the character and scope of the present war. It is a world-wide conflict between irreconcilable forces. On every continent, including the confines of our own, and on all oceans, forces that aim at world domination oppose forces that seek the preservation of freedom. In every quarter of the globe, civilization is confronted by savagery.

It appears to me that in that paragraph lies the reason why the government of Canada should have power to use the whole resources of Canada in men and materials to fight the enemy wherever the enemy may be found.

As I said, the speech of the Prime Minister yesterday to some extent cleared away one of my fears, that is, that the government did not sufficiently realize the urgency of the situation. It is urgent. Speaking for myself and also, I think, for the group with whom I sit, we believe the government should be given the freedom and authority which it seeks. But we are not satisfied to leave the matter there. From what I hear from my own province of British Columbia, I am satisfied that if the plebiscite is put in its present form to the people of Canada without some assurance that not only men will be conscripted but also the wealth and industry and material resources of this country to the last ounce and last cent and that those resources are going to be used, the plebiscite will be defeated in British Columbia just as sure as the people are asked to vote on it. The same thing will happen, I believe, in other provinces.

The Prime Minister in his speech yesterday said that the plebiscite was not a question of conscription but a question of freeing the government's hands. It is just nonsense to talk in that way because, when the people of my province are voting on the plebiscite, they are not voting to free the hands of the government. No they are voting on conscription. When the people in the province of Quebec vote on the plebiscite, what are they voting on? They are voting on the question of conscription. No mere play with words can alter that fact. The plebiscite says that it is for the purpose of freeing the government's hands, but the government's hands are tied only in one respect, in respect only of the compulsory enlistment of men for overseas service. Let the government be frank with the people. Let the government take the people into its confidence. Let the government appeal to the intelligence of the people and tell them exactly what the circumstances are and what they are voting for. Let the government demonstrate itself by its dealings with the people that it believes in those phrases it uses when it says we are fighting for freedom and democracy and such things as that.

It is essential that the government should have this power. But that does not necessarily mean that Canada would send more men out of the country than it is sending now. That would depend a great deal on how the war goes. To

be quite frank, I am not sure that anything has been gained so far in a military way because of the men Canada sent out of the country. I am saying that nothing has been gained up until the present time, and that the men could have been used to much better advantage at home. But I say again that this does not mean that I am opposed to sending them out of the country if that is considered necessary. They should be sent where and when they are needed. We are fighting a world-wide war. We are fighting out in the far east. Why in the world should Canada send soldiers to the far east to fight the Japanese when China has her millions who are anxious to fight the Japanese. Not only that, but her soldiers are acclimatized and know and understand the country where the fighting is taking place. Canada's work in these circumstances would be to supply the Chinese with the arms with which to fight. We cannot do both things. We cannot be on the sea and on the fighting front in the far east, and at the same time be producing equipment in the factories in Canada.

Since it is nearly six o'clock I shall try to conclude before the house rises. In my opinion there are two things the government should do if it wants to get a satisfactory affirmative vote on the plebiscite. First, it should give a solemn undertaking, just as binding as the pledges that were given in regard to enlistment for service overseas, that concurrently with the conscription of man-power there shall be conscription of industry and finance. I want to say here as clearly and as definitely as I can that if that is not done, there is great danger that the plebiscite will be defeated. Second, as I have already said, the government should tell the people the urgency of the war situation and indicate clearly to them that it is going, if necessary, to use the power it is asking for—going to use the whole resources of the country. I ask the government to observe the changes that are taking place in the mind of the people all over the world. There is a change of mind in Great Britain. Many people are convinced that our reverses in the far east have been to a large extent due to our refusal in the past to grant or guarantee to the people of the far east equality of status with ourselves. If we do not do that—and there is rising hope that it will be done—we are not going to get as much out of this war as we thought we would.

There are one or two suggestions I should like to make in regard to the taking of the vote. There is danger, unless a great deal of enthusiasm is created in connection with the plebiscite, that the vote will be very small. We know that in parliamentary elections great pressure has to be used to get the people out to the polls. The opposing candidates have an incentive to apply that pressure, and they try to get out every possible vote. But such an incentive will be largely lacking in taking the vote on the plebiscite. There may be a general desire to get out a large vote, but there will be no specific desire unless the thing is well organized. We should see that every possible vote is polled. I understand that the statement has been made by the chief electoral officer that the enumeration of voters and the other work necessary for the taking of the vote will be carried out on a patronage basis. It is a terrible thing that the government should allow a statement like that to be made.

Mr. McLARTY: May I interrupt, for a moment, my hon. friend? I have not heard of any statement such as that having been made. I do not know the circumstances, but I would doubt the correctness of the report.

Mr. MacINNIS: I did not read it myself in the press, but I have it from people whose word I accept, that they read it in the Ottawa *Journal* of last Saturday. It is something with which the government has plenty of time to deal.

May I offer, what seems to me to be a feasible suggestion, that instead of having an enumeration of voters and voters' lists such as are used at a general election, there should be a registration of voters along the same lines as the general registration of 1940. It would be obligatory on each person to go to a particular station to register, and if he were entitled to vote he would receive his ballot and proceed to vote. Of course there may be valid objections to the proposal; I do not know.

Mr. MARTIN: Why does the hon. member say it should be obligatory? It was obligatory.

Mr. MacINNIS: Yes, it was obligatory in 1940. I am referring, not to the general election but to the national registration conducted by the Department of National War Services. An individual would not be compelled to vote, but he would be at the place where he is entitled to vote, he would receive a ballot, and he could mark it either for or against the proposal or leave it blank. The registration and the voting would be carried out in one operation.

Mr. McLARTY: Would the hon. member make voting compulsory?

Mr. MacINNIS: No, I do not think so. It is the old point: you may take a horse to water but you can't make him drink. You can take voters to the poll, give them ballots,

and direct them to the polling booths, but you can't go in with them and compel them to mark their ballots.

Mr. McLARTY: Would the hon. member make it compulsory for everyone to attend?

Mr. MacINNIS: Decidedly. I would make it compulsory for them to register. Everybody was compelled to attend the national registration; there is no reason why that phase of compulsion should not be repeated.

I do not see why this suggestion could not be carried out. At any rate I hope the government will take it into consideration. Let me add that the government must give a definite assurance—one which the people will accept as binding—that its purpose is to conscript not only man-power, but the wealth and industry of this country as well, so that we can fight the war with everything we have.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to occupy a very brief space of time this evening, and shall, so far as may be possible, devote my entire attention to this Bill No. 10 now before the house. When the speech from the throne was brought down on January 22 and it was announced that the ministry would seek release from its pre-election pledge in regard to the man-power situation by means of a plebiscite, there was not the slightest intimation that the bill to be brought down would be anything other than an enabling measure designed to fulfil the promise contained in the speech from the throne and providing a way and means whereby the people would be asked to say whether they released the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the government from a past commitment with respect to a particular pledge.

When I made my remarks on January 26 they were predicated on the theory that there would be brought down an enabling measure of a particular kind and nature, patterned in some degree at least upon the Plebiscite Act of 1898, designed to enable the government to secure release from a particular commitment. When the Prime Minister made his speech on the same day the whole underlying reasoning of his statement with regard to the legislation for the plebiscite was based on the same theory. Again in the speech which I made on Wednesday the 18th instant, just prior to the vote, I predicated my remarks on that same theory. Again in the remarks which I made on the resolution preceding the introduction of this bill on Monday last I based my entire argument on the assumption that the bill was to deal with a particular situation in a particular way. And when on the same day the Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty) made his speech supporting the resolution it was, as I interpreted it, predicated on the same theory, that the house was being asked to pass a measure designed to meet a particular situation which had arisen, and from which the government sought release, and on that theory alone and to meet that situation alone. If the hon. Secretary of State had any other design, I should say that he most skilfully concealed it.

When I spoke on that resolution on Monday last I had not seen the bill. I had tried to get a copy—

Mr. McLARTY: I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend, but I stated the specific question that would be asked and stated specifically at that time that it would not be included in the bill.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is another matter. The Secretary of State made it clear that the specific question would not be in the bill. He stated that it would be in the proclamation, and I remember interrupting, or in some manner it developed at that time that the Prime Minister stated that, if necessary, it would be put in the bill.

I tried that day to get a copy of the bill. I tried to get a copy immediately after the resolution passed and the bill was introduced, and again I failed; the bill had not been printed. I tried again early on Tuesday last and again was denied it for the same reason. I am not complaining of any lack of courtesy; the bill had not been printed. I did not apply to the minister personally for a copy of the bill; perhaps I might have done so and probably he would have given me at least a draft of it. But it was not until late on Tuesday that the bill was distributed.

I then discovered really for the first time that the bill as introduced and given first reading was not designed particularly to carry out the announcement in the speech from the throne and the announcement in the Prime Minister's speech of January 26. But to my surprise it was and is general in its nature and is designed to be general, and to import into the constitution of Canada an entirely new principle. This is a general act to be introduced in the statutes of this country, to be there for all time unless it is changed. I am going to speak later about the promise, the very definite promise, which the Prime Minister made this afternoon.

To me that was a rather startling situation, the importation into the constitutional practice of this country of a new constitutional principle, a new instrument in government. It is chiefly because of that that I am participating even briefly in this debate to-night.

This is not only an innovation in our constitution; but, may I say, it is a violation of the political principles on which the Canadian constitution is established, principles which have been developed over the centuries by the matured experience of British statesmen; and I certainly object to the introduction of a new constitutional principle in the system of our government in Canada.

Mr. CRERAR: It was never contemplated.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We can only take things as they are.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend has been told at least four times that we are willing to put the question in the bill.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am coming to that. But this protest is on a matter of principle and I am entitled to put it on the record. I shall deal with the altered situation in due course, and if any credit is coming to the government and the Prime Minister I am quite prepared to give it to them. But I do protest against the introduction of this new departure in constitutional practice. This is not the bill we were promised.

There is one other protest I want to make. This bill, even if altered—and I am going to deal with that in a few minutes—merely sets up the substantive proposals of the government. It leaves the rest to a large number of regulations which we have not seen, but which I understand are ready to be taken to the committee with the bill—regulations which are in themselves legislative in character.

Let me call attention to the elections act. We have in Canada an elections act, containing a very large number of sections; and all the legislative features relating to the carrying on of elections in this country are incorporated in that legislation itself. Accompanying that election law are an equally large or perhaps a larger number of regulations. but those regulations are in no sense legislative; they are explanatory, instructional, interpretative.

Let me make that point clear. Here it is proposed to do by regulation something that under the election law of this country we do by legislation. That itself is a departure from established principles. Of course I have not seen the regulations; none of us have. We do not know what they contain; but I would not be astonished if a large number of sections of the regulations deal with this question of legislating in respect of the plebiscite that is to be held. That, I think, is quite improper. That function should be reserved to parliament.

Let me turn now to the bill itself. As I said before, it merely sets up the substantive law relating to the holding of a plebiscite; and, as I stated a while ago, until it is changed it provides for the taking of a plebiscite on any question that may be submitted by authority of the governor in council, under proclamation. The Prime Minister stated very early in the discussion, I think, that the question would be incorporated in the bill itself, and for that I thank him; but I am going to ask him to go further than that. Unless there would be a violation of some understanding, arrangement or agreement, I suggest to him that this bill should be entirely revamped, so that we shall not even have the appearance of incorporating into the constitutional system of this country the principle of the plebiscite. That I think he should do; and I think he has almost gone that far. Not only should he limit the operation of the statute that will be passed to the holding of this one particular plebiscite; the whole bill should be redrafted on that theory and along the line of the bill that was passed at the time the temperance plebiscite was taken away back in the last century. I believe the proper way to do that would be to withdraw this bill and bring in a new bill, based upon that theory. I do not know whether the government will do that, but I offer the suggestion. I do not think it would delay matters; so far as I am concerned I would undertake that there would be no delay, though of course one would want to see the bill.

If the government will not yield to that suggestion, then, in accordance with the undertaking given explicitly this afternoon, I ask them to give instructions to the committee, of which they will be in complete control, that the bill be revamped in committee along the lines I have suggested. I submit with great seriousness that there is a principle at stake, that this is a violation of the principle of responsible government as we understand it in Canada. If we once incorporate a principle like this into the constitutional practice of Canada,we shall have departed from every principle of representative and parliamentary government that we have followed down through the decades since Canada has been a confederation, and for decades before that under the British constitution. Under our practice the people of the country delegate to their elected representatives power to make

laws in accordance with the constitution of the country. The principle of the plebiscite is the negation of responsible government, and so is the referendum. I did not quite understand the reference made by the Prime Minister yesterday to the referendum. I have never heard anyone recommend a referendum; at least I have not done so. I have not mentioned the question of a referendum, which of course stands upon a somewhat different principle. A plebiscite may or may not be binding upon the government that submits it, but a referendum has to do with a particular statute or proposal, and when submitted to the people it becomes binding upon the government. As I understand it, that, in a word, is the distinction between the two. I could not quite appreciate the point of the questions which the Prime Minister directed at me and others across the gangway here. We have never advocated a referendum. We are opposed to both referendum and plebiscite, but since the Prime Minister is bound to have a plebiscite I say, let him have it; let us get it over with; let us limit it to the particular situation and that alone, and let us not hear any more about it as an integral part of the system of responsible government in a British legislature.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does my hon. friend wish me to explain my reference to the plebiscite, in regard to himself?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, I have no objection.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It comes just to this, that my hon. friend wished me to say what I would do if we got a majority, whether I would regard that as an obligation upon the government to introduce conscription. If I were to say anything of that kind, the plebiscite thereby would in reality become a referendum. When the plebiscite was placed before the people, they would then be voting on the question of conscription, which is the very thing the plebiscite is intended not to have them do. A referendum would require the people to make a military and political decision, something which I contend should be the responsibility of the government.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I agree with the Prime Minister on that, but I had never advocated other than a plebiscite, and therefore I could not understand the implication of the questions he directed to me.

The Prime Minister has referred to the plebiscite, and he has argued at great length that the plebiscite would not deal with the question of conscription. Theoretically that is absolutely correct. So far as I am concerned, in whatever part I take in connection with this plebiscite, it should not and will not; but I am going to tell him that in the country I fear it will be for or against conscription. That question will be raised, and, believe me, by his own people. It is raised now, here in this house. It was raised the other day by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Veniot), and if I followed him correctly he reaffirmed that issue to-day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was raised in the recent by-elections.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It may have been. I did not take part in those by-elections; I do not know what occurred, and I am not responsible. But I do know this, that much as the Prime Minister would like to get away from it; much as I—and I am very frank about it—should like to see the plebiscite freed from a discussion for or against conscription, I fear that is what will happen. Being anxious that something should be done in the event of a great tragedy occurring in this war, that is why I want this government to be free; that is why I want this plebiscite to pass; that is why I am going to advise my constituents, at all events, to vote yea and not nay.

I rose primarily for the purpose of voicing my protest against the form in which this legislation has been submitted. If we are to take the Prime Minister's word at its face value, as I am sure we may, then this whole bill should be redrafted. It should be either withdrawn or, when it reaches the committee, revamped to make sure that this parliament is not going to be committed to the principle of the plebiscite as an instrument of government under the British constitutional system under which this parliament is set up and under which it has been carried on during all the years. I hope this appeal will strike a responsive note in the minds of the ministry and their supporters.

I wished to say a few words about the Prime Minister's speech. He made one of the big efforts of his life.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, no.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh, quite so. He is much too modest, and I really do not think anyone would have accused the Prime Minister of being unduly modest about his public efforts. As a rule they are studied efforts. While he did not use a manuscript yesterday, I am sure he spent a good deal of time in the preparation of that speech.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not spend two hours.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then, of course, he is much more competent than I thought he was—and very much more competent than I am. I can say that, with all humility and modesty.

Mr. JACKMAN: He has had a lot of practice.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, he has had long experience, and a good deal of practice. He has had a good deal of practice in putting up straw men to knock down; and he did that yesterday to a large degree. He has had a great deal of practice in public debates—undoubtedly more than any other man in the house. He is a past master at the art of making the worse appear the better part. There can be no doubt about that, and I pay him that compliment. That, of course, is an art, and the Prime Minister is therefore an artist.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Compliments to-night.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): He asked that the public give the government a free hand. For different reasons we want the government to have a free hand. He pointed out the distinction between the legal power possessed at this time by the government, and the moral authority which it possesses, or should possess.

With respect to the legal aspect of the matter, there is not any doubt about it that parliament is sovereign and supreme. I have heard the Prime Minister ring the changes of that phrase on many, many occasions in the house. Parliament has full legal power to pass any legislation. But he bases this on a high moral plane. He says that the one limitation is a moral obligation he owes the people, and he devoted a great deal of his speech to that issue.

He made a case—of course we can have our own opinions as to whether it was a good or a bad one. But he certainly made a case at least to the satisfaction of his followers. Now I put this to him: Is the moral obligation he described of such a nature as to prevent the government from doing what is necessary in wartime, with an invasion threatened, and if the necessities of the situation are as many people believe them to be, or believe that they may become? If the Prime Minister held the opinion that it was necessary to change the mobilization act by eliminating the limiting clause, would he pause to take a plebiscite? Would he do that, at a time when the country was in danger?

Of course he denies the truth of the premise. His suggestion is that the situation is not that bad now, that we are doing nicely. Yet the war comes home to us nearer, nearer and nearer every day. We grant—he grants—I grant—we all grant that parliament has legal power. He says the one defect is the moral obligation. Is that a detriment to doing what we ought to do, if it is the right thing to do? What did the people send us here for? Why did they give my right hon. friend such an overwhelming mandate on March 26, 1940? It was to carry on the war to a successful conclusion, no matter what the cost, no matter what the needs might be. There was no limitation from the people, because conscription as I understand it was not an issue; certainly it was not an issue with me.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has asked what I would do in case of invasion, or in a perilous situation such as he has just described. Well, I say the last thing I would do would be to begin compulsorily to recruit men to send them overseas. I would keep the men at home, and see that they were prepared to meet the invasion.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh, yes. Would my right hon. friend send them to Seattle? Would he send them to the panhandle of Alaska?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not mind answering that. I regard the moral obligation as one not to send men overseas. But with respect to any technical limitation, should immediate necessity arise—in the panhandle, or any place in the vicinity of the coast of Canada—I certainly would make use of the War Measures Act to see that the men were sent, within these immediate areas, to protect our own shores.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yet that would be illegal, because of the very language the Prime Minister has put in the mobilization act. According to him, it would be immoral to send them beyond the territorial limitations of Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The reference was always to overseas. This is quite a different thing.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is not the language of the mobilization act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am saying what the moral obligation is.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then the Prime Minister would go further than the mobilization act. He would violate the pledge in the mobilization act, because that represents government policy in the most concrete form in which policy can be formulated and set out before the people, namely in an act of parliament. The Prime Minister has proved my thesis.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would get parliament to amend its provision.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, he would get parliament to amend it; and parliament would do right to amend it—and parliament can amend this situation, without going through the form of a plebiscite.

But, we have to have a plebiscite, so let us have it. I have said all I want to say on that point.

An hon. MEMBER: So has the Prime Minister.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I say the Prime Minister, when he talks about moral obligations—and especially in the light of the admission he has now made—was putting up a straw man to knock down again. He has proved it himself by his utterances here to-night.

In days gone by the Prime Minister and his government have not always been so concerned about political morality. When I heard him speak yesterday I could not help recalling the days of Beauharnois. I remember the political morality of Beauharnois—how the Beauharnois corporation had applied to his government for the passage of an order in council allowing the deflection of a certain number of cubic feet per second of water through their canal at Beauharnois. I remember how the application was held off, and off, and off until the stage had been fully set. Then the government passed an order in council authorizing the diversion. We all know what happened. Hundreds of thousands of dollars contributed by the public of Canada to Beauharnois securities, I shall not say were stolen by the promoters, but were taken from those funds put up by the public and passed along by the promoters to the organizers of the Liberal party.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I wonder why my hon. friend would make a statement of that kind? He knows as well as I with respect to Beauharnois that not only was no charge of any kind whatsoever proved against the government, but the government's record in the matter was as straight as anything could possibly be. In addition to that, while hon. members like himself tried to make a case against the government before the public in one, two or three general elections, on every such occasion the public sent back this government with a stronger majority than ever.

My hon. friend had better be careful what he says when he talks about moral obligations. Something can be said from this side of the house, if he begins to reflect upon anyone here.

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am not reflecting upon the government; I am reflecting upon the Liberal party. I never heard it said that it was actionable to libel a party. If it were, there would be a good many libel actions in this country. My only answer is to ask hon. gentlemen to recall the speech which the Prime Minister made from this side of the chamber in regard to the Beauharnois transaction.

Another thing about pledges. I recall the platform of 1919; I recall the various planks in that platform. Among others was one with respect to the British preference. Does the Prime Minister say that those pledges in the 1919 platform were kept? I remember hearing something about their being just a chart to go by. In his opening speech in the 1940 election the Prime Minister said that there would be extravagant statements made and promises given. Those are not his exact words. That is always done during the course of an election by everyone in the hope of influencing the votes of the electors. I do not think these extreme appeals meet with great success very often. I have been most careful about making concrete pledges because I have always had a horror of not being able to keep any concrete promise which I made. I am leery about making election pledges. I do not think promises of public works and the expenditure of the taxpayers' money and that sort of thing ever brought many votes. I know that actual expenditures on public works prior to an election do not bring votes; all they do is to make enemies. These simply illustrate the futility of using the taxpayers' funds in an attempt to influence votes. Other people's experience may be different, but that is mine.

The Prime Minister made a strong political speech. I thought he was rather truculent in dealing with the political aspects of the question he was debating. When, however, he reached the point where he wanted the help of the country in relieving him of his pledges, he was most conciliatory. It shows how clever the Prime Minister is. He appealed to our better judgment; he appealed to all of us to vote favourably to relieve the government. I could not help but call to mind a couple of passages in the book entitled "The Unknown Country", recently written by Mr. Bruce Hutchison, a gentleman who is not at all unfriendly to the Prime Minister. He sizes up the Prime Minister's character at page 93 as follows:

> The Prime Minister, the egoist and autocrat as Mr. Dafoe calls him, is not merely the first among equals, not just the chief minister. He is the boss.

That is intended to be complimentary, and it is. I think it is true of the Prime Minister. He is the boss over there, and in a measure he is the boss of all of us.

An hon. MEMBER: What about over here?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, you too.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend would not think that I was just the office boy.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have not even suggested it. I am merely showing the Prime Minister what his own friend is saying about him.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I can give my hon. friend several more extracts by the same author.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Here is one that is rather mixed; it is complimentary and it sheds some light on the Prime Minister's character. At page 96 the author said:

He is a highly complicated and finely spun creature, half mystic, reading his Bible—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is that wrong?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No; that is quite right. I used to do it myself, but I have not had the time to do it for a long time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I thought my hon. friend must have given its reading up.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I quote:

—praying daily, believing devoutly in the human soul's immortality—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Anything wrong about that?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I ask the Prime Minister to listen to this. Perhaps he will agree with it.

—half ruthless and selfish politician, who can slit an enemy's political throat with a single expert motion of the wrist and without changing expression.

I do not think anyone will ever put me in a book. Certainly I would not want anyone to say that about me.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the only way to treat certain classes of enemies.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Perhaps it is. "Ruthless"—the Prime Minister admits it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend is going to take Mr. Bruce Hutchison as authority for my character, I shall be glad to give him lots of recommendations by Mr. Bruce Hutchison. I am ready to abide by Mr. Hutchison's decision.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think he is a friendly critic.

An hon. MEMBER: On that same page he says the Prime Minister is a great man.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Certainly he does. I have not the time to read it all, but I hope hon. members will read this book. Perhaps I have been a little facetious, but I want to be serious for a minute. The Prime Minister's whole position, as indicated by his speeches and his requests, ignores the principle that the safety of the state is paramount in war time and that pledges given long anterior to the happening of a given event must and should give way before the realities of an occasion such as that with which the nation is faced to-day. That is the factor which should override everything. The time for parliament to act is when that situation presents itself. We may disagree as to whether the time has arrived.

I have been greatly interested the last day or two in reading what has occurred in Great Britain with respect to India. Anybody who has read Mr. Churchill's speeches in days gone by before he formed his national government must know that in season and out of season he combated from first to last the proposal to give self-government to India. He was the bulwark of the forces that opposed dominion status, if I recall correctly, and yet without any mandate from anybody save and except the situation which has grown out of the necessities of the war—I am not questioning his decision; I do not know enough about it to say whether it is wise or not—it is contemplated now to give India at least dominion status, perhaps something more, as part of this war effort. Did he pause to hold a plebiscite?

The Prime Minister said that the government must have full power. I agree absolutely. No government could undertake to carry on this war without full power. That is axiomatic; that is fundamental. The Prime Minister limited his powers by his own action, and of course he has to be released. He should have full power. No one will deny that proposal for one moment. We may differ only in the method of giving him that full power. We say that the people's elected representatives can do it under our constitutional practice, under the powers delegated to us. The Prime Minister says that that is not good enough. Let us give him full power to conduct an all-out war effort by all means, even if we do differ about the method by which that is to be attained.

I have one other brief observation which perhaps would have come in better in the early part of my remarks. If this bill is not altered, if it is not restricted to a specific case of one plebiscite, I say that we shall

cast responsible government out of the window and substitute therefor the principle of government by plebiscite.

The Prime Minister expressed great concern as to public opinion outside Canada, particularly in Britain and the United States, with regard to the government's war effort. I say to him that he may well be concerned about public opinion concerning the government's war effort, not in respect of the things that have been done, because most peoples think we have done well and I think so too, but in respect of the self-imposed limitation on our war effort. That is what the Prime Minister is concerned about, or he would never have adverted to it in the course of his speech yesterday. He knows as I know, and as I read in the United States press, that the fact that this government has not full power to do any and everything in relation to the war has called forth a good deal of adverse criticism. I have seen it. In the United Kingdom they wonder why we have not full powers of mobilization. They are too polite to say so publicly. They would say publicly, they do say publicly, that it is none of their business, and they refuse to be drawn into a discussion over it. Nevertheless they are wondering about it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Are they wondering about Australia too?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, but conditions are a little different there.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: And about South Africa, too, and Northern Ireland?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Let me say to my right hon. friend in respect of Australia that if the Australian people were to-day to decide this question, does he doubt what they would decide when every man in Australia has been called to the colours for the defence of his country? If that defence lies beyond the seas, they will be sent there. With respect to South Africa, I think we should be careful what we say.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Be careful what you say about any of them.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I hold this view, that if it were not for one man South Africa would be neutral in this war. That is my view. That, however, is not very germane to what I have to say.

I now urge the government to put this plebiscite through just as quickly as possible by means of a bill in redrafted form. I think the government should submit to the house at some stage—I presume it should be when the special committee reports—the regulations so that those of us who are not on the special committee may be accorded an opportunity to review them before they become law.

Mr. McLARTY: There will be opportunity.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is a good undertaking, unequivocal. I also think that those parts which are in the nature of legislation should be incorporated in the legislation itself. Those parts which are not in the nature of legislation, those parts which are instructive and those parts which are interpretative, need not be in the form of legislation.

I am not going to detain the house further. I am going to ask the government to withdraw the bill. But if they will not do that, we have the unequivocal undertaking of the Prime Minister that the question to be submitted to the people will be put in the bill, that the bill will be limited to one plebiscite, this proposed plebiscite and this plebiscite only, and that when this plebiscite is over, this bill ceases to be the law.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, during the long weeks of debate in which we have indulged it has been difficult at times to be sure just what are the questions at issue, and there has been so much of almost irrelevant talk and so much of what appears to be a failure to see what are the relevant issues that the whole matter has been somewhat confusing.

It seems to me that there are three main matters which probably it would be fitting for me to touch upon in the short time at my disposal. The first is the question of a plebiscite. I am not sure that I entirely concur in the views of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) with respect to plebiscites. As a matter of fact the plebiscite is a device which is only being tried. It has been experimented with considerably in various parts of the world, but I am not sure that what we know concerning the success or failure of attempts in other lands is sufficiently definite to justify us in drawing any very clear conclusions. But this I think all of us desiring to preserve democracy must grant, that democracy is passing through testing fires. Times are changed; events happen fast; news travels speedily, and opinions change rapidly. Any government, particularly in a democracy, should keep in contact with the will of the governed, for governments must govern in accordance with the will of the governed. How any government in such hectic times as these can keep in contact with the will of the governed over a period of four full years without recourse to some such device as a plebiscite, no member of the

opposition has succeeded in making clear to me. It would seem, therefore, that perhaps the plebiscite might be tried. We may find in it an instrument which will assist us greatly in carrying on a democracy.

There are, however, certain conditions which we must take care to see applied. In the first place, I would say that the subject of a plebiscite needs to be rather simple. The wording of the question submitted must also be very clear, and the question itself should be of such a nature that its meaning is not in doubt. Also there should be a thorough education of the people with respect to the whole matter concerning which the plebiscite is being submitted. Then there should be a number of safeguards thrown around the plebiscite to avoid the creeping in of abuses.

So much having been said regarding plebiscites in general, let us turn to the bill before us. This bill in its present form, as I see it, has three main defects. In the first place, it fails to prescribe the length of its own life, and this defect has been laboured by several speakers. Second, it fails to provide for making clear the meaning and significance of the question which is to be put before the people. This also has been dealt with more or less by various speakers. Then, the bill neglects to provide for such adequate education of the people as would enable them completely to apprehend and understand the reason for the plebiscite and the significance of the vote, either yes or no, with respect to the plebiscite.

May I deal with the matter of the length of life of the plebiscite. As the wording in the bill appears—as I think the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker) pointed out—there is no automatic limitation of the life of the bill; one would say that this is to be a plebiscite bill in general, is to go on the statute books for an indefinite period of time, and is to be a measure under which any administration at any time could hold a plebiscite on any subject whatsoever. The hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck) reflected upon that situation, and several other speakers have spoken about it. I will grant that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) specifically stated that the bill was not intended to last long. He said, as reported in *Hansard*, page 822.

> The intention, however, is that the bill should be for one plebiscite only, and that the plebiscite when taken, shall have reference to only one question. That question has already been made clear to the members of the house and the public, but I will take occasion at once to bring again to the attention of the house its exact wording.

Which, by the way, he never did.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, yes. The hon. member has not read the whole speech.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Well, it is just as clear as mud. The members of the Prime Minister's own cabinet would not agree, I am sure, as to the meaning of the bill.

Mr. McLARTY: Oh, yes. The Prime Minister stated it specifically.

Mr. FAIR: What does it mean?

Mr. BLACKMORE: My hon. friend must have a different meaning of "specifically," much different from the one I used when I taught school.

Mr. McLARTY: Just the dictionary meaning.

Mr. BLACKMORE: May I turn to the bill itself, in opposition to what the Prime Minister said? In clause 3 it reads as follows:

> (1) The governor in council may by proclamation order the taking of a plebiscite under the provisions of this act.

It does not say whether that is to be in 1942 or in 1952.

> (2) The proclamation shall state fully the question to be submitted to the voters at the plebiscite in the same words and form as it will appear on the ballot papers to be used at the plebiscite.

So far as I can find from a perusal of the bill, there is nothing more specific and definite than those words to limit the life of this bill. Suppose the bill were enacted in its present form, and the Prime Minister, after having given the house the assurance which I have just read, should die, or should fall ill—

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Don't be morbid!

Mr. BLACKMORE: —or should for some reason choose to leave public life, we would have nothing whatever to guarantee that the promise he gave there would be kept by his successor as long as the bill remains in the form in which it now appears.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The pledge there is given in the name, not of the Prime Minister only, but of the government. The hon. member will find all members of the government wholly reliable.

Mr. BLACKMORE: We are obtaining some assurances, Mr. Speaker, as we go forward. If the bill remained in its present form and a new administration came in—

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Which is very likely.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Don't be optimistic!

Mr. BLACKMORE: —a new government, such as a Conservative government, there would be nothing whatsoever to bind the new administration but the Prime Minister's few words. I believe we are perfectly safe in saying that the bill as it is must be changed, otherwise there is no legal protection for the Canadian people against any one of several abuses which might creep in as a result of the application of the bill.

As regards the meaning of the plebiscite, the Prime Minister has contended that the meaning is clear. I maintain that, as the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston) pointed out the other day, this plebiscite is being used throughout Canada as meaning either of two things. It may mean that if one votes "yes", one brings in conscription, or it may mean that he insists that the Prime Minister shall continue without conscription. The plebiscite could be interpreted as meaning no conscription, just as easily as it could be interpreted as meaning conscription.

There is another difficulty which I think I can show some cause for fearing. I turn to page 823 of *Hansard* and read a passage from the Prime Minister's own speech yesterday. He said:

As I have said, the purpose is to give the government—I put it in general terms—a perfectly free hand to deal with all matters affecting the war in the manner which, in its judgment, is most in the national interest.

If the Prime Minister's remarks concerning the life of the bill are to be taken as affecting the interpretation of the bill, surely his remarks as to the significance of the bill can likewise be taken as a modifying clause of the meaning of this plebiscite. May I direct the attention of hon. members to another passage of his speech, which they will find on page 826 of *Hansard:*

This is the issue: Is the government of Canada, in time of war, to have freedom to take whatever action it thinks most advisable with respect to the furtherance of Canada's war effort?

In that passage, the plebiscite is not particularly limited to the raising of men for overseas service. Let us now turn to page 827 of *Hansard,* and read:

. . . I feel very strongly the time has come when that limitation should be removed—

The Prime Minister there is talking of the power to conscript for overseas service.

—and when the government should be given the utmost freedom to deal with any phase of the war effort as it thinks best subject always to its responsibility to parliament.

[Mr. T. C. Douglas.]

I turn now to page 833 and read the last passage which I shall read in this connection:

In the presentation of the plebiscite to the electorate the desire of the administration to possess complete freedom of action will of course receive the vigorous and wholehearted support of all members of the government. It will, I hope, receive the support of every member of parliament, and will, I believe, receive the support of the Canadian people.

The Prime Minister was there quoting from his speech of January 26, on page 51 of *Hansard.*

I believe there are sufficient statements there to make it quite clear that this plebiscite can be interpreted to free the government in respect of far more matters than the raising of men by conscription for overseas service. Some people may say, has the government not all this power under the National Resources Mobilization Act? The government has. But when we remember some of the things that this government has attempted to do under the excuse that they were advantageous to Canada's war effort, one will not hesitate to conclude that there are some things which the rank and file of the people should not interpret as being involved in that act. I refer to the iniquitous recommendations of the Sirois commission. Imagine that, with the statements which are in that speech to give meaning to this plebiscite, the people all over Canada voted "yes"; and the government then declared that the implementing of the report of the Sirois commission was essential to the war effort of Canada; then it would have the mandate of the whole people of Canada to go over the heads of the provinces and implement the recommendations of that report. People may disagree as to the implementing of that report, but I have an idea that when the smoke has cleared away and people realize more fully what that report means, they will certainly not be as much in favour of it as many people have seen fit to be up to the present.

There has been a most dangerous attempt on the part of the government to invade provincial taxation fields, and to do so with the most callous disregard for the commitments, obligations and responsibilities of the provinces. The rebuff which they received in connection with the Sirois report made them a little more cautious, but imagine with what impunity they would go forward if they were backed by a plebiscite such as that upon which we are now going to vote, with the Prime Minister's remarks to give colour to the interpretation of that plebiscite. The wording of the plebiscite should be far more specific and its significance should be far more unmistakable.

The bill should provide for an edequate educational campaign. Upon reading the bill it will be noticed that there is in it no provision whatsoever for the education of the people. Long ago it was said:

> Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

Especially is it necessary for the people of a democracy to know the truth. Throughout this dominion the truth has been withheld, has been garbled, has been distorted in a way that ought to make the public men of Canada for the past several generations hang their heads in shame. To-day we are reaping some of the harvest that was so plentifully sown by the men who distorted the truth. The people must have the truth; otherwise how can they vote intelligently? For example, in many provinces and in many parts of many provinces there is a complete failure to understand this racial problem which goes to the very heart of Canada. There is failure to sympathize with and appreciate the point of view of Canadians who were raised to speak French. As a result, there is bitterness which there never should be and which would be removed if the full truth were known. This bill should provide for educating the people of Canada from coast to coast concerning the races that live in Canada, their numbers, their needs, their preferences and their history. A full account should be given, without reservation, of the shameful appeals that have been made in election campaigns to Canadians who speak French, when men have stooped to sordidness which will forever constitute a stain upon them, to misinform, to inspire with apprehension and anxiety innocent people.

I was much enlightened by two speeches from the other side of the house, one by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. McDonald) and the other by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Veniot). Many hearing them felt that those hon. members were, shall I say, indelicate in having brought out into the open details of the reprehensible behaviour of which Canadians who speak French had been the victims. I never have been able to find any more successful way of adjusting differences between people than the simple method of telling the truth, finding out just why there is misunderstanding. I fail to see why the application of the same principle would not greatly improve conditions in Canada. Here we are, two great races of people, as it were, those whose blood is drawn from French people and those whose blood is drawn from Anglo-Saxons. I think there are no finer peoples in the world to-day than those two races. I find the French-Canadian people whom I know in every way admirable and estimable, and I see no reason why there should be any prejudice. We are, as it were, two races married. We have a glimpse of ourselves in the midst of a great stream of national life that flows out of a remote past, for which we have no responsibility, and flows into an indefinite future for which we are in some measure responsible. We are similar to a man and wife in a home, with children. We do not wish to break up the home. We do not wish to have a separation or a divorce. If we did wish anything like that, surely a time of such peril as this is not the time to bring the matter to a head. We must come to understand each other. There is only one way in which that can be done; that is, by hearing the facts, sordid as they may be. I can now understand what I have heard men say in this chamber during the four or five years of my sojourn here. I can understand why they have spoken in this way, when I look at the speeches of those two men to whom I have referred. I marvel that the speeches have not been even more extreme.

There should be provision in this bill for an educational campaign from coast to coast, to teach the Canadian people the facts concerning those who dwell with them in this great national household of Canada. The Prime Minister, as reported at page 832 of *Hansard*, mentioned his desire for an educational campaign, in these words:

> I should hope that the campaign would be made an educational campaign which would help to impress upon the people the necessity of giving the government full power in time of war. I think it can be made that. My hon. friend and I are to-day agreed that the government ought to have this power and we are agreed for the same reason. And the leaders of the other parties are agreed.

But the Prime Minister did not touch what in my judgment is the festering sore which is threatening to break out in eruption, resulting in several kinds of disorder in this country, of which none of us desires even to think. Why not insert in the bill provision for education? While I am referring to this point, may I say that I have never been able to see why the two major parties did not decide to make the last election campaign an educational campaign also. I do not believe the leaders of those parties should be forgiven by generations to come for their neglect to attend to the important matter of educating the people to the truths for which they stand.

When war was declared, in September, 1939, I rose in my place and urged the people concerned that they should go into Quebec

and tell the truth; everywhere tell the truth. Is it to be conceived that it could not have been made known to every Canadian at that time how colossal was the preparation that Hitler had made, how terrible a foe was Italy, how charged with dynamic explosiveness was the whole Japanese situation? How much more wisely and sanely, and with how much better feeling all would have gone forward if such had been done. Instead of that, what had we? We had an appeal to the basest prejudices, with every attempt to becloud the issues and distort the facts, I presume in every constituency throughout this country. So I say that in this bill there should be specific clauses providing for the setting aside of an adequate fund to provide for the education of the people.

May I turn now from a consideration of the bill to a brief consideration of the Prime Minister's speech. I agree with the leader of the opposition; I do not know whether the Prime Minister has ever delivered a greater speech in his history. It was great, I thought, in every respect. At the same time, he said things which I think should be pointed out. He spoke of the false position in which the government finds itself. If the government finds itself in a false position, the government has only itself to blame.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BLACKMORE: There may be smiles, but the more deeply we probe into that statement, the more truth we shall find in it. As reported on page 827 of *Hansard*, the Prime Minister makes one remark which is worthy of our attention:

> I would say further, that not only is it putting the government in a false position to have its hands tied at this time, in the manner indicated, and that it is putting parliament in a false position, but it is also putting Canada in a false position, before all countries of the world, including her allies in the war.

Then at page 833 there is another passage which I believe is worthy of note:

> I do not believe it will be possible for an administration to carry on, in a time like this, with the sense it ought to have of complete authority without being given complete power. It should not be put perpetually in a false position just because of some obligation necessary at an earlier time, but which, as I explained in the debate on the address, is having an effect quite different from that originally intended in its relation to the state of affairs that exists at the present moment.

I said a moment ago that the government had only itself to thank. There was no reason why the government or any member of the Liberal party should have committed himself on the question of conscription. The leader of the opposition has repeatedly declared that he did not make conscription an issue in his constituency. Why did any of the Liberals need to make it an issue? I would say that any grown man over the age of twenty-five, equipped with even a smattering of the facts, should have been able to foresee that we were preparing to enter, or that we were already entered into a conflict which would become so terrible as to render it necessary that the government in control of the country should have the freest hand possible. In the light of that fact can anyone possibly excuse a man for committing himself on any platform in the dominion on the question of conscription? Why was it done? Simply to get some sordid votes; that is all.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Political advantage and sculduggery.

Mr. BLACKMORE: That is all. That was a noble object!—simply to beat somebody else.

Mr. GRANT: What did you run for?

Mr. BLACKMORE: If my hon. friend will come around to see me some time, it may take a little time to tell him, but he will be quite satisfied. In respect of what I ran for I have a record I can be proud of—which is a good deal more than my hon. friend can say.

It may be said that the Liberals feared they would lose the election. It seems to me I have heard that the British people were left unprepared because the government of the day feared the loss of an election. With that in mind they risked the loss of an empire, and the welfare of 600,000,000 people, rather than lose the election.

Mr. HANSELL: There is no answer to that one.

Mr. BLACKMORE: The Conservatives were not in any way disposed to make the conscription question an issue. They had made it abundantly clear that they did not wish to fight on that issue. That fact removes from under the feet of the Liberals the last vestige of excuse for making conscription an issue. Why did not both parties go out sensibly, sanely, patriotically and with public spirit and say to everyone, "Now, folks, we are in a most terrible war; heaven only knows what may happen in the next four years; we do not dare to tell you."

Mr. WOOD: Offer them $25 a month.

An hon. MEMBER: They are entitled to it, too.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Gems of wisdom.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Remarks like that help a person to understand why the Liberals took their stand on conscription, and why they lacked vision. Was it because the people in power lacked vision, or did they just lack courage?

The Prime Minister expressed great anxiety and concern about the fact that the government now has its hands tied. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if the people of Canada vote "no," where will the government be? Its hands will be worse than tied; they will be manacled. Yes; they will be hanging alongside the government's sides, and the whole thing will be inside a plaster-of-paris cast.

Mr. POULIOT: It will be the best solution for the defence of Canada.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I shall leave my hon. friend to explain himself at length some time. If the government wishes to be sure of freeing its hands, then the last thing it ought to have is a plebiscite.

To avoid the possibility of defeat of the plebiscite, which may possibly come about, I am going to make a suggestion, and then I shall have completed my remarks. The people of Canada, from coast to coast, those who are informed and those who think, have begun to realize that there is some sort of dead-hand lying over the whole war effort of this country. I am neither minimizing nor disparaging what the government has done. But it is certain that in a country like Canada, with such bountiful resources, but which at the end of this length of time still has as many unemployed, there is something radically wrong—and simply passing a plebiscite on conscription is not going to set it right. What the people want is that the full, majestic, magnificent strength of this dominion shall be mobilized. People now realize that the devices being used by the government cannot achieve that end, and they are looking for leadership along some new line which will achieve it.

I would suggest to the government even at this late stage that along with the plebiscite in which they are asking if the people are willing that the hands of the government be freed to conscript men for overseas service, if needs be, they ask the further question as to whether the people would be willing to leave the government free so that it could adopt any new financial system which it might find to be advantageous.

I am going to suggest that the last words in the resolution passed by the legislature of Alberta be given careful attention. Those words were:

> The people should be given an opportunity of approving or disapproving not only of the conscription of man-power but also the complete mobilization of all our material and financial resources through the effective control and issue of all currency and credit by the dominion government.

This was a laughing matter perhaps four years ago. As the days pass, however, the danger that this country will be defeated is increasing, because this matter of money is being neglected. It is by no means a laughing matter to-day, nor can it be taken in any degree lightly. This bill should be redrafted so as to indicate the limit of its life, and to provide for adequate education; and the plebiscite should be revised so as to make its meaning and significance explicit. It should also contain facilities to enable the people to express their opinions on monetary systems.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, while I have been a member of the House of Commons I have found it to be a place of very much kindness. While I am here I hope I shall never be charged with showing any lack of ordinary Christian charity toward those who sit round me or hon. gentlemen opposite. To-day we are passing through a great battle of nerves, and the affairs of state place a heavy strain on the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), the cabinet and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson).

The government, however, should not be afraid to tell the people when they have made a mistake because, as I have said on former occasions, the people do not expect their leaders to be gods. There has never been a question in Canada concerning which all people have ever been united, and that arises because of our population and other matters. The plebiscite question is one on which different views are held.

Before discussing the plebiscite in detail, may I compliment Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker and the splendid Clerk of the House upon the very kind and efficient way in which they have handled the proceedings of the house in these critical times. They have done their duty as they have seen it, and I believe they have won the admiration and respect of the members and the people of Canada. True it is that sometimes I did not agree with them, but the fact that I say so, does not make it so.

Next December 9 it will have been twenty-one years since I was first elected to this house. As I say I have found that the house has discussed all these questions in a calm way. There is no necessity for anybody getting rattled at the present time over the questions that are before us. I am one of the opposition, but I believe the opposition

has given the government pretty good independent support in this war. That is what we were sent here for, to offer criticism, on behalf of the man on the street, on behalf of the people in our constituencies and the people of Canada generally. They may not like the way in which the war is going on, but it is no disparagement of the Prime Minister, of any of his ministers or of the government of the day if criticism is offered. I believe in the parliamentary system. They do not believe in it in Germany and Japan, but in this country we have a parliamentary system in a democracy. There cannot be a democracy without a free press. That is why I have urged the government to abolish the censorship as they have done in England. If that had been done, we would have avoided many of the mistakes which have been made in the giving of news and information to the people.

I think I have known the Prime Minister longer than anyone else in this house, and I have never had anything but respect for him while he has held his present position. I also have a great deal of admiration for the leader of the opposition. This party was not disgraced in the last election because it polled nearly one-half of the total vote in the country. Our leader was defeated, and the hon. member for York-Sunbury took up this work and has done well. He has not been very well, and his conduct of this job has won him the respect and admiration, not only of his colleagues over here but, I believe, on all sides of the house. He has won considerable public estimation in the country. He is not here at present this evening. Probably if he were, I would not be saying this, but it is true.

As I said in the first speech I made when this present parliament was opened in 1940, and when the government were being criticized, after all is said and done the people have elected them. They won 178 seats and they are the government of the day in a democracy. The people put them there. As I said at that time, they were a government of Canadians in Canada. Aside from the question of man-power, which they have misjudged, I think they have done a great deal of good useful work. Their efforts so far have been considerable, and Canada's war effort is very creditable in many ways, but they have not done one-half of what they should have done nor enough for a total war effort. They misjudged things in connection with man-power, in connection with the European and Pacific situation, in connection with the disarmament movement before the war. The members of the opposition have endeavoured to give the government good and independent support on the whole, for a total effort. The government has very little about which to complain except on this one question of the plebiscite, which never should have been started.

This is an involved question and one cannot expect everybody to agree. We are not all constituted the same. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I am a little shortsighted. I can speak without notes for forty mintues, but I have a few short quotations I should like to make. I did not want to bring in a lot of books, so I have these quotations typewritten in my notes.

One thing has been shown since the start of the war—the tremendous popularity of the monarchy. We had evidence of this during the visit of the king and queen in May, 1939, and again last December on the king's birthday. The king and queen have been most magnificent in giving leadership in these critical war days. As I say, one of the cardinal things we have noticed in Canada is the popularity of the monarchy, but with that we have seen the decay of parliament and the decline of the House of Commons. This is evidenced by the mistakes that have been made in allowing our functions to be usurped. We come here for a few days; then the doors are locked and we go home. Our colleagues in another place have been here for four or five hours since last June. Why can we not follow the example of London and Washington and have a joint session of the two houses, as I urged here in 1939 and 1940? This is what should be done during the course of this greatest war in the history of the world. But nothing has been done. Some very good talent is to be found in the other part of this building, men of great experience and ability, but no use has been made of their services in connection with war work. That is one of the mistakes which have been made.

I do not mean any disparagement when I say that the Prime Minister has been conducting this war as a Liberal war. The Asquith government went out of office in England during the last war for the same reason. The conduct of this war is much more difficult than was the conduct of the great war, and I think the Prime Minister would have been well advised to have hearkened to the hand-writing on the wall. Instead of conducting the war in the way in which it has been conducted, we should have had a man like Lord Beaverbrook or

used the great talents and ability of Viscount Bennett in the war cabinet in London. We all know the wonderful work that Lord Beaverbrook has done in production in the old land. He was born at Maple in York, although he is considered to be a Nova Scotian. I was sorry that he did not accompany the Prime Minister of Great Britain when he came here. Lord Beaverbrook is a remarkable man and a great Canadian. Considerable could be done in London by way of better managing of our part of this war. This is not the battle of the Atlantic; it is the battle of the seven seas, and there must be a new management of our own war effort. This has been shown by results in the Pacific. When the Right Hon. Mr. Menzies addressed this chamber last June he pointed this out. The government knew about it; they could see the hand-writing on the wall, but nothing was done till too late, and the disaster there shocked the world.

The government are a board of directors appointed by the people to conduct the war. The responsibility is theirs. It is a difficult job, and I sometimes fear for the health of some of the leaders. The strain they undergo is one of the tragedies of this game, and I hope it will not injure their health.

On the second reading the principle of the bill is considered. This is set out in the splendid textbook I hold in my hand, Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms. I remember reading what the assistant clerk, now the clerk of the British House of Commons said about this textbook. Standing order 75, at page 216, deals with the second reading. I should like to quote citation 753, which reads:

> The second reading of a bill is that stage when it is proper to enter into a discussion and propose a motion relative to the principle of the measure.

Citation 755 reads:

> It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a bill, to move as an amendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction, or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its progress; or seeking further information in relation to the bill by committees, commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence or the opinion of judges.

For that reason I oppose the principle of this bill. I should like to point out the cause and effect of this bill. What has been the cause for this sudden departure from parliamentary institutions and all we have had here for over one hundred years? As I said the other day, a civil war was fought in England over the very principle involved in this plebiscite, the control of the executive by parliament. In my opinion the cause for this plebiscite was simply a smoke-screen, a bit of shadow-boxing to cover up the mistakes which have been made about man-power since the war started and the disaster in the Pacific. It is simply a smoke-screen to cover the Pacific and Singapore. Who proposed this plebiscite? Who asked for it? What will it cost? It will do nothing whatever to beat Hitler.

I was very much disappointed with the speech which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), who is not here to-night, made in this house on February 4. The government can spend all this money like water on a useless plebiscite and on the league but has not a dollar to pay the poor dependents, the wives and children of the soldiers, many of whom are suffering from lack of a bonus, from lack of fuel and all that kind of thing. Yet the Minister of Finance brings down a page and a half of an order in council to give a cost of living bonus to civil servants who are staying at home and not going to the war. In addition to their $175 a month, they are being given a war bonus, and we cannot get a dollar for the dependents of the soldiers, or free fares for the soldiers on the railways, or a national insurance scheme. History will score this disgraceful treatment of our forces.

This plebiscite will not amount to a thing in beating Hitler. The effect of it will be like the effect of all commissions and committees in this country—to kill a lot of time, and delay and hinder and prevent this House of Commons from fulfilling the function for which it was created and urging upon the government an increased war effort. This is no time for such a reference to the people, and the plebiscite has already done a lot of harm in this country. I was sorry to hear some of the language used in this house to-night by two most honoured and respected leaders. I know that it was done in the heat of debate and that the battle of nerves is pretty hard on both of them, but I was sorry to see it.

If Hitler comes here—and he is not far from our shores now—he will take no plebiscite. What he will do will be to hang the plebiscite and all connected with it on a sour apple tree, like John Brown's body. That is what he will do with it, and Hitler and Japan are not, I repeat, far from our shores now. When the members representing British Columbia constituencies urged the government to do something to solve the Japanese question out there, why, on the same plebiscite reasoning, did the government not hold a plebiscite on the question of moving these Japanese—twenty-

eight or thirty thousand at the maximum and twenty thousand at the minimum—away from the coast province? It did not hold a plebiscite on that because the members would not stand for it.

This vote will probably be taken in May or June, which are going to be two of the most fateful months the world has ever seen. In those months will be decided the fate of civilization, perhaps for the next two hundred years. It will not be home defence that will count then. The decisive battles will be fought in the Atlantic and the Pacific, in Asia, and Europe, and the Mediterranean. In the Pacific we have lost the command of the sea and you cannot keep up with the Japanese who are moving around to these various islands in the Pacific—no, not if you had one million men, as I quoted Mr. Churchill early in the session. They have command of the air, aeroplane carriers, all the deadly instruments of war and have battered the fleets of Britain and the United States in the Pacific. The danger to the people of this country is great. Our fate will be decided, not by home defence, but in the Pacific; in the battle of the Atlantic, which is really a misnomer because it should be called the battle of the seven seas; and in the Mediterranean and on the Russo-German front, whether we like it or not. They can go like a circus from place to place with sea and air supremacy.

You cannot conduct this war with a plebiscite. It must be conducted by the House of Commons. Under the constitution you must either support the government or oppose it, and you cannot change the constitution by a plebiscite. The members of the House of Commons have not only the right but the duty to come here and report what they find wrong with our war effort and in connection with our armed forces and economic effort, and I say the critics have been right. It is their duty to point out what is wrong.

On the second reading of the bill you can discuss the principle, but you cannot discuss the bill in detail clause by clause. The interpretation clause provides that "during a plebiscite" means the period between the date of the proclamation ordering the plebiscite issued under section 3 of this act, and the close of the poll on polling day. That is what the definition says about the time of the plebiscite. But if Hitler comes to this country first, what are you going to do about it? He will not hold any plebiscite. He did not hold one in Belgium or Holland or France and these other countries he has conquered.

[Mr. Church.]

By clause 3 of the bill it is provided that the governor-in-council "may" by proclamation order the taking of a plebiscite. The "may" is enabling, permissive; it is not mandatory. The governor in council has control of the plebiscite election. But if Hitler or the Japanese come here, there will be no vote at all, because the governor-in-council can call it off then, or at any time.

Section 5 of the bill provides that any person who shall have voted at the plebiscite shall not be exempted from military training. That smacks of conscription, and it is conscription. There is no such provision in the statute which Attorney-General Conant brought down in the Ontario legislature for soldier votes abroad and at home. He has given a free and untrammelled right of way to all the soldiers overseas and all those wearing the service uniform to vote at the next election. He is not taking away from them by conscriptive methods anything at all as we are, their right to apply for exemption, postponement of training, and all that kind of thing.

Another section of the bill provides that members of the forces, irrespective of age, shall be entitled to vote on the plebiscite. Another section deals with the manner of voting by a qualfied voter whose name is not on the official list of voters. Anybody who knows anything about elections, especially in districts where there is a foreign-born population, knows that this will lead to a lot of telegraphing of votes. Persons will be going round to various booths and voting if their names are not on the lists. I remember an election once where the candidate got 178 votes at one poll, but the "8" was struck off, so that this candidate got only 17 votes. I do not like to see that kind of thing, and voting by those not on the lists.

When the seed planted by this plebiscite has reached its maturity, what will the harvest be? It will not fill the farmers' barns with crops. It will empty their pockets of their money, and their taxes will pay for it. All the harvest will be that the people will not know what they are voting on, and when the votes are counted up, half the ballots will be spoiled because the people did not know what they were voting on. It puts me in mind of the battle of Dundee. I see the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) sitting over there with his colleague. They know about the battle of Dundee where no one knew who won it. Some say we won; some say they won; some say nobody won—and that is how it will be when the plebiscite ballots are counted.

It is not right to place private government members of parliament in the position in which this plebiscite places them, against their own convictions. We are being asked to relieve the government of responsibility for policy by submitting to the people a plebiscite asking them to vote "yes" or "no." It is parliament's duty to frame policy; and if we are not here for that, the government had better lock the doors of this house and send the members home for good.

A "yes" vote is simply a vote of entire confidence in the government. I do not know whether I shall vote or not. My constituents have the right to vote the way they see fit, and it is not for me to advise or interfere with them. I am not going to be a party to any snap or humbug vote or anything in the nature of a vote when the people do not know what they are voting for. They do not know what will happen if they vote "yes", or what will happen if they vote "no"; they are bewildered. To the average voter the thing is a genuine Chinese puzzle without any issue or sense. What is going to be the result of it? What was the cause of it?

Yesterday the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said that conscription is not an issue in this vote, that the issue is a pledge of the government. Let me remind him that Mr. Roosevelt, the President of the United States, gave a pledge in the last election that there would never be a contingent of troops sent out of the country if he were returned; he would stop at measures just short of war and they would keep out of war. What happened? Last June he carried the army vote by a majority of only one. The isolationists were so strong that the majority for the repeal of the Neutrality Act was only fourteen votes. Things looked pretty dark for the administration until Pearl Harbour changed the whole situation and the whole nation was united. Are we going to wait to take a plebiscite until we have a second Pearl Harbour in Victoria or Vancouver; because, as Prime Minister Churchill told the House of Commons in London publicly the other day—it was reported in *Hansard* of January 28 there—for the next year or two, until the allies get command of the sea in the Pacific again, we must expect these visits from the enemy in the Pacific, and for Japan to roam all over. Are we to wait until then before we do anything?

So much for the bill. My leader is quite correct in what he says about the plebiscite as being contrary to the constitution. I have here an authority for my statement—and I shall quote it in a moment—because this matter has been up in the house before. This particular plebiscite method of doing business is subversive of our constitution, which is derived from that of Great Britain. It takes away the collective responsibility of the cabinet of the day and cabinet solidarity. Instead of the public being approached through a plebiscite, the issue should have been embodied in a government measure in the house here, and if rejected, the government falls. I believe the house would have released the government from any pledge in this connection. Why are they worrying about pledges? I do not know. As the late J. Israel Tarte said, elections are not won with prayers, and platforms are made to get in on, not to stand on—and so are pledges.

I might point out that the Prime Minister, when replying to me in 1937 concerning a national register, gave a pledge in this house that the government would never again send overseas an expeditionary force; he said that the danger to Canada was minor in degree and secondary in origin—which statement is shown to have been incorrect. In addition, what did he do in the Atlantic conference, which binds Canada whether we like it or not? At the last imperial conference, in 1937, when we refused to give anything to the Singapore base, or support an empire shipping policy, although it meant more to Canada than almost any other country in the way of protection in the Pacific, he said, "We have no commitments. Parliament will decide." How was the pledge carried out?

Take the Hyde Park and Ogdensburg agreements. We have a so-called joint board of defence, which is more board than defence; in fact, it seems to be all board. That body has made recommendations of expenditures running to two or three hundred million dollars—all over the head of parliament, although we are in session. In the Hyde Park agreement are pledges binding on Canada, also the giving away of bases from Newfoundland to British Guiana and elsewhere. In return for fifty ships, some of which have been returned, and others of which are very little use, we gave away parts of our empire. This binds Canada, although it was not a party to it.

At the Atlantic conference they decided that we would be at war if war came to the United States and Japan; Britain would join the United States, and that bound Canada. We have never yet had a defence or foreign policy. We have never yet had a foreign policy except a policy of day to day and hand to mouth. These commitments which are being made between the governments of Great Britain and the United States bind Canada, because when Britain is at war, Canada is at war.

I do not agree with the head of that high-sounding Department of National War Services, which with all its circuitous ways should have been abolished long ago, when he allows Mr. Brockington to make such statements in literature as these: "King George did not declare war for us; we declared war for him."

When war broke out on September 3, 1939, although it took ten days for this parliament to declare war, Hitler did not wait for our declaration of war of September 10; he sank the *Athenia* on September 3, with a hundred and thirty Canadians and other Britishers on board. It needed no declaration from us to become involved, because when Britain is at war, Canada is at war also. Another instance of a pledge which has not been carried out is the Ogdensburg agreement.

Then, more recently, how was war declared on Japan? I had asked the Prime Minister on June 12 last whether, during the parliamentary recess, there was to be any further appeasement of Japan. He said he was not an appeaser, he was a conciliator. Under the appeasement policy Japan received from us five million bushels of grain. One of those who spoke in connection with that particular subject when Japan declared war on December 7 was the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson), who for many years supported pacifist doctrines and resisted even the moderate votes which were proposed for armaments in 1937 and 1938. He gave a long interview last December to the press about Japan, in which, according to him, Japan could not last any time at all. His prediction has proved to be incorrect and his facts out of date or judgment.

I come to this point. During the time we were giving away the Ottawa valley and other power rights, allowing increases in telephone rates, and when large vested interests were threatening municipal control over streets, it was proposed to adopt in Canada the municipal policy of submitting to the ratepayers at every general election great national questions in peace time. In this connection I would refer to what was said by the late honoured Secretary of State, Mr. Rinfret, in corroboration of what our leader has said. A report of the discussion will be found in *Hansard* of March 17, 1939, page 2186. The constitutional aspects of the matter were debated; and it was pointed out, in relation to an act of June 13, 1898, respecting the prohibition of importation and manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, that a vote was all right; but there was no legislation, although Sir Wilfrid Laurier had pledged legislation.

I recall an occasion when Sir Wilfrid, who was very popular with those who came to interview him, saw that one member of a delegation did not have a chair, and he would not sit down himself but got the delegate a chair. His name was the Reverend Mr. Huxtable, who addressed him as "Sir Wilfrid." Sir Wilfrid said, "Don't call me Sir Wilfrid; I am plain Mr. Laurier, a democrat to the hilt." But a few months afterwards Sir Wilfrid forgot his pledge and took a knighthood—quite rightly and quite properly; he was held in very affectionate regard and respect by the people not only of his own province but of others.

The Secretary of State pointed out what the government did after the vote to which I have referred was held. What they did was to place the Canada Temperance Act on the statute books of a later day. It provided for local referendums, and under that act the Secretary of State of that day said that some two hundred separate local votes were held throughout the country and in Ontario and Manitoba. The late Minister of Justice, the very able and respected minister whom we all miss so much this session, opposed plebiscites on March 17, 1939, and he gave some reasons for not applying it to federal matters at general elections. He said it could not be applied in an emergency. I told my leader some years ago on referendums that if war came, I would never see Mr. General Election become commander in chief of the British forces; I would never with my vote allow Mr. General Election to become admiral of the British fleet, because before Mr. General Election could open his ballot boxes, the enemy would sail and fly up the St. Lawrence and bomb the citadel at Quebec and this building and the Chateau Laurier hotel. I am still of that opinion. My present leader is absolutely correct in saying that the plebiscite is contrary to the constitution and that the matter should be dealt with by way of a special act and not a general act, because under the Dominion Elections Act you cannot submit a question, and that is why they have to bring in this bill. It will have to go to the senate, and I shall be very much surprised if it does not get a rough reception in another place.

In 1939 the then Secretary of State (Mr. Rinfret), pointed out the time this referendum will take. There are no standing lists in Ottawa; it will take seven or eight weeks to prepare them. I think it was Mr. Devlin in the home rule debate who said the House of Commons was at its best when it was frank. We want some frankness from the government as to the management of this war—the better management. It is the duty of this house to be frank and to criticize the measures placed before it, because criticism is a tonic to government action. This government has refused

to do anything in regard to some of the main measures but was urged on by public opinion. It was so in regard to man-power and many articles of munitions and in many other ways.

I believe that the man on the street has a right to be heard here in criticism. In my opinion the criticism by the opposition has been very moderate. The man in the street has a right to be heard and the only way he can be heard is through a member of parliament, because the private member is the connecting link between the government of the day and the electorate; if he ceases to function, parliamentary government is at an end. If the press is to be muzzled by censors on this plebiscite then the public is not going to learn the facts.

I for one do not intend to fall into this plebiscite trap. I know something about the conduct of elections and the mysterious and devious ways sometimes used to win them, and I am opposed to it. I am not going to be manoeuvred into a wrong position by the jokers in this bill, and there are many of them. I am not going to be told to put a cross "yes" or "no" to any such question, or to be a party to such tomfoolery. I have seen too much manipulation of ballot boxes in my day, and I never had much organization, no more than any of the other Toronto members; we have had very little organization except in a voluntary way.

The people do not believe in this plebiscite. The Prime Minister evidently looks on it as a straight vote of confidence; if you vote "yes," you vote confidence. Mr. Churchill asked for a vote of confidence, but he asked for it in the right way, in the House of Commons under the constitution, and that is the way it should be done here.

The government may get a surprise in the ballot boxes. With regard to the referendum or plebiscite—it is a distinction without a difference, a play on words—I believe the people are not going to be fooled. You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time as to an important matter like this, especially when it means life or death with the enemy close to our shores.

In 1937 I predicted the war over Japan on a vote for the Tokyo legation, and my late leader Viscount Bennett said I represented a large body of public opinion in this country that did not like the way in which Canada had been for many years a drag on the mother country. As I said in that debate, one of our chief errors was the refusal to cooperate with the motherland in connection with Singapore and the shipping conference. Britain at that time had two thousand fewer ships than in 1914 and five million more mouths to feed.

Conscription was not an issue in the last election. I never heard of it; in fact I had a difference of opinion with one of our leaders about this question. I did not speak in the last election except in my own constituency, and no leader is going to tie me down. I am not a yes-man or a nodder, or a follow your leader; your leader is your policy; I never have been and do not intend to be now. It is a great mistake for the present Prime Minister to ask his followers to agree with him on this and no government member should be placed in this position.

The Prime Minister asked the question and gave the answer. I have the answer here. The question was "to release the government" from its pledge. I am in favour of striking out all the words after "release the government". If he will have the question read: "Are you in favour of releasing the government?" to be answered by a straight "yes" or "no", the people would understand. If the Prime Minister is appealing to Caesar, let him appeal and be bound by the answer.

If there were a little more humour in the house, tempers would not be so frayed or rattled. I think this plebiscite is unsportsmanlike. I was at a rugby game not long ago, where there were some five thousand people; one side began to yell, "We don't like the ref, we don't like the ref", meaning the referee. We do not like the referendum. The men are all right. I look on this vote as war according to Hollywood and not war according to Hitler. The people are not going to be fooled by any such farce. I have seen voters in the voting booths decline to vote on such similar questions because they do not like to be humbugged and did not understand them. The average voter knows as much as members of the House of Commons and the cabinet; he does not need any meetings to tell him how to vote. I think it is an insult to ask members of parliament to go to the constituencies and pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the government on such a proposal. I do not intend to do it; my constituents can vote themselves as they see fit. I do not know whether I am going to vote myself on the question, because I took a stand in this house for rearmament all along the line when it was very unpopular and not fashionable, and it is very unwise now for some hon. members to throw cheap sneers at those who in season and out of season, for years before the war, urged a larger army, navy and air force.

The German barbarians with their mechanized hordes have destroyed the whole of Europe, and they are not far from our shores now. I do not think you are going to fool any of the people at the ballot box by this sort of thing. Before the ballot boxes can be opened the enemy may arrive on the Pacific or the Atlantic coast, with the tramping of feet, the loud speaker, the cracking of the whip, the sergeant-major, the gestapo, and all that sort of thing. He may decide the matter long before the ballot boxes are opened. I like the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Slaght); he has been very kind to everyone, but I do not like some of his arguments about the ballot on the plebiscite. Neither do I like those of his young friend, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Fulford), who sits beside him. I think it would be far better if in future he used a little more temperate language with regard to those who do not agree with him. I hope it may never be said of me that in my twenty-one years in this house I ever failed to show a lack of ordinary Christian charity toward my political opponents.

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, I have not so far availed myself of the opportunity to speak on this plebiscite issue. Much has been said about it since the opening of parliament some weeks ago. I think I can agree with some of those who have already eulogized the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) on his speech yesterday. I believe he is a past master at saying a great deal, yet so speaking as to avoid any possibility of being pinned down. Sometimes I think he is rather like a jack rabbit; just when you think you have him, he is not there. I quite agree with those who have expressed the opinion that yesterday he excelled himself in oratory and forcefulness, and as he was speaking I felt that if only he had made that speech during the early part of this session, instead of waiting until yesterday, he might have saved a great deal of time. Sometimes, however, first impressions are best, and I believe that as we seriously analyse the Prime Minister's speech of yesterday we may discover some things that perhaps he overlooked or some things that perhaps he did not very brilliantly cover up.

Yesterday the right hon. gentleman said that the question he was going to ask the public to answer in this plebiscite was as follows:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I think this question is so ambiguous that it is not capable of even one interpretation. Some hon. members have said that it is capable of many interpretations, but I cannot interpret it at all. Already under the mobilization act the government has perfect freedom; it is not restricted at all in its method of raising men for military service. That has nothing at all to do with the restriction. Where the government is restricted is in respect of where the men who are raised should fight the war. I want to point that out, because we have been told here, and the Prime Minister made the statement himself, that this plebiscite has nothing whatever to do with conscription. Yet all our arguments have centred around whether or not the government could conscript men for overseas service. Therefore the government is not restricted as to the methods of raising men for military service, but rather as to the purpose for which the men who are raised for military service should be used. Are they going to be raised to serve at home, or are they going to be raised to serve abroad? But that is not contained in the question which is to be submitted to the people. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the question is so very ambiguous that personally I do not know what it does mean. I should like to ask the Prime Minister what it means. He says that it does not mean the conscription of men for overseas service; yet throughout his speech yesterday he continually mentioned the matter of overseas service.

When the Prime Minister mentioned yesterday the question that was to be submitted to the people, he went on to say this, as it appears at page 823 of *Hansard:*

> As I said, at the time of speaking on the address, the question is very simple in its language and meaning and is a straightforward one.

Yet a few lines further down, in almost the next breath, he went on to say:

> My purpose this afternoon is not so much to attempt to add to what has been said but rather, if possible, to clear away some of the confusion that has arisen out of the discussion that has already taken place.

If the question we have been debating is couched in language so straightforward that there can be no doubt about it, how is it that confusion exists? That is one point at least on which the Prime Minister did not cover up so brilliantly as he is accustomed to do.

Let me go a step further. Yesterday the Prime Minister took time out to mention specifically that there is a tremendous difference between a legal obligation and a moral obligation. I wonder whether there was any

moral obligation in 1940, in going to the people with a promise of restriction. I wonder whether there was any moral obligation in going to the country and saying, "We want you to return us to power so that we can prosecute the war so far but no farther." If ever there was a moral obligation, it was in 1940, when the Prime Minister went to the country; and the moral obligation was to tell the people that he was going to do anything under God's heaven to win the war. But I think he went to the country with only one moral obligation in mind, and that was to win the election.

Later on in the Prime Minister's speech he makes special reference to the fact that both Conservative and Liberal parties, the two major parties of Canada, going to the country in 1940, were in agreement on the matter of voluntary enlistment and compulsory enlistment; that is, the matter of conscription.

Then he deals with the pledge that was made to the country. Let me read the Prime Minister's words:

> The pledge was given later, direct to the people, to the electorate themselves. It was a pledge made between the leaders of two great political parties in Canada and the electorate of this country in regard to the most solemn question that could have been put before them at that particular time.

The Prime Minister specifically states that this was the most solemn pledge that could be given the country. I repeat—the most solemn pledge. The most solemn pledge any man could give the country in a time of war is the pledge to win the war at all costs. That is the most solemn pledge which could be given.

But what was the pledge that was considered so solemn? It was: We will prosecute this war in order to win the war at home; but we will not prosecute the war to the very limit of our capacity to win it abroad. That is the sort of pledge the Prime Minister regards as a solemn one.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Shame on him!

Mr. HANSELL: Some of us could say a few things about solemn pledges. Here again, talking about public men in public positions, and how they must regard their pledges as solemn and irrevocable, the Prime Minister goes on to say:

> We intend to be ever mindful of this, and that if we have given a solemn pledge to them we intend to carry out that pledge.

That sounds good; it sounds beautiful. But might I ask the Prime Minister about the solemn pledge he made a few years ago to end unemployment?

Mr. POULIOT: Bennett made that pledge.

Mr. HANSELL: Perhaps he did. That was a solemn pledge. Did the Prime Minister keep it?

Mr. POULIOT: Bennett did not.

Mr. HANSELL: When the Prime Minister found, as year after year went by, that he could not keep that solemn pledge, did he go to the country and ask to be released from it?

An hon. MEMBER: He never made it.

Mr. HANSELL: I believe I remember reading in *Maclean's* magazine about October, 1935, where the Prime Minister was going to ease the burden of debt on agriculture. Did he ease the burden of debt? Did he go to the country and ask to be released from that solemn promise? In this house in the last year or two we have been reminded that the farmers in Saskatchewan were promised dollar wheat. The government was not able to give the farmers dollar wheat. Was that a solemn pledge? Has the government asked release from that pledge?

Then I would remind the house once again of that most solemn pledge respecting the issue of currency and credit in terms of public need. We know what the Prime Minister said in 1935; these words have almost been worn threadbare:

> Once a nation parts with the control of its currency and credit it matters not who makes the nation's laws. Usury once in control will wreck any nation. Until the control of the issue of currency and credit is restored to government, and recognized as its most conspicuous and sacred responsibility, all talk of the sovereignty of parliament is idle and futile.

The Prime Minister talks about keeping solemn pledges. Here is one he has described as a sacred responsibility. I do not know what the broad meaning of the word "sacred" is, but I have before me the meaning as it appears in a dictionary I secured in the parliamentary library. The meaning of "sacred" as outlined here is "consecrated, or held dear to a deity; dedicated or reserved or appropriated to some person or purpose; made holy by religious issue; hallowed."

Let us think of that. Here is a sacred responsibility, one which is consecrated or held dear to a deity. Did the Prime Minister keep that most sacred obligation? Has he restored to the government the right to issue currency and credit in terms of public need?

I should like to read something he said on the night of the election, when Mr. Bennett's government was swept out and Mr. King's government was swept in. In the light of what has gone on since, in the light of

the fact that millions of people have been on relief, let me read what the Prime Minister said:

In the new era which dawns to-day the struggle for the rights of the people will, in the realm of economic liberty and security, be carried on as never before.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Amen!

Mr. HANSELL: I continue to quote:

Poverty and adversity, want and misery are the enemies which Liberalism will seek to banish from our land. They have lain in wait at the gate of every Canadian home during the past five years, and their menacing mien has served to destroy the souls as well as the minds and bodies of an ever-increasing number of men, women and children in our land. We take up at once—

No time must be lost.

—as our supreme task the endeavour to end poverty in the midst of plenty, starvation and unnecessary suffering in the land of abundance, discontent and distress in a country more blessed by Providence than any other on the face of the globe, and to gain for individual lives and for the nation as a whole that health and peace and sweet content which is the rightful heritage of all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am trying to find some link between the hon. member's speech, the extracts he has been reading, and the bill before the house. I do not believe he is speaking to the question now before us.

Mr. HANSELL: I have been talking about the most solemn pledges concerning which the Prime Minister spoke yesterday.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question before the house has to do with a plebiscite.

Mr. HANSELL: I am the last one who would want to break any of the rules of this house. If, however, you had been in the chair this afternoon you would have heard members here and members there talk their way around the world and half way to the moon and still be permitted to go on and speak. I want you to rule, Mr. Speaker, but I am saying that if there ever was a sacred obligation or pledge which the Prime Minister has ever made and which should have been kept—if it could not be kept, he should have submitted the matter to the people by way of a plebiscite—it was the pledge to end suffering and want in the midst of plenty.

Mr. FAIR: He did not want to do it.

Mr. HANSELL: The hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair) says that he did not want to do it; it did not suit his political convenience. Imagine the Prime Minister going to the country in those days with a plebiscite asking that he be released from his obligation to end poverty when he found he could not do it. That would not have suited his political convenience, but this plebiscite does. May I go on with the Prime Minister's speech of yesterday. He is reported on page 826 of *Hansard* as follows:

It is because of this we want to have perfect freedom of action as an administration, to have all the right to do what is in the public interest at the time the situation may demand it, and we feel we ought to be given this freedom as quickly as possible. The reason we want it, as I have stated already, is to be free to act in the manner which will best serve the interests of the people of Canada to serve in the manner that will make Canada's war effort the most effective.

That is self-admission that in 1940, when he made the commitment, it was a commitment which restricted him from putting forth Canada's greatest possible war effort. Are we to understand that the government went to this country in a time of war, in 1940, with the attitude that they did not want to be free to prosecute this war to the limit of their ability? In effect the Prime Minister says that they went to the country in 1940 with no desire to be free to carry on the war in the most effective manner. The only conclusion one can come to for the government permitting its hands to be tied is that it considered it was a very good piece of political expediency. I cannot comprehend it; it is beyond imagination, beyond all reason to believe that the government should consult the people as to whether they desire it to take such action as will win the war. That is the line of argument the Prime Minister used. He goes on:

Hon. members have been talking about conscription, about no conscription and the like. That is not the issue in this plebiscite. This is the issue: Is the government of Canada, in time of war, to have freedom to take whatever action it thinks most advisable with respect to the furtherance of Canada's war effort?

The Prime Minister informed the house that the question to be submitted to the people is not whether or not they want conscription, but whether or not they want the government to do all they can do to win the war. I am not going through my constituency doffing a cap with bells on, looking like a fool, asking my constituents to vote whether or not they want to win the war. Then the Prime Minister goes on to talk about the position in which the government finds itself in the eyes of the world.

He said:

First of all, the government is being put in an entirely wrong position before the people of this country and before the world just because we have not that full power.

Who put them in that position except he himself in 1940? Again on page 827:

. . . but it is also putting Canada in a false position, before all countries of the world, including her allies in the war.

Who put Canada in that position but themselves in 1940? I quote from page 826:

Nevertheless as long as that commitment is there we are being represented to the people of our own and other countries as a government unwilling to go the lengths other countries are willing to go, even should necessity for so doing become clearly manifest. That is a false position and a very wrong one in which to have the government placed.

Moreover, the present position in regard to the one commitment places the parliament of Canada, as well, in a false position.

Who put the government in that position but they themselves in 1940? If I have not misjudged what the Prime Minister says, it is that parliament is being put in a false position. I quote from page 827:

The very minute the subject were brought up, one hon. member after another, if it suited his purpose, would rise in his place in the house and say, "I cannot discuss this question, because the government is committed not even to raise it." So long as that commitment is there, no matter how the war may develop, there can be no discussion of the merits of the question of compulsory service for overseas. I say that that is putting parliament in a wrong position before the people of Canada.

It seems to me that the Prime Minister must think it is a Liberal parliament. Is he going to say that nobody in the house can talk about conscription until the government raises the issue? That is the way it reads here. I have thought for some time that this is a Liberal parliament. That is the position. Then he says:

. . . the enemy will construe this commitment as a limitation on the war effort of Canada.

What is responsible for that? I wonder how they interpreted that commitment in Germany in 1940?

An hon. MEMBER: They never thought of that.

Mr. HANSELL: Surely they must have thought of it. The Prime Minister is a brilliant enough man; no one will deny that. No one will say that the Prime Minister did not foresee how people would regard this, even in years to come.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): His party came first; that is all.

Mr. HANSELL: That is exactly the argument I am making, that it was political expediency. On page 828, the Prime Minister is reported as having said:

Talk about being courageous, I do not see anything courageous about that. Courage comes when you face the people, not when you run away from them.

A little more courage in 1940 would have been wise. It would have been better if he had faced the country with the statement, not "I will not put in conscription," but modified a little to read, "I see no need for conscription now, but if the need ever comes, I shall be the first to put it in." That would have been courageous indeed.

The Prime Minister answered the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) to the effect that he could not state what he would do in respect of conscription as a result of the plebiscite vote, and he could not state what he would do several months hence. But he did state in 1940 what he could not do and would not do—and that condition has lasted for two years. The Prime Minister said, as reported at page 831 of *Hansard* of yesterday:

I mention these things because they help to illustrate how impossible it is for the government to give a decision here and now as to what it is going to do next September or October or November or December, or in 1943 or 1944.

I am not pressing that he should tell us that. I am simply pointing out that he did tell the country in 1940 what he could not do and would not do. He went to the country then on a negative commitment, and I say and have always thought that it was one of the most foolish things for a statesman to do to go to the country and say: I am promising you that if you elect me I will not do something, but will go into office with my hands tied. That may have been a shrewd piece of political expediency, but I do not think I will apologize to the Prime Minister when I say that it was not statesmanlike.

The Prime Minister went on in his speech to talk about the New Order. It is true that he wound up his speech with a great finale. It is worth putting on *Hansard* twice. The Prime Minister said, as reported at page 833 of *Hansard:*

A great deal has been said in different parts of the world and in our own country, about the New Order that is to come when this war is over. I have said on two or three occasions, I feel it very deeply, that unless that New Order emerges and asserts itself before the war is over we shall see very litle of New Order when the war is over.

Might I just make some reference to that? The Prime Minister makes that statement in the sense that he wants to preserve democracy, wants the people's will to govern. He says so here, as reported at page 834 of yesterday's *Hansard:*

They will insist on public honour in the transaction of public business, and they will insist above everything else that the government that is carrying on the affairs of their country shall be responsive to the will of the people and see that it is administering that will and no other.

Will the Prime Minister tell me to-night if it is the will of the Canadian people to pay an old age pension of only $20 a month? Will he tell me that it is the will of the people that agriculture should get the deal it is getting and that soldiers' widows should get the deal they are getting? The government knows the will of the people on these things.

The Prime Minister goes on to say, as reported at page 834 of yesterday's *Hansard*:

> There has been very little said in the recent past about moral obligations on the part of nations, but unless I am greatly mistaken there is nothing that is going to mean as much in the future of mankind. If we are going to rule out of our public life the honour of public men and of parliament—

And so forth, and so on, and so on, and so on. Yes, there are sacred obligations, and statesmen should keep their commitments. I believe in that. But there are sacred obligations to feed and clothe and make our people happy and comfortable. That is the will of the people. but that is not being done to-day.

Speaking of the post-war period, the Prime Minister goes on to say, as reported at page 835 of *Hansard:*

> We are going to honour their rights as we seek to honour our own conscience, so we shall be laying the foundation of the kind of order that will be enduring through the years to come.

Then I say, let us start with the building of that foundation now by looking after these war widows and dependents, and let us look after the aged now, for these are sacred and solemn obligations.

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the arguments that have been made in the debate on the address and in this debate with respect to the plebiscite, pro and con, and also to the arguments for and against conscription. I am firmly convinced that before the plebiscite is put to the people, the first step we should take is this: We should have a resolution moved in this House of Commons by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) asking the members of this house to relieve the Prime Minister of his pledge. Most of the members who have spoken said that they were in favour of the plebiscite, but they have not said what they are going to do. They have not said whether they will back it up, whether they will ask their people to vote for it or whether they themselves will actually vote for it or not. To ask the people first, instead of this House of Commons, is putting the cart before the horse. I am not in favour of the plebiscite; I think the Prime Minister can get the release he requires from the members of this House of Commons; and before he submits the plebiscite to the people of the country, he should secure his release from the members of the House of Commons. If he gets release there, he certainly will be much freer to act than he is now; and if some unforeseen terrible thing should happen to prevent the taking of the plebiscite, he will at least have the consent of the members of the House of Commons to relieve him of his obligations and permit him to act. If the Prime Minister will take this course and ask the members of the House of Commons to give him the release he seeks, I for one will vote and call on my fellow members to vote to relieve him of his obligation with respect to that one specific thing.

Motion (Mr. McLarty) agreed to and bill read the second time.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With the consent of the house, Mr. Speaker, I would move that we return to government notices of motion so that the Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty) may introduce his motion for the special committee to which this bill is to be referred.

Motion agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

The house having reverted to the order for government notices of motions.

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State) moved the following resolution:

> That a special committee consisting of Messrs. Brunelle, Castleden, Black (Yukon), Emmerson, Fair, Hazen, Jean, White, McCuaig, McLarty, McNiven, Pottier, Ross (Calgary East), Turgeon and Weir be appointed to consider Bill No. 10, "An Act respecting the taking of a plebiscite in every electoral district in Canada and the taking of the votes of such plebiscite of Canadian service voters stationed within and without Canada," and that the said committee be empowered to send for persons, papers and records and to report from time to time.

Mr. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that the motion as moved is not the same as the wording which appears on the order paper.

Mr. McLARTY: There are two names amended, I believe, by consent. Both of them happen to be members of my hon. friend's party. The name of Mr. Black (Yukon) was inserted in the place of Mr. Diefenbaker and that of Mr. White in place of Mr. Graydon. I understood that that was definitely by arrangement.

Mr. STIRLING: Being consented to by whom?

Mr. McLARTY: By consent of the whip of the Conservative party.

Mr. POULIOT: I have something to say on this. I can start now, or we may call it eleven o'clock, if you wish, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion is to create a committee to which the bill will be referred.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, and I have just a few words to say on it. Will you please call it eleven o'clock?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that the government is anxious, as I believe all hon. members are, that we should proceed as rapidly as possible with this legislation. The second reading of the bill has passed; a committee has been now named as a special committee to consider it; it has been agreed upon by all parties; and if this resolution could be passed to-night, the bill will be referred to-night to the special committee, which will have to-morrow and Saturday to go over the various clauses of the bill, and may be able to report to the house on Monday. In that event the bill could be through on Monday, and pass its third reading here. It would be unfortunate, I think, if we lost the advantage of the extra day to the committee to consider the matter.

Mr. POULIOT: I cannot refuse anything to my leader except in a matter of this importance. I was about to speak on the second reading, but a colleague was talking to me, and I had thought that the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Ross) was to speak longer than he did. But I do not intend to speak at length, and if I am the only speaker on this matter the bill could be referred to-morrow afternoon to the committee.

May I say further that this is the most important bill which has been brought before the house for a long time. I appreciate what has been done, but it is impossible for me to refrain from saying what I have to say. I shall try to be just as brief as possible. It is not ill-will, it is not a bad disposition, but the matter is so serious that I cannot do otherwise. Besides this, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has said that his intention was not to take advantage of the plebiscite right away to impose conscription, that it might be a matter of a few months, even a year, or more than that. I do not wish to be disobliging, but I should be remiss in my duty if I did not say what I have to say upon the matter. I usually refuse nothing, either to my colleagues here or to my confrères at the bar. But this matter is of the utmost importance; we must think deeply upon it, and we have the right to express our views. I do not wish to stand in the way, but since the bill is to be referred in the first place not to the committee of the whole house, but to a special committee which will report to the committee of the whole, it is my intention to say what I have to say in order that the members of the special committee which will study the bill will consider it, or throw it in the wastepaper basket. Mr. Speaker, will you please call it eleven o'clock.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is not on the merits of the bill; the question is on the expediency of creating a committee to which the bill may be referred. Therefore, if any hon. member desires to speak on the motion which is now before the house, namely the expediency of creating a committee to which the bill may be referred, now is the time. Or, is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. POULIOT: It is one minute to eleven o'clock, but I will continue. I started at five minutes to eleven. Sir, this is exactly the same case as when the motion was made for the reference of certain matters to the civil service committee. There was a debate on that, and hon. members expressed their views. This is not a long bill, it is a short bill. But it is based—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point of order. Perhaps my hon. friend will excuse me. I should like to ask Your Honour whether a motion to refer a bill to committee is debatable under the rules of the house. I would cite standing order 38.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does any hon. member desire to speak on the point of order?

Mr. POULIOT: Sir, it is now eleven o'clock.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not yet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Standing order 38 enumerates the debatable questions. The motion to refer a bill to a committee is not therein enumerated. Therefore I declare that the motion is not debatable.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. McLARTY: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 10 be referred to the special committee which is now created.

Motion agreed to.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Friday, February 27, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. POULIOT

BRUCE COAL COMPANY—EMPLOYMENT OF A. E. BRADFIELD

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted once more to use the traditional parliamentary language of other days and rise to a question of privilege, as a private Liberal member of this honourable house, I would bring to your attention the wording I used yesterday as reported at page 846 of *Hansard:*

My second question is whether the secretary of that company is at present in the employ of the government, in the Department of Munitions and Supply.

I was not stating, sir, that the man in question was in the Department of Munitions and Supply; I was asking if he was in the employ of the government in that department, which is altogether different. Then in yesterday's Evening *Citizen*, five o'clock edition, under the headline, "Pouliot Declares Bruce Company Official is Government Employee," I find this paragraph:

So and so—

I need not repeat the man's name.

—reported by Mr. Pouliot to be secretary of the Bruce Coal Company, is not now and never had been an employee of the department, Mr. Howe told the press this afternoon.

My reason for rising to-day, sir, is that private members, whether Liberal, Conservative, C.C.F. or Social Credit, are handicapped by the fact that the public accounts are lacking in detail. Therefore when some information is asked from any minister of the crown, the answer should not be misleading, and no minister has the right to split hairs in answering any question put by any member with regard to the expenditure of public funds, in salaries or otherwise. I took the trouble to write the civil service commission in order to obtain further information. My letter was written yesterday afternoon, immediately after I saw the item in the *Citizen*. The reply is as follows:

Civil Service Commission
Office of the Secretary

File No. FT-MS-3206

Ottawa, February 27, 1942.

Dear Mr. Pouliot,

Replying to your inquiry of the 26th instant, I beg to advise you that the civil service commission has been notified by the comptroller of the treasury that Mr. Albert Edward Bradfield reported for duty on January 8, 1942, in the capacity of departmental accountant, grade 3, munitions and supply cost accounting office at Ottawa, at a salary of $2,700 per annum.

The duties of the position are set out in the requisition: "To investigate costs in connection with contracts for the Department of Munitions and Supply."

The civil service commission has not issued a certificate for Mr. Bradfield's employment.

Yours very truly,

E. Saunders,
Secretary.

I want you, sir, to understand my point, as I am sure you do. Technically perhaps the man was not in the Department of Munitions and Supply, but he was there in person, just the same as the accountant of the House of Commons is in this building, though he comes under the Minister of Finance. Therefore, sir, summarizing all that I have said, I do not speak very often—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. POULIOT: —if hon. members think I do speak often, at least my remarks are very brief, but I try to do my work just as conscientiously as I can, and I am not a conscientious objector. I want exact answers, and I do not want any more misleading answers of this kind from any minister of the crown.

Hon. C. D. HOWE (Minister of Munitions and Supply): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) asked his question when the orders of the day were called at the last sitting of the house. This is the first opportunity I have had to answer his question. An answer has been prepared, and I shall now read it.

Whilst A. E. Bradfield is not now and never has been an employee of the Department of Munitions and Supply, he was employed in January of 1942 by the Department of Finance, treasury branch, and is now working under Mr. F. E. Wood in the accounting section of that department.

This is the first opportunity I have had to give this answer. I think it answers everything my hon. friend mentioned in his speech. I do not know the purpose of the speech, but I wish to say that I try to treat hon. members as courteously as I can, and to give them the information asked for as quickly as possible.

Mr. POULIOT: My information was more complete than the minister's.

PLEBISCITE ACT

CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State) presented the first report of the special committee appointed to consider Bill No. 10,

respecting the taking of a plebiscite in every electoral district in Canada and the taking of the votes of such plebiscite of Canadian service voters stationed within and without Canada, and moved that the report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

CHILE, BRAZIL, AND THE ARGENTINE—MOTIONS FOR APPROVAL

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

That it is expedient that the Senate and House of Commons do approve the trade agreement between Canada and Chile signed September 10, 1941, and that this house do approve the same.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it will be observed that standing in my name as Secretary of State for External Affairs there are three resolutions similar in terms appearing under government notices of motion to-day. They relate to three countries, namely, Chile, Brazil and the Argentine. The agreements are between those three countries and Canada.

If the house will give its consent, it might be understood that the discussion on all three resolutions could take place at one and the same time. I do not believe that would confuse matters in any particular; on the contrary in my opinion it would, if anything, clarify them. If necessary I shall ask permission to introduce a special resolution for the purpose, but if it were now understood that consent had been given for discussion of the three resolutions at one and the same time I would waive that formality.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the request is a reasonable one, to which I believe the house might properly consent. At the moment I see no objection to the procedure suggested. I should like to see a fairly general discussion, because these resolutions involve an important question, despite the fact that the trade in actual dollars and cents may not be relatively large. We are about to consider an important problem, especially in its relation to the post-war period, and, I hope that hon. members will take part in the discussions. It is my intention to speak briefly myself, after hearing the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I am prepared personally to give consent to the Prime Minister's suggestion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I thank the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) and other leaders of groups in the house for giving consent to the discussion taking place as indicated.

The other two resolutions are similar in form to the one with reference to Chile. They are as follows:

Resolved that it is expedient that the Senate and House of Commons do approve the trade agreement between Canada and Brazil signed October 17, 1941, and that this house do approve the same.

Resolved that it is expedient that the Senate and House of Commons do approve the trade agreement between Canada and the Argentine Republic signed October 2, 1941, and that this house do approve the same.

The first agreement, namely the one between Canada and Chile, was signed in Chile on September 10, 1941, and has been provisionally in force since October 15, 1941. The trade agreement between Canada and the Argentine Republic was signed at Buenos Aires on October 2, 1941, and has been provisionally in force since November 15 of that year. The trade agreement between Canada and Brazil was signed at Rio de Janiero on October 17, 1941, and has been in force provisionally since October 17, 1941.

The three agreements were tabled in the house at the close of the last session, and the agreements themselves appear in printed form in the *Votes and Proceedings* of the house for November 3, 1941. It was thought that the latter part of the last session would not be a convenient time to discuss these measures, and for that reason they were left for the approval of parliament until the present time.

Except for the purpose of enabling me to explain the formalities of procedure, it might have been preferable to have the resolutions stand in the name of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, because he is the one who was responsible for their negotiation, and the member of the administration who will explain their terms to the house. However, as the Department of External Affairs is specially charged with matters respecting treaties and agreements, and as it is in that department, that formalities of signing, ratification and the like have to be arranged and completed, it seemed appropriate that I should be the one to present the resolutions.

While the trade agreements have been in force provisionally since the dates I have mentioned, the continuance of their operation requires the approval of both houses of parliament by joint resolution, and subsequent ratification by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. That is the position so far as Canada is concerned. The same would apply in corresponding manner to the administrations in the other countries concerned.

The first question which I know will arise in the minds of some hon. members is as to how it has come about that an agreement

has been signed, and is even provisionally in operation, without parliament having had an opportunity of passing upon it in the first instance. That question invariably arises in respect to agreements and treaties that have been entered into before being presented to parliament. The explanation, of course, is that the making of treaties and agreements are executive acts. In the making of treaties and agreements the government must take into account its responsibility to parliament. It must realize that if it is not in a position to obtain the approval of parliament, then it would incur defeat and the penalty of retirement from office.

It would be impossible for public assemblies to discuss agreements between different nations before they were actually signed. Hon. members will appreciate the many questions which develop in connection with the negotiation of any agreement. Negotiations of necessity are carried on among persons appointed for that purpose. This present stage of proceedings therefore is one wherein we seek to receive the approval of the house and, later, that of the other house, to the three trade agreements as negotiated.

The agreements themselves are all of the nature of agreements affording most-favoured-nation reciprocal treatment between the countries which have entered into them. They are similar to other agreements of the most-favoured-nation type which have been entered into in recent years. Four such agreements have been signed recently. One between Canada and Uruguay was approved in the session of 1937. One between Canada and Guatemala was approved in the session of 1938. One with Haiti received approval in the 1938 session, and an agreement with the Dominican republic was approved in the session of 1940. I believe in the case of the first three agreements mentioned this House of Commons proceeded by way of bills. However, with respect to the Dominican republic agreement, the procedure was simply by way of resolution approving the agreement. The reason that no bill is required is that no statute is being amended in any way. All the agreement does is to give most-favoured-nation treatment by one country on its part to the other, and to ensure that the most-favoured attitude will be reciprocated by the other country. If the agreement did in any way change a statute, of course it would be necessary to proceed by way of a bill. However, in the form in which these agreements are, and having regard to their contents, approval by resolution is all that is necessary.

I had one particular object in mind in taking upon myself the introduction of the

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

resolutions. It was that I felt that I should like in the name of the government of Canada to express our thanks for their many courtesies to the governments of the several countries in South and Central America which were visited in the fall of last year by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the trade mission of which he was the head. Hon. members will recall that among the countries which received my hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and his mission, were Ecuador, Peru, Chile, the Argentine, Uruguay and Brazil. In each of these countries the minister and the members of his party were extended exceptional hospitality and received the utmost in the way of cooperation in the furtherance of the object of the mission itself.

In the case of the three republics with which agreements with Canada have been entered into, a definite step forward has been taken in securing the advantages of improved trade relations. At this time of war the actual value in terms of trade may not be considerable, in fact may amount to very little, but there is great value in the fact that the treaties themselves serve to express friendship and goodwill between these particular republics in another part of the western hemisphere and the Dominion of Canada. I have received word from our ministers in the Argentine and Brazil since the establishment of our legations in South America that the trade mission which visited those countries has been greatly appreciated by the citizens. They felt that the mission itself had done a great deal to make Canada and its resources better known, had brought our country more to the fore than it had been at any time in the past. I might add that I have been told the same thing by the Hon. Doctor Pablo Santos Munoz, minister of the Argentine republic and the Hon. J. A. Lins de Barros, minister for Brazil, whom we are pleased to have at Ottawa as the representatives of these countries.

Hon. members will have noticed that the name of the Argentine republic has come before us recently in connection with the protection which is being given Canada's interest in Japan at the present time by that country. I mention this as indicative of the closer relations and cooperation which our country in the last year has come to enjoy with South America.

To-day, when conditions have become so much more serious in all parts of the world and where North and South America have been drawn together to a degree that has never obtained heretofore, it is particularly fortunate that we should have established diplomatic relations with these countries

through the legations which they have opened in Ottawa and which we have opened in Brazil, the Argentine and Chile. It is also fortunate that we should have established with these countries at this time of war the foundations for closer trade relations in the post-war era. When the war is over the way will already have been paved for the immediate development of trade on as large a scale as may be possible. This service will be due in no small measure to the trade mission which my hon. friend, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, headed last fall. The house will, I feel sure, permit me to extend to him the congratulations of its members upon the success of the mission and his leadership of it. If I am not going too far, and from the response apparently I am not, I should also like to extend these congratulations to him on behalf of the government.

The leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) has suggested that if the Minister of Trade and Commerce were at this moment to make his statement, which I have no doubt will be complete, it would lay the foundation for a further discussion of the matter.

Mr. GREEN: May I ask the Prime Minister what is the situation with regard to the other countries which were visited but with which apparently no treaties have been made?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am going to leave that to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): At some stage would it not be desirable if the house could go into committee so that hon. members might ask questions? I would not suggest that that be done at this stage, because the minister ought to have a chance to make his statement uninterrupted by questions. But it may be desirable at some stage after those who wish to do so have made extended remarks—I hope they will not be too extended—to have the house go into committee so that there may be opportunity for questions and answers.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As my hon. friend is aware, it is not necessary for the house to go into committee of the whole to discuss the resolution, but the house may so decide of its own accord. If it is thought to be opportune, after the minister and other hon. members have spoken in a formal manner, to have discussion in committee of the whole, I am sure that consent will immediately be given for that purpose.

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): In officially submitting my report on the first government-sponsored Canadian trade mission to South America, I desire not only to give to the house the actual accomplishments of the mission but to be permitted to go beyond this, and touch briefly on our visit to each country, how and by whom we were received, something of our reception, and a few highlights regarding each country visited. I should like to have gone into these matters more fully than my time will allow, because I am sure that it is tremendously important that Canada discovers South America and learns about the great countries there and the developments that are there taking place.

The success of our trade mission was unique inasmuch as we accomplished our objective in each country visited. The timing of the visit was fortunate, and for this good judgment the credit goes entirely to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King).

A word about the personnel of our party. Outstanding, of course, was the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. L. D. Wilgress, whose reputation for fairness, sincerity and practical knowledge had preceded us. Of Mr. Wilgress I cannot speak too highly. Mr. Yves Lamontagne, Director of Commercial Relations in my department, was of great strength to the mission, and his inclusion in it, with his bilingualism, made a definite appeal wherever we went. Mr. Escott Reid, of the Department of External Affairs, not only ably represented that department in familiarizing himself with conditions in the various countries visited, but by his tact and courtesy made a definite contribution. The very important and exacting work of secretary of the mission was most capably handled by Mr. A. C. L. Adams.

The objective of the mission was not immediate results, although we hoped to get and are getting these, but rather the laying of the best possible foundations upon which after-the-war trade can be effectively built. It is well known that we could be shipping huge South American requirements now were it not that, most properly of course, the munitions and supplies requirements of our war programme take first place. The matter of shipping also mitigates against our exports to and our imports from South American countries at this time.

The Canadian trade mission which left Ottawa on August 14 last and returned on October 28 was a resumption of the mission commenced in November, 1940, and abandoned because of my illness. Countries visited included Ecuador, Peru, Chile, Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil, all south of the equator.

A short stop was made at Port of Spain, Trinidad, on the return trip following an invitation to the mission from the governor of Trinidad to visit that colony for the purpose of discussing matters pertaining to trade between Canada and several of the West Indian colonies.

The mission's visit had several aims. The general objective was exploratory. We desired to investigate opportunties for the development of reciprocal trade between Canada and the countries visited and, when and where possible, remove obstacles which hindered progress in commercial relations. Powers were conferred upon me by the governor in council enabling me to conclude most-favoured-nation trade agreements, thereby removing or preventing discrimination against Canadian products in respect to tariff matters and exchange control.

An important aspect of the visit was the furtherance of goodwill. The mission found during its tour that in all the countries visited there was the highest regard for Canada and a general desire to strengthen trade relations.

The mission was received with the utmost courtesy on its arrival in each country. We were accorded the greatest hospitality and every possible facility was extended to us.

In each country visited the press devoted very considerable space to the activities of the mission and stressed the character and importance of the visit.

We first visited the countries on the Pacific coast, Ecuador, Peru and Chile, in the order given.

Up to the time of our visit Canada possessed no trade agreements with these countries. A feature of Canada's trade common to all three countries is the fact that over the last decade their balance of trade has been favourable to Canada. The favourable balance for 1940 with the three countries was $2,181,000, and for 1941, $654,000.

Compared with Canada's trade with the world, our trade with the countries on the western coast of South America is small, but the figures assume greater significance to them because their export and import trade is on a considerably smaller scale than ours.

Trade is an exchange of goods, a two-way process, and if we are to continue to sell our products abroad we must be ready to reciprocate. To the extent at least that we can increase our purchases from all the Latin-American countries we shall make it possible for them to increase their purchases from Canada.

[Mr. J. A. MacKinnon.]

It is interesting to note that while the balance of trade between Canada and Argentina and Brazil was favourable to Canada in 1938, it became favourable to these two countries in 1940. The volume of trade in both directions has in fact expanded, which is a satisfactory development. In 1941 Brazil increased its favourable balance but the balance became favourable to Canada in regard to Argentina.

With respect to Uruguay, we find that taking 1939 and 1940 together, our exports and imports from that country are about balanced, whereas in years prior to 1939 the balance of trade has been in Canada's favour. In 1941 the balance was again substantially favourable to this country.

The six countries of South America visited by the mission are inhabited by 75 million people. Brazil has about 45 million inhabitants, Argentina about 13 million, and Chile a population of 5 million. The total population of this group of countries, therefore, is 63 millions or approximately 84 per cent of the total population of the six countries visited.

The total imports of these six countries amounted to an aggregate value of $956,800,000 in United States dollars in 1938, Argentina, Brazil and Chile together accounting for 88 per cent of this total (United States, $838,500,000). This gives an idea of the purchasing power available in these three countries alone.

The aggregate exports of these six countries were approximately $1,020,000,000 in United States dollars in 1938, the share of Argentina, Brazil and Chile being 86 per cent of this total (United States, $872,400,000).

In 1938 Canada's exports to the six countries totalled $9,961,000 (in each case United States dollars), of which $8,801,000 or 87 per cent were consigned to Argentina, Brazil and Chile. In 1940 our total exports to the six countries amounted to $14,874,000, of which Canadian exports to Argentina were $6,107,000; to Brazil $5,063,000 and to Chile $1,436,000 or 85 per cent of the total. In 1941 the total was $20,092,000—$7,172,000 to Argentina; $8,097,000 to Brazil and $1,788,000 to Chile, these three countries again taking 85 per cent of the total.

Canada's total imports from the six countries in 1940 amounted to $14,129,000 ($12,960,000 or 92 per cent from Argentina, Brazil and Chile), and in 1941 the total was $28,134,000 of which 87 per cent came from these three countries.

As a matter of reference I would like to put these figures on *Hansard* in tabular form, if I may have the consent of the house so to do.

Population and Trade of Six Countries Visited

	Population (estimated)	Imports 1938 U.S. $	Exports 1938 U.S. $
Argentina	13,000,000	442,600,000	437,600,000
Brazil	45,000,000	292,700,000	296,100,000
Chile	5,000,000	103,200,000	138,700,000
Ecuador	2,800,000	10,300,000	11,700,000
Uruguay	2,200,000	48,600,000	58,900,000
Peru	7,000,000	59,400,000	77,200,000
Total (A)	75,000,000	956,800,000	1,020,200,000
First 3 countries	63,000,000	838,500,000	872,400,000
P.C. of total (A)	84 per cent	88 per cent	86 per cent

Trade of Canada with the Six Countries Visited—1938

Canadian Dollars

	Canadian exports to:	Imports from:	Balance of trade
Argentina	4,675,000	2,149,000	+ 2,526,000
Brazil	3,522,000	769,000	+ 2,753,000
Chile	604,000	179,000	+ 425,000
Ecuador	52,000	28,000	+ 24,000
Uruguay	216,000	137,000	+ 79,000
Peru	892,000	3,005,000	— 2,113,000
Total (B)	9,961,000	6,267,000	+ 3,704,000
First 3 countries	8,801,000 (87%)	3,097,000 (50%)	+ 5,704,000
	1940		
Argentina	6,107,000	6,542,000	— 435,000
Brazil	5,063,000	6,243,000	— 1,180,000
Chile	1,436,000	175,000	+ 2,261,000
Ecuador	131,000	26,000	+ 105,000
Uruguay	610,000	431,000	+ 179,000
Peru	1,527,000	712,000	+ 815,000
Total (C)	14,874,000	14,129,000	+ 745,000
First 3 countries	12,606,000	12,960,000	— 354,000
P.C. of total (C)	85 per cent	92 per cent	
	1941		
Argentina	7,172,000	4,764,000	+ 2,408,000
Brazil	8,097,000	19,444,000	— 11,347,000
Chile	1,788,000	233,000	+ 1,555,000
Ecuador	162,000	170,000	— 8,000
Uruguay	931,000	688,000	+ 243,000
Peru	1,942,000	2,833,000	— 891,000
Total (D)	20,092,000	28,134,000	— 8,042,000
First 3 countries	17,057,000	24,443,000	— 7,386,000
P.C. of total (D)	85 per cent	87 per cent	

It is only necessary that the three agreements negotiated with the countries of Chile, Argentina and Brazil be ratified by this house. The arrangement made with Ecuador was what is known as a *modus vivendi* and is a temporary agreement pending formal treaty. I wish, however, to give this house information in regard to our visit to Ecuador, Peru and Uruguay in addition to particulars of the three countries with which formal trade agreements were completed.

Having given a summary of the trade position with the South American countries which we visited, I intend now to deal particularly with the situation in each country. En route to Ecuador, sailing from New York

and on through the Panama canal, we touched at the Colombian port of Bonaventura but our first formal call was at Guayaquil, the main port of Ecuador. So as to enable us to see something of the country we travelled by rail and motor car from Guayaquil sea level to Quito, the capital, which is at an altitude of some 10,500 feet.

The trip was exceedingly interesting—plantations of pineapples, bananas, coffee and cocoa—and on the higher uplands at altitudes of eight and eleven thousand feet, grain and vegetables.

In our Rockies at this elevation there is of course perpetual ice and snow, but we were almost on the equator and in the territory of the great Inca empire of pre-Columbus days. Thousands and thousands of Indians in their colourful costumes tended the crops of, in many cases, the absentee landlords. Quito for the tourist with its ancient civilization is most interesting. Churches and other buildings erected shortly after Columbus' discovery are still giving service.

The morning after our arrival we paid our official call on the president and met the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Doctor Julio Tobar Conoso, and the Ministers of Agriculture and Finance, with their officials. Arrangements were made for us to have immediate conversations in regard to a possible trade treaty.

Because Ecuador's balance of trade with Canada was unfavourable to Ecuador, that country had imposed, in 1936, a surtax of 50 per cent on imports from Canada. This had the effect of immediately reducing the value of Canada's exports to Ecuador by one-half, and we were anxious to rectify this position.

The itinerary allowed the mission but one day in Quito, the capital, but negotiations resulted in an arrangement being made under an exchange of notes which not only removed the existing surtax, but, by placing the trade between Canada and Ecuador on the basis of most-favoured-nation treatment, extended to Canada the benefit of reductions of duties on Ecuador's minimum tariff which had been granted to the United States, under a trade agreement signed in 1938 and which affected thirty-three tariff items, the most important of which was flour.

Ecuador imports about 250,000 barrels of flour annually. In 1936, Canadian flour exports to Ecuador amounted to 18,452 barrels valued at $98,723, and since that year, because of the surtax, there have been no exports of Canadian flour to Ecuador up to October, 1941. In November and December, immediately after our visit, over one thousand barrels of flour have been exported to Ecuador. Our flour trade is in this way now being reestablished.

In 1940 Canada exported to Ecuador goods valued at $130,721 while our imports from Ecuador amounted to $25,676 only.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Relatively very small.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): Relatively very small, yes. That was in 1940.

In 1941 Canadian exports were $162,147 and imports $169,713.

Canada's main exports to Ecuador, at the present time, are newsprint, paper bags, farm implements, calcium carbide and sodium compounds. Other exports which stand to benefit as a result of the *modus vivendi* include patent leather, wallpaper and electrical apparatus.

The chief products imported into Canada from Ecuador are petroleum, cocoa beans, crude rubber, coffee, bananas and hard woods.

As will be readily understood from the way in which the exchange of notes was facilitated, we found a most friendly attitude on the part of all.

In the evening we met a great many of the business men of Quito at a reception given by the British minister, Mr. G. H. Bulock.

We flew from Quito to Lima, Peru, 1100 miles and had a most interesting view of the coastal district. An interesting pause in our flight was at Talara, Peru, the headquarters of the great International Petroleum development. Canadians, who gathered at the airport to meet us, regretted our inability to stay over and see this great Canadian development.

May I digress here, Mr. Speaker, to mention the ambassadors of Canada we have in our representatives in South America of Canadian enterprise. I refer among others, to our banks, our life insurance companies, our oil companies and Brazilian Traction.

The district of heavy tropical rains ended shortly after leaving Guayaquil, and from that point to Lima the country is barren and cultivation is only possible in comparatively small areas in the valleys, by irrigation. In Lima we found the Minister of Finance and Commerce, Mr. David Dasso, particularly friendly and cooperative. Mr. Dasso, when called to government service by the President of Peru, had for six or eight years been an active vice-president of the American Locomotive Works Incorporated, New York. Discussions had been arranged with us and for us with a permanent commission of very high standing known as the Foreign Political Economic Commission, which deals with matters pertaining to the commercial and economic life of Peru. This commission included Dr. Tudela as president, a former

ambassador in the diplomatic service; Mr. Benjamin Roca, director of the Guano Administrative Company and recognized as one of the outstanding economic advisors in South America; Mr. de Althaus, president of the Central Reserve bank, and Messrs. Miranda, president of the National Agricultural Society, and Alayza Roel, president of the Unemployment Funds Commission.

As Peru was at that time engaged in trade negotiations with another country, they thought it inadvisable to conclude a formal treaty with Canada until finality had been reached in their other negotiations.

Before the mission left Peru, however, notes were exchanged between the mission and the Peruvian Economic Commission expressing the desirability and definite intention of the two countries to conclude an agreement on a most-favoured-nation basis at the earliest possible opportunity. I have just had, informally, personal word from the Peruvian government, through their foreign minister, Mr. Dasso, that it is anticipated that their trade negotiations to which I have referred will likely be completed within a few days and that correspondence looking to a formal ratification of the understanding between our countries will then be undertaken.

Canada's exports to Peru have increased considerably since the pre-war year of 1938, when they amounted to $892,089. In 1940 they totalled $1,527,210, an increase of 70 per cent, and in 1941 our exports increased to $1,941,909.

In 1938 Canada's imports from Peru amounted to $3,004,743, and Canada had an adverse balance of trade with Peru of about $2,113,000. In 1939 the position was reversed; our imports from Peru dropped to $601,224 due to decreased shipments of Peruvian petroleum to Canada, while Canadian exports rose to $1,244,776, leaving a balance, favourable to Canada, of about $643,000. In 1940 the further rise in Canadian exports to Peru to $1,527,210 was also accompanied by a rise in our favourable balance with that country to $815,000. In 1941 the situation was reversed and the balance of trade was adverse to Canada by $891,000.

I might add that the entertainment arranged for us while at Lima included an official dinner by the president of the republic, Doctor Manuel Prado, at the palace. We had a most interesting trip on the Central Railway, which serves the great copper mining area to the east of Lima. We were given the opportunity to see something of the agricultural activities through a week-end visit to the hacienda of a Mr. Beltran, a very prominent resident of Lima. Other social activities included luncheons by finance minister Dasso and the British Chamber of Commerce; a reception by the British Commonwealth society; a dinner by the local manager of the Royal Bank of Canada and a luncheon by H. M. Minister, Mr. V. Courtenay Forbes.

I mention this entertainment here and in connection with all the other countries visited to show the warmth of the welcome extended to us as Canadians—not personally but as representatives of a country that has to them suddenly assumed great importance. We found a very definite interest in our country and a great new-found respect for us arising out of the seeping into South America of reports of what Canada was planning and accomplishing in its great war effort. They, in general, had known of us vaguely as a country lying between the United States and the North Pole, but now they are seeing us as a great new country, destined to take an even more important part in world trade.

May I just mention here, Mr. Speaker, what an eye-opener and what a liberal education our South America tour was to me and to my colleagues of the trade mission. When opportunity offers and circumstances make it possible, I hope Canadians will turn southward and learn about these great developing countries of South America and their great peoples.

From Lima we proceeded to Santiago, Chile, again travelling by air a distance of roughly fifteen hundred miles. Apart from the views of the Andes which rose to great heights above the clouds, it was not possible to see much of the country as we were flying at a height of about 12,000 feet, well above a blanket of clouds.

When we arrived at Santiago on September 3 it was their springtime and the district in the vicinity of Santiago was very attractive with the fruit trees in blossom, beautiful stretches of green country-side, and the snow-capped Andes in the near distance. Our welcome was most cordial.

We paid our official call on the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Commerce, H. E. don Juan Rosetti, the day after our arrival and again we found that arrangements had been made for the immediate commencement of trade discussions.

Previous to our visit Canada had no direct trade treaty with Chile.

In 1931 Chile and the United Kingdom concluded a trade arrangement on the basis of most-favoured-nation treatment, and in the past certain countries had been granted special concessions by Chile in trade agreements but these advantages had not been extended to Canada.

Negotiations between Canada and Chile had been undertaken early in 1936 on the basis of most-favoured-nation treatment but little progress was made, one of the main reasons being that the balance of trade between the two countries was unfavourable to Chile. Another problem was the granting of foreign exchange by Chile for the purchasing of Canadian goods. Chile, however, was anxious to obtain the advantages of the Canadian intermediate tariff as regards one of its most important exports—nitrates.

A trade agreement between Canada and Chile was signed at Santiago on September 10, 1941. Subsequently an order in council passed in Ottawa on October 1 extended most-favoured-nation treatment to imports into Canada from Chile provisionally as from October 15, 1941, and a decree No. 3,428 dated October 17, published in the *Chilian Official Journal* of November 4, 1941, provided for unconditional and unlimited most-favoured-nation treatment for Canadian goods entering Chile.

Based upon mutual concession of most-favoured-nation treatment in matters pertaining to tariffs, import quotas and foreign exchange control, the treaty provides:

(a) For the extension to Chile of the benefits granted under Canada's intermediate tariff as regards imports into Canada from that country. In return, Canadian goods exported to Chile enjoy the rates of duty under the minimum tariff.

(b) On the basis of most-favoured-nation treatment, Canada enjoys the benefits of any reductions which may be granted to other countries by Chile, and, conversely, Chile is granted any reductions under the intermediate tariff which Canada may grant as a result of tariff negotiations with other countries or otherwise.

(c) The tariff advantages which Canada may grant to imports from empire countries are excluded under the provisions of the agreements, as well as the treatment which Chile may reserve to imports from contiguous countries.

Where governments have established monopolies which affect the production, sale or importation of certain products, provision is made for fair and non-discriminatory treatment by the respective signatories of the trade agreement.

The agreement also provides against discrimination with respect to internal taxes and charges on imports.

Provision is made for consultation between Canada and Chile on the various matters covered by the agreement so that mutually satisfactory adjustments may be effected when measures are taken which may impair any of the objects of the agreement.

Exemption from the provisions of the agreement is made with respect to measures relating to public security, the enforcement of police or revenue laws and regulations, and the measures affecting imports and exports of gold and silver, and of war materials.

Special advantages granted to adjacent countries in order to facilitate frontier traffic and any advantages accorded to a third country resulting from a customs union are also exempted from the provisions of the agreement.

The agreement is for a period of two years.

I am outlining the agreement with Chile in detail as the agreements signed with Argentina and Brazil are practically identical, except that in the agreement with Argentina the special situation existing between that country and Peru as regards matters pertaining to foreign exchange is recognized. This agreement also recognizes the situation which exists as regards the conditions which govern trade between Argentina and the United Kingdom at the present time, although this matter is not referred to in the text of the agreement.

In brief Canada and Chile extend to each other most-favoured-nation treatment as regards tariff and all matters relating to control of foreign exchange and imports, with certain derogations relating to advantages granted by Canada to the British empire on the one hand and, on the other, by Chile to its contiguous countries.

The agreement also provides that products of Canada and Chile imported into the other country are not to be subject, with certain specified exceptions, to internal taxes, fees, charges or exactions higher than those payable on like articles of national origin or any other foreign origin.

Provision is also made that nitrate of soda and iodine, two important natural products of Chile, shall not be subject on importation into Canada to any form of quantitative control of imports less favourable, nor to duties or charges higher than, like products, natural or synthetic, originating in any other foreign country.

The trade agreement provides that it is to come into force thirty days after exchange of ratifications and provides that it is to remain in force for two years. It is to be renewed automatically thereafter for further periods of one year, subject to termination by either party on six months' notice. Pending the definite coming into force of the agreement it was put into force provisionally by both governments for a period of one year as from October 15, 1941.

Advantages to Canada. By assuring reciprocal most-favoured-nation treatment in respect to tariffs and exchange control, the trade agreement signed between Canada and Chile guarantees Canadian exports against discrimination in the event that Chile should conclude agreements with other countries providing for reductions below Chile's minimum tariff.

There are in force in Chile some conventional rates of duty, lower than the normal tariff, which will be accorded to imports from Canada under the agreement. These arise mainly from a trade agreement between Chile and France signed January 16, 1936. Among the products to which these reduced duties apply are preserved meats and vegetables, certain cotton yarn and cloth, medicinal preparations, gloves and certain other leather manufactures, wool and silk clothing, certain chemicals, structural iron and steel, toilet preparations, wallpaper and some other paper manufactures.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In the course of his statement has the minister taken occasion to give information with respect to the Chilean tariffs? It will be interesting to know. I have no means of access to them at the moment and I should like to know whether they are high or low, or what they are, generally speaking.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): They vary according to the commodity.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I would assume that.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): They vary very definitely according to the commodity, on account of the foreign exchange situation at the present time. I have not gone into that aspect definitely, but if and when we are able to discuss this matter, in committee or on my estimates, I shall be glad to give the leader of the opposition that information.

Advantages to Chile. The trade agreement assures Chile of the benefits accruing from Canada's intermediate tariff and removes the 3 per cent special excise tax on the duty paid value of imports when such imports are dutiable under Canada's general tariff, Canada's imports from Chile have consisted mostly of sodium nitrate, manila fibre, field seed and fresh onions, manganese oxide and undressed furs.

In 1940 Canada's total imports from Chile amounted to $174,688 and in 1941 $233,471, as against $226,158 in 1939. The main feature of Canada's trade with Chile is that we have had a favourable balance of trade with that country for many years. In 1933 that favourable balance amounted to $222,000. In 1939 it amounted to over $730,000; in 1940 to over $1,261,000 and in 1941 it rose to $1,554,955.

The total trade between Canada and Chile, as shown in Canadian trade statistics, has increased yearly from about $234,000 in 1933, at the end of the depression, to about $1,611,000. In both these years and in the intervening period, the balance of trade has been considerably in Canada's favour, as the following table shows:

Calendar year	Total exports to Chile	Total imports from Chile	Balance of trade
1933.....	227,922	5,877	222,045
1934.....	538,015	26,283	511,732
1935.....	856,348	53,953	802,395
1936.....	893,598	97,314	796,284
1937.....	928,176	67,744	860,432
1938.....	604,373	178,522	425,751
1939.....	956,592	226,158	730,434
1940.....	1,436,333	174,688	1,261,645
1941.....	1,788,426	233,471	1,554,955

The policy of the government is, during the war, not to make public details of Canada's foreign trade in respect to the value of specific commodities exported or imported. However, Canada's exports to Chile in 1940 rose to well over twice our exports in 1938 and almost seven times our exports in 1933. Our exports to Chile in 1941 exceeded the figures for 1940 by over $350,000.

The principal commodities which Canada exports to Chile are: Newsprint, rubber tires, farm implements, asbestos, rubber, boots and shoes, electric apparatus, iron pipes and fittings, rubber belting, wood pulp, soda and sodium compounds. Sawn lumber has recently been added to this list. Among the minor items are herrings, dry-salted; whiskey; canvas shoes with rubber soles; artificial silk manufactures; veneers and plywood; wallpaper; needles; hardware; storage batteries; telephone and telegraph apparatus; medicinal preparations and brushes.

I have mentioned rubber tires and rubber belting. These were taken from the trade figures of recent years, but of course shipments of these commodities, which are required so badly at home, now are being held in Canada.

We have instituted an intensive study of what additional purchases can be made from Chile, for an unbalanced trade can not be continued with satisfactory results indefinitely. With European wine supplies cut off indefinitely there might be a market in Canada for the excellent Chilean wines which are held in high favour wherever used.

Our very warm reception and the great hospitality extended to our mission was evidence of the interest in Canada at this time. The late president of Chile, although in failing

health at the time, officially and informally received us. The foreign minister, Mr. Rosetti, gave a large luncheon in our honour following the conclusion of treaty discussions. Among others who entertained us at dinner, luncheon or reception were the Chilean chamber of commerce, the British chamber of commerce, the British embassy, the Central Bank of Chile, the British Legion and the Free French organization.

We broke our stay at Santiago to spend two days at Vina del Mar and at Valparaiso, the main port of Chile, where many old established British firms are operating.

We chose what is known as the lake route to go from Santiago to Buenos Aires, going by rail some 550 miles south from Santiago, then by steamer and bus across a chain of lakes connected by short stretches of road to Bariloche and from there by rail to Buenos Aires.

This gave us an opportunity to see something of the Chilean farming districts in the central south which very closely resemble the central Alberta country. The lake region itself is most attractive and reminded us of our own mountain lakes—Louise, Emerald and Maligne, but in Chile and the Argentine these lakes are bordered with cultivation and these lakes, small and large, form part of a transportation route—with splendid boats and connecting bus lines. This, apart from flying, is at the moment the most dependable route over the Andes.

As we crossed the border from Chile to Argentina an officer in charge of a detachment of troops presented the compliments of the Argentine government and at Puerto Blest where we took the boat for Bariloche we met the Argentine minister of war and senior officers of the army on their way to Santiago to participate in celebrations marking the 125th aniversary of Chilean independence. The minister of war brought greetings to us from the president and his colleagues of the Argentine government. We found too that the foreign office had sent a special representative, Doctor Alexander Marshall, to look after us on the thousand mile trip from Bariloche to Buenos Aires. I mention these things to show how the Argentine government extended to us every courtesy—and I mention this to point a moral and to draw attention to this example for Canadian guidance.

The mid-southern part of Argentina through which we travelled from Bariloche is a fairly dry level plain given over partially to sheep raising but after about 18 hours' run we entered the beautiful pampas country and for the full morning before we arrived in Buenos Aires we saw great stretches of the finest cattle country which reminded me of the plains area in the southwestern part of my own province of Alberta.

The reception at Buenos Aires was warmth itself. A special railway car had been sent to bring us from Bariloche to Buenos Aires and on arrival we found at the station to meet us, members of the Argentine cabinet and senior government officials together with representatives of the various chambers of commerce, manufacturers' associations and other business organizations, and members of the British embassy. The station was bedecked with Canadian and Argentina flags and our cortege of cars was escorted to our hotel by motorcycle police. As a matter of fact two policemen were detailed to escort us everywhere we went throughout our stay in Buenos Aires and we were guests in every respect of the Argentine government. Trade negotiations commenced immediately and an agreement was reached and signed at Buenos Aires on October 2.

The trade agreement with Argentina is the first direct arrangement concluded between the two countries, and in many respects it is a most important agreement. It places our trade relations with Argentina on a secure basis.

Up till November 15 last, Canada's trade with Argentina had been regulated under the provisions of a treaty of amity, commerce and navigation signed by Argentina and Great Britain in 1825, or 42 years before confederation. This treaty placed trade between Argentina and the British empire on a reciprocal most-favoured-nation basis, but there had arisen doubts as to the rights which Canada enjoyed under the treaty. There was uncertainty, for instance, that Canada would be assured of the benefits of the reductions in rates of duty which Argentina was to grant the United States as a result of the trade negotiations which had just been carried on between Argentina and the United States. These were nearing conclusion when the Canadian trade mission arrived in Argentina. There were also uncertainties resulting from Argentina's foreign exchange control system.

As a result of the new trade agreement, the situation as regards foreign exchange control has been clarified. The agreement came into effect provisionally on November 15 and is to come definitely into force thirty days after the exchange of ratifications. It is to remain in force for a period of two years, and thereafter until termination by either government.

As Argentina was already enjoying the advantages of the intermediate tariff of Canada, it was not necessary to pass an order in council to implement the agreement.

The trade agreement contains an article (Article II) dealing with foreign exchange

control which recognizes the special situation whereby the trade between Argentina and the United Kingdom is regulated under a payments agreement.

Argentina agrees to grant Canada treatment not less favourable than it accords to other countries in matters pertaining to the rates and the allocation of foreign exchange which Argentina makes available for commercial transactions, excluding, however, the special advantages which Argentina extends to imports from countries contiguous to Argentina, and to Peru.

This means that Canada is assured of as favourable treatment in the granting of exchange as that which Argentina may accord to the United States and other countries not excepted under the provisions of Article II.

It may be added that the United States, under a treaty signed with Argentina on October 14 last, also made substantially the same reservations that are provided for under Canada's trade agreement with Argentina.

Under the new agreement, Canadian exporters are assured against discrimination during the life-time of the agreement.

Canada will also enjoy, under the most-favoured-nation clause, the benefits of certain reductions in duties granted by Argentina to the United States under a treaty between the two countries which was signed at Buenos Aires on October 14 and which was applied provisionally on November 15 last, which by coincidence, is also the date on which our agreement with Argentina also, provisionally, came into force.

The main commodities of interest to Canada and the percentage reductions from the existing net duties in Argentina's customs tariff are shown below:

Commodities	Reduction Per cent
Canned salmon and canned mackerel...	40
Apples (October 1 to January 31).....	50
Pears (October 1 to December 31).....	50
Sardines, canned, in tomato sauce, mustard or cottonseed oil.....	30
Asbestos linings.....	25
Containers for storage batteries.....	12·5
Insulating board.....	20

Canada's total trade with Argentina during 1932 and 1933, at the bottom of the world economic depression, averaged $4,096,000 yearly. In 1941 the value of the total trade between the two countries amounted to $11,935,856, imports from Argentina being $2,408,000 less than Canadian exports to that country. Statistics for the period 1932 to 1941 are shown in the following table:

	Canadian exports	Imports from Argentina
1932.....	$2,961,854	$ 992,323
1933.....	2,653,386	1,584,598
1934.....	4,248,609	3,082,522
1935.....	3,968,421	3,286,791
1936.....	3,426,051	10,787,360
1937.....	7,294,191	6,242,263
1938.....	4,675,489	2,149,160
1939.....	4,116,923	4,406,456
1940.....	6,107,215	6,541,862
1941.....	7,172,104	4,763,752

(Note.—Imports from Argentina reached a high level in 1936 because of large imports of maize.)

Canada's main exports to Argentina in recent years have been newsprint, farm implements, seed potatoes, electric apparatus. Other exports include apples, lumber, asbestos, calcium carbide, manufactures of iron and steel, wrapping paper, woodpulp, wallboards, fox skins, paints, dried cod and other fish products.

Canada's chief imports from Argentina are: Hides and skins, flax seed, maize, canned beef, quebracho (tanning extract), raw wool, horse hair, casein and gylcerine for refining.

Under the new trade agreement, Argentina is assured of continuation of most-favoured-nation treatment, whereby goods imported into Canada from Argentina are subject to the rates under Canada's intermediate tariff, and to the benefit of reductions which may be granted to other countries.

Buenos Aires is a great and beautiful city with a population of nearly 4 million people. It is fully modern in every respect with underground railway systems as well as very efficient bus and street railway transportation. There are magnificent boulevards, parks and squares, splendid modern business blocks, most attractive shopping districts reminding one of Oxford and Bond streets of old London with a number of the same establishments—great manufacturing plants—packing plants—race courses—great clubs and above all a great and most hospitable people.

I can give those of you who have not visited Buenos Aires an idea of the city and its people by briefly referring to some of the items on our official programme there.

There was dinner by the British ambassador, Sir Esmond Ovey, on the night of our arrival and a large reception at the embassy the following evening.

An official luncheon was given by the Argentina Minister of Agriculture at the magnificent Jockey Club, and another official luncheon by the foreign minister, Doctor Ruis Guinazu. There was dinner by Mr. E. C. Groening, manager of the Royal Bank of Canada.

Visit to La Martona. This is a ranch or Estancia in the Argentine language. It has been in one family for well over fifty years. On the ranch are 24,000 cows, and they are milking 12,000 daily and taking milk from 6,000 outside their property daily. They are marketing their produce in dozens of retail stores in the city.

The reception at the club, The Gimnasia. This is a great club under the presidency of Doctor Aldao. It represents a great life work of the doctor and has a membership of some twenty-two thousand. Supervised sports of all kinds are conducted, both at the downtown club headquarters and at their more extensive establishment in a suburban area.

Luncheon by the British Chamber of Commerce.

Dinner by the American ambassador, the Honourable Norman Armour, at their beautiful and pretentious embassy.

Attendance at the ballet at the Colon Opera House, guests of the President of Argentina. A German opera had been on the programme for that evening, but those in charge had, out of regard to what they thought our sensibilities might be, staged a special ballet dedicated to the Canadian mission.

Dinner by Doctor Leguizamon at the Circulo de Armas, a most beautiful and exclusive club. This was for Argentinians only. Doctor Leguizamon is the Argentine chairman of the Argentine British railroads and has a son in the Argentine Legation in this city.

We visited:

The Argentine Stock and Grain Exchange, where not only stocks but all bond transactions are handled. We were formally received here and trading stopped for the few minutes' ceremony.

Anglo (Vesty's) Packing Plant: daily capacity 5,000 cattle, 15,000 sheep and lambs, and 1,500 hogs per eight-hour day. The plant covers 65 acres and employs between seven and eight thousand people.

The Alpargatas Factory which we saw has been in one family, the Fraser family, since its commencement by this Scottish immigrant family about sixty or seventy years ago. The Alpargatas is a cheap shoe, widely used in South America by working people and agriculturalists. The daily production of the plant is—Alpargatas shoes 120,000 pair, rubber shoes 18,500 pair, welt shoes 2,000 pair, stitchdowns 4,000 pair, women's 2,000 pair.

At the great river port of Rosario, we were cordially entertained. Here we visited the Yerbe Matte factory. Yerbe Matte resembles green tea. This industry was taken in hand by the earliest Jesuit missionaries. They started the domestic cultivation of this plant.

We visited a large straw pulp mill. Paper is made from straw, but my interest greatly modified when I was told that the factory secures its straw without payment, from the farmers.

From Buenos Aires we journeyed to Montevideo, the capital of Uruguay, some 135 miles down the Rio de la Plata, on which Buenos Aires, Argentina, and Montevideo, Uruguay, are situated. Here again there was the same great hospitality. Among those welcoming us was Doctor Guani, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and an old friend of Right Hon. Senator Dandurand and of Commissioner Roy, Canada's former representative in France.

A commission had been appointed by the Uruguayan government by official proclamation to "maintain conversations" with us. This commission included very senior officials of the Department of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, and the Bank of the Republic. As I mentioned earlier, Canada had concluded a most-favoured-nation trade agreement with Uruguay in 1936. The provisions of this treaty, however, had not been fully implemented, as certain difficulties had arisen regarding the granting of foreign exchange for the payment of imports of Canadian goods into Uruguay.

The discussions, therefore, had as their objective the removal of the difficulties which existed. A very satisfactory understanding with the government of Uruguay was arrived at, which was embodied in a signed memorandum. The effect of this agreement should be reflected by an increase in our exports to Uruguay, our trade in seed-potatoes and agricultural implements standing to benefit most.

Uruguay is a most progressive republic and Montevideo a most beautiful city of over 800,000 people. Its people are very pro-democratic. We spent four days in all in Uruguay, returning to Buenos Aires before leaving for Brazil.

We landed in Brazil at Santos on October 6, the port for the tremendously rich Sao Paulo province, travelling the fifty miles from Santos to Sao Paulo city by a railway which carries trains up from the coast valley by a series of cables, some 2,500 feet in ten miles. The city of Sao Paulo is one of the most rapidly growing cities, I believe, of the western hemisphere. The city has a population of one million and a quarter and is fully modern and well planned. While at Sao Paulo we were entertained by the chamber of commerce and commodity exchange and every opportunity was given to us to learn of their coffee and cotton production. After

four days at Sao Paulo and vicinity we reached the beautiful city of Rio de Janeiro and were again most hospitably received by members of the cabinet and government and business officials. May I add here that while the Canadian trade mission was in Brazil we were at all times the guests of the government.

Sr. Aranha, Brazilian foreign minister, and Sr. Machado, the minister for labour, industry and commerce, met our early morning train and immediately arranged for trade negotiations which lasted throughout the ten days we were in Rio. A most-favoured-nation trade treaty was signed in that capital on October 17. The trade agreement was applied provisionally as from that date, as it extended the provisions whereby reciprocal most-favoured-nation treatment between the two countries had been ensured under an exchange of notes effective on June 12, 1937.

Whereas the previous arrangement was subject to termination at any time on thirty days' notice, the new agreement is effective for a period of two years and is continuing subject to cancellation by notice. Canadian exports to Brazil are thus assured against discrimination in respect to tariffs and exchange control.

The Brazilian tariff consists mainly of a minimum tariff and a general tariff under which the rates are approximately one-quarter higher than the minimum tariff. Some rates, lower than the minimum, granted to the United States under an agreement with Brazil in February, 1935, are also extended to imports from countries enjoying most-favoured-nation treatment.

Prior to the war, Brazil was second to Argentina among the Latin-American markets for Canadian products but an increase in Canada's exports to Brazil since 1938 made Brazil our most important Latin-American customer in 1941. Concurrently with an increase in Canadian exports to Brazil since the war began, there has been a substantial rise in Canadian imports from that country, mainly due to our purchases of Brazilian cotton.

Canada's total trade with Brazil since 1932 is shown in the following table:

	Total exports to Brazil	Total imports from Brazil	Balance of trade
	$	$	$
1932.....	1,136,043	754,227	381,816
1933.....	1,897,688	543,090	1,354,598
1934.....	2,606,702	806,548	1,800,154
1935.....	3,500,440	996,339	2,504,101
1936.....	3,627,931	874,613	2,753,318
1937.....	5,002,552	847,805	4,154,747
1938.....	3,521,766	768,915	2,752,851
1939.....	4,406,789	1,111,291	3,295,498
1940.....	5,062,829	6,243,344	— 1,180,515
1941.....	8,097,143	19,443,946	—11,346,803

44561—58

Canada's most important exports to Brazil in recent years have included sewing machines, newsprint, lead in pigs, wood pulp, dressed furs, asbestos, malt, manufactures of felt, upper leather, iron pipes and fittings, rubber tires, rubber belting, electrical apparatus, farm implements, machinery, apples and dried fish.

Among the items of lesser importance the following may be mentioned: Whiskey, rubber goods, textile products, wall-board, hardware, lamps and lanterns, abrasives, fertilizers, mineral pigments, paints and calcium carbide.

Brazil's main exports to Canada include cotton, cotton seed oil, coffee, rice, iron ore, castor oil, and cattle hides. Under the agreement, Brazil enjoys the benefits of the Canadian intermediate tariff and any reductions in rates which may be granted under the tariff to other countries.

We were honoured in Rio de Janeiro by being entertained at a luncheon by President Vargas. We were also guests of the minister of finance, Dr. de Souza Costa, at a luncheon at the jockey club; of Dr. Aranha, the foreign minister, at the beautiful Itamaraty palace, and at a reception by Dr. Machado in the very palatial offices of the ministry of labour and commerce.

The officials of Brazilian Traction both at Rio and at Sao Paulo arranged that we inspect their huge projects at these points, and at all times during our Brazilian stay the officers of these great Canadian developments did everything to make our visit interesting and profitable. Time does not permit of an extended account of the kindnesses and hospitality extended to the Canadian mission in this entrancingly beautiful and interesting city of Rio de Janeiro and at Therezopolis and Petropolis.

Canada's new minister to Brazil had arrived shortly before us and the result of this was that we participated in the great reception that Brazil extended to Mr. Desy. Brazil has welcomed Mr. Desy with open arms, and Canada is very happily represented in this great country larger in extent than the United States. Our minister to the Argentine and Chile, the Honourable Mr. Justice Turgeon, passed us on his way to these countries while we were leaving Brazil.

We flew on the last leg of our journey from Brazil to Trinidad, some 3,200 miles, stopping at Belem or Para, a large port at one of the mouths of the Amazon river, en route.

Discussions regarding our trade relations with Trinidad and other West Indian islands were informal but extremely valuable and we were able during our visit to meet a number of very influential men who have trading connections all through the West Indies and were able to iron out a lot of

difficulties and explain actions which had been a source of irritation to many of the importers in the West Indies.

The Latin-American countries are among the few markets which have remained open to us since the outbreak of the war in Europe over two years ago. They constitute markets which we did not cultivate sufficiently before the war.

It is necessary of course that our war effort must come first, that the supply of war materials which we require for our own needs and those of our allies must be assured before everything else. But there are a number of commodities which we can and should export, particularly when they bring back much-needed United States dollars as in the case of our exports to Latin America

Our trade statistics show that we can, and have been able to, increase Canadian exports to Latin America. In 1938 the value of our aggregate exports to the 20 Latin-American republics totalled $17,739,000. In 1940 these exports had risen to $26,190,000 in value, an increase of approximately 50 per cent. For the first ten months of 1941 the value of our total exports to the Latin-American republics exceeded by about $850,000 our exports during the twelve months of 1940, so that the figures for the twelve months of 1941 will show a considerable increase over 1940.

The three trade agreements signed in the course of the mission's tour in South America, the *modus vivendi* concluded with Ecuador, the arrangement effected with Uruguay as regards foreign exchange, the goodwill created and the publicity accorded to Canada in these countries and in Peru as a result of the tour constitute, we believe, very modestly, much progress in the right direction. These trade agreements were concluded with a view to improving reciprocal trade relations between Canada and the countries concerned, and the necessity of that trade being reasonably reciprocal must be borne in mind by our importers and exporters and by Canadians generally.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I have listened with the utmost interest to the statement the minister has presented to the house. I think he did well to go to South America. I recall that in the session of 1940 I urged that the avenues of trade with the British West Indies, Cuba and the South American countries be explored to their uttermost, having regard of course to the fact that the war was then on and that a very large amount of our commerce with continental Europe had been cut off.

[Mr. J. A. MacKinnon.]

Latin America, to which the minister has referred in great detail, is a very important part of the western hemisphere. While our trade with Latin America in the past has been small, nevertheless $26,000,000 worth of exports represents a substantial amount of money, and I believe that that trade is capable of great expansion. There are, however, difficulties in the way of extending our trade. There is the question of exchange, and there is the question of transportation, which at all times has been difficult due to the fact that we have had little or no direct connection with those countries. My province is particularly interested in this question of transportation because we grow seed potatoes, in which we have been endeavouring to build up a substantial trade with Argentina. That position has been explored. The minister was good enough a year or so ago, at the request of those interested, in which I had some little part, to send a trade commissioner there. He is supposed to be and I think is, especially qualified to explore the market for seed potatoes and, I hope, bring about results. The young gentleman comes from my own constituency. He is an agronomist by profession. Personally I had not thought of a professional agronomist being sent. The appointment was made by the civil service commission, upon a requisition being made by the department, and apparently the qualifications which the department thought were necessary were those which could be filled only by a professional agriculturist. I am not quarrelling with that decision at all. If the gentleman who was appointed is practical, he can do good work, although there was another man in the employment of the government of New Brunswick who had already been in South America and explored the whole position in previous years, and had intimate personal connections there. I thought possibly some arrangement could have been made to send him. But that is merely in passing.

I referred a moment ago to the question of transportation, and I shall have something to say about that later on. The minister himself also referred to the difficulties of transportation. For the most part cargo space for shipment of our goods to South American countries has to be arranged through New York. I do not assume that there is a great deal of difficulty with regard to package freight; but with regard to large shipments, we will say of potatoes, shippers from my province have found extreme difficulty in getting a substantial amount of cargo space on the New York boats, those of the Grace line and boats of other regular lines sailing to those countries.

That has not been satisfactory, and the result has been that shippers have had to charter ships themselves and arrange for full cargo shipments. With the restrictions on shipping to-day the situation is becoming increasingly difficult.

My colleague from the constituency of Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Hatfield) is personally very much interested in that trade, because he himself is a shipper and knows a great deal more about the whole position than I do. I invite him now to have something to say on this problem of shipping to Latin America, especially Argentina, and to give the house and especially the minister the benefit of his views as to what changes, if any, ought to take place and what can conveniently be done.

Mr. REID: Is there any direct shipping line from the maritimes?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There is no direct shipping line from the maritimes to South America. I say that subject to some little reservation because the Canadian National Steamships on the outer service did go as far as Demerara and carried freight to Demerara, but that is in British Guiana. There was a side service to Central America in days gone by, but just what the position is now with respect to that I do not know. It was the only direct service of which I am aware. What effect the loss of one of our ships since the war began has had on our power to transport goods down there, I do not know, but I do understand that one of the difficulties of exporting from the maritimes, at all events, has been lack of shipping. That is a question to which I hope the minister will give his attention as the days go by, in order that we may have more direct communication in the matter of export trade than we have had in the past. I commend that suggestion to him.

The minister evidently had a good time in South America. I almost envied him as I heard his narration of the social events which he attended, but then I reflected that perhaps I did not have, shall I say, the capacity of some people for enjoyment. Perhaps I was better off for not being in the party, although I had thought of reproaching the minister for not having asked me to go along with him. But after hearing from him the details of the lavish and, I am sure, genteel entertainment which he and his party enjoyed there, I am almost glad now that he did not invite me, and I hope that he himself did not find the entertainment too exacting.

I should like to corroborate what the minister said about the capacity and the ability of his deputy minister. I do not want to flatter anyone, but I have an idea that there is no better servant of the crown in the public service than the minister's deputy.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Very good.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): Hear, hear.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am sure we all appreciate that fact, and I am glad the minister, in the course of his remarks, paid tribute to his deputy. I do so myself. I have done so before, and I reaffirm now my faith not only in his integrity—of course that goes without saying—but in his ability and his immense knowledge of Canada's trade. The fact that he is also bilingual—I was almost going to say multilingual—is another great advantage, and I am very glad the minister paid the tribute to his deputy which he did.

Missions of this kind, if properly conducted, as I have no doubt this one was, should always produce good results. The interchange of contacts in international trade visits of this nature should be of inestimable value not only to us but to the nationals of the countries visited. We in Canada know altogether too little about Latin America. Canada, of course, is not unknown in certain portions of Latin America. For years the Royal Bank of Canada have had a chain of branches in Latin America; it began twenty-five years or more ago. At Bogota, in the republic of Colombia, is located the supervisor of the Royal bank for that area. He is a gentleman from my own city, whom I know very well; he is a keen Canadian and has done a great deal to advertise Canada. I do not believe that the minister in the course of his travels reached the capital of Colombia, although he referred to visits to one or more of the coastal cities on the Pacific side. I make no complaint of that, because the capital of Colombia is a very difficult city to reach. The only reasonable way is to fly in from the coast. A journey partly by land and partly by water is a matter of days; by air it is a matter of hours.

At Caracas, capital of the republic of Venezuela, is located a branch of this great Canadian institution, whose manager is also from my city. I had the pleasure of visiting him in days gone by, and I know he has been an agent of good relations between that country and this.

Although it may take a little time, I should like to mention an incident which occurred there that shows the respect in which Canada and Britain are held in Venezuela. We had

spent the day in Caracas—this was back in 1929—and we had had a survey of the whole political position and learned something of the situation which subsisted there, and the marked difference between democratic governments here and in that republic. I will go no further than that. But I remarked to Mr. Coburn, who is the agent there, that, having regard to the situation which the students and other elements of the population found themselves in, I thought that some day, when the dictator then in power died, there would be a revolution in the country, and I asked, "Just what would you do with all this American currency and all this gold which you have in this branch?" It was a big branch with a staff of one hundred. We were sitting in his private office, and on the rear wall was a large union jack. I said, "What would you do if the revolution should come?" He said, "I would take that flag and I would drape it over the front door; I would turn the key in the front door and I would go away; and when I came back everything would be all right." He said the people had a great respect for the Canadian business man and for the British business man. I commend that incident of the flag to hon. gentlemen who may be thinking of discarding the union jack as our national flag —the flag which is a protection of Canadian as well as of British interests in Venezuela. I do not intend to make any further observations on that matter.

Another agency there which has made Canada very well known in Brazil is the activity of some of our financial men, especially that relating to the Brazilian Traction company, which, as everybody knows, is controlled in Canada, and which has done a great deal to make the dominion known in the republic of Brazil. The same in a lesser degree is true of Argentina.

I have nothing but praise for the efforts made by the minister and his mission to spread the gospel of good will as well as good trading among the Latin-American republics. Good will is an enormous factor, and the personal touch exemplified in the sending of a cabinet minister and high government officials to the nations of that great sub-continent can have nothing but good results if the matter is properly followed up.

I could not follow the minister in all the intricacies of his explanations respecting the various trade agreements. Some of them are very technical, and unless one had the text in front of him one could not follow with precision the operations of the minister and his party with respect to the agreements with these various countries. But I desire to offer a few comments of a general nature upon our trade relations with South America. They fall naturally under two headings: first, the procurement of essential war supplies from South American countries—which I believe is quite possible; second, the extension of our trade with South America in the post-war period. With regard to the latter, I hope we shall have a forward-looking policy, because when the war is over we shall find an impoverished Europe which will not be able to take much from us in the way of actual purchases. I think there is no doubt that we shall have to supply Europe with many things in order to rehabilitate its peoples, but we cannot look forward to any great trade in that direction until rehabilitation is accomplished. In the meantime we shall be losing a tremendous amount of foreign trade—trade which has been and, I hope, always will be important to Canada. It is not quite as important as the internal trade, which constitutes ninety per cent of our commercial transactions. But any country which has an exportable surplus must keep constantly in mind its foreign trade; and Canada, in some lines, is in that position.

Mr. MARTIN: I would almost say that it was our lifeblood.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I should not like to say that—"our lifeblood." It is important, so long as we have an exportable surplus, to the extent that we have an exportable surplus, and in relation to those commodities in which we have an exportable surplus. My hon. friend may have in mind the wheat problem and questions of that kind. Today, of course, our most important, or rather our only outlet across the water is Great Britain.

May I for a moment turn aside to deplore a speech made by a member of the administration during the recent by-election in Quebec East—I refer to my hon. friend the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Michaud), who sits for a New Brunswick constituency—in which he stated that sooner or later we should not have to sell anything to Great Britain. I am not attempting to epitomize precisely what he said, but it is something which had better have been left unsaid, even on the hustings in a by-election. Where would this country be if we did not have some outlet to Great Britain? I am not going to say anything more about that. I had intended to say something about it on a previous occasion, and I refer to it now only in passing.

But to return to what I did want to say: It is an accepted fact that up to the outbreak of war at all events the traditional South American trade had been with Europe rather than with North America. Europe required raw materials which South America could produce and paid for those raw materials by the export of manufactured goods. That

is why you will find entrenched in Chile, the Argentine, Brazil and other South American countries huge commercial concerns dealing in the export and import trade of those countries with Britain, particularly with Germany, and to a lesser degree with Italy in the latter years. Germany was and still is, I think, very strongly entrenched in the commercial life of some of these Latin-American republics. That has been true in recent years. Germany and Italy have developed an extensive export businss chiefly in the heavy-manufacture lines and in a marked degree have cut into British exports of these lines. To-day, of course, that situation is entirely suspended—at least I believe it is suspended—and the result is that many of these Latin-American countries face very difficult economic circumstances. They are not able to import from and certainly are not able to export to continental Europe, and for that very reason I should think they would welcome the chance to export to Canada if, as and when that can be arranged. They have very large surpluses of raw materials and are unable to secure the required quantities of manufactured goods except from the United States. Of course, our friends in the United States are very keen traders. They have become a great country because of their business acumen and their ability to manufacture and export. The minister will find that there will be the keenest kind of competition with the United States for the Latin-American trade. That is to be expected, and our exporters will, I think, have to accommodate themselves to that situation and endeavour, if they want a part of this trade, to meet the competition that will inevitably arise.

There is this further factor. The United States have been helping financially some of these countries in their economic distress.

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West): Substantially.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, substantially. I believe the aggregate amounts are enormous, relatively at all events, and of course that certainly gives them an inside position which it is going to be very difficult for Canada to meet. We simply cannot meet it if that is to be used as a lever for exports to those countries—purchases by the Latin-American countries.

I wonder how many hon. gentlemen have read Mr. John Gunther's book recently published entitled, "Inside Latin America". I recommend that book to them. They will find it most interesting reading, and most instructive as well. Those who have read it will have been impressed by the importance placed on trade relationships with the Latin-American countries. Mr. Gunther gives a list of fourteen strategic war materials, indispensable to the conduct of the war, which are not produced in the United States. It may be of interest to list these commodities, only two of which, as I understand, are produced in Canada:

Antimony, chromium, coconut shell char (for gas masks), ferrograde manganese, manila fibre, mercury, mica, nickel, quartz crystal, quinine, rubber, silk, tin, tungsten.

Mr. Gunther further states that Latin America has surpluses in several of these commodities, and that, with proper development, they could produce them all except silk. Antimony, he states, could be furnished by Mexico and Peru; manganese by Brazil and Cuba; mercury by Mexico; quartz crystal by Brazil; chromium by Cuba; mica by Peru and Chile; tin and tungsten by Bolivia. Coconut shell char could be produced; manila fibre is now being made experimentally in Costa Rica.

I commend that list to the minister; he will read it in *Hansard*. It may be that some arrangements can be made to increase our imports of these items. He gave a list himself, but I commend this one to him as having been taken from a source which, I believe, is well informed. It may be of interest to observe that Brazil was once the world's largest producer of rubber, and rubber is, at the moment, a very important element. Indeed, up to fifty or sixty years ago Brazil was, I am informed, the only rubber producing country in the world. It may be that it will become once more a great producer, having regard to the fact that the East Indies plantations are now destroyed or being destroyed. To-day, while rubber trees grow wild over immense areas, I am afraid that production in Brazil has sunk to a low ebb. That, I am told, is because of the competition of the East Indies. With that competition eliminated, it may be possible to revive that production and that export trade. It is said that the President of Brazil is profoundly interested in the resuscitation of the rubber industry and wants to see it developed. There will have to be assistance from the United States and Canada, and with appropriate assistance it might be possible, through such development, to offset any future rubber shortage resulting from the fall of Malaya I offer that, as a constructive suggestion to the minister and the officials of his department, for what it is worth.

I direct attention to the productive capacity of the Latin-American countries in these strategic war materials for the reason that it

may be possible to secure from Latin America substitutes for those important raw materials which we can no longer import from the far east. In the meantime one should not forget as well that in Latin America there are other materials produced in which shortages may occur, such as wool, copper and petroleum; and then, of course, Argentina is and has for many years been a great source of supply for the best beef hides in the world, Alberta notwithstanding. The best beef hides come, I am told, from the Argentine.

Mr. REID: There is neither barbed wire nor the warble-fly there.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not pretend to give the reason, but that is what tanners and importers have told me. There was a time when these hides were imported direct into Fredericton and turned into sole leather, but like many other maritime industries it has been absorbed by central Canada. We buy our sole leather pretty largely from Ontario, and that is a pity, because we should be able to manufacture it ourselves, though they tell me that they cannot profitably compete because consumption is so low. However, that is just a matter in passing. I commend these suggestions to the minister; and I hope the officials of the government, if they do me the honour of reading them, will explore—perhaps in consultation with officials of the United States government—the possibility of increasing the productive capacity of South American countries in these essential war supplies.

I wish to turn now to a brief consideration of the extension of our trade with South America both now and in the post-war period. As I mentioned earlier, the former trade relations of South America were largely with Europe. These have now ceased. I believe that in the post-war period Canada should make a most aggressive attempt to sell manufactured goods as well as raw materials and the products of agriculture, particularly flour, seed potatoes and other things we can produce in quantities for export. No better seed potatoes are grown anywhere in this northern hemisphere than those produced in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. Our farmers are restricted in a degree in their exports to the United States, and they have to meet the competition of the seed potatoes produced in Aroostook county, which, as everyone knows, is a very large producer. But quality counts, and our producers have the quality; there is no doubt about that. The cleanest seed potato fields on this continent are found first, I think, in Prince Edward Island, and second in New Brunswick. The hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Hatfield) shakes his head. I suppose he would reverse the order, and perhaps I should place them at least on an equal plane. But the question of plant disease is important in that regard, and of course we must send out the very best quality that can be obtained. There is a very large market for seed potatoes in South America if the proper transportation and exchange facilities can be arranged.

I should like to say to the Minister that within the last few weeks the whole thing has been hampered by the controls that now exist. Export licences and all that sort of thing have a hampering effect on that trade, which is a very desirable trade indeed. The minister said it was paid for in United States dollars, which is correct. That is important from another standpoint; and I hope that officialdom—I am not using that word in any derogatory sense at all—will make it as easy as possible to send these things to South America. I recommend to the minister that his department give some attention to this question of cramping regulations and restrictions on a trade that ought to be as free as it is possible to make it, for the good not only of our producers but of trade relationships generally between this country and South America. I am not going to particularize further.

Prior to the war, all the Latin-American countries imported large quantities of manufactured goods from Europe. That resulted more or less from very intelligent trade direction, especially on the part of Germany. I believe it should be possible for us, pursuing the good neighbour policy, to gain at least a portion of this market for Canadian manufacturers in the post-war period. There is the difficulty of United States competition, of course. If we could accomplish this, together with the export of natural products, we would be taking a long step toward providing for the readjustment of war industries to a peace-time basis, thereby providing employment for our workmen. I am speaking now of the post-war period. These are the things to which we ought to be looking forward, trying to get as many new markets as we can to take up the slack which will be created when we change back from a war-time activity to a peace-time economy. We cannot afford to forget for a moment that this transition is coming. There need not be a depression if officialdom and business will get together and plan ahead, and I recommend constant study in that regard.

I have referred already to the difficulties in connection with trading with South America resulting from the fact that we have no direct trade routes. Has the minister given any attention or thought to this point? It is not possible at the moment to establish direct trade routes; I am quite sure the shipping is

not available. Any shipping that we are building will have to go to replace the shipping being lost in the Atlantic, and for transatlantic trade; but some of that shipping might be diverted to the South American trade. Certainly some of the cargo ships that Canada is building can be diverted to the South American trade after the war is over, and I commend that suggestion to the minister. Perhaps as the result of our merchant shipping programme and our great naval expansion we may become once more in the post-war period what we were a generation or more ago, a great mercantile marine nation. I am sure that is what the people of the maritime provinces would like to see happen. Then we may be able to establish for ourselves direct shipping routes to all the important countries in the world, including those of South America.

Unless in future we are able to establish direct trade routes I fear that it will not be possible to extend our trade with the Latin-American countries in the manner we would all like, particularly because of the competition with the United States. These particular trade agreements to which the minister has alluded, especially the three that are before us, the result of the visit to South America by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and his party last autumn, constitute a step in the right direction. By securing for ourselves most-favoured-nation treatment in the markets of Argentina, Brazil and Chile, subject to certain small limitations, as I understood from the minister's statement, I am hopeful that at last an initial step has been taken to extend our trade with these countries.

I should like to have some enlightenment from the minister on one particular matter in connection with the most-favoured-nation treatment. I note that the advantages accorded to Canada do not carry with them the advantages which in one instance Chile accords to Argentina, Bolivia and Peru, and which in another instance Argentina accords to Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay, and again which Brazil accords to contiguous countries. The minister may have covered that point fully; I was not able to follow him. I think he did refer to these matters, but perhaps at a later stage he would be good enough to state succinctly just what the effect of these exceptions from most-favoured-nation treatment will be upon our trade.

I would ask the minister, also, to tell us in what particular lines it is anticipated that our trade with the three countries will be extended as a result of these agreements. In what particular lines does the according of the most-favoured-nation treatment give to Canadian products favourable tariff status, so that increased exports are likely to result? I believe he might also give us a statement as to what tariff barriers are to be surmounted.

In the agreements with Argentina and Brazil I note that certain articles provide that prohibition or restriction may be imposed for the protection of plants and animals, and that measures for protection against disease, degeneration or extinction, as well as measures taken against harmful seeds, plants or animals are not to be affected. Presumably this provision is directed against certain Canadian commodities which might be exported to these countries. I should like to have that position elucidated.

I should hope that these countries will not use these provisions to declare prohibitions. We have a classic illustration of that in connection with the export of potatoes from Canada to Great Britain. They are adamant against importing any of our potatoes in a commercial way because of the presence in Canada, they allege, of the Colorado beetle. Of course that is a terrible pest, and costs the farmers of this country vast sums of money each year. Not only do they lose a large sum of money, but the presence of the beetle causes a great deal of labour.

I am afraid, however, that agricultural communities in the old country have used the beetle as—I shall not say a pretext, but as a means of excluding our potatoes from Great Britain. I have never thought that that was cricket.

I have very little more to say to the minister. I was interested, however, to learn that he spent some time in Chile. I suppose it was not within the ambit of his mission to inquire what Chile was going to do about the service of her external debt. There are many Canadian nationals who bought Chile bonds in days gone by, and who would like to have some interest on those bonds.

Mr. REID: The same as German marks.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Probably so. I am not in that class, but I have some Chile bonds. Perhaps I should not have said that; I shall add that I have not many of them. The fact is, however, that large quantities of these bonds are held in Canada, and it will be most reassuring and a mark of the best of bona fides if those countries were to resume payments on their foreign obligations.

Mr. PAUL MARTIN (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I have neither the qualifications nor the background of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) or the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) to take part in this debate. I have, however, given some attention to these matters for a number of

years, and I accept the invitation of the leader of the opposition to offer some comment.

When the minister began his mission in 1940, as he related to the house he took ill, and there was considerable criticism in various parts of the country to the effect that the minister's illness ought not to have precluded the progress of the mission. I believe it should be said here—and I suggest anyone who knows Latin America will agree—that to have sent anyone other than a minister, and particularly the minister of this department, as head of the delegation, would have been a great mistake.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I agree.

Mr. MARTIN: The minister has paid appropriate tributes to certain officials in his department. I should like to pay my tribute to a friend of mine who did considerable work, not under governmental but under private auspices. I refer to Mr. Ronald McEachren of the *Financial Post* in Toronto, a paper with which I cannot always say I am in full accord. I feel, however, that special reference should be made to Mr. McEachren's work. He went to the various Latin-American countries, and did a great deal af advance work of his own which has proved to be of incalculable value. That fact is apparent to anyone who reads business journals, and particularly those in the South American countries.

The discussion thus far has been largely confined to the economic aspect of the problem which, I venture to suggest to the minister, is by no means the important one. To illustrate my meaning in that connection I purpose bringing out into relief, but with a different emphasis and consideration in mind, some of the figures the minister and the leader of the opposition have discussed.

The minister's figures dealt essentially with six countries. There are at least ten countries which, I suggest, should be characterized as being among the most important ones, and whose trade figures must be related, if this discussion is to receive the complete coverage it deserves. The two important countries, *per se* and in respect of our relations with them are, first Brazil, and then Argentina.

In 1939 Brazil imported from Canada goods to the value of about $4,406,789. That importation made Brazil in that year our chief Latin-American customer. Argentina was next with an importation of about $4,116,923. In 1940—and I am taking these three years because I believe they tell a very interesting story—Argentina took first position, with purchases from Canada amounting to some $6,000,215, representing a 40 per cent increase over the previous year, made up chiefly of imports of newsprint. In the same year Brazil increased her imports to a sum of $5,062,000. In 1941 Brazil continued to increase her imports. In that year they reached a total value of about $8,097,143, while those of Argentina fell back into second position, with a total importation from us of about $7,172,104.

Our imports during these three years from the two countries named are significant. In 1939 we purchased goods to the value of $1,111,291 from Brazil, and from Argentina $4,406,456. In 1940 we bought from Argentina $6,541,862, and from Brazil about $6,243,342, a slightly smaller amount.

In 1941 we bought from Argentina goods valued at $4,763,752, and from Brazil we almost doubled our imports. In that year we imported a value of $19,443,946.

These figures yield but one conclusion—and I do not say this by way of any criticism of our trade commissioners—but the fact remains that two years of war have brought more for us by way of increased trade from Latin America to us, and from us to Latin America, than did fifteen years of good, energetic and efficient work by our trade commissioners. I do not want to criticize what the minister has done because his work in this particular has been of tremendous advantage to our country, particularly in respect of the political relations of this part of North America with Latin America, but the fact is that the trade figures are not impressive. For instance, in 1939 our exports to South America were only 1·8 per cent of our total exports, and our imports from South America in the same year were but 2·8 per cent of our total imports. When you compare that with our trade with all of North America, excluding the United States, where our exports amounted to 2·9 per cent of our total exports and our imports to 2·3 per cent of our total imports, you will realize that trade between Canada and the United States is more important to the United States than the whole Latin-American trade carried on by that country. There are reasons for these relatively unimportant trade balances, reasons which in former days parliament has not frankly considered.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I suggest one reason? It has always been an astonishing thing to me that our trade commissioners are not and never have been what I heard one Minister of Trade and Commerce indignantly deny that they were, commercial travellers.

Mr. MARTIN: The leader of the opposition, having been Minister of Trade and Commerce,

is more expert in that particular than I am. I was glad to hear his speech to-day, particularly bearing in mind that he spoke on behalf of the Conservative party. I know something about Latin America. I well remember a speech delivered in this house by the former able member for St. Lawrence-St. George. That gentleman had had considerable experience with Latin Americans and he characterized them as people who were hardly civilized, as people with whom we should not try to cultivate any relations. That has been the impression which many Canadians, generally and officially, have had about Latin America, and perhaps the Latin Americans have had somewhat the same impression about us. The time has come, with the world in its present dire straits, when we can no longer take that view of these other twenty-one countries who share our American continental interest.

I would not for a moment suggest that we cannot find increasing opportunities for trade with Latin America, but I do believe that we are overemphasizing and have overemphasized the importance of our trade in the past and the possibilities of our trade in the future, for various reasons, some of which were set out by the leader of the opposition. It is possible that we may increase Canada's imports of linseed, fruits, hides and wool from Latin America, and we may sell them more lumber, newsprint, machinery, textiles, fish and perhaps some wheat to Peru. But the fact is, as the leader of the opposition has mentioned, we must compete in the Latin-American countries with the United States with its lower costs because of mass production and its added advantage because of having been in these markets long before we thought of getting into them. There have also been huge extensions of credits by the United States to Latin America. Then there is the further fact that our economy is competitive with Latin-American countries, rather than complementary. Some of the things that are basic in their national income are basic in ours, and this presents additional difficulties.

As far as tropical products are concerned, a large part of our supplies come to us under preferential agreements from the British West Indies and British Guiana. Even though a movement has been set on foot in the course of the last few days, particularly in Washington, for the general lowering of tariff barriers, I venture to suggest by way of qualification of what the leader of the opposition has said that in the post-war period we shall find it to our essential interest to recover established channels of exchange with Europe; not that we should not try to increase our trade opportunities in Latin America, but because we are an exporting nation, because thirty per cent of our income is based upon what we sell to other nations of the world. Because of our competitive position with the United States we should not forget our normal channels of exchange.

It is true, and I should have said this earlier, that the future may have great opportunities for this country in the Caribbean and in South America, particularly as a result of recent capital expansion on the part of the United States. The anticipated increases in the nutritional standards of many Latin-American countries, together with the consequential increase in the standards of living, may conceivably change the market potentialities for Canada in Latin America. But I think it is safe to say that the strictest analysis of our trade possibilities by those who are specialists in these matters indicates the impossibility of our ever getting into the position of hemispheric self-sufficiency in the economic sense.

I said a moment ago that one of the reasons for our relatively unimportant trade increases in Latin America was our lack of appreciation of Latin America itself. As the leader of the opposition has said, one of our most important contacts with Latin America is the mining, power and traction enterprises which are financed by Canadian capital in Mexico, Brazil, Peru and Colombia. Yet the most serious criticisms of Latin Americans and their ways have come from Canadians who draw dividends from these companies.

I do not wish to emphasize the economic aspects so much, although they are important, as to suggest that we should give attention to the penetration of nazi influence into almost every country of Latin America. This penetration has been by way of subventions to industry and subsidies to air companies, and a situation was created which caused the greatest alarm on the part of the United States and Great Britain. One might well ask where we who are fighting Germany to-day would be were it not for the good-neighbour policy of the United States and Latin America, to which policy we as a nation have made very little contribution. Consequently in analysing our opportunities in this respect we must bear in mind not only our economic position but particularly our political opportunities with Latin America. I do not think I am expressing far-fetched views or stretching the bounds of relevancy when I suggest that the conclusions reached at Ogdensburg by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mackenzie King) can be considered to

be related to this whole problem; for the report given out jointly by the President of the United States and our Prime Minister on the Ogdensubrg agreement included this phraseology, that the permanent board was to:

—commence immediate studies relating to sea, land and air problems including personnel and material, and to consider in a broad sense the defence of the north half of the western hemisphere.

The north half of the western hemisphere may include the south side of the Panama canal or it may merely embrace the north side, but I do submit that this important statement made on behalf of our two countries has a definite relation to the problem under discussion. The area covered by the understandings or conclusions reached at Ogdensburg includes the north American Republics of Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Costa Rica and Panama; the republics and colonies in the Caribbean, and Colombia, Venezuela, the Guianas and parts of Brazil and Ecuador in South America. Thus it includes the whole of the greater Panama canal zone, which according to the very text referred to by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson), namely, Mr. Gunther's work, would be that part of America where the nazis would be more likely than not to exercise mischief.

Our interest in the defence of the canal is not less than that of the United States, although we traditionally seem to regard it as out of our sphere; for the canal is the shortest ocean route between our eastern and western provinces. The canal also affords the quickest means of ocean communication from our western ports to the European market, upon which we are more dependent than even the United States.

I am not suggesting or trying to read into these treaties or into the Ogdensburg conversations something that was not contemplated, but it may be that we are unconsciously, and I think properly, drifting into an orbit where there are at stake economic interests for this country, and more particularly that there lies an opportunity of recognizing that in Latin America exists the only contemporary collectivity of nations outside of the British commonwealth whereby there can be some guarantee of peaceful relations between states. There has been great difficulty in the past in discussing this subject in the house. Closer relations with Latin America have always been construed by many as an attempt to weaken the ties we have with the United Kingdom and the British empire, just as attempts to bring about closer relationship between Canada and the United States have often been similarly construed. Surely the fact that to-day twenty-one of the South American and Central American republics have recently severed connections with the axis powers, in spite of nazi influence in those countries during the past six years, indicates that it is up to us, not only unconsciously but consciously, to go about to identify our position in Latin America—not thereby weakening our relationships with Great Britain or the British commonwealth, but just as our friendship with the United States has brought Britain and the United States closer together, we might as a result of our more active participation in the whole matter of hemispheric defence, viewed economically and politically, bring Britain, the United States and ourselves and the Latin-American countries closer and closer together in respect of the period of post-war reconstruction.

Why should this not be done? While there is some denial in pan-American countries of the democratic process and of the principle of due process of law, there is nevertheless a general sympathy with the democratic method. In the whole system of collective organization as we have it in the pan-American system there is a recognition of racial equality, an acknowledgment of the desirability of preserving the democratic processes. We find there in almost every national instance a respect for religious beliefs. Is there not there an indication such as we have had recently at Rio de Janeiro that there can be cooperation, and effective cooperation, between one nation and another? Do these nations not have respect for treaties?

It seems to me therefore, Mr. Speaker, that we have every bond with these peoples. We want not only to increase our trade with them but to go along generally with them and, as the leader of the opposition said, build a stronger world politically in the interests of civilization and decency. To the extent that these treaties are a step in that direction, I compliment the minister and the government upon their efforts. I am sure that the house, if given the opportunity, would want this discussion to go down as indicating to the people in what I might call the unknown countries south of the Rio Grande that we regard them to be civilized men and women and members of nations with whom we would like to enjoy the most friendly relations, and that we propose in the future to perpetuate our economic and political relations with them to our mutual advantage.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed greatly the speeches which have been delivered thus far. I feel that it is in order to congratulate the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. MacKinnon) and his party on what I believe was a fine piece of work. Inasmuch as the minister himself accorded to the Prime Minis-

ter (Mr. Mackenzie King) a good deal of the credit in this connection, I should like to pass along a similar tribute to him too. I enjoyed the contribution of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) and the contribution of the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin), who always speaks in this chamber with moderation and with evidence of scholarship and good judgment.

With respect to the measures now before us, I believe that they deserve our hearty approval. It seems to me that judged from almost every point of view, these agreements are highly commendable. It is true that we need particularly at this time good-will in the hearts of as many peoples as possible, and it surely does seem difficult to conceive why good-will should not be engendered first in the hearts of our neighbours, and our nearest neighbours. The Latin-American people are surely our neighbours.

It is well, I think, that all the goods listed as being contemplated for exchange between Canada and the South American countries named are goods, first of all, which we need from them, and second, goods which do not compete with our own. I consider it an unwise tendency in any state to endeavour to leave its own industries unprotected, to throw them open to competition with goods coming from abroad. It therefore is an important matter that these goods do not, as it appears, compete with Canadian goods.

Now, the goods which we are to export are goods which we can spare. I believe that for many years we have been neglectful of our own people. The first duty of Canada with respect to her production is to see to it that her own people have their needs supplied. Many times in the past we have thought first of all of the goods which we could sell abroad, not bothering much about the people at home—very much as our fathers on the farms used to sell the marketable eggs and keep the poor ones for the family to eat. That was good management in those trying times, but I am not sure that it is good management nationally.

Another thing which appeals to me in connection with this treaty is that very few other nations wish to export the particular goods which we propose to export. I believe that long before this parliament finishes we shall be engaged in earnest discussions of the causes of war. It ought to be borne in on every hon. member that one of the greatest causes of war is the attempt on the part of one nation to force its goods into markets which it does not need in order to live, thereby excluding from those markets similar goods from other nations that need to sell in those markets to live. No offence is committed in this treaty in relation to that important matter. Therefore we can say that Canada, in enjoying these treaties, will not be excluding others from needed markets, will not be depriving others of enjoyment.

Another aspect of these agreements which commends itself to members of my group is the tendency to give favoured nation treatment in so far as that means a lowering of tariffs. It may be difficult for people who think along lines which Conservatives habitually follow to conceive of lowering tariffs and at the same time protecting home industry. It must be understood—it must come to be understood—that there are ways of protecting the home industry other than the raising of a tariff barrier, which increases the price to everyone in the country. It is completely possible to protect our own industry by special favours conferred upon our industry. For example, by using the national credit of a country it is completely possible—has been proved so in the world time and again during the last ten years—to lower the costs of production, to decrease the costs of freight, and to discount the price of the commodity as it comes to the consumer. If such a series of devices be used within the state it is completely possible to lower the tariff and still protect home industries. Since that is so I commend this tendency toward lower tariffs.

I believe I have said all that at this time we feel disposed to say. We commend the treaties.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): These treaties have had a sufficiently long discussion this afternoon and little more needs to be said. I rise simply to say that we of this group are in favour of every treaty and every move that can be made to bring about better relations, both commercial and social, across the world.

I should like to emphasize one point. In our relationships with our South American neighbours the time has come when we ought to join with them in the pan-American conference. I am British-born and therefore I have naturally a great regard and love for the old land. But I can see no reason in the world why this country should not realize its geographical, economic and commercial position and enter into the closest relationships possible with our neighbours across the line, and with our neighbours, rather more remote, in South America. It would be good for the world, for Britain, for Canada, for all of us; and I hope that as these trading relationships are promoted, as these treaties go into effect, the government will fill that vacant seat at

the pan-American conference and assist our good neighbour to the south in bringing about still better relationships between the Anglo-Saxon and Latin-American peoples.

After all that has been said in praise of the treaties, nothing much remains for me to say. We approve them. We hope they are a forerunner of future trade relationships in ever-widening fields; and we give the adoption of these treaties our whole-hearted support.

On motion of Mr. Stirling the debate was adjourned.

FARM CREDIT

ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS IN SPRING OPERATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Has the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Trade and Commerce or the government made any provision for seeing to it that the farmers of Canada are granted the credit they need for their spring farming operations?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): The hon. member was kind enough to send me a copy of the question just before the house convened this afternoon, and I passed it on to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley), who I thought would properly answer it. I can only say what was said at the time we discussed it, that the only provision made by the federal government to provide credit for the farmers is through the farm loan board. No other provision is made.

Mr. BLACKMORE: What I had in mind was this. Has the government made any representations to the banks urging them to be a little more generous in granting credit to farmers in view of the fact that we need production just now?

Mr. GARDINER: Some representations were made by the Department of Agriculture, on behalf of the farmers of Alberta, to the banks in connection with the purchase of feed for the finishing of hogs, and I understood the banks did make that provision at that time.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

KIRKLAND LAKE STRIKE—PROTECTION OF UNIONISTS—SUPPRESSION OF PRESS REPORT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): During the present week a brutal attack was made upon certain trade union organizers and on certain trade union premises at Sudbury, Ontario. The question was raised in this house a few days ago. This incident has been completely suppressed so far as the press of Canada is concerned, and I should like to know if the government will investigate to ascertain the reason for that suppression.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): It strikes me that it was suppressed at the instance of the parties concerned. There was no suppression on the part of this government. No knowledge has come to the government of anything that has happened at Sudbury, and it does seem to me that with regard to any question of this kind raised in the house, when people wire to private members they should in all fairness wire to the government as well. Let me say frankly and honestly that we have no knowledge whatever of this matter from any source except the telegram read by the hon. member for North Battleford (Mrs. Nielsen).

Mr. MacINNIS: I think the minister misunderstood me. I am not finding fault with the government. I am asking if this incident was suppressed by the censor, or is there some other reason for its suppression. The Prime Minister will understand the seriousness of such a thing.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should be greatly surprised if it was suppressed in any way by the censor. I will look into the matter, but I see no reason why the censor would suppress it, and, as I have said, I should be surprised if it had been suppressed.

Mr. MacINNIS: It has been suppressed.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Some of the papers never pay any attention to some things I do, and the censor has nothing to do with it.

Mr. SLAGHT: May I say a word of information for my hon. friend's benefit? I am advised that those who are alleged to have been mistreated have refrained from laying any charges whatever before any authorities ready at hand. There is a suggestion that the whole matter was a show.

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY

REFERENCE TO ADVERTISEMENTS IN TORONTO "SATURDAY NIGHT"

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I wish to call the attention of the government to an advertisement appearing in to-day's Toronto *Saturday Night* entitled "Let's quit kidding ourselves about our big war effort". I refer particularly to the last paragraph:

The fault is not all industry's, of course. There are fat-headed bottlenecks in political

ranks at Ottawa to be reckoned with. But even those barnacles on the nation's war effort can't stop us if we won't let them. Fortunately, we have in the Department of Munitions and Supply, men recruited from industry—men who know production. Let us give those men all the help and support we can. Don't wait for leadership. Provide it!

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): By whom is that signed?

Mr. COLDWELL: "Manufacturing and Industrial Engineering", published by Consolidated Press Limited. I wish to ask this question of the government. In what respects has political interference militated against industrialists who are in charge of our war effort? The only real interference I know of was at the beginning of the war when these gentlemen refused to accept contracts from the government on a limitation of five per cent profit. It is about time that these people should understand that, so far as this house is concerned at least, we are giving them all the money and support that we are asked to give.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think the hon. member expects me to answer him.

JAPANESE NATIONALS

BRITISH COLUMBIA SECURITY COMMISSION—EVACUATION FROM PROTECTED AREAS

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I thought I ought to bring at once to the attention of the house a decision which the government made to-day with reference to the situation in British Columbia and the evacuation of persons of Japanese origin in that province.

All hon. members, I am sure, realize what an enormous undertaking the moving of large numbers of persons from their homes to other parts of the country really is, and how many are the considerations of which account must be taken in a transaction of great magnitude, particularly where it has to be carried out expeditiously. We have felt that it would be helpful in every way to the province of British Columbia, in meeting the situation, if we were to associate with the government's effort prominent citizens of the province itself so that they might bring their combined knowledge of affairs in the province to bear on the carrying out of the various projects which it will be necessary to undertake in evacuating this large number of people. The government therefore has decided to appoint what will be designated the British Columbia security commission. The present intention is to have three members, all of whom will be persons outstanding in the province. The government has asked Mr. Austin Taylor if he would act as chairman of the commission and he has expressed his willingness to accept the position. The commission will be for the purpose of directing and supervising the evacuation of persons of Japanese origin from protected areas to the particular localities to which they will be sent. The commission will have to do with the transportation, placement, accommodation and so on of the different persons who are to be evacuated. The government itself will continue to do all that it is doing and had planned to do, but the work will be carried out in association with, and more particularly under the direction of the commission. Every agency of government that can be of service to that body will be asked to assist in helping to perform this large undertaking in a manner that will serve to occasion the least irritation among those who are being transferred, and in a manner which will help to give the citizens of British Columbia the most in the way of essential security. All that can be done by government departments will be carried out through that agency.

I thought it advisable to make this statement at once in order that the citizens of British Columbia may know of the government's purpose in the matter. The order in council appointing the commission has not yet been passed, but in all probability will be passed to-morrow.

Mr. GREEN: In that connection may I ask whether this security commission will have any power to settle evacuees outside the province, or is it the intention that they shall simply be moved from one part of the province to another? There is also another question. In this evening's Ottawa newspapers there is a news dispatch to the effect that there has been an amendment made to the defence of Canada regulations providing that the Japanese may not possess motor vehicles and other articles. Has that order been passed within the last day or two and, if so, could we have the details?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was going on to tell the house that my colleague the Minister of Justice (Mr. St. Laurent) has a copy of the recent order just referred to, and I believe he intends to table it before adjournment. I have no doubt that the minister will also wish to reply to my hon. friend's question. As to the scope of the powers of the commission, the commission will not be restricted in the matter of the localities to which members of the Japanese population are to be moved. The powers of the com-

mission will be broad, and the cooperation of the government will be as extensive as government cooperation can be made.

Mr. GREEN: The powers will extend beyond the boundaries of the province?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): This is rather an important announcement. As I understand the Prime Minister's statement, the commission is set up with full plenary powers, both administrative and executive, and, I suppose, responsible to the government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is certainly a new departure. I understood this matter was going to be dealt with under the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell), who spoke the other day as though he were taking complete charge of it. This is a complete change of policy.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Minister of Labour will be the minister responsible.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But this commission will have full plenary powers, both in administration and in an executive capacity, under the terms of the order in council which is passed, I assume, under the War Measures Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should not like to specify at this moment in exact terms either the powers of the commission or the extent of the government's administration of the phases of the work which will have to be carried out. My hon. friend will realize that an order in council making provision for a body of this kind will have to be prepared with great care; and until it is prepared I prefer not to say more than I have said about the scope or purpose of the commission's work. I have thought it advisable, however, to make known immediately that the government has this step in contemplation.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: In view of the authority given this commission or advisory board—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is not an advisory board, according to the statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not an advisory board.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: All right; this committee or commission is to have rather wide powers. I understand the chairman is to be Mr. Austin Taylor, for whose appointment I commend the Prime Minister. Apparently, from what the Prime Minister has said, the advice of this committee is to have a great deal to do with what action is taken in connection with the Japanese; and as a British Columbia member vitally interested in the matter I am particularly interested in knowing who will make up the remainder of the committee.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot give my hon. friend the names at the moment, because I am not in a position to do so. Mr. Taylor has been advised to confer with the government of British Columbia and will of course have further conference with our own government with respect to the selection of the further personnel of the commission. Beyond that I cannot say.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I thank the Prime Minister for the information that Mr. Taylor has been requested to confer with the government of British Columbia as to the personnel of the committee. In all seriousness might I ask the government to suggest to Mr. Taylor that he also consult with the elected federal members from that province.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Naturally the government here has to take the responsibility for the entire personnel of the commission.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Responsibility for the whole thing.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly; but I want to make clear to my hon. friend that in this matter the government is most anxious to enlist the cooperation of every agency in meeting the situation that has arisen on the coast, and in meeting any other situations which may arise, and we would wish particularly to work in complete cooperation with the government of British Columbia, as well as with the citizens of the province in so far as their cooperation can be helpfully secured.

Mr. SLAGHT: As I understand it, the powers of the commission have not yet been defined conclusively; the matter is still in the making. The selection of Mr. Austin Taylor is a most happy one, and the appointment of this commission, in this most extraordinary situation which has ever developed in our country, is an excellent move. But in all deference may I suggest that the powers of the commission should not override any of the powers contained in the defence of Canada regulations.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They will not.

Mr. SLAGHT: They can walk along hand in hand, but I suggest that there might be an individual case, or ten individual cases, in which it would be desirable to act more drastically than the commission might see fit to act, and that our defence of Canada

regulations should not be interfered with in any way by the powers given to the commission.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is absolutely certain.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not think they could exercise any powers under the defence of Canada regulations. I do not think you could delegate such powers to a commission.

Mr. SLAGHT: Under the War Measures Act you might.

Hon. L. S. St. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the defence of Canada regulations were amended to empower the Minister of Justice to make certain orders with respect to all persons ordinarily resident in a protected area. That order in council was tabled here on Wednesday of this week. There has been an amendment to the defence of Canada regulations to authorize the enforcement of such orders as may be made by the Minister of Justice, not only by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police but by any police officer, provincial or municipal, in the area affected. I should like to table a copy of that order and to suggest that perhaps it might be printed, as were the others, in the *Votes and Proceedings*.

Following that, there was made by the Minister of Justice an order dated February 26, 1942, which I also table and suggest that it be included in the *Votes and Proceedings*.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): To what does that relate?

Mr. St. LAURENT: That is the order dealing first of all with the curfew imposed upon all persons of Japanese origin; an order that all persons of Japanese origin give up all motor vehicles, cameras, radio transmission or receiving sets, firearms, ammunition and so forth; that they be required forthwith to deliver up these articles to the nearest justice of the peace or peace officer, and that he be required to give a receipt for the article delivered to him and immediately notify the Royal Canadian Mounted Police of the receipt of such article by him. The order also provides that every person of the Japanese race shall leave a protected area forthwith. That is completed by the terms of the regulation itself, which provide that any person in any protected area reasonably believed by any peace officer or by any person acting on behalf of his majesty to be contravening the regulation may, without prejudice to other proceedings, be removed from the protected area or detained therein by any peace officer or person acting on behalf of his majesty as aforesaid. Therefore the order made by the Minister of Justice, and the regulations, provide that from now on it is an offence against the regulation for any person of Japanese origin to be outside his premises between dusk and dawn. It is an offence for him to retain possession of a motor car, explosives, or one of the other objects enumerated. It is an offence for him to be within a protected area, and for any such offence he may be removed from the area, or detained by any peace officer. Instructions were immediately given for carrying out these provisions, through the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and in cooperation with provincial and municipal police in British Columbia.

The instructions provide, of course, that with respect to the removal of persons of Japanese origin there will have to be priorities. They cannot all be moved at the same moment, and for that purpose instructions are to be taken from the chiefs of the army, navy and air services, as to which are the most urgent cases. Males of sixteen years and upward will be and are being dealt with just as quickly as provision can be made to house them.

The hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling) has been kind enough to call my attention to what was regarded as some conflict respecting the orders of February 24, as reported in *Votes and Proceedings*. I think the hon. member will agree, upon looking at them, that there is no real conflict. The one order which is generally applicable to the whole of Canada prevents the acquisition of land or crops by a person of Japanese origin. That contains provision that it does not apply to the taking by lease of buildings for a period of not more than one year.

It was believed that when these people had to leave protected areas it might be possible for them to take short-term leases of buildings for their own accommodation, pending some other arrangement. It is now represented that there may be areas outside the protected areas where they should not be allowed even to do that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Where they are not wanted.

Mr. St. LAURENT: Yes, and where there would be unusual reasons for not wanting them. I should not imagine there would be many areas in Canada where there would be an active desire to acquire them.

On that point I wish to assure the hon. member that we shall welcome any suggestion, and that these orders may have to be further extended. Any suggestion made will receive very careful consideration, because it is the desire of the department to have these orders in form such as adequately to cope with the situation.

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): Mr. Speaker, if I might be permitted, under these unusual circumstances, I should like to make one or two comments. The minister has been good enough to explain to me some of the conditions under which this new order is being issued. I note that it applies not only to nationals, as did the previous order, but to those of Japanese origin. They are to move forthwith.

It appears to me not improbable that this may start something in the nature of a flood. I want to warn the government once more that if the representations and protests from the part of British Columbia which I represent are not heeded, and these people are allowed to filter in and to settle for a temporary period, even under lease, I am very much afraid there will be grave trouble.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the minister. I understood him to say that those Japanese in areas considered most vital are to be moved. My understanding is that the first Japanese to be moved are the Japanese nationals. My question is: Will Japanese be moved from vital areas, such as power plants, irrespective of their nationality?

Mr. St. LAURENT: Yes; those to be first moved will be moved having respect to the area. The various departments of national defence are to indicate which areas they consider specially vulnerable, and all persons of Japanese origin are to be moved from those areas as quickly as possible.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: They will be the first moved?

Mr. St. LAURENT: Yes; they will be the first ones moved.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make some comment respecting the point raised by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Stirling), and would suggest that we have to be reasonable. If we are going to put the onus on the government—and it will have to be put on the government—of removing these people from areas in which it is dangerous to leave them, we must remember that they must be settled somewhere. There is an obligation upon the government to find a place to put them. There is also an obligation upon hon. members to assist the government in finding that place. Otherwise there is no rhyme or reason to the attitude we take.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: We have done that.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 6.20 p.m.

Monday, March 2, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. POULIOT

REFERENCE TO LETTER IN OTTAWA "CITIZEN" FROM JAMES E. BROOKS

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, as a private Liberal member and a French Canadian from the province of Quebec it is my duty to rise to a question of privilege in respect of a letter published by the Ottawa *Citizen* in its issue of February 18. The letter is headed "Shadow of Vichy in Canada," and is addressed to the editor of the *Citizen* in these words:

> Winston Churchill says that the lowest point in the war was when the French folded up. French politicians were responsible. Can it happen in Canada that the representatives of French-Canadian political remote control can cause the same thing here?
>
> Think it over. Vichy is still represented at Ottawa. French Canada controls 65 seats in the House of Commons. There are only 245. 'Nuff said.
>
> James E. Brooks
>
> Montreal, February 16, 1942.

This James E. Brooks is the president of the James E. Brooks Cotton company, of Montreal. His business address is 614 St. James street, Montreal; his home address is Sea Island Beach, Georgia. The records of the customs offices will show that he deals in cotton imported from United States and Brazilian firms which are enemy controlled.

Does he not know the names Esteve Brothers, or J. Kahn and Company, of Campanera? The money he pays for this cotton goes to Italy or Germany, because it is cotton that was originally bought for and on account of German and Italian principals. He gets it cheap and sells it to well-known Canadian textile firms, who are not averse to exploiting their French-Canadian employees.

The proof of this could be found in the files of the customs department. If a return were tabled of Canadian firms which trade with the enemy, no French-Canadian firm would be found in that list; only good "patriots" who are shouting for conscription. And no French Canadian is on the board of directors of any such company.

Brooks purchased time over American radio stations, as an American of the south, and probably a member of the Ku Klux Klan, to carry on a political campaign during the last by-election in Welland and York South, in favour of Arthur Meighen. It is time that these "patriots"—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. POULIOT: —who trade with the enemy for profit, should be shown up when they want to conscript the good farmers' sons. I wonder if that dirty Brooks is not well acquainted with the fellow who sent an electoral death threat and an electoral silver bullet to Arthur Meighen during the last by-election.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Have we to listen to tirades like that?

PLEBISCITE ACT

SECOND REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State) presented the second report of the special committee appointed to consider Bill No. 10, respecting the taking of a plebiscite in every electoral district in Canada and the taking of the votes of such plebiscite of Canadian service voters stationed within and without Canada, as follows:

Your committee has held four sittings. Representations were made to it on behalf of the residents of the Yellowknife administrative district in the Northwest Territories. Careful consideration was given to Bill No. 10, "The Dominion Plebiscite Act 1942" and your committee have agreed to report the said bill with amendments.

A reprint of the bill, as amended, has been ordered.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 21 TO PROCEED WITH BILL THIS DAY

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in announcing on Friday evening the business for to-day, I did not mention the possibility of the house considering the plebiscite bill. I did refer to the matter on the previous evening. I then stated that if the bill were given its second reading that evening it was possible that we might be in a position to consider it on Monday when it would have been reported back to committee of the whole.

The bill has just been reported back to committee of the whole and, as the leader of the opposition and all hon. members are aware, the government is anxious to proceed with it as quickly as possible. Under the circumstances I was going to ask if hon. members would give their consent to proceeding with discussion of the bill in committee of the whole to-day. If we are to proceed a motion will, of course, be required, because the rule is that there must be forty-eight hours' notice after a bill is reported back from any standing or special committee before it can be considered. There is another rule, however, which provides that in respect of an important matter consent may be obtained and a measure proceeded with.

If the house would give its consent I should like to move:

That bill No. 10, an act respecting the taking of a plebiscite in every electoral district in Canada and the taking of the votes at such plebiscite of Canadian service voters stationed within and without Canada, be considered in committee of the whole this day and that standing order 21 be suspended in relation thereto.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to delay the passage of the bill. I believe everything that could be said against it has been said more than once. I am content therefore to accede to this order of business, if there is an understanding that we will not hurry over the bill and the regulations. Frankly I have not been able to read all the regulations. They are most voluminous, and there are at least one or two which to my mind are contentious. If there is an undertaking that it will not be forced through to-day I should be quite agreeable. What would be the alternative? What other business would we go on with if we did not take up this bill? Would we take the agriculture resolutions?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, not the agriculture resolutions.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Not to-day?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, not to-day. There are two resolutions with respect to trade with south American republics; in fact there are three. I doubt if they would take very long. There is also a resolution to be moved by the Minister of Pensions and National Health which might possibly come up this evening. I mentioned that we might wish to move into committee of supply to call one or two items. I have no hesitation in giving my hon. friend the assurance he has asked for.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): With respect to the trade agreements, my colleague, the hon. member for Victoria-Carleton (Mr. Hatfield), probably knows more about these from the standpoint of business than anyone in this house. He was desirous of speaking but he has gone to bed with a bad cold and cannot be in the chamber to-day. If some means could be afforded whereby this could be held over, say until to-morrow or the next day, we would be most grateful. In the meantime I shall be glad to facilitate matters as much as I can.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is no immediate haste with regard to the trade agreements.

Mr. MAXIME RAYMOND (Beauharnois-Laprairie): I would ask the Prime Minister not to proceed with this bill to-day, because many hon. members who are interested in it

are not here. They were under the impression that we were not going to proceed with this measure to-day. Besides, I should like to have time to read the provisions of the bill, which are voluminous.

Mr. BRADETTE: The members should be here.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon. friend that the bill may take some little time in committee and I think there will be ample opportunity for hon. members to discuss the matters they would wish to discuss on the bill. If we proceeded with it this afternoon there would be an opportunity afforded also this evening for discussion. As to having discussion begin now in committee of the whole, I hope my hon. friend will not press his objection. If we find as we proceed that we are going too rapidly, the committee will I am sure agree not to conclude discussion at the present time but to permit a general discussion later on.

Mr. RAYMOND: If the Prime Minister will agree that section 4 will not be passed I am agreeable.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, speaking on this motion, it was stated by the right hon. the Prime Minister that a certain entente had been arrived at between the allied countries regarding the conduct of this war. My privilege to-day is to offer a primeur to the house. I am sorry I have not the English translation of that word for the benefit of my hon. friends. What I have to offer is a magnificent letter which is a worthy preface to any discussion or debate on a bill like this. This letter was sent by ferry command by a prominent citizen of the metropolis of Canada, the city of Montreal, and it was received this morning in London by no less a person that the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Right Hon. Winston Churchill. Here is the letter which I hold in my hand and which I have the privilege to read to this hon. chamber:

Montreal, February 25, 1942.

Mr. Prime Minister:

A citizen of the commonwealth, no matter how humble, always enjoys the right to communicate with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, to give him his reflections and make known to him his thoughts. There are moments, rare it is true, when the right becomes a duty. I think that, for the writer, that moment has arrived, sir.

Mr. Prime Minister, the citizen who writes is a Canadian of the French language, a loyal subject of the king of Canada faithful to the culture of his forebears devoted to the Franco-British union in Canada,—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The motion before the house is that Bill No. 10 be considered in committee of the whole this day and that standing order 21 be suspended in relation thereto. I take it that the hon. member is speaking to the merits of the bill, and this could more properly be discussed in committee of the whole rather than at this time.

Mr. POULIOT: If I may be allowed to read the letter as soon as the house goes into committee of the whole, then I have no objection. What I want to read pertains to the conduct of the war, and it is drafted in the finest English language. This is precisely the matter before us now.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would be in order for the hon. member to take that up when we get into committee of the whole. At the moment we are dealing with a motion for the suspension of standing order 21 in order that the plebiscite bill may be considered in committee of the whole this day. Perhaps the hon. member will wait until the bill gets into committee of the whole.

Mr. POULIOT: It was not a matter of obstruction. I just wanted to place it before the house.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I was not able to hear distinctly whether the Prime Minister gave a commitment that this discussion would take place to-night rather than this afternoon.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I said that I thought we would be all afternoon on the bill as well as to-night. We could hold over any clauses which it was thought desirable to discuss later. I have already agreed to holding over clause 4 till to-night. We will not try to rush the bill through but would like to make what progress we can with the general consent of the house.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PRAIRIE FARM INCOME REGULATIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

1. What is the total amount paid under the prairie farm income regulations?
2. What has been the total cost of administration?
3. What are the names and addresses of any additional persons hired as inspectors and supervisors for the administration of this bonus, and what was paid to each in (a) salary, (b) expenses?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. $6,668,909.14.
2. $44,529.44.

3. No additional persons hired. This work was carried out by the inspectors engaged in connection with the wheat acreage reduction and Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

UNPRODUCTIVE GAS AND OIL WELLS—STEEL PIPE

Mr. WINKLER:

Is there any regulation of any department of the government requiring that steel pipe in unproductive oil and gas wells be drawn for use in war purposes?

Mr. MICHAUD: No.

GASOLINE RATIONING—DISABLED WAR VETERANS

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

Will the regulations rationing or limiting the use of gasoline give preference to crippled or partly disabled war veterans using for transportation vehicles requiring gasoline for motive power?

Mr. MICHAUD: Incapacitated citizens requiring the use of an automobile for the normal conduct of their business have been given special consideration and have been placed in category "C" of the gasoline rationing regulations. No special consideration has been given for incapacitated citizens using a car for other than business purposes. Such cases will be dealt with on their merits.

ONTARIO HOG BONUS

Mr. STOKES:

1. How many hogs entitled to the bonus offered by the government of Ontario were marketed during the year 1941?

2. What amount of money was paid to hog producers in Ontario by the provincial government as bonus during the year 1941?

Mr. GARDINER: Information not available.

HIGHWAY ROUTES TO THE NORTH*

Mr. HANSELL:

1. Has the government considered the setting up of a commission to study an inland route, north from Edmonton to the Yukon and Alaska?

2. If so, when will the government make some announcement in respect thereto?

3. Has the government had any communications either by correspondence or otherwise, or representation, with the United States government, since May, 1940, in respect to a highway through Canada to Alaska?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might answer this question orally. Answering the first question, as the house has been informed, the appropriate defence agencies of Canada and the United States have been and are giving close consideration to the problems of communication with Alaska. As to the second question, I may say that the reason I am answering the question orally is to say that the report that is made on the matter will likely be a military report and it is doubtful if publicity can be given to it. I cannot give any assurance at the present time that publicity will be given to it; I would first have to see the report. The answer to the third question is yes.

NATIONAL RAILWAYS DINING CAR SERVICE—FRESH SEA FOODS

Mr. WHITE:

1. Are fresh sea foods always served on government-owned trains operating out of Halifax?

2. If not, why?

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Yes; as available and according to season.

2. See answer to question No. 1.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

Mr. CASSELMAN:

1. Who are the present members of the Canadian section joint international board of engineers for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence power and navigation scheme?

2. When were they appointed and what have each received each year since 1938 in, (a) remuneration; (b) travelling expenses?

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. It is presumed that the reference is to the "Canadian Temporary Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin Committee", presently dealing with the engineering features of the project, the members of which are: G. A. Lindsay, Department of Transport; T. H. Hogg, chairman, Ontario, Hydro-Electric Power Commission; O. O. Lefebvre, vice-president, Quebec Streams Commission; J. E. Read, Department of External Affairs.

2. The members of the committee were appointed by order in council October 23, 1940.

(a) Remuneration: T. H. Hogg and O. O. Lefebvre received no remuneration for their services on this committee. Messrs. Lindsay and Read received no additional remuneration over and above their regular salaries.

(b) Travelling expenses: The following travelling expenses were paid in connection with the work of the committee:

Name	1940-41	*1941-42
G. A. Lindsay	$312 76	$1,174 33
T. H. Hogg	nil	nil
O. O. Lefebvre	218 69	658 18
J. E. Read	11 35	470 38

*Up to February 15, 1942.

COARSE GRAINS

Mr. BRUNELLE:

1. What quantity of coarse grains was brought to Ontario from western Canada last year, under the preferential freight rate?

2. What was the average price of such coarse grains (oats, rye and barley), in Winnipeg and in Toronto, last year?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Quantity of grain which was brought to Ontario from western Canada under freight policy which was carried out co-operatively with the Ontario Department of Agriculture and expired July 15, 1941, was as follows:

	Bushels
Oats	1,717,016
Barley	888,690
Screenings	301,108
Wheat	248,259
Mixed Grain	69,698
Rye	33,599
	3,258,370

2. As the grain was purchased by private transaction no record is available as to the prices paid.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. GRAYDON:

1. What was the total amount paid up to February 1, 1942, under the national unemployment insurance scheme by, (a) employees; (b) employers?

2. What was the total amount of benefits paid up to the aforesaid date to employees entitled to same?

3. How many employees were paid the said benefits up to the aforesaid date?

4. How many employees in Canada were contributing under the scheme as of February 1, 1942?

Mr. MITCHELL:

1. Contribution and revenue figures covering contributions by employers and employees including remittances from Post Office in February, 1942, covering January purchases of stamps are: (a) Employees (50·37%), $13,972,636.26; (b) Employers (49·63%) $13,767,360.29; total $27,739,996.55; contributions from government, $5,547,999.31; interest earned to December 31, 1941, $105,890.48; grand total, $33,393,886.34.

2. Nil.

3. Nil.

4. Up to February 1, 1942, approximately 2,300,000 books had been issued to persons working in insured employment.

ALASKA HIGHWAY COMMISSION

Mr. HANSELL:

1. What was the total cost of the British Columbia-Yukon-Alaska highway commission created by order in council P.C. 3252?

2. What are the names and occupations of each of the members of the commission?

[Mr. Brunelle.]

3. What did each of these members receive by way of (a) salary and emoluments, (b) travelling and other expenses?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. $18,287.67.

2. Honourable Charles Stewart, Chairman, International Joint Commission; Brigadier-General T. L. Tremblay, Department of National Defence; J. M. Wardle, Esq., Director, Surveys and Engineering Branch, Department of Mines and Resources; Arthur Dixon, Esq., Deputy Minister, Department of Public Works, province of British Columbia; J. W. Spencer, Esq., David Spencer Limited, Victoria, B.C.

3. (a) Nil; (b) Hon. Charles Stewart, $1,864.85; Brigadier-General T. L. Tremblay, $782.20; J. M. Wardle, Esq., $1,336.48; Arthur Dixon, Esq., $1,026.45; J. W. Spencer, Esq., $1,087.30.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE

Mr. BLACKMORE:

1. What was the total amount of bonuses paid in 1940 to each of the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act?

2. What was the total amount of collections under that act in each of the three prairie provinces?

3. What was the total number of townships eligible for bonus under the act in each of these provinces?

4. What was the total number of townships ineligible for bonus under the act in the said provinces?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Alberta, $1,600,934.39; Saskatchewan, $7,434,424.27; Manitoba $868,942.11.

2. Alberta, $743,115.16; Saskatchewan, $1,344,208.23; Manitoba, $333,453.13.

3. Townships which applied for bonus and were eligible:—

Alberta 584; Saskatchewan, 1,183; Manitoba, 156.

4. Townships which applied for bonus and were ineligible:—

Alberta, 218; Saskatchewan, 846, Manitoba, 144.

RURAL AND URBAN POPULATION

Mr. GRAYDON:

1. What were the respective percentages of the rural and urban population in Canada as shown in the census of 1901, 1911, 1921, 1931 and 1941?

2. What is Canada's rural population as shown in the census of 1941?

3. What number are shown as urban in the said census?

Mr. MacKINNON (Edmonton West):

The following table answers questions 1, 2 and 3.

Canada Classified as to Rural and Urban, 1901, 1911, 1921, 1931

Census Year	Total	Rural	Urban
1901	5,371,315	3,357,093	2,014,222
1911	7,206,643	3,933,696	3,272,947
1921	8,787,949	4,435,827	4,352,122
1931	10,376,786	4,804,728	5,572,058
1941	11,419,896*	Not yet available	

*Preliminary.

PAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. HANSELL:

1. Was Canada officially represented at the Pan-American conference held in Rio de Janeiro in January of this year?
2. If so, what was the name or names of the official representative or representatives?
3. If Canada was represented, were any commitments made?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

PRINTING CONTRACTS

Mr. GRAYDON:

1. With what corporations, firms or individuals did the government enter into contracts for printing during the calendar year 1941?
2. Were such contracts let by tender in each case?
3. If not, upon what basis was the contract in each instance given?
4. For what did each contract call, and what was the price?

DOLLAR-A-YEAR MEN

Mr. WHITE:

1. How many dollar-a-year men are serving the government of Canada?
2. What are their names and addresses?
3. What are their duties?
4. What living allowance and other expenses do they receive in addition to the $1 a year?
5. On what basis is such living allowance paid?

ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE—GASOLINE

Mr. WINKLER:

1. From what companies are oil and aviation gasoline for Royal Canadian Air Force training schools purchased?
2. What is the general practice in fuelling the gasoline tanks in planes?
3. Is it customary to overflow tanks and run gasoline on the ground?
4. Is it customary to drain tanks after the plane has been used?
5. Is gasoline below standard ever accepted?
6. Is gasoline of any kind ever destroyed? If so, how?

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE AIRPORT

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's):

1. What was the total cost of the airport at Portage la Prairie, Manitoba?
2. How much land was purchased in connection with this airport?
3. From whom was this land purchased and at what price?
4. What was the total cost of buildings and equipment?

ANCIENNE LORETTE AND ST. JOHN'S, QUE., AIRPORTS

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's):

1. How much land was purchased in connection with the development of airports at (a) Ancienne Lorette, Quebec; (b) St. John's, Quebec?
2. From whom was the land purchased in each case, and at what price per acre?
3. What was the total cost of each of these airports?
4. What was the total cost of buildings and equipment at each of such airports?

WHEAT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE ACREAGE REDUCTION AND CERTAIN PAYMENTS TO FARMERS

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to introduce a measure respecting wheat acreage reduction, to provide for the payment of certain sums to farmers in connection therewith, and for the administration of the act.

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.

Motion agreed to.

PRECIOUS METALS MARKING ACT

AMENDMENTS MADE BY ORDER IN COUNCIL UNDER WAR MEASURES ACT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I have frequently had occasion to call the attention of the government to the fact that while parliament was in session orders in council have been passed changing the statute laws of this country but I have never had an instance that was so coincident in point of time as the one to which I now desire to call attention, namely, the order in council P.C. 1372 passed on February 23, 1942. This order in council was passed under the War Measures Act and suspends the operation of subsection 4 of section 11A of the Precious Metals Marking Act for the duration of the war and six months thereafter.

Hon. members will recall that on the very day this order in council was passed under the War Measures Act this house gave second reading to a bill to amend the Precious Metals Marking Act, considered it in committee and then gave it third reading, and we were never told for a moment that a very much more important change in the law was being made under the authority of the War Measures Act by order in council.

I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce why as a matter of principle the government did not in these circumstances seek to suspend section 11A by act of parliament, which could have been passed on February 23, rather than by order in council passed on that day. The provisions of section 11A, suspended, were not important, but they are very much more important than the provisions of the bill which will shortly become an act of parliament. I think this is treating parliament with contempt.

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to give my hon. friend an answer to-morrow.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REPORTED TRANSFER OF ONTARIO HARD ROCK MINERS TO NOVA SCOTIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. E. McGARRY (Inverness-Richmond): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. According to press reports, hard rock miners are to be brought from Ontario gold mines to work in the Nova Scotia coal mines. Does the minister know that owing to the contemplated closing of No. 4 mine at Inverness many coal miners employed there will soon be thrown out of work?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The hon. member was good enough to give me notice of this question, and the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) gave me notice of a similar one. The Department of Labour has no knowledge whatsoever of the contemplated transfer of hard rock miners from northern Ontario to Cape Breton, but further inquiries will be made.

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): I wish to address a further question to the Minister of Labour. In reply to the hon. member for Inverness-Richmond (Mr. McGarry) with reference to the transfer of men from Kirkland Lake to Nova Scotia, the minister indicated that inquiries would be made. I am not entirely satisfied with that answer, because the press dispatch referred to by the hon. member for Inverness-Richmond definitely sets out that five hundred men are being recruited in Kirkland Lake now to be shipped to Nova Scotia, presumably because there are vacancies in the coal mines of Nova Scotia. If this is allowed to continue for a few days the chances are that we shall have the Kirkland Lake problem transferred to a section of the country where there already exists a problem.

Mr. SLAGHT: They would not stand the committee for industrial organization down there.

Mr. GILLIS: There is no committee for industrial organization in Canada. My hon. friend merely demonstrates his ignorance of that question; that is all.

Mr. SLAGHT: The hon. member doesn't know what he is talking about.

Mr. GILLIS: The labour supply board is definitely set up for the purpose of regulating the labour supply for Canada, and I am wondering who has the authority to institute a transfer of men from one section of the country to the other without the sanction of the labour supply board.

Mr. MITCHELL: I myself would like to ask the hon. member a question. What is the labour supply board he is speaking of?

Mr. GILLIS: The Minister of Labour is supposed to be chairman of the labour supply board, upon which are representatives of industry, the manufacturers' association, and labour.

Mr. MITCHELL: May I say this to my hon. friend: Don't believe all you read in the newspapers. When I made the statement that I had no knowledge of the organization of which the hon. member speaks, I meant that the Labour department has no knowledge of any contemplated transfer of miners from Kirkland Lake to Cape Breton—none whatsoever.

Mr. GILLIS: Has the Labour department any jurisdiction?

UNEMPLOYED MINERS AT KIRKLAND LAKE

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Minister of Labour whether he has taken cognizance of a communication from the miners at Kirkland Lake who have not yet been taken back to work, asking to be transferred to other scenes of labour in Canada? What is the government going to do about these miners who cannot find work in their own area? It seems to me that their position is almost hopeless if they cannot get back to their old jobs.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I have received no notice of my hon. friend's question—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But the minister is familiar with the subject.

Mr. MITCHELL: I am familiar with it, too, more so probably, in some respects. Transfers could be arranged to other industries by the employment service of Canada, but as hon. members know, the position taken by the miners primarily is that they should be returned to the mines.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I agree that that is what they would like.

Mr. MITCHELL: The hon. member for Cape Breton South on February 23 asked me with respect to the miners returning to work at Kirkland Lake. I made inquiries and to-day received this reply from the chairman of the Kirkland Lake committee of operators:

> We are taking the men back as quickly as possible with due regard to balancing our operations, but it is slower than we anticipated, and we are giving preference to the older and the married men first and I am sure that when the matter is finally cleared up you will be satisfied that we have done a good job on it.

Mr MacINNIS: May I ask the minister if he got in touch with the miners' organization to see whether their reply would agree with the operators' reply?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MITCHELL: Well, I have no objection to answering that; it is a proper question. That information came to my desk just as I was leaving for the house. The hon. member for Cape Breton South asked me a direct question, and I answered it as best I knew how, based on the question asked by the particular hon. member interested; and as the matter was raised by the leader of the opposition I thought I might combine the two.

Mrs. DORISE W. NIELSEN (North Battleford): I should like to address one more question to the Minister of Labour, and to have a definite assurance from him. Is he going to solicit from the union in Kirkland Lake an account of the proceedings in that town with regard to the taking back of men to work in the mines? I ask this question specifically because I was in the town of Kirkland Lake yesterday, and as regards the report of the operators' case which was read by the minister to-day, I would say it is an absolute falsification of what is going on.

Mr. MITCHELL: Answering the last statement of my hon. friend, of course that is a matter of opinion; she is entitled to her opinion and other people are entitled to theirs. I have always taken the position that one should not convict until all the evidence is in; that is sound British practice. But this can be fairly stated to my hon. friend, that the files of the Department of Labour are fairly complete as regards the case both of the operators and of the miners in connection with the Kirkland Lake dispute. As to the particular question raised by her, if she wishes to receive these files I shall be glad to have them placed at her disposal.

RADIO BROADCASTING

ANNUAL REPORT OF CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to direct an inquiry to the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson). Is it the intention of the government to refer the last annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to a standing or special committee of the house in order that the report may be considered and the operations and policies of the corporation fully reviewed at this time?

Hon. J. T. THORSON (Minister of National War Services): As yet there has been no definite consideration of the matter by the government. I would be glad if the hon. member would let the matter stand. An announcement of the intention of the government in this regard will be made in the course of a few days.

Mr. GRAYDON: I may mention that last year a similar question was raised. The Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe), under whose department this corporation was at that time, said then that we need not assume that there would be any reference to a committee during the war. That is the reason I asked the question.

ADDRESSES OF MR. LITVINOV AND LORD HALIFAX OVER UNITED STATES STATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): I wish to address a question, of which I gave notice on Friday, to the Minister of National War Services. Was Mr. Maxim Litvinov's first public address as ambassador to the United States, and which, according to news reports, was broadcast last Thursday night over one hundred and eighty United States stations and translated for transmission to

south America and the world, carried by Canadian Broadcasting Corporation stations in Canada? If not, why not?

Hon. J. T. THORSON (Minister of National War Services): I have had some inquiries made regarding this question, and have been informed that speeches by ambassadors particularly addressed to the United States public are not normally carried by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. There is however an agreement with the United States broadcasters for an exchange of information and facilities in the case of addresses which would appear to be of special interest in Canada. In this advance information service, Mr. Litvinov's speech of Thursday was not included—

Mr. COLDWELL: And that of Lord Halifax?

Mr. THORSON: —nor was that of Lord Halifax. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation believes, however, that a speech by Mr. Litvinov would be of great interest to a large number of people in Canada. It has been seeking to make arrangements for a broadcast of that sort, but as yet it has not been possible to make the necessary arrangements.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Does the minister not think that a broadcast such as Lord Halifax's statement would be a very fine thing for the Canadian people, stating as he did what sacrifices Britain has made to help Russia?

Mr. THORSON: No doubt it would be.

HUDSON BAY ROUTE

QUESTION AS TO USE BY CANADIAN AND UNITED STATES SHIPPERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Press items to-day report an apparently increased intensification of submarine attacks on Canadian, British and American shipping on the Atlantic. Coupled with that is the apparent danger of congestion on our railroads of east coast bound freight traffic. I would therefore ask the Prime Minister whether the government has given consideration to an increased use this summer of the Hudson bay route for the shipment of grain and other materials required overseas, thereby reducing the danger of submarine attacks to a considerable extent as well as relieving probable congestion on the railroads; also whether consideration has been given to granting to the United States of America free use of the Hudson Bay railway and the harbour facilities at Churchill for the remainder of the war?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): If I were anxious to advise the enemy as to what he should take notice of with respect to his possible avenues of attack in the course of the next few months, I would answer my hon. friend's question in full detail, provided that, in answering it, I were able to give him the kind of assurance which I think he wishes to have. I must say to him that if he will look at his own questions to-morrow he will see that it is not in the public interest that they should be answered publicly. I believe that answer applies to both questions.

ALASKA HIGHWAY

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ARMY ENGINEERS ROUTE THROUGH CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. G. HANSELL (Macleod): The Prime Minister answered a question of mine appearing on the order paper with respect to the Alaska highway. I should like to ask him a question now. According to news dispatches, the commission of the United States army engineers recently travelling from Edmonton to Alaska in respect to the United States-Alaska highway have reported to the joint international defence board. May I ask if the government has knowledge of such a report? If so, will it lay the report on the table or make some announcement in respect to the matter? I have no desire to elicit military secrets from the Prime Minister, but I believe the country is waiting to know whether the Alaska highway is going to be built this year and what route it is going to follow.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would not be able to satisfy my hon. friend or others with respect to the point which he has just raised. The matter, as he himself has indicated, is under consideration, but what the final decision will be I am not in a position to say until it is made. As soon as the government is in a position to make a public announcement on the matter it will be made, but meanwhile reports on the subject are necessarily confidential.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): The Prime Minister has already answered several questions with regard to the Alaska highway. I wish to ask either himself or the appropriate minister—possibly the Minister of Mines and Resources (Mr. Crerar)—whether, before the agreement is made with the United States that a highway shall be built from the United States through any part of Canada to Alaska, the route that will be followed, and

so on—before these questions are definitely decided and an agreement reached, and the route selected—the matter will be submitted to the house. I happen to know a good deal about the terrain over which the route will go and I have my own opinions after a study of a good many years as to where it ought to go, where the interests of the country can best be served in this war emergency, where freight and other materials should be moved, to and fro, and I should like to be able to give the government the benefit of these opinions and at the same time ascertain what their plans are before they have gone too far to be rectified, if they need rectification. I should like to be assured that the house will be acquainted with what is going to be done before it is finally done.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend's question is one of those to which it is rather embarrassing to answer either yes or no. I should not wish to give him either answer at the moment, but I do appreciate what he has just said about the knowledge which he has on matters pertaining to the Yukon and the approaches thereto. This knowledge, I know, the government would be glad to avail itself of. The same may be said of special knowledge possessed by many other hon. members especially those with constituencies in British Columbia. I shall see that what my hon. friend has in mind is brought to the attention of my colleagues and also to the attention of the members of the joint defence committee who are dealing with the subject. We shall perhaps be able to decide, later on, on the course which in the public interest should be taken.

ENEMY PROPERTY

SALE OF JAPANESE FISHING BOATS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty). May I say that I thought when I came here that the question should be directed to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Michaud), but in these days the departments overlap to such an extent that one hardly knows to whom to direct a question, as instanced by the return brought down by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Ilsley) regarding the handling of fish oils. My question has reference to an advertisement which appears in the local paper, *British Columbian,* of New Westminster, having to do with the sale of fishing boats. The second last paragraph of the advertisement I shall read, and on it I am going to base a question to the Secretary of State:

Offers for fishing boats, if accepted, will be those from bona fide fishermen of fishing companies who are entitled to own vessels of Canadian registry.

My question is: Are these fishing vessels being offered only to those fishermen connected with fishing companies, or are vessels for sale being offered to all fishermen? As one reads this advertisement, it would appear that fishermen must be attached to fishing companies before they can make an offer for these vessels.

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): I take it that the hon. member's question is directed to me, not so much as Secretary of State but as custodian of enemy property. I believe a certain limited number of boats were taken possession of, having been formerly owned by Japanese nationals in British Columbia. With regard to the particular question of the advertisement to which my hon. friend refers, I have had no notice of the question, and should appreciate it if he would allow it to stand until I have had an opportunity to obtain the necessary information.

HOUSING

CONDITIONS IN OTTAWA—ADVISABILITY OF MOVING GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS TO OTHER CENTRES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): May I ask the Prime Minister if the government proposes to take immediate steps to deal with the serious housing situation in the city of Ottawa brought about by the necessity of providing shelter for the multitude of employees engaged on the staffs of the new departments which it has created; or, alternatively, has it considered the advisability of moving some of these departments to other centres where sufficient accommodation is available, as has been done by the Washington administration?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend was kind enough to give me notice of his question. Since I received his note I have tried to secure information additional to what I already had in a general way, but the wartime housing officials have their office in Toronto and it has not been possible for me to get any additional information from them thus far. I would say with respect to the question of the housing of government employees in Ottawa that the government has been giving a great deal of consideration to the matter. The difficulty here has been that some of the controllers of war materials and building supplies have found it very difficult if not impossible to release cer-

tain supplies at this time which are required for war purposes. That has created one difficulty with respect to going ahead with some work of construction which might otherwise have been proceeded with.

In regard to decentralization, there is the difficulty that the government departments are much interrelated and it is going to make administration more difficult if decentralization has to be resorted to to any extent. That aspect, however, has been and is being considered. I do not think I can say more than that at the present time.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask the Prime Minister if the attitude of the treasury board has not something to do with this? The suggestion has been made in an Ottawa paper—I would not have brought up the question if it had not been raised otherwise—that the treasury board has frowned on the expenditure.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think that is correct. My recollection is that the treasury board has been if anything benevolent in regard to most expenses that are being called for.

Mr. CRERAR: Too benevolent.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may be giving the minister more credit than I should, but in this matter I think he has been ready to go ahead if matters could have gotten under way from other sources.

Mr. BRUCE: Would not the unemployment insurance commission's activities be just as well housed elsewhere as in Ottawa?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Again it is a matter of administration I think.

TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY

QUESTION AS TO COMPLETION TO SERVE MILITARY PURPOSES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. C. E. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I should like to ask the government what is being done to complete the trans-Canada highway in case such highway is required as a military road, and when will it be completed?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I heard only part of the hon. member's question. It had reference to something being used as a military road.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I asked, when will the trans-Canada highway be completed?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot say, and I do not believe anyone else can.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

WAR INDUSTRIES

WORKING HOURS IN PLANTS PRODUCING WAR SUPPLIES

On the orders of the day:

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I now have an answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston) on February 23 as recorded on page 782 of *Hansard:*

It is impossible to state how many factories producing war supplies are working full time and how many are working only part time. Many plants producing war supplies have only a portion of their employees so engaged. The rest of their employees are working on civilian production.

On inquiry I find that orders placed with aircraft plants in Canada are sufficient to keep each plant operating at full capacity at least until 1943. Lay-offs will take place for some time to come for such reasons as the following:

1. Orders on certain types of planes are tapering off, and persons engaged in certain occupations are being temporarily laid off until suitable work becomes available on the new models.
2. The tooling-up process for new models requires much fewer workers than will be required for production.
3. In some cases lack of materials and delays in securing certain supplies have caused temporary lay-offs.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I did not hear what the minister said at first. Does he say it is impossible to find out how many factories are working full time?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

GOVERNMENT NOTICES OF MOTION ON MATTERS AFFECTING AGRICULTURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. C. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the fact that he allowed his motion on to-day's order paper to stand, and that in other years the subject matter of his motion and the resolution of the Minister of Agriculture in relation to wheat have always been discussed together, would it be possible to get copies of his bill? It will be impossible to assess the value of either one unless the complementary matter of the other is available.

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Attention will be given to the suggestion of the hon. member. The question relates to government policy. I do not know that there is anything further I can say at the moment.

PLEBISCITE ACT

PROVISION FOR TAKING OF VOTE ON ANY QUESTION SUBMITTED BY WAY OF PLEBISCITE

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State) moved that the house go into committee on Bill No. 10, respecting the taking of a plebiscite in every electoral district in Canada and the taking of the votes at such plebiscite of Canadian service voters stationed within and without Canada.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Fournier (Hull) in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. McLARTY: I think it might be appropriate, before we proceed too rapidly with the bill, that I should make a few observations in connection with the work of the special committee that was appointed to consider it. I do not think it necessary to make them at any length.

In the first place the committee met and gave intensive study to the measure, even though in point of days consumed the time was short. It will, I think, be a matter of gratification that the report is unanimous, that all shades of opinion were able to agree on the particular enactment that the committee had to consider.

The committee not only considered the particular clauses of the bill, but as the bill provides and as was announced at the time the motion was introduced and upon second reading, regulations to implement the provisions of the bill were also considered.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Will they be before this committee?

Mr. McLARTY: I would say not. I think any matter relating to them, any question as to procedure, questions as to scrutineers and things of the kind might properly receive the attention of this committee, but the regulations are not part of the bill. Three provisions were applied, however, which should make the regulations fair in their application.

First, it is provided in the bill itself that these regulations shall as far as possible comply with the sections of the Dominion Elections Act. That would apply largely to the case of the ordinary voter. In the case of the service voter, however, the regulations, which are under separate cover and form a section by themselves, comply with the regulations that were used in the last dominion election in 1940 to take the vote of service voters.

A third point which I might suggest is that while it is undoubtedly undesirable to impose penalties by way of regulations, no penalty is provided under the existing regulations which the committee approved, so far as it had any authority to approve them, that is not contained in the Dominion Elections Act, save one. That is the provision of the bill as to vouching and illegal voting by way of the vouching provisions, so that every penalty clause included in the regulations has received the consideration of the parliament of Canada. In other words the specific regulations relating to ordinary voters are an adaptation as closely as possible of the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act. So far as they relate to service voters they are an adaptation of the regulations used in the last dominion election, which apparently worked successfully. I believe the regulations have been distributed to hon. members, as was the bill, after consideration by the special committee. Consequently, I suggest that there can be no possible objection to giving to the committee any information that may be required as to specific points covered by the regulations, but to go over the regulations clause by clause as we undoubtedly shall on the bill, in the case of both ordinary voters and service voters, would probably be an undue waste of time of this committee and of the house.

With these few general remarks I should like to deal with the amendments, because the committee did make some amendments to the bill. The principle of the bill has been debated at length, but despite that fact the special committee gave careful and considered attention to the respective sections. In general, it may be said three principal amendments have been made. The first of these is to ensure that the bill is not general, but specific in application. That is done by a definite amendment to section 3 by setting out therein the form and terms of the ballot, and by making other necessary minor changes, such as changing "a" to "the" when it is necessary to prescribe a particular limitation in respect of the plebiscite. That is the first important amendment.

The second amendment extends the coverage of the bill to include a situation which arose in connection with the Yellowknife administration district. The bill itself refers to electoral districts. This was a district which had grown up within the last few years, but which was not included within the definition of the term "electoral district". Representations were made by representatives of the council of the northwest territories to the effect that the people who had settled in the Yellowknife administration district within the last few years should not be disfranchised. The committee saw fit to accede to the representations thus made, by adding a new paragraph (d), the wording of which includes the administration district of Yellowknife.

This is a compact district, having something like 1,400 voters all within a radius of three and a half miles. Although it is a new district, the act of disfranchising them appeared to the special committee both unjustified and unjustifiable.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Are they at present in any electoral district?

Mr. McLARTY: No, they are not, and that is why we have had to have a specific paragraph (d); otherwise they would not be included. It is true that there are others in the northwest territories who might have been considered, but it was thought to be impracticable to include them because of the vast area and the tremendous expense which might be involved. The committee sought to extend the bill as far as possible without involving any great measure of expense in connection with the vote.

The third major amendment is that found in paragraph (c) of subsection 2, section 4. During his observations the hon. member for Rosthern (Mr. Tucker) pointed out that in that paragraph we were leaving with the provinces the possibility of regulating as to those who might vote in the plebiscite. It is remarkable, I believe, that in the plebiscite of 1898 provincial lists were used exclusively.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We had no federal lists then.

Mr. McLARTY: No, as the leader of the opposition has said, we had no dominion lists. Prohibitions were made in the elections act of 1938; but in order that there might be no misapprehensions in the matter we have provided in paragraph (c) that the provincial enactment shall be operative only at the time of the coming into force of this act. It precludes any possibility, as suggested by the hon. member for Rosthern, that between now and the taking of the plebiscite provincial legislation could be extended to disfrancise other voters in Canada.

I believe those are the main amendments recommended by the special committee. A perusal of the bill will indicate the minor changes. I might explain that the words inserted in paragraph (c) of subsection 2, section 4, are "at the time of the coming into force of this act." The leader of the opposition will recognize the change. It merely limits any change in the provincial right to amend an election list to the time when the act comes into force.

I believe I have dealt with all the important amendments. Minor changes must necessarily be made in order to give effect to the chief amendments. Then, some other matters were considered by the special committee. In the debate on the resolution and on the second reading of the bill there was some discussion as to the break-down of cost. It was suggested by the leader of the opposition that the break-down might be examined by the special committee, and then placed on *Hansard*. That break-down was given to the special committee, and I believe the purposes of this committee would be served if I were to have leave to place the break-down on *Hansard*. It is as follows:

The following is the estimated detailed cost of the holding of a plebiscite, subject to the adoption of the proposed procedure for compiling lists of voters, and subject also to approval by the governor in council of a tariff of fees providing lower allowances than those paid at the last general election.

1.	Plebiscite supplies consisting of ballot papers, books of instructions, index books, poll books, record books, and various blank forms required to be ordered by the chief electoral officer.....		$ 80,000
2.	Temporary assistance in the office of the chief electoral officer.....		7,500
3.	Sundry expenditure in office of the chief electoral officer, such as stationery, telegrams, etc.		3,000
4.	Returning officers' personal services, 32,000 polls at $4.....		128,000
5.	Clerical assistance to returning officers, 32,000 polls at $1.50.....		48,000
6.	Sundry expenditure by returning officers, 243 estimated to average at $50		12,150
7.	Rental of offices by returning officers, 80 at $75.....	$ 6,000	
	163 at $50.....	8,150	
			14,150
8.	Election clerks, 123 at $25.....	$ 3,075	
	120 at $10.....	1,200	
			4,275
9.	Printing ordered by returning officers		17,000
10.	Urban enumerators, 3,500,000 names at 7 cents....		245,000
11.	Rural enumerators, 3,500,000 names at 7 cents....		245,000
12.	Deputy returning officers, 32,000 at $6.....		192,000
13.	Poll clerks, 32,000 at $3.....		96,000
14.	Polling stations, urban, 12,000 at $8.....	$96,000	
	2,000 at $4.....	8,000	
			104,000
15.	Polling stations, rural, 16,000 at $5.....	$80,000	
	2,000 at $3.....	6,000	
			86,000
16.	Advance polling stations, 200 at $41.....		8,200
17.	Constables, 10,000 at $2.50.....		25,000
18.	Travelling by plebiscite officers..		50,000
19.	Allowances and expenses of special returning officers, chief assistants, scrutineers, and clerical assistants *re* Canadian service voters.....		50,000
20.	Sundries		85,000
			$1,500,275

A question was asked by the leader of the opposition as to the specific date on which the plebiscite will be held. I believe it is the unanimous opinion of the committee that the earlier the date selected, the better it will be. When introducing the resolution I suggested it was difficult to have it in a shorter time than ten weeks. Just when the bill will become law is a matter which will depend not only on this committee but on the action taken in another place. Royal assent will have to be given. I believe, however, that assurance can be given the committee that the plebiscite will be held at the earliest possible moment. Of course the bill itself provides that the vote must be held on a Monday, and to some extent when determining the date we are in the hands of the electoral officer.

Another point that was raised by the leader of the opposition had to do with the actual procedure to be followed in taking the vote of the active service voters. This was placed before the special committee and I think it was a matter of some interest. I do not believe it would be outside the interest of this committee if I outlined the exact procedure which it is proposed to follow.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is all in this pamphlet.

Mr. McLARTY: Has that been circularized to every member of the committee?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not think it has.

Mr. McLARTY: That is what I had in mind when I proposed taking up the time of the committee by reading it. This is a memorandum prepared by the chief electoral officer and it gives the clear and definite procedure which was followed in 1940 in taking the overseas vote.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I do not think the minister is quite correct in referring to it as the overseas vote; it applies to Canada as well.

Mr. McLARTY: Service voters. There are two classes of voters, ordinary and service, and this refers to the method of taking a vote of the service voters.

The vote of the Canadian members of His Majesty's forces and corps on active service and in training within and without Canada will be taken in much the same manner as the vote of active service electors was taken at the last general election.

Special returning officers will be appointed and will establish offices in London, England, in Newfoundland, and in various places in Canada.

To some extent we will be in the hands of the Department of National Defence as to the exact points at which troops are concentrated and at which it would be practicable to take a vote. In so far as it can be done, the vote will be taken on the widest possible basis, but there are some who will necessarily be overlooked. For example, there are men serving in the imperial forces or in parts of the world where it would be impracticable to take a complete vote. The only assurance that this committee can be given is that in so far as the Department of National Defence feels that a vote can be taken practicably, it will be taken.

Mr. LOCKHART: Guards serving in outlying districts could be brought in?

Mr. McLARTY: That is too broad a question for me to answer. I think the question would have to relate to a specific district before it could be dealt with. I suggest that there are probably no outlying districts in Canada that could not be reached, but that would be subject to the advice of the Department of National Defence. I continue with the memorandum:

These special returning officers will distribute ballot papers, envelopes and other plebiscite supplies to commanding officers named by the Department of National Defence and stationed in the territory under their jurisdiction. Such commanding officers will designate a commissioned officer attached to his unit to take the votes of the members of such unit. As at the last dominion election, what is termed postal voting will be resorted to in the recording of such votes. The voting will be held on nine week days immediately preceding polling day. The hours of voting will be fixed by the commanding officer, but shall be not less than three each day.

When a Canadian service voter seeks to vote at the polling place, he will first be required to complete a declaration giving his full name, his regimental number, that he is a British subject, that he has not voted before at the plebiscite, that he ordinarily resided in Canada prior to his enlistment, and giving the name of the place, with street address, of such ordinary residence in Canada.

When this declaration has been duly completed and signed by both the voter and the commissioned officer, the voter will be handed a ballot paper in practically the same form as that used in Canada, and an inner envelope, and will go to a compartment and there secretly mark his ballot paper. The ballot paper will then be folded, and, in full view of the commissioned officer, placed in the inner envelope. The inner envelope will then be placed into an outer envelope addressed to the special returning officer, and upon which the postage is paid. The voter will then himself mail the envelope at the nearest post office or mail box.

Upon receipt of the outer envelopes in the office of the special returning officer, they will be examined and parcelled in lots of 500. Each parcel being labelled with a consecutive number and stored in a safe place until the counting of the vote begins.

At six o'clock on polling day the special returning officer and his staff will count the ballot papers included in each lot of 500 and

a special statement of the count will be completed in the case of each lot. A period of one week is allowed for the counting of the votes of Canadian service voters.

The special returning officer will then be required to send to the chief plebiscite officer by telegraph, or otherwise, a statement of the number of votes cast in the affirmative and in the negative, respectively, at the plebiscite in the territory under his jurisdiction. As soon as this is done, the special returning officer will transmit to the chief plebiscite officer a statement giving the number of votes cast in the affirmative and in the negative, respectively, in each of the lots of 500 outer envelopes parcelled as above referred to.

Mr. STIRLING: It would look as though a large proportion of the 27,000 sailors will be unable to vote.

Mr. McLARTY: That is a matter which the chief electoral officer is taking up with the Department of National Defence for Naval Services. Of course it will be quite difficult for some of those who are actually on the high seas to vote. The chief electoral officer explained to the special committee that in so far as the Department of National Defence for Naval Services could advise him, arrangements would be made to take the vote as widely as possible. I know the hon. member will appreciate that there will be no intentional desire to miss anyone, but inevitably there will be some votes that cannot be taken.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The naval department could make it possible to take the greater majority, if they wished.

Mr. McLARTY: That is the desire, and I think I can assure the committee that no steps will be left untaken to see that every man, whether in the navy, the air force or the army who can be reached, is given an opportunity to cast his vote. It is a matter of the mechanics of the thing. The committee instructed the chief electoral officer in no uncertain terms that they wished the coverage to be as broad as possible, and with that he agreed.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: In totalling up the votes of the service voters will it be done en masse, by constituencies or by provinces?

Mr. McLARTY: It will be en masse; there will be no attempt made to relate the total to a particular riding or constituency.

Other suggestions were made when the resolution was being considered, one by the leader of the opposition being that as a condition precedent to obtaining a ballot the registration card of any voter should be required to be presented. The committee gave that careful consideration and the conclusion arrived at was that since it was desired to get the widest possible vote, the least possible number of obstacles should be placed in the way of those who are anxious to vote. It was thought that the benefit to be derived from insisting as a condition precedent upon the production of registration cards would be more than offset by the fact that a good many of those who wished to vote, admitting it is the law, might inadvertently—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is the law.

Mr. McLARTY: Of course it is, but inadvertently they might lack them. For the purposes of identification the registration card would have only one value, as to the name. While a registrant is supposed to advise the department of any change of address, the card itself would not contain any record of that. For this reason, while careful consideration was given to it, it was thought that the disadvantages outweighed the advantages.

In the next place, the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) made the suggestion on Thursday last that it might be possible to acquire a new registration by virtue of making registration compulsory in order to vote. The committee gave that consideration, but there again, bearing in mind the different ages of registrants as compared with voters, and that there would be a large class of active service voters which the registration would not in any event affect, it was thought better to allow the polling to be more wide open and not have it compulsory to have registration, which would not be compulsory, on the one hand, but might be inducive to voting on the other.

Another matter which was considered by the committee was that discussed by the hon. leader of the opposition, with respect to the section of the act allowing for vouching and declaration by a proposed voter who had been left off the enumeration list. The committee considered that carefully. They had the experience of the chief electoral officer and of counsel for the chief electoral officer, and the conclusion to which they came was this: In the rural sections there is no doubt that the open vote works out satisfactorily. In the urban centres on such a wide scale it might fairly be said that the open vote has not been taken advantage of. It has, however, been used in a number of the provinces, in Saskatchewan, for example, and it has been used in urban municipalities with a population up to 10,000. The evidence presented to the committee, which undoubtedly determined the committee's decision on the matter, was that wherever this system of voting has been used it has been proven satisfactory.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Has it ever been tried in Montreal?

Mr. McLARTY: No, it has not been tried in Montreal, or in any urban centre with a population over 10,000. But the fact that wherever it has been tried it has worked out satisfactorily led the committee to believe that perhaps a wider experiment would not be disadvantageous and would not prove to be disastrous to the vote itself, in any way, shape or form. In other words, merely because it has not been tried out on a wider scale is scarcely any justification for saying that while it has worked out well wherever it has been we should not extend the field where it operates. Consequently, the committee felt that for the purpose of this plebiscite the system of vouching and swearing could with advantage be tried, and the thought was expressed that it would work out in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. HOMUTH: Could the clerk or the deputy returning officer vouch for a voter who came in?

Mr. McLARTY: The answer to that is no. When I say the answer is no, I believe the answer is no. The one who vouches has to be a qualified voter in the same subdivision.

Mr. HOMUTH: May I follow that up. I think the point is important. People will go to the polls to vote, thinking they are on the list and then find they are not on the list. In order to vote they would have to find someone to vouch for them. But once in the booth they cannot go out. Then they would be deprived of their vote.

Mr. McLARTY: That is a matter of regulation into which I should like to inquire further. But I suggest this: it is the intention to post a list of voters, and anyone wishing to vote can go to the trouble, if he wishes, of seeing whether his name is on the list. My impression is that the man who leaves the booth is not thereby disqualified from voting. My impression is that he is disqualified if he refuses to take the oath.

Mr. HOMUTH: Under the act, if he goes out, he cannot come in again to vote.

Mr. McLARTY: I am not going to question the hon. member's judgment on that, because I know he has had a wider experience than I have.

Mr. HOMUTH: I have had plenty of experience with it.

Mr. COLDWELL: That is how many voters were disqualified in 1917.

Mr. McLARTY: A voter could not return to vote if he refused to take the oath, but if he merely went into the booth and then came out he was not excluded from returning. That is a point on which I should be very glad to get information.

Mr. MacINNIS: Are we not confusing two things, the booth and the polling place? Once a man has gone into the booth he certainly cannot vote again.

Mr. McLARTY: I simply followed the wording used by the hon. member for Waterloo South. It should be "polling place."

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There is no limitation on the number of voters for whom one elector can vouch; that is to say, no limitation on wholesale vouching? The minister sees my point; there may be a racket.

Mr. McLARTY: The only limitation that is placed on the person vouching is that section of the act which provides severe penalties for vouching for an unqualified voter. Otherwise there is no limitation placed on the number of voters for whom one person can vouch. The limitation is purely a matter of the penalties which are prescribed against illegal vouching.

There are other matters which the committee considered, but I believe I have dealt with the principal ones, and I suggest that the others might await consideration of the bill, clause by clause.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, as I said a moment ago, it is my intention now to read a very important and magnificent letter which has been sent by a great Canadian citizen to the Prime Minister of Great Britain. It was received by Mr. Churchill this morning, having been sent across via ferry command. The letter is dated Montreal, February 25, 1942, and reads:

The Right Honourable
Winston Spencer Churchill,
Prime Minister,
10 Downing Street, London, England.

Mr. Prime Minister:

A citizen of the commonwealth, no matter how humble, always enjoys the right to communicate with the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, to give him his reflections and make known to him his thoughts. There are moments, rare it is true, when the right becomes a duty. I think that, for the writer, that moment has arrived, sir.

Mr. Prime Minister, the citizen who writes is a Canadian of the French language, a loyal subject of the King of Canada, faithful to the culture of his forebears, devoted to the Franco-British union in Canada, who prays with all his power for a total war effort. He believes that the future of the world rests in the victory of the united nations and their defence of free institutions.

He is one of your admirers, for you are the great heroic figure of the war. Victorious over the treachery of the appeasers you have, in an

hour of tragic responsibility become the spirit incarnate of British resistance, the spirit of the Commonwealth's sacrifice, the spirit of victory itself. With that spirit you have inspired the whole coalition. After the abandonment of Czechoslovakia, stupid and dishonourable as it was; after the destruction of Poland; after the disaster of Norway; after the defeat of Holland and Belgium; after the fall of France; Britain stood alone with the commonwealth nations against the nazi monster. The position of Russia was uncertain and ambiguous; the United States, far away in distance and in its own state of mind, disarmed, its people devoted to the ways of peace, believed itself safe behind the two oceans which lave its shores. In this desperate plight you alone were not desperate, did not despair. You communicated your hope and courage to all men. Led by you, Britain faced with high hope whatever sacrifice might be met, faced it alone with her sister nations of the commonwealth, engaging her very existence and that of her empire. Because your magnificent words have spurred men to new hope, because Britain made it known that she would perish before she would yield, you have brought home to men everywhere the prime condition of victory . . . the will to win.

To-day you are faced by a new task, one more difficult and which will call for the exercise of new virtues in you. Victory will not adorn your standards until you accept the new task with all the tenacity which marks your very appearance. You have united the will and the conscience of all men of good will to fight for freedom, have done it with brave heart and brave words. Now we must go on and win.

Now we must win . . . It is no longer a question of eloquence.

Now it is a question of eternal vigilance, of intelligent imagination, of sternness in criticism, of passionate devotion of the services, who certainly yearn for victory but which, in all truth, are overburdened by a stiff-necked bureaucracy at the top. The duty of our political leaders is undoubtedly to protect the fair name of the services, if only for the sake of the dignity of the homeland, and there are times when, for this very reason, the statesman must suffer attack in silence. But the duty of the political leader is, above all, to control, to criticize, to inspire, to discipline the services of the state, both civil and military, to eliminate from them all uselessness and paralysis and to imbue them with fighting spirit, imagination, realism and the will to action. Never believe, sir, that the services will reform themselves from within; every biological organism, or social organism, always attempts by natural law to retain its existing form and being. It is only possible to change it from without. We cannot change the natures of men. But we can change men.

I do not think, Mr. Prime Minister, that I am unduly pessimistic. I believe with all my heart in the possibility, the hope, of victory. But we shall have to change methods and we shall have to change men. The democracies always seem to believe that it is sufficient to change ministers. That is only a beginning. Changes are urgently needed, at the top, in all the services of the state. Unless the series of disastrous events is to continue we must find men of initiative to undertake command of our forces, our technical departments and the services of the state as a whole. The cry of the ostrich: "The British only win one battle in any war; the last one!" still seems to be our slogan. The Lords of the Admiralty still think, no doubt, that it is enough to be British to be invincible and to them the column which commemorates Trafalgar and the spirit of Nelson in itself constitutes a definite promise of victory. Was it not Kipling who said: "If blood be the price of Admiralty, Lord God we have paid in full!"?

I do not wish to make a dolorous inventory of the series of disasters which have attended us on the seas. They provide a stern indictment against Britain's senior services. These continuous disasters have seriously impaired the spirit of all men, sir. Bring into your mind's eye, before your coldest and most lucid judgment, the effects of just the most recent on even the most resolute hearts . . . The *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse*, redoubtable and magnificent instruments of naval science, yet sent to the bottom almost instantly, for lack of aerial defence. Think of the *Scharnhorst*, *Gneisenau* and *Prinz Eugen*, bombarded for months in the harbour of Brest, yet with an insolent defiance which commands respect, braving Britain's power as they forced the Channel and the straits of Dover, despite the Royal Navy, the Royal Air Force and the guns of Dover.

What food for thought such occasions create! Do not tell us, as the services would like us to believe, that the escape of these three ships from Brest is a victory, or at least an amelioration of sea-problems, almost as though the great ships of the Royal Navy had let them through the Straits for that reason. You have courageously offered the people blood, sweat and tears. They accept this new defeat with grim resolution. They will accept more. But your duty and your policy must be to limit to the smallest inevitable amount this expenditure of blood, sweat and tears of a determined people.

It is no longer a question of heart or of eloquence. To-day the problem is one for the intelligence, one of implacable reform in high places. It is not possible for men to work 24 hours a day. But the departments of war must work without respite and with true intelligence if we are to win. Rejuvenate your Admiralty, sir. Do not judge all men by yourself, Mr. Prime Minister; not all the old men enjoy your physical and mental youth. Cut down by ten and twenty years the ages of all the men at the top. Forget peace-time rules of advancement. Let the young generals who win successes on the field receive without delay, not medals, but immediate increase in the importance of their commands. Surround yourself with twenty or a hundred young men . . . military men, naval men, aviators, men of science, engineers, business men . . . whose function it will be to think, and plan. Let it be their mission to exercise a passionate, endless, zealous watch over all the services of the state, military, naval, air force, foreign affairs, whatever these may be. Inspire these young men with your own spirit, as young men in other countries have been inspired to leadership by another passion, the nazi doctrine.

Our combatants are pledged resolutely to the supreme sacrifice. Our material of war reaches immense proportions and it grows from day to day with prodigious speed. With such great

resources at your command, in men and munitions, do not permit the victory of our cause to be delayed forever by the ingrained bureaucracy of old men of old mind.

We cannot lose the war. You have said so with moving eloquence which has stirred the whole world, rekindling its hope and its determination. But, Mr. Prime Minister, I put it to you that we cannot make the right moves on the chessboard of war if we leave the responsibility for decision to fossilized old men in uniforms.

Think, as often men did during the course of the last war, of the magnificent statue of the Victory of Samothrace, which was intended to crown the prow of a victorious battleship. It was clad in the wind. Its wings were spread for flight. But the Victory had no head! We cannot fight in such terms to-day. The true direction of this war depends upon creative minds, on organization, on skilled and determined leadership. What we need is not committees of old men in uniforms who come together occasionally to discuss the problems of the war as a matter of course, or duty, but who leave all initiative to the enemy. We need a brain trust, young and energetic, of whom constructive thinking, imagination, determination and daring will be expected daily . . . men who are not afraid to act, men who are not still fighting the last war . . . men who will brush aside all obstacles, permanent officials of alert and innovating mind. This is the urgent need in the armed forces and in all branches of administration of the war.

This is the price of victory.

Mr. Churchill, your back is against the wall, face to face with this task. Discharge it well and men will follow you to the ends of the earth.

I have the honour to be,
Mr. Prime Minister,
Respectfully yours,
Emile Vaillancourt.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have no idea in the world why that letter has been embalmed in *Hansard*. I was not able to follow it carefully but I shall read it. In the meantime, if the government had any knowledge of what was in the letter I think the Prime Minister ought to have taken a point of order so that it should not be in *Hansard*.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I had no knowledge of the letter, but I think it is a very good one.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Maybe it is; I do not know whether it is or it isn't.

Mr. POULIOT: If the hon. gentleman does not know, he has only one thing to do—say nothing.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think that ought to be struck out of the record. It is an impertinent observation on the part of the hon. member for Témiscouata.

Mr. POULIOT: It is pertinent.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not think it should be in the record. He has no right to interject anything of that kind.

Whatever observations I have to make to-day will be confined to the bill immediately before us. I regret to have observed, as the minister proceeded, that certain recommendations which I made—I believe it was in the committee stage on the resolution—have been rejected by the committee. I shall deal with these briefly as I come to them, but I want to register immediately a vigorous protest against the statement made by the minister near the conclusion of his remarks, that the service votes are to be counted en masse. I think the soldiers, sailors and airmen will want it to be known how they voted in relation to their constituencies, and, if that is not possible, at least in relation to their provinces. To allocate the votes in the general amount as pro and con will not, I think, be satisfactory to the men themsleves, and certainly it will not be satisfactory to us.

The bill which is now before the committee, the reprint as a result of the committee's report, differs entirely in principle, although not in form, with certain exceptions, from the bill to which second reading was given last week. I think it is the most awkward kind of drafting I have ever seen, to take a general bill of this kind and superimpose limitations upon it and make it a special bill applicable to one particular situation. From the standpoint of draftsmanship it could not be worse. I do not know why the bill was ever introduced in the form in which it was brought down unless it was the policy of the government to have the principle of the plebiscite in our system. I do not think for a moment that that was ever the intention of the Prime Minister. Certainly there was no utterance of his or of the Secretary of State which would give justification for that principle. The bill should have been withdrawn and brought down as a special bill designed to take this plebiscite. Instead of that, we have superimposed on the bill special limitations, including the ballot itself, as promised by the Prime Minister; but the rest of the bill is general in its character.

I do not suppose the government will at this late stage accept the suggestion which I made last week and withdraw the bill and bring it back in the form which good draftsmanship would dictate. With the limitations imposed by the amendments, that is to say, the limitation with respect to the ballot, and with the limitation that the ballot shall only be applicable to this plebiscite and no other plebiscite, I am in agreement. I am objecting just at the moment to the method by which that position has been arrived at. As a

lawyer, I say it offends my sense of good draftsmanship, and I am sure that will appeal to the Secretary of State as well. Whoever drafted the bill proceeded on a certain principle when it was the intention of the government, as I gather, that it should have been on another principle. That is all I am going to say about the form of the bill.

The changes as indicated by the minister were three. In section 2(d) a new definition of electoral district has been given so as to provide for including the Yellowknife administration district. That is all right. Where there are fourteen hundred people living in a contiguous settlement, in a territory which is not within an electoral district, they should have the right to vote. I have not the slightest objection to that. Section 3(1) provides for limitation to the taking of the ballot on the question set out in the ballot paper. I wish to make some brief observations with respect to the ballot. The question is the one which the Prime Minister stated in his speech on February 25. I have not compared it but I take it for granted that the very words are used.

Mr. McLARTY: It is identical.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am wondering why it was put in this form, the same question repeated twice. However, I am not raising any great objection to that, although it does seem to me to be a rather awkward way of doing it. Why should not the voter be asked to vote yes or no? Here we have two questions put to the voter and he is asked to put a cross after yes or after no as the case may be.

Mr. McLARTY: I intended to deal with that point in my remarks, and I wonder if the hon. member would object to my interjecting an observation here, because that was a matter that received very serious consideration by the committee. A number thought that perhaps one question could do, being answered yes or no. The point that swayed the committee in its decision was the evidence given by the chief electoral officer that this is a form of ballot that has been used repeatedly under the dominion temperance act, and the experience has been very satisfactory. A number of members of the committee, before they heard that evidence, thought that one question, to be answered yes or no, would be desirable; but after hearing the explanation it was decided otherwise. It looks like a double-barrelled proceeding, but that was the view of the committee.

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am obliged to the minister for the explanation, and there may be a good deal of reason in what he says. I should never have thought of repeating the question. I hope, however, it will work out all right. When we get to the committee stage I want to ask the minister certain specific questions with respect to some of the sections, but I shall not pause to deal with that now.

I wonder whether this parliament ever before consented to the imposition of penalties by regulations that never came before parliament. I may be all wrong, but I think that is a terrible principle, to impose penalties in regulations that under this bill have the force of law, that may be changed overnight by the governor in council and never come before parliament, and under which a man can be put in gaol.

Mr. McLARTY: I might remind my hon. friend that there is not a single penalty in the regulations that the parliament of Canada has not passed on.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think in his previous statement the minister made one exception.

Mr. McLARTY: That is included in this bill.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): This parliament has not passed on those regulations. For a government to bring down a measure imposing penalties by regulation which might land a man in gaol without the people's representatives having anything to say about the matter savours at least of dictatorship, if nothing worse. I do object to that. In a democratic country to impose penalties involving the liberty of the subject without the people's representatives having anything to say is an absolute negation of liberalism, of democracy.

I do not want to discuss the penalties. The minister has said that the regulations follow, as nearly as may be, those in the elections act. I would point out one exception. In this country we have been against the idea of the numbered ballot, because without doubt it is a method whereby the secrecy of the ballot is destroyed. If the minister will turn to section 28 of the Dominion Elections Act, chapter 46 of 1938, subsection 5 reads:

(5) The ballot papers shall be numbered on the back of the stub and the counterfoil, the same number being printed or written on the stub as on the counterfoil; each ballot paper shall bear on the back thereof an impression of the stereotype block supplied by the chief electoral officer pursuant to subsection 2 of section 13 of this act.

Then it goes on to say that the ballot paper shall be bound up. Section 15 of the ordinary voter plebiscite regulations reads:

15. (1) Immediately after the issue of the proclamation, the chief plebiscite officer shall cause the ballot papers to be used at the plebiscite held under the Dominion Plebiscite Act, 1942, and these regulations, to be printed on both sides, consecutively numbered, perforated and bound in books of twenty-five. . . .

If that clause is left in the regulations, every deputy returning officer and any man in the voting booth will be enabled, if he so desires, to learn how every voter voted. I do not think the minister intended that. I do not understand how that escaped the eagle eyes of the members of this committee, unless they are going to adopt a new principle and hereafter we are going to have numbered ballots. If that is going to be the case in Canada, look out. I do not know any better chance for tracing a voter's ballot and finding out how he voted. The numbered counterfoil I understand. That is a safeguard against fraud from the time the ballot leaves the hands of the deputy returning officer and is taken into the secret compartment until it is brought back and delivered to him. That is quite proper. But that is detached before the ballot is deposited in the box. I hope the Prime Minister, who is following me closely, will get my point. To have the ballot numbered as provided by clause 15 of these regulations is to provide a method whereby the secrecy of the ballot is destroyed. I ask hon. members to study this thing and test it. I ask that that regulation be changed, and I do not think I ought to have to elaborate the reasons why. There is no doubt that this is not in conformity with the elections act. I have demonstrated that. It is not a real adaptation of subsection 5 of section 28 of the act to which I have referred. If this is kept in the regulations, it is a violation of every principle of the secrecy of the ballot, enabling identification of voters, and it opens the door to abuses of the most glaring kind. I appeal to the government to have that changed. A very simple wording in the regulations following the provisions of subsection 5 of section 28 of the act will bring about the cure I am seeking. I think I should not have to argue that any further. Everybody will agree that we ought to preserve the secrecy of the ballot. I do not understand how the chief electoral officer, having regard to the provisions of subsection 5 of section 28, ever put that in the regulations, or what he had in mind. Certainly I would not for a moment think the government instructed him to do it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly not.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Not at all. I would not think the government would have any ulterior purpose like that, and if the minister is now cognizant of what I am endeavouring to substantiate, I think he will rise in his place immediately and say that should be changed.

Unless these regulations have been checked with the greatest care, there may be other instances where there has not been a proper adaptation of the provisions of the elections act. I pointed out to the house in the committee stage that the regulations should be instructive and interpretative, but that they should not be enacting or legislating.

That is a very sound principle, but it has not been followed. Apparently it never was the intention of the government to follow it. I admit it would take time but, after all, this is an important matter, even though it is now limited to one plebiscite. We ought not to do by regulation that which heretofore and under the general law of the country is done by legislative enactment. There is no doubt in the world about the power of the government to change any of these regulations. Just let us look at section 9:

9. (1) The governor in council may, for the purposes of this act, make such regulations as are expedient for the effectual taking of the plebiscite and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, for the printing, distribution and publication of the act and instructions issued thereunder, the preparation of voters' lists and other documents.

I refer particularly to subsection 3:

(3) Any regulations made under this act shall have the same force and effect as if enacted in this act.

I protest against legislation by regulation, even though the necessity for speed, from the government's point of view exists. This is wrong in principle, and it ought not to be followed in practice. I can just hear the welkins ring if my right hon. friend were in my place, and I were over there! He would object to this—make no mistake about it—and he would be right. I have thrown out in a gentlemanly manner the suggestion that the government ought not to do this sort of thing. My suggestion has been entirely ignored. This is not right; it is not good legislation, and it is not democracy.

In the course of my previous observations I made reference to the production of registration certificates. The committee did me the honour of investigating the matter but, according to the Secretary of State they were unanimous against my suggestion. I tell the minister and the committee that there are a large number of people in Canada who never registered under the national registration scheme. How great that number is I do not know. But I would

point out the law of the country states that everybody shall carry his registration certificate. Those people who did not register are shirkers, and ought not to be allowed to vote in a plebiscite which may, or may not, mean a great deal.

Any man who has not registered should not be permitted to vote. Every good citizen will have his registration certificate. I have carried mine, although I have never been asked to show it. I am sure, however, that each hon. member carries his registration certificate. The present bill allows a man who never intended to register, a man who may be a shirker, and everything else, to exercise his franchise. Is that a proper principle to encourage? The carrying of a registration certificate is no hardship. The Secretary of State has said it was the opinion of the committee that some people from rural areas might have forgotten their registration certificates. I heard about a man who died, and in whose safety deposit vault was found his registration certificate. That is the last place I should think it ought to have been. I know of no place where a man could get it less quickly.

There is no real reason in the world why a man should not produce his registration certificate, if he wishes to vote. This is a time of war, and it was my understanding that national registration was primarily intended to line up the man-power and woman-power of a nation. There have been cases of prosecutions for non-registration; there have been other cases of prosecutions for fraudulent connection with registration, and there have been other prosecutions with respect to the issuing of floating registration certificates. I cannot, however, conceive of any good reason why the government should give a vote to the man who for safety's sake, shall I say, did not register. I suppose it is now too late to make the necessary change. I would point out, however, that it is the law of the country that every man shall carry his registration certificate. If the government does not place in these regulations or in the bill something such as I have suggested, it will be saying in effect to the man who did not register, "Well, it is the law of the country, but we are not going to enforce that law."

May I now turn to the question of the open vote in urban municipalities. I said on an earlier occasion that open voting in rural districts, where a man could be vouched for by another elector, was a safe and proper procedure, because everybody knows everybody else. There would always be someone who could properly vouch for a prospective voter, and subscribe to the terms of the oath. But I tell the Secretary of State that in large urban centres the open vote will be subject to great abuse; it will be an instrument of fraud. Why, there is not anything in certain constituencies of the city of Montreal which is not resorted to at election time. It is well known that elections in Montreal are—I cannot summon language adequate to describe the fraud practised. They had nothing in Tammany Hall on election methods in Montreal.

I have heard of cases in smaller areas, under 10,000 persons where one man vouched for dozens of electors. My colleague will speak about that, later in the debate. You see, it becomes a racket, and I say this practice of open voting ought not to apply to the big urban centres. I have had no experience in other large urban areas, such as Toronto, but I have heard stories about what obtained at some points, and my information leads me firmly to the conviction that we cannot be too careful in our provisions to ensure honest voting in some of the big cities. There are all kinds of frauds. This measure lends itself to that type of fraud, when nobody knows anybody else, and it will become a racket. I suggest to the Secretary of State that the fact that certain members feel that the system of open voting has worked well in certain rural areas is no argument with respect to urban areas, because conditions are entirely different. The premise upon which one reaches the conclusion that a system may work well in one given situation, does not exist in the other situation.

Mr. McLARTY: I think I went a little farther than suggesting rural areas; I suggested urban areas up to 10,000 population.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is about the size of my own city. When I was a young man I knew practically every man and woman in my city. Most younger people would. I cannot say that that applies to-day because I do not live in my city six months in the year. Generally speaking, in cities of 10,000 or under, most people know all the adults either by sight or personally. If it is not too late, I would suggest that this be reconsidered.

On the matter of taking the active service votes, I see no reason why a very large proportion of the army vote should not be taken. As a rule, these men are concentrated fairly well, although there may be a few isolated cases. I am thinking of the men overseas who are all in Great Britain. But what about Canadians who are operating with the Royal Air Force? What about the several hundred Canadians who are with the Royal Navy? These boys would like to vote. My colleague has a son in that position and he would like to vote. What arrangements

are going to be made to take care of these boys? As I said, there are a great many Canadians in the Royal Canadian Air Force who are operating with the Royal Air Force, and they are not segregated by any means. I saw them working under Royal Air Force direction in certain parts of the old country. Are they to have a chance to vote? I am afraid, unless we get some assurance, they will not be given a chance to vote.

I do not see much difficulty about the army except where they may be isolated. I understand there are Canadian engineers in Gibraltar, and there may be some Canadians acting as observers in Libya and that sort of thing. I would think it would be almost an impossibility to get their votes, but what about the men at Gibraltar? I think it is most important that every service vote should be polled at this plebiscite. Certainly these men will have opinions on this question, and they are at a disadvantage as compared with the men at home. The greatest care will have to be exercised to get the service vote out.

I regret I have not had time to do more than read the memorandum which the minister quoted this afternoon and which outlines what is proposed to be done. I have not had time to read the regulations under which the service vote is to be taken. I should like to point out to the minister that in the last election a substantial proportion of the service votes was not polled. I have not a memorandum in front of me from which I could give the exact figure, but no doubt the authorities will know just what proportion was not polled. There was a substantial proportion polled in Canada, but in England all the service vote was not polled.

To sum up briefly, because I do not want to keep the committee too long, I object to the draftsmanship of the bill, but I am bound to admit as a lawyer that, awkward as it may be, it meets the objection which I have. This bill will die in law at the conclusion of the plebiscite. It is fairly good draftsmanship with respect to the general bill, but when you have superimposed these limitations and restrictions, from the point of view of legal draftsmanship it is just a botch. I still think the suggestion I made as to the production of registration certificates is sound for the reasons I gave. No man who has not registered should be allowed to vote in this or any other election.

I am going to deal with certain sections in the bill when we reach them, and I shall ask the minister for definite information. He has announced an amendment to section 4 which deals with the disqualification of voters to make this relate to the time of the coming into force of the measure. This will be quite definite if the principle involved in this section is adhered to. I assume that that will be the case and this, of course, remedies certain objections which were raised in the committee. I shall ask the minister certain questions about this matter of disqualification.

I intend to refer particularly to the Doukhobors. When we were in the west we saw some of these gentry, and we were told that the women worked the farms while the men hired out. The young men did not register under the mobilization act, and they were waiting around to take the jobs of other young men who enlisted in the active service forces. As labour gets scarcer, no doubt many of these Doukhobors will be able to get positions. I do not think that is a situation which ought to obtain in Canada. I do not know just what the provincial law is in British Columbia, but perhaps the minister will be prepared to give us details of the provincial laws that bar certain people from voting. We shall want to know about the Japanese and how many soldier Japanese will be permitted to vote. There will be other questions of a similar nature.

I mentioned the Doukhobors. A young man who comes forward to vote, certain other conditions prevailing, will lose his right to postponement of military service. Therefore he is not apt to come forward to vote. What about his father and mother, his cousins, his sisters and his aunts? Are they to be allowed to vote in Saskatchewan, we shall say? I raise the question and I want some information. A young man will not fight; he will not come forward to register, but his whole family will vote. I know it is a difficult matter to deal with, but this has been the position ever since these people came here. Then there are the Mennonites. Personally I do not know much about them.

I read with a great deal of interest the orders in council which relate to these conscientious objectors. I must say that the legal interpretation which I put upon these is not the same as has been put upon them heretofore by both parties, but it may be that that has been done for the purpose of avoiding trouble. You can lead a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink. There is a good deal of truth in that old saying. You can say that a man must work, but it is pretty hard to make him work. There is the celebrated case in the English law reports dealing with the opera singer, about which the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) spoke. You can restrain her from singing for somebody else, but you just cannot make her sing for you. There are physical

limitations about these things, and it may be that the interpretation that has been given in days gone by to some of these orders in council with respect to conscientious objectors has been given for the purpose of saving trouble to those in authority. I am not urging anything; I am just looking for information. If we have to have this plebiscite bill, let us have it and get it over with and get on with the war.

Mr. HANSELL: Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak on this plebiscite bill at this stage I find myself still tremendously confused as to why we are now facing the responsibility of passing such a bill as this seems to be. I am still confused over whether the people realize what they are voting for. I have tried to think my way through it. I have read many statements that have been made, particularly by the Prime Minister; I have studied not only the statements he made in the past few days but statements he made some time ago, and I am still confused. Perhaps I am not very brilliant, but I maintain that if I am confused over the issue, there are a lot of other people in Canada who are confused over it too.

I recall that last fall the Prime Minister, speaking on the issue of military service for overseas, made this statement in the house on November 12, 1941, rising to a question of privilege. I believe the press at that time were pressing him in respect to an all-out war effort, and as reported at page 4321 of *Hansard* of November 12, 1941, the Prime Minister used these words:

> I want it to be distinctly understood that so far as the principle of compulsory selective national service is concerned for Canada, in Canada, I stand for that principle. I have never taken any other stand. It is the position that I have held all along. It has been applied in connection with military training and applied in a number of other directions I might mention. How much further it will be applied the house will learn as the government takes its decisions on that matter.
>
> But so far as conscription for service overseas is concerned in the armed forces of Canada, that question was submitted to the people of Canada at the last general election, an election which was held in war time, and in which the leaders of all political parties made their statements to the electorate, and the people of Canada decided against conscription for overseas service. So far as I am concerned, without any consultation of the people on that subject, I do not intend to take the responsibility of supporting any policy of conscription for service overseas.

That is a clear and definite statement. I have nothing to say against it. It is bold; it is open; it cannot be misunderstood.

The question that is confusing me to-day is whether the people of Canada are now to be asked to vote on that issue which the Prime Minister said he would submit to the country. The reason why I am confused is this, that when the Prime Minister was speaking in the house the other day on the same subject he said, as reported at page 908 of *Hansard* of February 25:

> Hon. members have been talking about conscription, about no conscription and the like. That is not the issue in this plebiscite.

If that is not the issue in this plebiscite, in view of the Prime Minister's statement last fall that he would not bring in conscription for overseas service until he had consulted the people, I would ask this question: After this plebiscite is disposed of, when the government decides to bring in conscription for overseas service, are we to have another plebiscite? Is the Prime Minister then to go to the country on that issue? I believe that is a fair question based upon these two statements of the Prime Minister which I find confusing, with the plebiscite bill in its present form and the question framed as it appears in the bill. I think the minister or the Prime Minister should answer that question while we are in committee, and answer it definitely so that the people will understand.

Another reason for my confusion is the statement that was made by the Prime Minister, in that same speech, on February 25, as reported at page 914 of *Hansard:*

> We are simply asking to be given freedom to make an untrammeled decision and to come to parliament with that decision. Let my hon. friends keep that in mind, that before any measure can be passed in this parliament, no matter what it relates to, conscription or anything else, it has to get the support of a majority of the House of Commons and the ministry has to consider very carefully every aspect of the question which will bear upon the situation in presenting any measure to parliament.

After this plebiscite is disposed of, the government has not even then received from the people an expression of their feeling with respect to conscription for overseas service, and I ask this further question: Suppose another plebiscite is submitted to the country and the Prime Minister desires to bring in conscription for overseas service; am I to understand from this statement by the Prime Minister—and if language means anything it must mean this—that a measure will still be submitted to parliament to be accepted or rejected by this house?

I rose while the house was in committee to ask this one specific question: Are we to understand that irrespective of this plebiscite the people are still to be consulted with respect to compulsory military service for overseas and that a special measure will be brought down to this house for that purpose? I

should like an answer. I know I made a speech, but I asked a question, and it is a question the whole country is asking.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think there is any mystery about the government's position in the matter. At the present time the government is restricted with respect to recommending to the house, should it so desire, a course of action with regard to conscription, in virtue of commitments which have been previously made. If release from those commitments is given by the electorate of Canada, the government will feel itself entirely free to consider the question of conscription on its merits in the light of all the circumstatnces existing at the time, to recommend its course to parliament, and to have parliament deal with the matter as it does with any other matter brought before it. There is no different attitude assumed with respect to this one question from that with regard to any other.

Mr. HANSELL: Shall we need another plebiscite then to find out whether we are to have conscription?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope to heaven not.

Mr. HANSELL: I did not hear the Prime Minister's answer.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I say I hope not. And I say that I cannot imagine any circumstances under which it would be thought of.

Mr. HANSELL: My contention is that the present bill does not ask the people whether they want conscription for overseas service.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There are a lot of things which the present bill does not ask the people, because we want to ask them one question and one question only. If we had wished to ask twenty questions, we would have inserted twenty questions.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is it not a fact that under the terms of the War Measures Act the government can bring in total conscription at any time if it so desires?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, it is a fact. I made that very clear the other day. The legal power is there, but the government in this matter feels, and feels rightly, that it is under a moral obligation because of certain pledges which were made in the past and during the last general election not to use its legal power to enlist men compulsorily for service overseas.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: When the bill came down in its original form, the house raised serious objection to the generality of the bill in the form that it was in, and I think those who raised this objection were quite right. As the bill then was, it was possible to take a plebiscite in this country merely by the issue of a proclamation; and our committee was instructed, I believe from both sides of the house, to alter this particular phase. I think the committee will agree that this bill has now been made a particular one, since clause 3 now provides:

> This act shall be limited to the taking of a plebiscite on a question to be set out in the ballot papers in the following words and form.

The matter of the wording of the question in the plebiscite ballot also came up during the discussion, and the committee was informed, and I believe the majority agreed, that we had no power to deal in committee with the matter of the question. Since the question was presented to us in that form, the committee was not allowed to alter that, and we had to abide by the decision of the majority.

I must say that I, too, am still somewhat confused by the wording. I would certainly like to have it changed, and the direct question put to the people, whether they are willing to have a complete conscription of the accumulated wealth, the natural resources and the industry of Canada along with complete conscription of man-power.

I was surprised to find the regulations so copious. About sixty pages of them, for the most part adapted from the Dominion Elections Act, were considered. As regards the objection to section 15 of the regulations, I believe the regulation states:

> Immediately after the issue of the proclamation, the chief plebiscite officer shall cause the ballot papers to be issued at the plebiscite held under the Dominion Plebiscite Act, 1942, and these regulations, to be printed on both sides, consecutively numbered, perforated, and bound in books of twenty-five, and furnished in sufficient quantities to each returning officer.

It is a matter of doubt whether the term "ballot papers" includes the counterfoil or not. I do not believe there was any intention at any time that the ballot should be numbered, and I feel quite sure that, had that been the impression of the committee, such regulation would have been immediately amended.

Mr. McLARTY: Would my hon. friend allow me to interject a remark? It is not to differ with him; it is to agree with him. If he will refer to the ballot papers under the elections act and also the regulations under the plebiscite act, he will find the numbering

is identical, which, as he suggested himself, was the case as it was presented to the committee.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is it not a fact, though, that the form of the ballot paper is merely directory, while the regulation is mandatory, as a matter of law?

Mr. McLARTY: Probably the form following the regulation must comply with the regulation to be a proper form; and if the forms under the election act and under the regulations under the plebiscite bill are compared, it will be found that they are identical. There is no difference at all.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh, yes, there is.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: Thank you. There were one or two minor changes. One to which I would refer, is the matter of leaving the polling stations open. According to the Dominion Elections Act, polling stations are to be open from eight in the morning until six in the evening. I should like to have seen them kept open for the plebiscite from eight in the morning to eight in the evening, so that many thousands of workers in the factories and elsewhere can exercise their right to vote. An amendment was adopted providing that polling stations should be open until seven o'clock in the evening, which is a step in the right direction.

We have spent far too long on this matter of the plebiscite. However, now that this administration and this parliament have decided to go ahead with it, I hope it will be proceeded with speedily and the matter disposed of without delay. The people of Canada are looking askance at what is happening here, particularly at the time which is being spent. They must feel pretty much like soldiers who have been watching the enemy arm, seeing him approach, and about to attack. Then they are told by some brass-hat to go and polish their shoes. I hope we shall get through rapidly with this bill and have the plebiscite over and done with.

Mr. GRAYDON: Supplementing the remarks of the hon. member for Yorkton, may I ask the minister whether there is any good reason why the time for polling could not be extended to a little later in the evening. It seems to me that many of these sections were drawn by those who do not fully understand what the working man has to contend with as regards his hours of leisure. Do hon. members realize that many working people have difficulty, because of the limited number of hours that stores and offices are open, in finding time to attend to their outside business affairs? I think this is one place where we might well make a concession to the wage-earning section of our population, by extending a little the time for voting. In some sections where, perhaps, in a general election the results of the polling are of great importance, there may be some reason for restricting the number of hours, but with all possible emphasis I urge the government to reconsider the period for voting, particularly with a view to its further extension in the evening. I should like to see it so arranged that our working men will not have to line up at the booths during the last part of the day in order to vote. These are some of the busiest people in the country and they should be given proper consideration. I make that suggestion in a friendly and constructive spirit.

Mr. McLARTY: There is one section of the elections act which is incorporated in the regulations under the plebiscite act. The hon. member for Yorkton referred to the discussion we had in the committee. We did extend the hours from eight to six to the hours from eight to seven. In addition, I might point out that one matter which was impressed upon the committee was that each working man had two hours off with pay in order to be able to vote at any time during the election, and that will be incorporated in the regulations under the plebiscite act. It is in the elections act. That was one of the factors which were impressed upon the committee, and it will avoid the unfortunate situation of all having to vote at one time, as the hon. member has suggested.

Mr. GRAYDON: I am not so sure that is a complete answer to the problem. If I recollect —it is only an offhand recollection—a man working in a factory must make application to his employer to get time off. Arrangements must be made on that basis, and my suggestion would avoid the difficulties which might arise between employer and employee with respect to that request. I cannot see what great damage would result from keeping the polls open another hour, because, after all, some of these workers, particularly in war works, and in places far distant from their homes, have much difficulty in taking the two hours off. Most hon. members realize that. If the workers are a long piece away they must get transportation, and it is much easier for them to vote at the latter part of the day either after supper or when they are coming home. Moreover, it would be more convenient for them. I wish the minister would consider that point. I may be entirely wrong in my contention, but I am quite honest in urging it.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): Let me point out the difficulty that will arise in rural Canada,

especially if the vote is taken early in May. The farmers will be labouring under tremendous handicaps this year. There will be a great shortage of help, and there are very few farmers who can take the two hours off to vote in the busy season, in the seeding month of the year. If another hour were added, extending the time to eight o'clock, it would help to get out a greater number of farmers to vote, especially in the rural sections of western Canada. Most people do not quit work until late in the evening and if they had the extra hour many more people could go to vote.

Mr. FAIR: I am sorry that the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon), the prospective Minister of Agriculture when the Conservatives get into office, forgot about the farming population. Perhaps, when he becomes minister, he will forget the farmers just as much then as he does to-day, but that will only be in keeping with the practice of the present Minister of Agriculture. I rise to protest, as I protested as far back as 1938, against the discrimination that is being carried out in certain provinces—in four of them—against a particular class of citizens who find themselves in very unfortunate circumstances. I refer to section 10(k) of the regulations covering ordinary voters:

> in any province, every person who is an inmate of an institution which is maintained by any government or municipality for the housing and maintenance of the poor, if such person is by the law of that province disqualified from voting at an election of a member of the legislative assembly of that province, and did not serve in the military, naval or air forces of Canada in the war of 1914-1918 or in the war that began in September, 1939.

I am very sorry that this is in effect in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and British Columbia. Those hon. members who were on the elections and franchise committee when we revised the present election act in 1936, 1937 and 1938 will remember that we had a heated discussion on that problem, and in 1939 I brought in an amendment to the elections act which was defeated. We are living in a democratic country, at least under the forms of democracy, and I regret that the people of those provinces, and this parliament, have not seen fit to change those regulations so that we might have the benefits of democracy extended to people who are in our poor institutions. As I have pointed out on other occasions, the old age pensioners are demanding pensions because they have been legally robbed during their years of productive activity, and I believe that if we investigated the cases of a number of those who are in the institutions to which I have referred, we should find exactly the same position existing. To-day I am asking again, before this bill proceeds much further, that parliament take into consideration the plight of those who are in these institutions and give them the right to vote. There is no reason why that right should be denied them. These regulations are man-made, and surely we who are boasting of and fighting for democracy should put enough of our democratic speeches into practice and give these people the right to vote on this and other questions hereafter.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): As a member of the special committee I quite agree with the hon. member for Yorkton that it was never the intention of the committee that the ballot papers should be numbered. It is true that in section 15 of the regulations it is provided that the plebiscite officers shall cause the ballot papers to be used at the plebiscite to be printed on both sides, consecutively numbered, perforated and bound, and so on. But if you will look at subsection 2 of section 15 you will find it stated that such ballot papers shall be according to form number 15 and shall bear the question to be submitted at the plebiscite in the form set out in the said proclamation. Turning to form 15, there is no numbering on the ballot, but there is on the form a replica of the back of the ballot—this is on page 76 of the regulations—and the stub and counterfoil are properly numbered. But the ballot is not numbered and it was never the intention of the committee to have it numbered. Nor was it by any oversight that section 15 of the regulations was passed by the committee, because the voter is protected by the form of ballot as shown in form 15.

The minister, who was chairman of the committee, has made a general statement. He gave us a memorandum of the method of taking the votes of service voters, and under the terms of that memorandum an officer is designated to take the votes of the members of each unit. It is provided that a ballot paper shall be handed to the voter in the same form as that used in Canada, in an inner envelope, and he will go to a compartment and mark his ballot and so on. There is no provision whereby the returning officer, or the commissioned officer as the case may be, will initial the counterfoil on the ballot or that the counterfoil will be removed before the ballot is put in the envelope. I expect regulations will be passed to cover that, but this does not cover it.

Mr. McLARTY: I think my hon. friend will recall that that was explained by the chief electoral officer. The secrecy of the ballot is being retained in the case of both the service

voter and the ordinary voter. I think my hon. friend will recollect that what happens is that the outer envelope is torn off when it is forwarded in groups of one hundred, and the inner envelope is put in the ballot box. I agree with my hon. friend on the other point, namely, that the only number appearing on the ballot paper is on the counterfoil, and as explained by the chief electoral officer, that portion of the ballot paper placed in the box will have no number on it. That, I agree, is the reason why it passed the committee.

Mr. MacINNIS: I rise to a point of order rather than to say anything on this bill. Is it not customary, when a bill is in committee after second reading, that we deal with it section by section? Otherwise I do not think we shall ever be able to give this bill the kind of scrutiny it should get.

Mr. POULIOT: Speaking to the point of order, as a rule we are all supposed to keep our discussion within the section that is before the committee. If, for example, there is a question of the qualification of a Canadian service voter, it is not permissible to talk about it on a section dealing with another matter. But we are now on section 1, short title, and it has always been the practice in this committee of the whole to discuss under that section any matter pertaining to the bill.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Fournier, Hull): I understand that on section 1 hon. members are given considerable latitude. When we come to the following sections I shall expect them to keep within the rules.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The leader of the opposition urged the necessity of having those who vote on this plebiscite produce their national registration certificate. The minister has taken the stand, and the committee agreed with the view, that to do so might deprive some people of their vote. As an alternative I suggest to the minister that as to those voters whose right to vote depends upon their being vouched for, in order to guard against the possibility of wrongdoing, the production by such persons of their national registration certificate be made a condition precedent. In that way any suggestion of the possibility of a racket being perpetrated would be entirely obviated. I can see no reason why those whose names are not on the voters' list should not be required to produce their registration certificate as an additional safeguard to those set out in section 7 of the bill.

Mr. POULIOT: The other day the minister who is piloting this legislation said that he was open-minded—something everyone knows; we appreciate him for it—and that this bill is not like the laws of the Medes and Persians.

[Mr. McLarty.]

I am not yet convinced that this legislation is opportune. I have listened to everything that has been said about it, or what I did not hear have read in *Hansard*. Fine speeches have been made since this legislation was introduced, but I have not found a single argument that convinces me in its favour. The question is not to submit a plebiscite to the people of Canada. It is to assure and complete home defence.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, on January 24, a journalist came to me requesting an interview with respect to the plebiscite. I told him that it was impossible to give any definite opinion until the wording was made known, and that I was opposed to any high-pressure or uncalled-for publicity. I said that I favoured free public comprehension and expression, and that I expected the plebiscite would not be after the pattern of Hitler's plebiscite in Austria. I said that the defence of Canada should be completed and assured before our men were conscripted for overseas.

On February 22, the day after the last black-out in the province of Quebec, Miss M. V. Cummings, secretary of the civil protection committee of Quebec city, was interviewed by the press. The following is a report:

> Throughout the province, Miss Cummings said, especially in the northern Quebec area of Lake St. John and the lower St. Lawrence district, officials reported that everything had run off smoothly. Miss Cummings added that "it is particularly gratifying to see that the most vulnerable points of the province have had such a marked success."

Speaking with respect to the victory loan on Friday, February 20, Premier Godbout of Quebec is reported in *La Presse* to have said that the province of Quebec is in imminent peril.

One of the most interesting dailies published on this continent is undoubtedly the New York *Times*. On the front page of the magazine section of the issue of yesterday, March 1, I read this:

> But among many prominent officials a number of illusions still exist. They are dangerous illusions, almost as dangerous as those mentioned above, and nowhere are they more evident than in Washington.
>
> The first of these illusions is that since we are the richest and potentially the strongest people in the world we cannot lose the war.

This, of course, is said of the United States.

The second is that we can win the war without using our very best men in government, regardless of party.

The third is that we can win the war without scrapping a number of high military officers and naval commanders who are still thinking in terms of classic defence rather than of modern offence.

The fourth is that the nation will fight its best on a diet of optimistic news and that it is necessary for our government, in order to confuse its enemies, to confuse its own people and its friends.

The fifth is that we can beat the axis on the forty-hour week.

Nothing is more fallacious in time of war than the illusion that money is power. We may be able to solve most of our difficulties with it in peace time, but one cannot stop a tank with a hundred-thousand dollar bill. Even the official dollars-and-cents war production figures dispel this illusion.

The article is headed, "Are We Awake?" and was written by James B. Reston.

On the first page of the editorial section in the same issue there is a map of Asia and the Pacific ocean. Below the map twelve strategic places in the Japanese drive are mentioned. They are as follows:

1. Thailand submits to the Japanese, December 8.
2. After siege Hong Kong surrenders, December 25.
3. British-controlled Sarawak falls, January 1.
4. Japanese troops march into Manila, January 2.
5. Celebes invaded by the Japanese, January 12.
6. New Britain attacked by Japanese, January 23.
7. Conquest of Malaya is completed, January 31.
8. Japanese occupy Amboina naval base, February 7.
9. Sumatra, flanking Java, invaded, February 14.
10. Fortress of Singapore surrenders, February 15.
11. Japanese open struggle for Bali, February 20.
12. Rangoon is menaced by Japanese, February 27.

On the front page of the issue of *Le Soleil* of Quebec for February 26 there is a picture of Mr. Dies, the well-known United States congressman, who has discovered Japanese maps showing an invasion plan of the United States through Alaska and northwestern Canada. He states as a fact that those maps were found in the possession of a Japanese spy in the United States. Mr. Dies is photographed with those maps in his hand.

I do not wish to say anything of a secret nature. I wish merely to refresh the memories of hon. members by using clippings which, with few exceptions, have appeared in our own newspapers.

This I have taken from the Ottawa *Citizen* of February 24:

Canada within range of bombers from Norway. Young Belgian artillery officer declares nazi four-motored machines could make trip easily.

The Ottawa *Journal* of December 10 contained a dispatch to the effect that Canada was only twelve hours from German air bases. These are the words appearing in the article:

Air Commodore Albert de Niverville addressing a luncheon here to-day—

This was in Montreal.

—said Canada was about twelve hours from German air bases. While Halifax is half a day from Brest, Bordeaux and German air bases, our Pacific coast itself must face a new danger resulting from Japan's entry into the conflict.

Several hon. members have mentioned the worry which exists to-day in Australia because of the Japanese coming closer and closer. But that is not all. I hold in my hand a Canadian Press dispatch dated at Wellington, New Zealand, January 25:

British-United States reply heartens Antipodes.

Prime Minister Peter Fraser said to-day that New Zealand had received a heartening response to pleas to the United States and Britain for aid in the Pacific war. This was the first official disclosure that New Zealand had joined Australia in such appeals.

On June 18 of last year—and I mentioned this fact the other day in the house—at a meeting here in Ottawa the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Ralston) said that the need for men was immediate and urgent. He was referring to men for overseas. He asked for volunteers on two grounds, first that Canada could do no less than the British people who stood so bravely on the front line and, second, that men had been pledged to Great Britain. When I asked him for supplementary information, as always he was vague.

During last summer I took the trouble to make a scrap book of news items. I did this for a little over two months, from the end of June to the beginning of September, during which time many important events occurred. One of them was the quick about-turn of Russia. At that time, because of a statement by the Minister of National Defence which appeared in the press, it was stated that the number of men required overseas from Canada was approximately 100,000. According to the papers of February 11 there has been a big jump. I have here the headlines of an article which was published in our contemporaries here in Ottawa. The Minister of National Defence may have made some arrangement with Sir John Dill while he was here or with

Mr. Churchill, because this article states, "Ralston says forces require 193,000 men during present year." That is twice as many as were contemplated during last summer.

There are some people who may be termed armchair strategists because they contend that Canada is menaced. There is a gentleman familiar to all members of parliament who are war veterans. I refer to Mr. Walker, the head of the legion. The Montreal *Gazette* of February 27 had this to say:

Coasts of Canada fronting danger.
Head of legion, Alex Walker, compares situation to Australia.
Denies scare mongering.
Tragedy facing antipodes real for this dominion unless it prepares itself.

We have been told that submarines have been off the coast of Nova Scotia, and we know that Jap submarines have shelled the coast of California. There is one thing that I cannot understand. If England, which is smaller than a handkerchief on the map when compared with Canada, considers that 4,000,000 men are not enough for her defence, who will say that half a million men would be too many for the defence of Canada? Many times I had occasion to discuss this matter with my very dear and lamented friend, the former Minister of Justice, Mr. Lapointe. One time when he was away one of the acting ministers decided to send men of the mounted police overseas. More than that, applicants for positions in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police had to consent to serving overseas before they were accepted in the force. When I brought Mr. Lapointe's attention to the matter he wrote me the following letter which has been made public and which is on record:

I have your letter of the 3rd August enclosing copy of a page of *Hansard* and of a communication addressed by you on July 31 to Mr. S. T. Wood, Commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

I have given consideration to your representations regarding certain questions appearing on the form of enlistment in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and concerning the applicants' consent to serve overseas. As you are aware, the question has been settled in the way you wished, and consent to serve overseas is no longer required of applicants for enlistment in the R.C.M.P.

Believe me, dear Mr. Pouliot,

Yours sincerely,

Ernest Lapointe.

That letter was marked "personal", as were all his letters. When I saw Mr. Lapointe about it I told him that that must have been a clerical error, and he gave me permission to publish the letter.

Le Canada, is a strong government paper, and a brilliant one too. It is published in Montreal, and I should like to quote an editorial which appeared in the issue of February 23, as follows:

The out-and-out advocates of conscription for overseas service should awaken to reality and understand that it would be unwise to deprive ourselves of our defenders at the very moment when we are more exposed to attack than ever before. So long as Canada could be considered secure from any attempt at invasion, it was natural that we should contribute to strengthen the United Kingdom, our strongest bulwark against the undertakings of Germany. But it is no longer so. The western part of our country is to-day an area of war. Further striking successes by the Japanese would place us in still graver peril. It must therefore be expected that the government wishes to guard against this danger and will inform members of parliament of the measures it has taken. The secrecy of the proceedings will prevent any advantage accruing to the enemy. On the other hand, our representatives will know exactly what is being done and will be able, if necessary, to advise the government regarding the nature of our defence preparations.

In the New York *Times* of March 1 there is a dispatch from Mr. P. J. Philip of Ottawa, dated February 28. This is quite interesting, and it reads as follows:

Coast peril shifts policy in Canada.
Idea that war must be won in Europe is shelved—Pacific strategy role forecast.
Japanese transfer plan.
Board set up to move British Columbia's aliens.

This progress is only on paper. When I first read it I was surprised to see that the government still intended to proceed with the bill. "Joint defence is relevant." Surely my chief, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), remembers what was said by the member for Témiscouata at one of the last sittings of the session that ended in August, 1940. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Fulford) and I were the first to speak about the need for signing a war treaty with the United States, but at that time we were told that it was not an opportune time to mention matters like that. Not long afterward the Prime Minister had an interview with the President of the United States, and matters were arranged for mutual defence. In the *Gazette* of February 27 there is a front-page item which reads:

Canada to aid U.S.
Fight any invader on Pacific coasts.
Trainees would go.
Prime Minister says he would amend law if necessary.
Answers Hanson query.
Opposition leader poses case of attack on Seattle or Alaska.

Then follows a summary of what was said in the house. Everyone will admit that there is a threat to our country. I have never been fearful; fear is a feeling that I ignore completely; it is unknown to me. But I am much worried and concerned about the future of this country so long as we forget that this Canada of ours is on mother earth rather than on the planet Mars. Some people seem to be just as indifferent to the fate of this country as though Canada were on the planet Mars. We are surrounded by fearful enemies and we need some protection in this country. The Department of National Defence is nil with the exception of the deputy minister of militia and his secretary who are two good men. There may be a few others such as Brigadier Pope. He is a brass hat, but he is a good man. These were really good men; and capable, efficient military men are very few. The Montreal *Gazette* of Monday, January 26, contained an editorial about Hong Kong, in which there were some learned remarks about it, some of them good. The New York *Times* of March 1 said:

Hawaii's defences held inadequate.
Situation not improved since December 7, but more forces are declared required.
It cannot happen again.
Pacific war seen reaching stage where foe might move on islands.

Here again is the Toronto *Telegram*, from which I have already quoted. In its editorial of January 23 it mentions that I had asked for the resignation of the Minister of National Defence on account of the unfortunate Hong Kong affair. Then we have Mr. Drew—what is his first name? I do not remember.

An hon. MEMBER: George.

Mr. POULIOT: There is always an honest George in Ontario. George Drew was chosen as counsel for the leader of the opposition in the Hong Kong probe, and speaking of that probe the Montreal *Gazette* says:

There remains the inescapable feeling that secrecy must always beget the feeling that this inquiry was a "government affair". No better means could be found of dissipating this faint distrust than the appointment of Colonel Drew as opposition counsel. Not only was he the initiator, one might even say the source, of the opposition's stand on this issue, but he is of all Canadians now in civil life, one of the best qualified to judge a military question.

I come now to a good Liberal paper, *Le Soleil* of Quebec. In its editorial of February 23 it complains of the fact that the probe will not be public and goes on to say that it does not see the usefulness of such a procedure unless the investigation is to be based on new facts as well as on charges and admissions heard in the House of Commons. *Le Soleil* adds that it is necessary to have a declaration from the government on the matter and asks:

Is it left to the discretion of the tribunal to limit the scope of the inquiry and information promised to parliament and the nation?

I come now to a very fanatical paper, the Ottawa *Journal*. I shall read only the first paragraph of two articles, one on George Drew and one on my humble self, and members will see how blind are these nasty Tories. I quote first from the Ottawa *Journal* of Thursday, January 22, 1942, from an editorial entitled "The Rights of a Critic," which says in part.

Col. George Drew, Conservative leader in Ontario, states a truism when he reasserts his right to criticize government activities even in war. It is necessary, however, to maintain this unquestioned democratic right against some who feel, quite honestly, that even well-founded and constructive criticism is "subversive" and to be deplored.

There would be nothing wrong with that. But here is the first paragraph of an article dedicated to the Liberal member for Témiscouata, who had asked for the resignation of the Minister of National Defence, who probably leases some floor space in the Ottawa *Journal's* building. This article in the *Journal's* issue of February 20, headed, "Sort of thing that hurts parliament," reads in part:

On the principle that one cannot argue from the particular to the general it would be wrong to condemn parliament for the antics of Mr. Jean-François Pouliot. Yet Mr. Pouliot's silly sub-amendment to the speech from the throne, asking the house to condemn the government for "contemplating" conscription, is precisely the sort of thing which leaves many people contemptuous of parliament. What is wrong, it is asked—what is wrong with a democratic institution which, at this time, seems powerless to put a stop to such palpable tomfoolery?

I take great comfort in the thought that in every province, particularly in Ontario, provincial governments are enlarging their lunatic asylums, and I have no doubt that there will be room in one of the new wards for the fellow who wrote that.

The fall of Hong Kong was deeply felt by all. There is one thing that happened there, and that is that our soldiers were sent without equipment and without ammunition. Of course, some responsibility might rest with the Minister of National Defence. But he was not alone. There was a very high officer, there is now, who was inspector-general of the western command, and he is no less than Tory Senator Griesbach. How could our men have left for Hong Kong without the approval of the inspector-general of the army? My fear is that the appointment of George Drew

on the Hong Kong probe is precisely to give a whitewash to Senator Griesbach. I see the leader of the opposition laughing. I would not have expected him to do it because what I say is the truth. He knows I am not afraid to tell the truth, and I say that the man who is responsible must be held guilty for such a thing occurring. It is not the quartermaster-general who should be punished for that. It is the inspector-general of the western command, who is a Tory senator, and he should be fired at once, and moreover, should be court-martialed.

I have another clipping here headed, "Bennett explains fall of Singapore." This was the commander of the Australian imperial force in Malaya, and he blames the fall of Singapore on the lack of water, heavy bombing, and greatly superior numbers. The British had no means of flying from Singapore.

Then here is a caricature by Low, the celebrated cartoonist. This cartoon was published in the Ottawa *Citizen* of February 11. It shows a silk-hatted politician with a book in his hand, and beside him in the jungle handling a machine gun are two Australian soldiers. The cartoon has the politician saying:

No reinforcements yet—but I'm sent to read you this parliamentary debate proving:

(1) That Air-Chief-Marshal Blimp is a great statesman;

(2) That there are no lessons to be learned from all this;

(3) That Blimpapore will be defended to the last.

Here is another article which I find in that Tory paper, the Ottawa *Journal*, on page 3 of its issue of February 27. The article is headed "Lady Brooke-Popham blames inertia for Singapore fall."

Here is a gentleman from New Brunswick, not Viscount Bennett, but Lord Beaverbrook himself, who is quoted in the New York *Herald-Tribune* of June 9, 1941, as saying:

Adolf Hitler had "given youth its head" in his plans and preparations, and Britain now found itself confronted "with a mentality which makes rings around many of our old ideas", he said.

Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, High Commissioner for Great Britain in Canada, made an appeal in Toronto the other day to send Canadians overseas. Here is what this gentleman said when he set foot on Canadian shores, according to a dispatch by Mr. John Marshall, a very able journalist and president of the press gallery. This article appeared in the Windsor *Daily Star* of April 4, 1941. Speaking of the British people, for whom I have a deep admiration because I know them well—the only ones who do not deserve admiration are the British politicians with the exception of Mr. Churchill—Mr. MacDonald said:

Even if they were fighting alone, they couldn't be beaten. But, they are not alone.

Et cetera. And he said that our help was superfluous. But I have something still better in my hand, and it is—again—that Tory paper, the Ottawa *Journal*. Some interesting news is contained in its five o'clock edition, July 3, 1940:

Want Canadians to halt nazis if they land.

Dominion troops have "more novel conception of warfare".

London, July 3—(CP)—Lord Mottistone, who as "Jack" Seely commanded the Canadian cavalry in the first great war, suggested in the House of Lords to-day that Canadian troops should be chosen to engage the enemy if he lands in Britain because of their "more novel conception of warfare".

He recommended the Canuck soldiers not because he served with them in the last war for 3½ years "and so knew their value", but because amongst these Canadian divisions—and this also applies to other divisions overseas where there are wider spaces—there are people with more novel conceptions of warfare.

Lord Mottistone said he had made the suggestion to a Canadian officer with a distinguished record, who had replied "that just suits me".

What did Sir Stafford Cripps, the present Lord Privy Seal, say the other day? Coming from Russia, he told us many things which are very interesting; he endorsed our victory loan, and he complained that a full effort was not being made at the present time in Great Britain. Mr. Eden, and also many labour leaders, spoke along the same line.

Some years ago, in this honourable house, sitting in committee of the whole, I objected strongly to red tape. Here is what the member for Témiscouata said about red tape, *Hansard*, February 22, 1937, page 1124:

Red tape must disappear from the Department of National Defence. I am in favour of a good army to defend our country, but I want no red tape and I want no other people than good Canadians to defend our own country.

And then:

I blame the bureaucracy that has been established there—

In the Department of National Defence.

—a long time. . . . There are some in the department who were hiding themselves when the others were fighting—

In the last war.

—and now they are the bosses and try to run the whole show. Enough of that; it must stop. Representatives of the people must bring them to their senses.

Previously I had said, at page 1120:

Some people are fond of brass hats and so on; I do not care for them. . . .

Here is the definition which the member for Témiscouata gave at that time, as quoted in the Windsor *Star*:

These people in the Department of National Defence cannot learn warfare. They must be trying out their penmanship all the time. Everybody in that department, from the chief of staff to the last appointed stenographer, must also be a typist. We hear a lot about that—most foolish; most stupid—and it continues like that.

This we call red tape. What is red tape? Red tape consists of a lot of formalities carried out just to show the importance of the one who performs them. Red tape is useless, but it is made use of for a purpose. It is carried out to show that the man who executes the formalities is the only man who could do this well. In the civil service my experience has been that the simplest things, the easiest to understand, are made the most difficult in order to show the ability and the wonderful genius of an ass. Hon. members laugh, but that is the case. Let us take the fellow who is stupid, and who cannot do anything well. He says, "I will make myself important." Then he assumes a solemn air, and attempts to convince his minister that he is the only being on earth who can do a certain thing. Sometimes he is believed; sometimes the officials do not see the ears of the ass. There is a lot of that, but I shall not insist upon it.

This is enough for the moment. I want to put this on record as a preface to what I am going to say and to move afterwards.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I would point out to hon. members, that this section of the bill provides the only opportunity for discussing the regulations. On the point of regulation 15—

Mr. McLARTY: May I, Mr. Chairman, differ on this with the leader of the opposition.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is my understanding of the rules.

Mr. McLARTY: I believe that under subsection 2 of section 9 the regulations can be discussed.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Possibly.

Mr. McLARTY: The clause which refers specifically to the regulations being in accordance with the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Referring now to the question which I raised this afternoon with regard to the numbering of the ballots, I desire again to make my position clear on that point. It will be recalled, sir, that the minister took refuge in the form of the ballot, which appears as form number 15 of the regulations, in which the numbering is on the stub and the counterfoil only. As I said this afternoon, however, anything relating to the form of the ballot is directive only and not mandatory. I refer the committee to section 28 of the Dominion Elections Act, to which I believe I referred this afternoon. Subsection 1 is as follows:

All ballots shall be of the same description and as nearly alike as possible. The ballot of each voter shall be a printed paper, in this act called a ballot paper, on which the names, addresses and occupations of the candidates alphabetically arranged in the order of their surnames, shall, subject as hereafter in this section provided, be printed exactly as they are set out in the nomination paper; the ballot paper shall have a counterfoil and a stub—

This is the part which I think is pertinent.

—and there shall be a line of perforations between the ballot and the counterfoil and between the counterfoil and the stub, the whole as in form No. 32.

Then, referring to subsection 5:

The ballot papers shall be numbered on the back of the stub and the counterfoil, the same number being printed or written on the stub as on the counterfoil—

It will be observed that in section 15 of the regulations it is provided, by subsection 1, that:

Immediately after the issue of the proclamation, the chief plebiscite officer shall cause the ballot papers to be used at the plebiscite held under the Dominion Plebiscite Act, 1942, and these regulations, to be printed on both sides, consecutively numbered, perforated, and bound in books of twenty-five, and furnished in sufficient quantities to each returning officer.

I suggest that after the words "consecutively numbered" in line 35 these words be inserted:

on the back of the stub and counterfoil only.

Then, I believe, it will be in conformity with the Dominion Elections Act. I urge the minister to adopt that amendment.

Mr. McLARTY: Mr. Chairman, there is not the slightest objection to doing so. I would have mentioned the matter before, but I thought that perhaps opportunity would be taken under subsection (2) of section 9, of discussing the regulations. The suggestion I have to make to meet the criticism—it was not a severe one—of the leader of the opposition was to insert in the regulations the necessary amendment. I do not think we can move it here as an amendment, because the regulations are not before the committee. But I would undertake that the amendment will be made to the regulations when they are passed. It is practically the same as the wording suggested by the leader of the opposition, but perhaps it makes it even more specific and removes it entirely from the realm of controversy. It is proposed that after the word "numbered" on page 19 of the regulations, to which the leader of the

opposition has referred, we insert the following: "on the back of the stub and counterfoil, the same number to be printed on the stub as on the counterfoil." I think that is identical with what the leader of the opposition suggested, except for the last few words.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is rather redundant. Mine is a good deal better drafting.

Mr. McLARTY: I think the hon. gentleman's is briefer, but perhaps this will meet the situation.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We will leave it to the two draftsmen who are in the gallery and let them decide.

Mr. GRAHAM: May I call attention to a principle set out in section 5 of the bill—

Mr. McLARTY: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member for Swift Current, but we are in committee of the whole, and seeing that we have extended the discussion I wonder whether the hon. member would feel that it might be in order to wait until we come to that section so that we may get on with some of the intervening ones. So far we have not covered a single section. Perhaps I must bear some measure of responsibility for that, but if we adopt the ordinary procedure in committee of the whole and deal with each section as we come to it, it will afford a more concentrated discussion of the merits of each section.

Mr. GRAHAM: I agree with the minister, but almost every other principle involved in the bill has been discussed under section 1.

Mr. POULIOT: Just a word, and this time my intention is not to speak at great length.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. POULIOT: I always appreciate very deeply the generous response I have from all corners of the house, and I may tell you, Mr. Chairman, I find it inspiring. When I look at the good faces of my colleagues I feel like speaking at great length; I want to tell them all the good I think of them; but as time is precious, I shall have to consider only the matter that is before us.

A matter that has interested me deeply is the French-Canadian war effort. Early in the summer some reports were sent by some people who knew, in the Department of National Defence, and two months after these reports had been forwarded no action was taken. I had an opportunity of perusing them, and I wrote an article in the best weekly in Canada *Le St. Laurent* of Riviére du Loup. That article was translated into English and a part of it was published in the *Citizen* of Ottawa.

There were many complaints about the French-Canadian war effort. It was said in many quarters that French Canadians did not consider this war as their own and were not ready to do their share. This is absolutely false. What French Canadians have done since the beginning of the war in the matter of enlistment, war production, and so on, and contributions to the victory loan, can be favourably compared with what has been done in any other part of the country.

The article to which I refer was written some time last summer and appeared in the *Citizen* of September 3. I quote:

> The number of voluntary enlistments in our province is already at the present time greater by 15,000 than the total for the whole duration of the last war. Quebec military district has the honour of ranking fourth in the recent volunteer recruiting campaign, being surpassed only by Saint John, N.B.; Halifax, N.S., and Winnipeg. It made a better showing than the three military districts of Ontario and those of Saskatchewan and Alberta, even of British Columbia. Quebec's percentage of the quota allotted was 122 per cent; at London, Ontario, the rating was 73 per cent, and at Victoria, B.C., 61 per cent.
>
> Small wonder, then, that after a rapid inspection of the military camps, air fields and war industries of Quebec province, the British high commissioner to Canada, Right Hon. Malcolm MacDonald, should have said: "In the first place I congratulate Quebec in going over the top in the recruitment of men for the active service."

He had changed his views by then. He came here and saw that Canada was doing a great deal to help Great Britain.

Over the signature of Emile Benoist, a former president of the press gallery, *Le Devoir* commented as follows on this intolerable situation:

> For month after month, ever since the war began, French newspapers, not only in Quebec but in the other provinces, too, have called for the recruiting of French-Canadian regiments outside Quebec province. Nothing was done about it. On the contrary, we have seen Quebec regiments, which we have always considered to be French-Canadian regiments, become mixed units to which Anglo Canadian as well as French-Canadian officers are posted. This was the case, notably, for the Sherbrooke regiment and for the tank regiment of Three Rivers. We have even seen a Jew appointed to the command of one of these regiments, that of Sherbrooke. This same Jewish officer is to-day in command of one of the military camps in the Montreal district. Did the same thing happen in Ontario, for instance? Certainly not. Can you hear, not the noise, but the riotous uproar that would lift the roof in the Toronto hamlet if a Jew were appointed to the command of the Highlanders in that city?
>
> * * * *
>
> In the first place, the evidence of true history is there to prove that in 1914-1918 there was not a single unit without French-Canadians. They numbered 3,000 in the first contingent; but at that time General Sam Hughes refused to allow them to form a regiment.

It is true that the second contingent contained the immortal 22nd Regiment, made up exclusively of French-Canadians; but there were also a great many French-Canadians in the English regiments of Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, particularly in the Tenth of Calgary (now the Calgary Highlanders), of which R. B. Bennett was the honorary colonel. Our compatriots, however, were given no credit for this because there were no French-Canadian officers in those regiments.

In two English regiments, the R.M.R. (Royal Montreal Regiment) and the 87th (Canadian Grenadier Guards), there was respectively a company composed of French-Canadian officers and men. In two other regiments of our province the proportion of French-Canadians was very high, but they were all rankers. There were no French-Canadian officers in the Royal Highlanders of Canada or the Victora Rifles.

In the latter regiment French Canadians formed at least one-half of the strength, and it was, apparently, as a posthumous homage to a considerable number of them that the regiment's flags were lodged in the church of Notre Dame in Montreal.

We must hope that the errors of the past will not be repeated indefinitely. . . .

The conclusion is inescapable; it is high time to publish bilingual military manuals, to train French-Canadian officers in numbers commensurate with the proportion of French-Canadian soldiers, to open wide to them the doors of the military schools instead of merely leaving them slightly ajar, to entrust them with positions of command at the head of their compatriots even outside our own province, to preserve for French-Canadian regiments their French-Canadian character, to acknowledge the patriotism of all those French Canadians who have enlisted in regiments other than those of Quebec province by giving them besides officers of their own race, the legitimate hope of deserved promotion, of forming a French-Canadian brigade, instead of trying to break up French-Canadian regiments, finally to allow to every French-Canadian fighter, in the army, the air force or the navy, the satisfaction of being treated as an equal by his English-speaking comrades in the three services, so that there will be no inferior race that is shouldered with all the risks and no superior race to garner all the benefits, all the gold braid and all the glory.

French Canadians are often handicapped in the army. Here is a letter that I will read. It is unfortunately in French, but hon. members will be able to read it in the morning. The letter itself I shall send to the minister concerned.

(Translation)

Brantford, Ont., February 4, 1942.

Mr. J. F. Pouliot, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Sir,

I appeal to you on a question of the highest importance—freedom of speech.

I feel sure that you will bring the matter before the house, because I know that you are above all a French Canadian and that nothing can hold you back on questions of race or liberty. The circumstances are as follows:

There are here at Brantford several French Canadians, some of whom are unable to speak a word of English. Almost every day disputes break out because we are not allowed to speak our language, which is dear to us as it is to you. Last week I was charged twice with having had arguments about my language.

I also, Mr. Member, am a strong defender of the French tongue, that beautiful language so pleasant to hear. But the reason why I write to you is that last Sunday, February 1, at 8.30 p.m., I and three companions were conversing together in French when an Englishman told us to shut up, calling us "d——d Frenchmen", etc., etc. You can imagine the words he used. I replied that we were in a free country and could speak any language we wished. I told him it was none of his business if I spoke French. Then three men assaulted me. The corporal in charge had me arrested and thrown into prison. He said nothing to my assailants.

The following day I was paraded before Lieut. M. Wisseman who, when I explained the matter, said that I was in Ontario and had to speak English. He then condemned me.

Mr. LACOMBE: What is the name of the writer?

Mr. POULIOT: I shall give it to the minister.

Mr. LACOMBE: What is the name of the camp?

Mr. POULIOT: Brantford.

Mr. LACOMBE: What is the name of the commanding officer?

Mr. POULIOT: I shall give all that to my hon. friend later. An official of the Department of National Defence, Mr. Leon Trépanier, a former leader of the Montreal municipal council, complained on February 4th of the lack of system in the recruiting carried on in the province of Quebec. He declared that the rural districts were being stripped bare of young men and, in short, that the recruiting methods used were all wrong. I have noticed that in the county of Témiscouata. Still a large number of young men have enlisted in the army.

(Text) On January 14 last, I wrote to the Prime Minister as follows:

My dear Chief,—

I wish to draw your attention to attached marked copy of *Hansard* of November 12, 1941, page 4344, in which appears a statement from your colleague, the hon. Mr. Power, that he believed that information concerning the number of French Canadians who are serving in regiments that are not wholly French could be obtained.

I have sent you a copy of an article that I have published last summer about the war effort of the French Canadians and the number of enlistments in the three branches of the army.

It is of the utmost importance to get that information at the earliest possible opportunity. Our mutual and very dear friend, the late Mr.

Lapointe had also asked for that information which he found most important to get under the present circumstances, especially when the Tories intend to divide the country by making a campaign against the French Canadians.

At the same time, I take the liberty to send you a copy of a letter from Mr. Adrian Pouliot, Dean of the Faculty of Science of Laval university and President of the Permanent Committee of French Survival in America.

I hope that you will have no objection to give your kind attention to the matter and give definite instructions in order that such information is available at the earliest possible opportunity.

Unfortunately I have not the figures now, but I hope I shall get them in the near future.

Many things are said about the people from my province, and I will show how some people act with regard to Canadian unity. I have here an advertisement from the Windsor *Star* of February 21 last. It is over the name of a man named Wilkinson who is a shoe dealer. It reads:

It has been said through all the ages, that Nero fiddled while Rome burned, but some Canadians (so-called, only some of them) don't even fiddle.

This space contributed by Geo. H. Wilkinson, Ltd. in the interest of Canada's war loan.

Think how stupid it is.

Friends of mine in Windsor gave me some information about the enlistment of French Canadians in that district. According to the census of 1931, which is the latest available, in the three counties of Lambton, Kent and Essex the population was 268,319 and the number of French Canadians, 41,887. At the time that the Wilkinson advertisement was published in the Windsor *Star* a local regiment left for overseas, of which the French Canadians formed 35 per cent of the effective strength. Putting aside the United States citizens enlisted in that regiment, the French Canadians were at least 42 per cent of the total number. They are only 15½ per cent of the population of the three counties. It seemed that those good fellow citizens should be treated better than that.

Some time I shall have an opportunity to discuss matters in connection with the navy. I sent a memorandum last year to the Minister of National Defence for Naval Services (Mr. Macdonald), but I have received no definite information about the matter.

At six o'clock I was saying I did not see any argument in favour of the plebiscite. All hon. members have been saying that we have made a promise to the people not to impose conscription. I admit that that promise was made, and that it was made in high quarters. But the point is not as to whether a promise was made to the Canadian people. The question is: What is our duty to-day?

Mr. DUPUIS: To win the war.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, and we are all for it. But we do not want to be caught napping if the enemies invade our country, just as has happened in so many parts of the world. We must have some kind of defence; we must have some kind of protection. I do not wish to frighten anybody, but I have quoted what is being said in many quarters. What I cannot understand is that nobody is paying any attention to this country; everything is being done for other countries. I cannot conceive it, and I regret it deeply. At any time this country can be invaded.

Hon. members from British Columbia have spoken along those lines, and rightly so. There were occasions when they spoke alone. I did not wish to interfere with them when they were arguing on behalf of British Columbia, but I could have argued for the shores of the St. Lawrence river, for the shores of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and, in fact, for the whole country.

I am astounded that the most simple things, things that are based on common sense, are so hard to put into the heads of those in power. I cannot understand it. The more simple a thing is, the more difficult it is to have it accepted.

It is said that we shall have a plebiscite to decide whether we shall send men overseas by conscription, or whether we shall not. We are to decide whether or not the government is to be relieved from a promise made in the past. Why were those promises made? They were made on account of the deep patriotic feeling of the population of Canada, who wanted some protection provided by the Department of National Defence. At the present time what we have is very small, if it exists at all.

We are going on with the plebiscite; we are asking the people if they are willing to relieve the government from what is called the prosecution of the war. What reason does the government give for being relieved of its commitment given during the past year? None at all. Not a single reason has been given by any minister or any hon. member to justify the plebiscite. So much is that so that the Prime Minister said, "I do not know if I need it now, but I may need it later. But, trust me." I trust the Prime Minister; I have supported him for a great many years. But we have reached the time when I am ready to support anybody who will inculcate a system of defence in this country so that our people may be protected.

Mr. DUPUIS: Where is he?

Mr. POULIOT: He is surely not my hon. friend.

Mr. DUPUIS: No. I want to keep the actual Prime Minister in office.

Mr. POULIOT: I would ask my hon. friend to keep quiet. I do not want any interruptions. Let him remember that he spoke no words during the debate, and I am not supposed to receive instructions from him now—and he must know it. If he has anything to say he must explain it to his electors.

Mr. DUPUIS: Where is he?

Mr. POULIOT: I told my hon. friend it was not he.

Mr. DUPUIS: That is not an answer at all.

Mr. POULIOT: And I was most gracious in saying that. I could have abstained from saying it, and asked that you, Mr. Chairman, call the hon. member to order.

Mr. DUPUIS: Where is he?

Mr. POULIOT: If I continue for five minutes I may convert the hon. member—

Mr. DUPUIS: You will do well.

Mr. POULIOT: —so as to make his views coincide with those of his constituents. I would not have said anything unpleasant—in fact I never do so unless I am interrupted. But when I am interrupted I am like a tiger, because I defend my own people. At the same time, I defend not only my own people, but I defend the people from the constituency of my hon. friend.

I wonder if another question could not be asked in the plebiscite. Could the people not be asked if they approve the gift of a billion dollars to Great Britain? That will be a fine question to put alongside the first one. I believe the question in its present form is not complete; it should be double. The Canadian people should be asked if they are ready to relieve the government from any pledge made in connection with establishing conscription and, in the second place, they should be asked if they are in favour of a gift of a billion dollars to the British exchequer. That would be a fine question.

I can see no reason why the question with respect to conscription should be submitted alone, and the question in connection with the billion dollar gift be left out. The people will have to strive and sweat; they will have to empty their pocket-books to pay taxes to meet that billion dollars. And that was imposed on us. No hon. member was consulted about it; we were faced with the accomplished fact. If we are to have a plebiscite, then let it be complete, and have the two questions.

Mr. DUPUIS: Which ones? There is no question of conscription in the plebiscite.

Mr. POULIOT: And besides that, the bill says nothing about the priority of the defence of Canada. There was an amendment on that point, but it will be recalled that the hon. member who has been interrupting me voted against it. That was his right. There was an amendment, too, with respect to farmers whose work is necessary in a time of war as well as in a time of peace. Theirs is essential work. The hon. member who has been interrupting voted against that amendment—as was his right.

Then, would it not be wise to ask a third question of the Canadian people: Do you not believe that Canadian defence should have priority over any commitments with or in favour of any other nation? Then there could be a fourth question: Are you in favour of exempting farmers' sons?

Mr. DUPUIS: The government is actually endeavouring to settle that question.

Mr. POULIOT: I would ask the hon. minister *in petto* to let me continue.

Those are the four questions that I would ask, that I should like to see asked. If they are asked in the plebiscite I will vote for it. If they are not asked, I will vote against it. And, again, I shall vote against the plebiscite itself when it goes to the people.

Mr. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, I have risen several times to speak for a few minutes, and I shall detain the committee for only three or four minutes. There is a rule in the house that in committee an hon. member may speak as often as he wishes. He may speak in English and in French, or both, if he chooses.

I have no objection to the minister now making headway with his bill clause by clause, but I should like to point out three or four facts—because facts are facts. I am opposed to the principle of "follow your leader" and "your leader is your policy" on an important measure like this. Every day the bill is before the house the government shift their position with respect to the principle and policy of this bill. They began by telling the country, before parliament met, that owing to the scarcity of man-power the government were going to take some steps at the coming session of parliament, and announced a plebiscite. The reason for it and the cause and effect of the vote have been changed.

The government did announce a policy in the speech from the throne. Now they are

shifting their position. They shifted it in the house, and they shifted it again in the committee the other day and now in this committee, and in all the debates we have had so far. It was said there was great difficulty in getting sufficient man-power and the government were going to lay down a new policy. Then they come along before the house met and propose a plebiscite or a referendum. This has never been done before except that one was held in 1898 in the days of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. In that referendum there were 200 local votes off it taken all over Ontario and Manitoba. The Prime Minister made a speech last Wednesday of a different nature. What is the cause and effect of this plebiscite bill, the first we have ever had in Canada, now under the title of the Dominion Plebiscite Act, 1942? The cause is the failure to get man-power or to do anything for a total war. Last Wednesday the Prime Minister said, as reported at page 826 of *Hansard:*

> Hon. members have been talking about conscription, about no conscription and the like. That is not the issue in this plebiscite. This is the issue: Is the government of Canada, in time of war, to have freedom to take whatever action it thinks most advisable with respect to the furtherance of Canada's war effort?

If that is the question, then what is the plebiscite for and why is it at all necessary? Have the government of Canada no courage to act and govern, and do their duty when the enemy is at our very gates? The Japs have submarines that can cross the Pacific without refuelling. As the Prime Minister of Great Britain told the House of Commons the other day, we shall have to expect the enemy who now have captured the command of the sea in the Pacific and will appear on many islands and shores of many countries in the Pacific, and in many other places. If you had a million men, he said, you would not be able to stop them because they move from one island and place to another like a circus from place to place. If the enemy appear in time in the inlets and harbours of British Columbia, will the commanding officer there have to wire Ottawa and say that the enemy is there and will he have to hold a plebiscite before firing a gun, or before sending up an aeroplane?

That is what they would have had to do under the Laurier naval bill in 1909. The same principle applies or may apply with this plebiscite bill to-day. If the enemy in 1909 had approached on the ocean, before the then Canadian navy could have fired off a pin-wheel, a fire-cracker or a sky-rocket, they would have had to have an order in council passed here in Ottawa first, under the naval bill of 1909. That was the principle of the navy bill. Are we going to have the same principle in this bill? The people of the country are awake to what is going on. They know more than we do about this plebiscite. They look upon it as being absolutely unnecessary. They consider that with the enemy at our doors, it is no time for it or for playing so at war. The situation is too grave for such by-play.

What will happen when the vote is taken? The ballot in this bill has black all round it and we may have a black-out here with Hitler and Japan arriving first before we can vote yes or no. The enemy may arrive before we can go into the polling booth and mark yes or no. The ballot reads:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

I would strike out all the words after the word "government" and have the ballot read, "Are you in favour of releasing the government?" It is the government that is asking for a release and that is the question to submit, if any. Some pledges were given, but we do not know to whom they were given and conscription was not an issue. I tell you what will happen. Instead of government of the people, by the people and for the people, what have we in this country to-day? We have government by order in council—twenty to twenty-five thousand of them—government by plebiscite and, in addition, government by dollar-a-year men. Is it any wonder that the people are losing confidence in this parliament? Is it any wonder that the electors are asking if there is any parliamentary government or any semblance of it left in this country, or if we are trying to imitate the methods of a mock parliament by this bill? That is what I think we are trying to do, and just playing at war.

When the vote is counted, what will happen? This is going to tie up our war effort for three months; it is going to throttle our effort in the most critical months of the year, April, May and June. We may not know to whom this country belongs by June the way things are going on with the Japs in the Pacific. I tell you what will happen to your vote. The minute the ballots are counted, they will simply be taken to the archives for decent burial of it all in that big new building, where it will be a case of "earth to earth, ashes to ashes and dust to dust" for this plebiscite; in the sure, certain hope, so far as this plebiscite on conscription is concerned, it will never be mentioned by the government again. That will be the end of it.

The Prime Minister made a magnificent speech the other day. I have never heard such a magnificent speech since the old days

when he was a student going to university and when the temperance orators of the world used to speak each week-end in the city of Toronto. We heard a lot of oratory in those days in Massey hall, which was a new building then. The oratory in Massey hall was no better than what we heard here the other day. If it was simply a matter of taking a vote on who was to sign the pledge, it would be a different matter. But it is more than that. The voters know more than we do. They are not going to be humbugged or fooled or consent to be blindfolded by members of parliament or anybody else. A lot of them will not vote. A lot of ballots will be spoiled. No one understands it. Many of them think it is an insult to the electors of this country that this house should sit here day after day discussing academic matters and that kind of thing when the enemy in the Pacific have command of the sea, and when they may get it in the Atlantic as well.

If it were not for Russia, I do not know where we would be. The greatest friends the allies have had are General January and General February. If it had not been for General January and General February in the war between Germany and Russia, we would not know where the British empire would be. General January and General February, this year also are the best friends that British Columbia ever had. They saved the coast province after Pearl Harbour. They have given them a chance in British Columbia to get started and try to arm.

I protest against this bill, and if I can get a seconder I shall move the six months' hoist on the third reading. I believe the rank and file of the members of this house should have an opportunity of placing the blame where it belongs, on the government.

Hon. members opposite have brought in this bill just as a smoke-screen to cover up the mistakes made in the Pacific, Singapore, Hong Kong and other places. We had the Prime Minister rising the other night and wanting to have a dozen more Hong Kongs without consulting the military authorities in the sending of troops to adjacent territory, to Seattle, the Aleutian islands and other places where there are no military objectives. This was to be done over the heads of the military authorities by politicians, against the strategy and priorities set out by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. I protest against this.

My constituents can vote the way they want to. They know better than I how to vote. We had two governments in my riding in 1934. We had the whole dominion cabinet down there in 1934 in the by-election and we had the cabinet of the province of Ontario also. They all appeared there and I was glad to see them. The people of Toronto know how to vote without my telling them. I believe I know how they will vote. They will throw the ballot back in the faces of the government and say, "You have been elected to run the war, not us; go and carry on the work; as long as you are the government of the day, the responsibility is on your shoulders to see to it that we have a magnificent new war effort and a new war management."

Mr. CRERAR: I should like to make a suggestion to the committee. The discussion since eight o'clock has been of a general nature which would have been wholly appropriate on the second reading of the bill. We are now in committee considering the bill section by section. If we were to continue on the basis of the discussions of the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) and the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church), we might continue indefinitely. May I suggest that a good deal of the discussion is out of order. I think we would make better progress if we were to confine the discussion to each section of the bill as we come to it.

Mr. CHURCH: A private member shouldn't be a yes man or a nodder either.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCann): The understanding this afternoon, if I gathered it aright, was that on section 1 the discussion was to be general, but that when we came to the other sections the discussion had to be relevant to the section under discussion.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): You are quite correct, Mr. Chairman. That was the agreement, and the hon. gentleman who is leading the house is quite out of date. Moreover, if he had the remarks to make which he has just made, he should have made them before.

Mr. CRERAR: May I say in reply to the rebuke of the leader of the opposition that my duties required me to be out of the chamber for a great part of the afternoon, and I was not aware of the point which he has just raised. Even so, we have had quite a lengthy discussion and we are anxious to make as much progress as possible.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the discussion is not out of order in any event. I admit that on the part of one of the minister's followers there has been what I would term obstruction. I will withdraw that term if it is not parliamentary, but it was so apparent that I think everybody agrees with me. But the discussion per se is not out of order.

Mr. HOMUTH: I rise to a question of privilege. As one of the members of the opposition I resent the raising of this point of order by the hon. gentleman who is leading the house after one of our members had spoken for only eight or ten minutes while one of his own followers had wandered all over the face of the globe for seventy minutes with no protest whatever from the other side of the house. I am beginning to think they are afraid to call the member for Témiscouata to order.

Mr. CRERAR: A very courageous remark, that!

Mr. POULIOT: I am in your hands, Mr. Chairman. I hope that the issue of this war will be victory for us and that—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCann): Will the hon. gentleman say on what section he is speaking?

Mr. POULIOT: I am answering what has been said by the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Waterloo South. The leader of the opposition was referring to me because I was the only Liberal member who had spoken, and he said that I was guilty of obstruction. I know that he has too much parliamentary experience to make that remark seriously. I noticed that he was listening to me and that for the first time in his life he seemed interested in what I was saying. If I was guilty of obstruction, the thing should not have occurred. As for the hon. member for Waterloo South, who is a strong partisan with his own views, I do not care a bit.

Mr. McIVOR: I have waited most of this afternoon and listened as best I could until I might have an opportunity to ask a question. As I listened I could not help thinking of the words of Carlyle:

> There was an owl sat on an oak,
> The more he heard the less he spoke,
> The less he spoke the more he heard,
> I wish there were more like that old bird.

I intend to go out and get every vote I can in favour of the plebiscite because I think that is the right thing to do. I think that is the duty of every man in Canada at the present time, whether he be Irish, Scotch, English, French or anything else.

A question that I have been repeatedly asked, and one that I want to ask of the government is this: Will there be a time and place when the government will consider and act on this suggestion, that a soldier who leaves a job will get better pay than the man who takes it. I know that the soldier gets $1.30 a day, which, with board, would amount to about $69 a month, but the man who steps in and takes his job or perhaps sweeps up crumbs in a factory gets fifty cents an hour. which means, with overtime, $100 a month. I say that the man who dons the uniform, no matter where he serves, is the man who should get the raise of pay. I think we are past the time when a man should be asked or encouraged to volunteer for less pay than the man who stays at home, while the fighting man goes out to protect him. I hope, before this session closes, whether before or after the budget, soldiers will get a raise of pay rather than a deduction of former earnings.

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. Chairman, I was one of the members of the special committee to which this bill was referred. The members of that committee gave careful consideration to each section of the bill, and while they did not all see eye to eye in every particular, they were all agreed on this, that the bill as it came before the committee was too wide in its scope. I am glad to say they all agreed on that, and as a consequence the bill that comes before this committee to-day varies in its most essential provision from the bill as originally drafted and presented to the house. As originally drafted, the bill contained a principle—the Speaker may not agree with me, but I say that it was a principle—that is not to be found in the bill as it is now before this committee. The underlying principle of the bill as first presented to the house was that the government could by proclamation order the taking of a plebiscite at any time it saw fit. That provision was contained in section 3, subsection 1 of the bill as drafted, which read as follows:

> The governor in council may by proclamation order the taking of a plebiscite under the provisions of this act.

That was a most dangerous provision. If it had become law it would have made a radical change in the constitution of this country. It would have led the way to government by plebiscite—something which we should endeavour to avoid in Canada. Under our constitution—I may not be speaking accurately but this is as I understand it—the decision of the people on any matter of public policy is given and given only through their elected representatives. Within its legislative jurisdiction the power of parliament is supreme. If the government wants to change its policy or adopt a new policy, it must submit it to parliament for its approval, and if approval is not given, the government must dismiss parliament and appeal to the electors.

Our system of parliamentary government does not provide for any other procedure. It does not provide for procedure by plebiscite.

The two courses open to a government if it wants to change its policy are (1) to have parliament approve the change, or (2) to dissolve parliament and have a new parliament deal with the matter after an election has been held.

To have an important change made in our constitution by the passing of this bill as originally drafted and presented to the house would have been most undesirable and was to be avoided at all costs. It was, I think, with that thought in mind that the members of the special committee limited the provisions of the bill.

The reason why the government introduces this bill is to ask the voters of this country to release it from a promise which it made. That promise was, that there would be no conscription of our man-power for service overseas. The bill as it has been amended by the special committee limits or circumscribes the legislation to that particular question.

I do not think this legislation should be regarded as a precedent, or as changing in any way our constitution. It should be regarded—and I think the special committee looked at it in that light—as extraordinary legislation arising under special conditions brought about in war time. If it is so regarded, I do not believe that, speaking from a constitutional point of view, it can do any harm. But that is the way it should be looked at, and some emphasis should be put upon that phase of the matter by the members of the government who are interested in the bill.

I was impressed with the point made this afternoon by the leader of the opposition, that the regulations impose certain penalties, but that those regulations do not come before parliament but are made by order in council. It seems to me that we are neglecting our duties as members of the House of Commons in not paying more attention to that particular matter.

I would refer also briefly to the suggestion of the hon. member for Lake Centre this afternoon, that any person whose name was omitted from the voters' list, and wanted it added thereto should, in addition to making the affidavits for which the regulations provide, produce his registration certificate. That is a very wise proposal; it would provide an effective safeguard.

Mr. WHITE: As another member of the special committee to which the bill was submitted, I have one or two observations to make before we leave this stage. The hon. member who was chairman has already dealt with a matter raised by the leader of the opposition, as to the numbering of the ballots. I associate myself with what other members of the committee have stated, that when this particular section was before the committee their distinct understanding was that the ballots would be in the same form as those used at a general election.

Although the minister has suggested that we leave certain sections to be dealt with when we come to them, I ask the indulgence of the committee for a few minutes to indicate certain sections which were discussed in committee and to mention what the comments in the committee were. The first was in connection with the form of ballot to be used on the plebiscite, which is set out under section 3. When this section was before the committee I suggested that another form of ballot be used, whereby the question would be set out at the top of the ballot, and there would follow one, two or three lines of instructions to the voter as to how to mark his ballot; then there would be a space for the word "yes" and underneath that a space for the word "no." My reason was that, as the ballot now appears in section 3, with the question set out twice, I fear that the ballot will be confusing to many people, particularly those who live in rural sections, and perhaps those who wish to vote "yes" may feel that they have to strike or cross out the words which repeat the question followed by the word "no."

Mr. REID: Why in rural constituencies?

Mr. WHITE: The hon. member for New Westminster knows that in rural constituencies on election day there are many things which confuse voters. If you look over the number of spoiled ballots, you will notice that it does not take very much to confuse some of them.

Mr. REID: My point was that it might affect urban as well as rural voters.

Mr. WHITE: Well, being just one of these rural fellows, I should not like to express an opinion as to the people who come from the cities.

Mr. REID: I have some regard for the intelligence of the rural people.

Mr. WHITE: I have too, but I think the hon. member will agree that the ballot should be set out in such a simple manner that there will be no possibility of doubt about how it should be marked.

Mr. REID: I agree with the hon. member.

Mr. WHITE: I submit that as the ballot is prepared, with the question repeated, appearing once before the word "yes" and then again before the word "no", it has a tendency to confuse certain voters. I suggested that the question should be printed

at the top of the ballot with two or three lines of simple instructions. But, as the minister pointed out, the majority of the committee were not in favour of that suggestion, and the ballot has come before the committee in its present form.

There was further a question—

The CHAIRMAN: May I point out to the hon. member that he is now discussing the bill clause by clause.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Chairman, I take this point of order, that the minister himself opened the debate with a general discussion of all these points, after reviewing the work of the committee, and it was agreed that a general discussion could be held on the first section of the bill and that, after that was over, speakers would be confined to the section.

The CHAIRMAN: It was to be a general discussion of the principle, if I mistake not, and then the bill would be taken section by section. To continue as we are going now, means that the discussion will be repeated on each section of the bill.

Mr. WHITE: With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, I would point out that from six to ten hon. members who have served on the special committee have already spoken; they have ranged throughout the bill and made various comments. I think it is only fair that those who served on the special committee should have an opportunity to express in a general way their views and, more or less, what went on in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: That is what I understood—"in a general way", but the hon. gentleman is now discussing the bill section by section.

Mr. WHITE: I am taking just one or two special clauses.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not "in a general way". Discussing the bill in a general way means discussing the general principles underlying the bill. But if you take in a general way each section, section by section, it is a repetition of what is going to take place on the motion to adopt each section.

Mr. WHITE: If, Mr. Chairman, it is your opinion that I must sit down I will do so, but I would point out—

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. gentleman would confine himself to a few minutes I would—as a concession—allow him to go on. I should like to point out that I am in the hands of the committee. If we must expedite the work of the committee it is impossible, first, to discuss on the principle of the bill all of the sections, and then take them up seriatim.

Mr. WHITE: If you wish to expedite the matter, why was no objection taken when the distinguished member for Témiscouata took up about two hours? I did not hear anyone voice any objection then, but if you say that I must sit down I will sit down.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not say that.

Mr. McLARTY: We have allowed considerable latitude, and perhaps I am more responsible than anyone else for the course the debate has taken. The hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough (Mr. White) was a member of the special committee, and inasmuch as I had the privilege of dealing with the work of the committee I would not want to see that right denied to him. If, however, we could understand that there should be some limitation of the breadth of the debate, it would help matters materially. I cannot throw stones at anyone because I probably started it, but at some time we have to come down to the particular section of the bill, and I would suggest that if hon. members could bring themselves to discuss a particular clause when we come to it, it would be much more expeditious and satisfactory.

Mr. WHITE: In view of what the minister says I will finish my remarks and, as the different clauses come up, deal with them. After all, the bill is such an utter farce that it does not make much difference.

Mr. LOCKHART: When we are not permitted to discuss the regulations in this committee—

Mr. MacINNIS: Oh, yes. I think the minister said that the regulations could be discussed on subsection 2 of section 9. That is what I understood.

Mr. McLARTY: The leader of the opposition pointed out that this was the only clause under which the regulations could be discussed. I believe it was the original intention when the bill was introduced that the regulation should not be gone over clause by clause in committee. If there are any particular points in the regulations which do not conform to subsection 2 of section 9 they can be discussed under that, but I suggest that it be taken as an undertaking that we shall not go over the regulations clause by clause, the principal reason being the matter of time.

Mr. LOCKHART: Notwithstanding any points that have been raised, the minister did make it explicit that there would not be a general discussion of the regulations. He also.

in his enlargement on the general outline of the bill, raised the question of the registration certificate not being used. It is not my desire to detain the committee at any length, but I wish to recite an experience that occurred over the week-end and also to protest most vehemently against the deletion of the use of the registration certificate.

The CHAIRMAN: Deletion of what?

Mr. LOCKHART: The use of the registration certificate. The minister referred to it in his general remarks. My understanding was and still is that no employer of labour can employ anyone without first requiring him to produce the certificate. I understand also that not long ago there was licensing in connection with every transaction of business by wholesalers and retailers. That requirement in regard to licensing appears to have gone with the wind. Men are now shipping goods without a licence number and are doing just about what they like, although we were told at first that shipments must be held up if the licence number did not appear on the invoice. Unless there has been a change in the hiring of men throughout Canada, whereby they are required first to produce their registration certificates—

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. gentleman tell me under what item he is speaking?

Mr. LOCKHART: I am speaking in connection with the general discussion. The minister also referred to the registration certificate under the short title of the bill. I am not going to detain the committee very long, but on Saturday last two different firms who are desperately in need of men to carry on their business informed me that men had come into their place of business and were unable to produce their registration certificates. The minister explained why it was not required, in connection with men voting, to produce the registration certificate. I claim that unless the registration certificate has lost its value and if a man cannot get employment without producing his certificate, such persons wandering around the country should not vote on a question such as this. I do urge that consideration be given this point, notwithstanding that the committee may have compromised on the matter. If the cost of the registration of people throughout Canada is worth anything, if it is sufficiently valuable to make it the law of this country, that before a man can be employed he must produce his registration certificate, then surely the certificate ought to be used when it comes to restricting people in casting their ballot. Any further remarks I have to make I shall confine to the different sections of the bill.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Definitions.

Mr. McLARTY: There are some amendments which I would ask the Minister of National Revenue to move. In subsection (a) in line 9 the last three words "at a plebiscite" should be deleted. Perhaps the leader of the opposition is looking at the new bill, but I am dealing with the bill as the committee had it before them.

The CHAIRMAN: The other is a reprint.

Mr. McLARTY: Yes, but I am dealing with the bill as it went to the committee, and I am seeing that the appropriate amendments are moved so that it will correspond with the reprint.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): "At a plebiscite" came out.

Mr. McLARTY: Yes. In subclause (c) the words "during a plebiscite" should read "during the plebiscite".

The CHAIRMAN: I do not believe it is necessary to amend the bill in each particular in which the committee has amended it. We have the bill as reported from the committee and as reprinted.

Mr. McLARTY: I thought possibly a motion had to be made.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not aware of that.

Mr. McLARTY: If it is understood that the amendments in the bill as it came from the committee do not need to be moved, I will not press the motion.

The CHAIRMAN: The bill has been reprinted, and we are reading from the reprint as amended by the committee.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The reprint is for the convenience of the committee. I think the amendments have to be moved. I do not agree with the Chairman.

Mr. McLARTY: I remember at the time we were considering the Unemployment Insurance Act the question was raised, and at that time it seemed to be demanded that each particular amendment be moved.

Mr. HOMUTH: Was it not the report of the committee—the bill as reprinted—which has been turned over to the committee of the whole house?

Mr. COLDWELL: Yes, but the special committee report has not been adopted; therefore the recommendations of that committee have not been approved by this com-

mittee. Consequently the bill as submitted to the special committee has only been amended by that committee, and we have to amend the original bill here.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There has been no motion for concurrence.

Mr. McLARTY: The amendments are as follows:

In line 15, following the word "plebiscite" the words "issued under section 3 of this act" are deleted. Then a new clause is inserted dealing with the electoral district definition to include the Yellowknife administration district as it appears in the bill as printed. As a result subparagraphs (d), (e), (f) and (g) are changed to (e), (f), (g) and (h) by the insertion of clause (d) as it now appears in the bill.

Under clause (e) the words "ordering a plebiscite to be taken, issued under section 3 of this act" are changed to read "issued under this act, ordering the plebiscite to be taken".

In clause (g) which is now clause (h) the word "a" is changed to "the" before the word "plebiscite" in line one of page 2.

Mr. GIBSON moved:

That section 2 be amended in subsection (a), line 9, by striking out the words "at a plebiscite".

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GIBSON moved:

That section 2 be amended in subsection (c), line 14, by striking out the word "A" and substituting in lieu thereof the word "the".

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GIBSON moved:

That section 2 be further amended in subsection (c), lines 15 and 16, by deleting the words "issued under section 3 of this act".

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GIBSON moved:

That section 2 be further amended by adding after subsection (c) another subsection to be subsection (d) of section 2 reading "electoral district" means any territorial area entitled to elect a member or members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada, and, notwithstanding anything contained in The Representation Act, 1933, for the purpose of this act, shall include the Yellowknife administration district under the name Yellowknife as established on 1st October, 1939, under the provisions of the local administration district ordinance.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GIBSON moved:

That section 2 be further amended by making the present subsection (d) become subsection (e).

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There is a change there, isn't there?

The CHAIRMAN: It is making subsection (d) become (e).

Mr. McLARTY: In addition to changing the lettering of the subsection there is an amendment deleting the words "a proclamation of the governor in council issued under section 3 of this act." Those words must be deleted.

The CHAIRMAN: The lettering of the paragraphs (e), (f) and (g) becomes (e), (f), (g) and (h), and then that the new subsection (e) is further amended in lines 19, 20, and 21, by deleting the words "a proclamation of the governor in council issued under section 3 of".

Mr. GIBSON: I so move.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GIBSON moved:

That section 2 subsection (f) be further amended by deleting in lines 23 and 24 the words "ordering a plebiscite to be taken issued under section 3 of this act" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "issued under this act, ordering the plebiscite to be taken".

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GIBSON moved:

That section 2 subsection (h) be amended on the first line of page 2 by striking out the word "a" and substituting in lieu thereof the word "the".

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MacINNIS: There is a typographical error in subsection (h), line 8.

Mr. McLARTY: Yes, the word "the" is inserted incorrectly and should be deleted.

Section 2 as amended agreed to.

On section 3—Limitation.

Mr. GIBSON moved:

That section 3 subsection 1 be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Limitation.

3. (1) This act shall be limited to the taking of a plebiscite on a question to be set out in the ballot papers in the following words and form:

Every person qualified to vote at the plebiscite shall do so by making a cross within one of the spaces herein provided after the word 'yes' or after the word 'no' according to the manner in which such person desires to vote.

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?	YES
Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?	NO

Proclamation ordering taking of plebiscite.

(2) The governor in council may by proclamation order the taking of a plebiscite for the purpose of submitting to the ordinary voters and to the Canadian service voters the question set out in subsection one of this section.

Contents of proclamation.

(3) The proclamation shall state fully the question to be submitted at the plebiscite in the same words and form as it will appear on the ballot paper pursuant to the provisions of subsection one of this section.

Idem.

(4) The proclamation shall also state the date fixed as polling day for such plebiscite, which shall be a Monday and the same in all electoral districts. Such proclamation shall further state the respective days and dates upon which Canadian service voters, as defined in this act, stationed within or without Canada, may cast their votes at such plebiscite.

Publication.

(5) The proclamation shall be published forthwith in a special issue and in at least two ordinary issues of the *Canada Gazette*.

Mr. MacINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I am going to take exception to the form of the ballot. I agree with the hon. member for Hastings-Peterborough that this ballot is confusing. I have voted on a number of plebiscites—we call them by-laws—in municipal elections. The question asked on such occasions is whether one is in favour of or against a certain proposal. I have never seen a question appearing twice on the ballot.

On this ballot there are two questions, although it is the same question stated twice. In my opinion this is bound to cause confusion. People do not vote on questions like this every day; they are not accustomed to dealing with the written word, as are members of parliament. They have not had the training in these matters that lawyers have had. They will come in and read the first part of the ballot, and become confused. The whole thing is stacked against the voter, at the very beginning. For instance, a voter will read the question opposite which the word "yes" appears. Then, he may scratch out the "yes" and put down a big "no," with the result that a spoiled ballot has been cast.

I spoke to the representative of this group on the special committee, and pointed out to him my objection, while the committee was sitting. In my opinion the question should appear only once, and the words "yes" and "no" should be enclosed in brackets or in divisions at the end. Then the voter could make a cross either for or against in the "yes" or "no" division. In that way the ballot would not have to be repeated.

Mr. REID: Was this possibility discussed in the special committee? I agree with what other hon. members have said, namely that this ballot will confuse the voter. I believe the whole thing could be simplified by having the question appear only once, and then by providing places for "yes" or "no" votes.

Mr. McLARTY: This matter was discussed in committee. I have no violent feeling as to the form in which the question should appear. When the matter was first considered I was somewhat of the opinion that one question would be appropriate, and that spaces for "yes" and "no" could be provided. I believe, however, that the action of the committee was governed entirely by the experience of the chief electoral officer, who has suggested this form of ballot. My recollection is that it has been used extensively in practically all the provinces, in connection with the Canada Temperance Act.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Not very often.

Mr. McLARTY: Members of the special committee were surprised to learn the number of times it had been used.

Mr. LOCKHART: How long ago was that?

Mr. McLARTY: Between 1920 and 1925, if I remember correctly the dates the chief electoral officer gave us.

Mr. LOCKHART: That is sixteen years ago; we have a new generation now.

Mr. McLARTY: I would suppose that a change of ballot is not something which would change with the generation. However, according to the report given to the special committee, which was after some argument adopted by it, it was decided that this was the form which was most appropriate.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): There must be a large number of members of the legal profession in Ontario who are familiar with the provisions of the municipal act of that province whereby at annual elections what are known as money by-laws are submitted to the voters. They have them right here in Ottawa. I have never voted on one, but I know that the people are simply asked: Are you in favour of a bond issue for so-and-so?—and they are usually asked to answer "yes" or "no."

Mr. REID: They write "yes" or "no" on the ballot.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That seems to be a most simple method. In this instance the question would be asked: Are you in favour of releasing the government?—and the answer would be "yes" or "no." That procedure is familiar to the voters of Ontario,

although we do not have that type of legislation in New Brunswick. In that province a municipality wishing to make a capital expenditure takes the necessary steps, and the matter is referred to the legislature. That would apply to a town council or a county council, as the case may be. Such by-law would be reviewed by the Department of Municipal Affairs, and the government of the day accepts some responsibility in the matter.

I do not say the government accepts full responsibility, but it follows some policy, and either accepts or rejects. However, our by-laws are not submitted to the people—I believe it would be much better if they were, because such submission is an added control over councils.

In Ontario, however, the submission of by-laws to the people is universal practice. I am told that in British Columbia it is a procedure stipulated by law. I believe most provinces in Canada must have something analogous, where the voter writes his "yes" or "no". That is the simplest possible form of ballot. I am convinced that this one would be confusing.

Mr. McLARTY: I believe the voter simply makes a cross.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes; he does not write at all.

Mr. McCANN: I cannot see that there is any particular advantage or disadvantage in having the question repeated on the ballot paper. I have voted several times in reference to municipal by-laws in Ontario, and if I remember correctly, it is the practice to have the question appear only once. But I believe the minister will recall that in an ordinary election it is customary to put the names of those for whom the ballot is to be cast in alphabetical order. There is some advantage, especially when there are three names, in being either at the top or the bottom. There are many people who are inclined to vote for names at the top or the bottom. If the committee wishes to carry out that idea, then this would be reversed; it would be "no" and "yes", not the other way round.

Mr. McLARTY: Would the hon. member make it affirmative or negative?

Mr. McCANN: I do not know whether the "yes" being first reflects the wish of the government or not. If it does, then perhaps there is an advantage in having it at the top. But if you are going to follow the practice usually followed in electoral contests and have it in alphabetical order, then the "no" should be opposite the first question and the "yes" opposite the second.

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

Mr. HOMUTH: I agree with the hon. members who take exception to this form of ballot. I think it will be found that many people will go into the polling booth and instead of putting a cross or writing anything down, they will simply strike out that word which they do not want. If they want to vote "no", they will strike out the word "yes", and spoil the ballot. As the leader of the opposition has said, when we submit ballots to the municipal ratepayers in Ontario we submit the one question and then there is a "yes" and a "no" and they vote accordingly. I think the ballot provided for in the bill is most confusing and is going to cause a lot of difficulty. There is no reason at all why we should not do what has been suggested. In reference to the various plebiscites taken in Ontario, hon. members from this province will recall that the one in 1919 contained four questions. There were four different questions, but each question dealt with a different phase of the liquor act.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: What did you get? You got Mitch.

Mr. HOMUTH: No; we never got Mitch; Mitch just happened. There were other votes taken later on. The one taken in 1921 was submitted in such a way that it was simply a question of "yes" or "no". I think we could change this ballot from what it is.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Some time ago in Ontario the voters in most of the municipalities were asked to vote, "Are you in favour of daylight saving—yes or no?" There was no possibility of the voter getting mixed up. If you have this thing the way it is now, I know in my riding you will have half the ballots spoiled.

Mr. BOUCHER: I am altogether too young to remember the vote on the liquor question in Ontario, but I have had considerable experience with people signing forms and answering questions such as on applications to the civil service commission. My opinion is that this ballot is most confusing in many ways. I think the question should be asked just once and then have the word "yes" with a square after it in which the voter could put his mark, and then the word "no" with a square after it. There would be a place in which the voter could signify his intention. The way it is now the people will think they have to strike out that portion which they do not approve. In my humble opinion the ballot in its present form is very confusing. The voter will be led to believe that he is required to do more than is necessary, and there will be an obscurity as to his wish as expressed in the ballot. I would suggest that the question be a great deal simpler than it is now.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): When I said that half the ballots would be spoiled in my riding if the ballot were left as it is now, I meant that as the people there had such definite views, if they wanted to vote "yes" they would mark their ballot that way and then strike out the "no".

Mr. TURGEON: I have no deep opinion as to the particular form the ballot should take, but when I was in the special committee I was convinced by what the chief electoral officer told us was the experience of his branch. The members of the special committee made a change which has not been brought to the attention of this committee of the whole, and the following words were placed at the top of the ballot:

Every person qualified to vote at the plebiscite shall do so by making a cross within one of the spaces herein provided after the word "yes" or after the word "no" according to the manner in which such person desires to vote.

Mr. REID: How many do you think will read that?

Mr. TURGEON: The special committee thought they would read it. I am not arguing in favour of this ballot, but as one of the members of that committee I want to point out what was in the minds of the members of that committee when they were giving consideration to this question. There is no doubt that the members of the special committee felt that persons coming to vote would read that, and my opinion is that they would. When the average person goes into the quiet of the polling booth he will look at the ballot to see what is on it. When he reads what is at the top, the nature of the action he is expected to take will be clarified and he will be able to mark his ballot accordingly. I would not have any fear that there will be many rejected ballots because of the way in which this question is put. I am not saying that because I object to changing the question —that does not matter very much. I would have no fear that the average voter will be able to vote intelligently with this ballot.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Would it not be a sound principle to apply to this problem to have the form as simple as possible? I suggest that the question be placed on the form once and once only, and direction given to mark opposite the word "yes" with a cross in a square, or opposite the word "no", as the case may be.

Mr. McLARTY: I think the hon. members of this committee wish to get a ballot form that will be as fair and simple as possible. I suggest that possibly we may let this form stand, and I shall endeavour to have sample ballots prepared overnight and then hon. members will have an ocular demonstration as to whether or not it is simple.

Mr. HOMUTH: When the resolution was introduced I think it was mentioned that there would not be as many polling booths as would be provided in an ordinary election. Therefore, there will be a greater number of people voting at each booth. To a large extent, that will eliminate some of the questions of the cost of taking this plebiscite, but if every voter has to read a chapter of a book before he votes, we can see how it will slow up the voting.

Mr. GREEN: It does seem to me that the words at the top of the ballot could be simplified a great deal. Would it not be more satisfactory to use these words:

Make a cross within the space after the word "yes" or after the word "no" according to the manner in which you desire to vote.

Would that not be simpler than having all this business about "Every person qualified to vote", et cetera?

Mr. McLARTY: I think I shall be able to produce some sample ballots to-morrow, if that is the wish of the committee. I do not think this is a matter in which there is any great difference. It is simply a case of trying to get the ballot in the best form.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McLarty moves that section 3 stand.

Mr. McLARTY: Just subsection 1.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I should like to say a word before that motion is put. I think the minister is correct when he says that the committee was largely influenced in recommending this form of ballot by the opinion of the chief electoral officer who said that such form had been satisfactory in the past. After listening to the discussion that has taken place to-night, I really think the form of ballot would be simplified by printing the question on it only once.

If hon. members will look at the ballot paper as it appears in the bill, I think they will agree that it would be much simpler to raise the word "yes"—or "no" if you like—further up in the space, and then print "no" below it, drawing a line between "yes" and "no" and leaving a space after each word where the voter could mark his cross. That would be very much simpler, and then you would not need the printed direction above at all.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I think we are wasting a lot of time. In the last federal election we solved simple problems such as

this very easily so far as my riding is concerned. It was left to the intelligence of the voter.

Mr. HOMUTH: That did not solve it.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: They put the cross in the right place. Does this committee realize that Japan is still at our doors and that we are wasting time talking a lot of nonsense?

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): And holding a plebiscite.

Mr. HANSELL: I know I am of small stature, Mr. Chairman, but some time I may fill the shoes of a Minister of Agriculture, and then perhaps I can be seen and heard. I agree with all that has been said with respect to the confusion that may arise over this form of ballot. The hon. member for Caribou has called attention to the wording of the ballot paper and suggested that when people vote they will read what is at the top of the ballot. I am more concerned as to what the people will read about in respect to what they are voting for. I am more confused about that than I am about the form of the ballot. The question to be asked of the voters is this:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

I have tried to think my way through that, and I can think of only two methods of raising men: One is by conscription and the other is by voluntary enlistment. There may be some regulations governing methods. The government may be confused over whether they should send a postcard when a man is to be called up for military service or whether they should send an officer along to tell him he is required. I would ask the minister what methods of raising men for military service are used now, and what commitments have been made that restrict the government to any particular methods of raising men. I do not believe that the government are restricted in their methods of raising men. Where they are restricted is as to where to send the men after they are raised. But that does not appear on the ballot, and I think people are going to be confused as to what they are voting for when they read the question.

While on the question of the ballot, I appreciate the minister's suggestion that we let the ballot stand until he can reconsider its form. But if he is going to reconsider the ballot at all, there are a few other matters he should consider, and first is the thing I have already mentioned, the question to be asked. I should like at the proper time, Mr. Chairman, to submit an amendment. I do not know whether now is the proper time or not, but I will submit it for consideration, and if this is the time to vote on it, the minister may accept it and embody it in the ballot for our consideration when he comes back. I move that the following words be added to the question appearing on the ballot paper: "in any theatre of war." The question then will read:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service in any theatre of war.

Then the people will know what they are voting upon. I think it is only fair to say that the whole country believes that they are going to vote on whether or not there shall be conscription of men for service. But that is not what the ballot states.

There is another thing about this ballot. I have received a good many letters recently in connection with the plebiscite, and the general contention of the people who have inquired of me is that they are not going to vote for the conscription of men for overseas service if they are not privileged to vote on the conscription of finance. I think that is a reasonable attitude to take because, after all, the man who is conscripted to face shot and shell and who gives his life for his country is giving all he has. Surely there should be some mobilization and conscription of other things too. The government desires to be released from its commitments. I would suggest that another question be added to the ballot paper, and I would suggest that it read this way. I move this as an amendment:

That a second question be placed upon the ballot paper as follows:

Are you in favour of the conscription of the financial institutions of Canada so that the government can fulfil its commitment to issue currency and credit in terms of public need?

I pass these amendments along to you, Mr. Chairman, and I send copies of each of them to the minister. I trust that when the ballot comes back we shall find it amended exactly as I have suggested, and that the questions will be printed accordingly. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I shall gladly support the ballot if it is so amended.

The CHAIRMAN: We can take only one amendment at a time. It is moved by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Hansell) that the following words be added to the question appearing on the ballot: "in any theatre of war."

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Would you be kind enough to read it, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: The question as proposed to be amended would then read:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service in any theatre of war?

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the amendment?

Mr. PERLEY: No matter what the form of the ballot may be, I can assure the committee that there will be as few spoiled ballots in the constituency of Qu'Appelle as anywhere else in the country. My opinion is that there should be nothing on the ballot but the question itself. There is no need to print the directions on how to vote because the directions will be posted in the polling booth itself. You should have just the question on the ballot paper, without any directions.

I do not believe there are any commitments of the government restricting the method of raising men. That part of the question is outside the issue and quite unnecessary. The restriction is not with respect to the method of raising men; it is as to where you send the men. So I think that should be deleted, to make it more comprehensible, and there should be added to it something as to where you send the men for military service. The question could be made more understandable by deleting that part of the fourth line, also by striking out any instructions as to how to vote; have just the one question, with "yes" or "no", and I think it would be very readily understood.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I feel sure that this ballot is going to be very confusing to a lot of people in my part of the country. The manner of voting in municipal elections as regards the ballots suggests a much simpler form, where you have one question appear, and you can vote "yes" or "no". I am receiving a great many letters from people in my own home riding, irrespective of political affiliation, wanting to know what it means if they vote "yes" and what it means if they vote "no". I have not yet been able to learn from the government what it means. I have taken the trouble to read previous speeches in this chamber by the Prime Minister and members of the government, and after doing so I am unable to see that a vote on this ballot will get us anywhere. I think the hon. member for Macleod made it very plain in his discussion on the resolution as to this plebiscite that this ballot would not release the government from its pledges given in this house some years ago. He presented a very strong argument, and his suggested amendment does something to clarify to the public the meaning of the ballot. "In any theatre of war" makes it at least slightly more explicit. I think it could be improved even more. I suggest in all seriousness that only one question appear on the ballot paper, and I think that the words "in any theatre of war" should be added. The question would not then be so confusing to the general public.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The hon. member for Qu'Appelle has, I think, put his finger right on the fallacy of this question. In the mobilization act, in the admissions made by the Prime Minister in this house within a few days, the principle of compulsion is admitted. This government has power to raise men by any method, and it is raising them by all the methods which are now available—the voluntary system and the compulsory system. The only distinction is as to the disposition of the men raised by the government. In the one case, the men raised by compulsion may not be sent beyond the territorial limits of Canada, while men raised by voluntary methods may. So the question which is proposed to be put in this ballot is an untruthful one; it does not bear the essence of truth. There is not any restriction to-day on the method of raising men; it is the matter of the disposal of the men once they are raised; there is the fallacy of the whole thing. I put it to the Prime Minister, is there any restriction of the method of raising men in this country to-day? None whatever. The government can do anything it likes under the War Measures Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. That is not the point.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I know what the Prime Minister has to say. I have the floor, for just a few moments.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend asked me a question.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No, I didn't—or I did with a rider attached. I make this assertion, that there is no restriction in law or in fact on the method by which this government may raise men for military service, and I defy a successful answer to the contrary to that question. The only trouble with the situation in Canada to-day is that the government has voluntarily tied itself by a commitment which it made to the public in the last election as to the disposition of the men raised by compulsion. We have the

limitation in section 3 of the mobilization act, and this is self-imposed by the government. But by the same token, the government has in its possession to-day an opinion from its own law officers of the crown that, notwithstanding the limitation contained in the third section of the mobilization act, it may disregard that and send men out of Canada who are raised on a compulsory principle. So the whole thing is a hollow sham and a mockery; that is what it is. Analyse it, now.

An hon. MEMBER: Don't get mad.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am not mad at all. I am trying to emphasize an argument. You don't get me mad as easily as that. That is a fact. This question as framed by the Prime Minister is clever. I thought so the minute I heard it. It is intended to fool the people.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, no.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Oh, yes. You may not like it. As a matter of fact there is no restriction on the method to-day in law or in fact as to how this country may raise men. The whole point of the discussion, all the controversy, rages round the disposition of these men. There is, of course, also a difference in point of view, but that is not the question. There is no commitment in respect of which the government ought to be released in regard to the method of raising men. We have adopted every known method there is to raise men. Why, we have even resorted in this country to the method of coercion in the training centres to get volunteers for service overseas. I do not say that that practice is universal, but the Department of National Defence put it up to its training centres to get so many men from the draftees to volunteer for service overseas, and it depends very largely on the commanding officers, the men immediately in charge of recruiting, as to the methods to be adopted. Some take one method and some take another.

Mr. HOMUTH: Some of them you would not be very proud of.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes, I am afraid that is true. But it is put up to them to get the men, and it depends on the temperament of the man who is doing the job as to what method he pursues. But the government—"Oh, we never authorized anything like that!" Of course the department would say that "we never told them to take that course". Last year I saw a questionnaire which was put to trainees, and they were chased "right up into the clearing"; if they were not prepared to volunteer for overseas service, why? Men are supposed to sign on the dotted line after giving their reasons, and they are brought before officers and cross-examined then: "Why don't you sign up for overseas?" In some cases they are browbeaten and coerced into doing it. That is contrary to the principle of the voluntary system. That, of course, is not true universally.

An hon. MEMBER: Almost.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It all depends on the community and the training centre where it happens. I would not say it is universal, but it is true in certain instances.

I ask hon. members to get right down to business and analyse the language of this question. In the light of the law and of the known facts, there is not any commitment; there is not any restriction of the method of raising men. This is just another proverbial red herring drawn across the track to fool the Canadian people—which the Prime Minister has done so many times and so successfully.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

The CHAIRMAN: On the point of order, the words of the leader of the opposition are clearly out of order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Which words?

The CHAIRMAN: Citation 297 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms states that it is out of order to charge another with falsehood or deceit. It is also out of order to suggest that any hon. member has deliberately raised a false issue. The words of the leader of the opposition are therefore clearly out of order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I did not charge the Prime Minister with falsehood.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No, I did not.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Neither did I charge him with deceit. I did charge him with trying to fool the people, and I have heard that done a thousand times.

The CHAIRMAN: Words are given as examples in citations 297 and 298 under standing order 41, but they are only examples. What the hon. gentleman has said, to the effect that the Prime Minister had fooled the people, is equivalent to many of the expressions which are clearly given in the rule as being out of order, and I so rule.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I appeal with great respect from your ruling, sir.

Mr. POULIOT: The leader of the opposition said it with flowers, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it is customary in matters of the kind to ask *Hansard* to give the exact words.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I ask a question? Has the Chairman ruled that the words "fooling the people" or "seeking to fool the people"—I think those were my words—charged the Prime Minister with deceit? If that is his construction, I certainly never intended to do that.

The CHAIRMAN: The words I have to report are: "The leader of the opposition having stated that the question contained in the ballot form in section 3 of the bill was another attempt of the Prime Minister deliberately to fool the people, as he has done so many times in the past. . . ." Those are the words as I heard them.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): If that is out of order, I am quite willing to withdraw. I have no intention of being out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: Those words are withdrawn, are they?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): You heard what I said—if they are out of order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say first of all to the leader of the opposition that unless my memory fails me entirely, he was the one, the first one in the house, to express his approval of my having given a straightforward question.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Having asked the question. I never approved it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am coming back to what was said in the course of the debate on the address. Great emphasis was laid on the importance of having the question that was to be asked before the house when we were discussing the matter, and in speaking on the address I used the following language, as reported in *Hansard* at page 51:

> I shall not go into detail regarding the procedure to be followed in holding the proposed plebiscite. The question which the government proposes to submit to the people is the simple and straightforward question:
>
> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

That was informing the house at the earliest possible moment of what the question would be. At a later stage in the debate, and in the debate on this present bill, some question was raised as to the exact wording of the question, and I had occasion then to refer the house or the committee to what I had said on the address. This question has been before the house since the house opened, and until to-night the language of it has not been questioned, with respect to any ulterior motive, at least, that may have been in the mind, or as alleged to-night to have been in the mind, of the ministry in the drafting of it. I submit that there is nothing ulterior about the question at all. It is a straightforward question, and inasmuch as the discussion has taken place up to the present in reference to the question in the form in which it is, I hope that hon. members will not suggest the necessity of making any amendments to it.

May I say further that the reason why the question is before us as a part of the bill is largely due to the fact that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition asked that it should be inserted in the bill in the exact words in which it is. If he thought that the question was wrong, or that there was anything ulterior about it, or that there was any duplicity in the wording of it, and so forth, he should not have been the first to suggest that that identical question should be made a part of the bill. It was on my hon. friend's suggestion, that the question as he understood it should be a part of the bill, that I asked that instructions be given to the special committee to see that the question should be so inserted in the bill. I think that ought to be a sufficient reason why at this stage of the debate at any rate the question should not be altered one way or the other.

As to the question, the leader of the opposition now says that the government has the power under the War Measures Act—that it has the power in law and in fact to send men overseas, and that therefore there is no necessity for the question. I have said from the beginning that parliament is all-powerful. As a matter of fact parliament can at the present time pass any enactment it pleases regardless of any commitment that has been made in the past, or any pledge that has been given; but whether parliament would be prepared to do that or not depends a good deal upon what value a man attaches to his word, or what value parliament attaches to its action, or what value a government attaches to its pledge. As to the power, no one has ever denied that parliament has power to do whatever it pleases. With regard to the actual power it possesses to-day to conscript men to send overseas, we have that power under the War Measures Act.

But what was the nature of the pledge that was given, the pledge given on every platform, not by myself alone? I quoted and placed on *Hansard* on Wednesday last the

strong and emphatic language used by the leader of the Conservative party pledging all his party in exactly the same way as I was pledging mine. It was not as I say in reference to not possessing the power that any pledge was given, but having the power, that the power would not be exercised in one particular; that commitment was made. The pledge admitted the power, if you wish, but the commitment was that that power would not be exercised in one form or particular, namely, raising men for military service overseas by conscription. The commitment was a commitment restricting the methods of raising men for military service. The restriction was as to raising men by conscription for military service overseas.

Now the hon. leader of the opposition seeks to-night to make out that the question as it is worded here is related to the law or to the fact. It is not related to the law or to the fact at all; it is related to a commitment that was made with respect to whatever law there might be or whatever the fact might be. A commitment that no matter whatever power the government had, it would not exercise that power with respect to men to be sent overseas if the method to be employed was to be the method of conscription. In other words, that as far as service overseas was concerned that was to be by voluntary enlistment, not by enlistment under coercion or conscription. That was a commitment. That is the commitment. It is that commitment that the government is asking to be freed from. That commitment does not apply to the use of conscription generally; we have conscription with respect to the raising of men for service in Canada; this parliament itself has enacted a measure which contains the power of the use of compulsion for military service. No exception was taken by the government to that; in fact the government brought forward the measure. The commitment that was made at the time of the general election was not against applying compulsory service for the defence of Canada within Canada; it was only in relation to service overseas. That is why I said the other night that if to-morrow it became necessary to exercise compulsion in the matter of protecting our shores to the extent of our armed forces going out in the Pacific beyond Queen Charlotte island, or to Alaska, or to Labrador or Newfoundland, I would not hesitate one moment in using the War Measures Act to see that conscription was enforced for that purpose were such a step necessary. That would not be violating the commitment made. The commitment was not made with respect to the protection of our own shores; it was made with respect to sending men overseas; everyone so understood it, and it was to that extent that the law and the fact was limited and that the government at the present time is limited.

If we attached no importance whatsoever to a solemn pledge given in relation to this particular war, as respects one aspect and one phase of our war effort, then I might join as my hon. friend is prepared to do now, but was not prepared to do at the time he asked the people to return him to parliament; we might say, as he does, discount all that and pay no further attention to it. But we are not prepared so to do; we are going to stand by the pledge we have made until the people themselves release us from it. But we are going to tell the people that we believe it is in their own interest that the government should be released from that pledge or commitment. That is the simple question we are putting before them, the one and only question:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of—

Not the law, not the fact, but—

—any past commitments—

—and "any past commitments" and "any" covers everything that can be construed as a commitment.

—restricting the methods of raising men for military service.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Overseas; that is the point.

An hon. MEMBER: Put the word "overseas" in.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:—"arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service." "Any" covers everything, overseas, and all else. What more could any one wish for? That is the whole purpose. So that there can be no doubt whatsoever with respect to any commitment that has been made, whether it relates to any theatre of war or any part of the world, or any aspect of the war service, it covers everything. That is as clear as it possibly can be, and I am saying it as emphatically as I can.

I agree with those who have spoken to-night as to the form of the ballot and who have said that the simpler it can be made the better. I so expressed myself to the minister when I saw what the committee had recommended, but when I heard that the special committee, composed of members of all parties in the house, were unanimously of the view, after having heard the chief electoral officer, that this form of ballot which is now on the order paper was preferable, I said nothing further about it. And for the same reason I thought I would refrain from

saying anything on the matter in the debate to-night. However I think what has been suggested by the hon. member for Yukon, by the hon. member for Carleton, by the leader of the opposition and by several other speakers and what I know the minister himself would prefer would be that there should be but the one simple question, and that at the end of the question there should be a square divided into four with "yes" and "no" above and below each item in the squares nearest the question and two blanks opposite in one or other of which an X could be placed. It would be a very simple ballot, and I would be surprised if the house generally would not agree upon it.

May I say—it may sound a little absurd but I have sometimes thought that if one wanted to get from any group—I am not applying this to this honourable house, but as something to be secured from any group—just the opposite of what might appear to be what is desired, the thing to do would be to suggest the opposite form of question in the first instance, because exception would be bound to be taken to it at the outset. I am as sure as that I am speaking to-night that if the committee had brought in a single question in the form now being proposed we would have had an equal number of speakers asking why we did not put the question into two columns so that there could be no mistake if a person marked his ballot after the "yes" he meant "yes" in regard to that particular question.

I am of the point of view of the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Cruickshank) who said a moment ago that these are terrible times, and I do not think it discloses the truest sense of proportion that we should be spending an entire evening, as we have to-night, listening to one or two hon. members speaking at very great length with the remainder of the time pretty well taken up entirely with a discussion on the wording on a single ballot in respect to which consideration had already been given by a special committee of the house. There are grave issues at stake at the present time, and we may very soon have to consider some of them much more profoundly than we have thus far had occasion to do. I would suggest to hon. members that they try to make all the progress that can be made with the legislation before us, avoiding unnecessarily long speeches and also unnecessary and sometimes trivial objections to what may be before the house.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): With the chairman's permission and the permission of the Prime Minister, in speaking of the election in 1940 he said that the leader of the Conservative party pledged the Conservative party against conscription. I would remind the Prime Minister and the committee that the Conservative party was not in that election, that the Conservative party had been jettisoned, torpedoed, and that the then leader was then leading the National Government party. I am probably the only candidate of that time who ran as a Liberal-Conservative and was elected. I could not stomach the National government party.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was very careful to say that the Conservative party had another name for the purpose of the election, that they did travel under the name of the National Government party. I am prepared not only to admit that but to congratulate my hon. friend on being the only Simon-pure in the party.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I take strong exception to that. I am a Simon-pure and always have been, notwithstanding that I was not consulted by the gentleman.

Mr. COLDWELL: I agree with the Prime Minister that we are spending far too much time on this plebiscite. There are other and graver issues, we should be dealing with them instead of wrangling over the wording of the plebiscite. But I agree with the amendment of the hon. member for Macleod. The Prime Minister himself is a master of English, and if he reads the question carefully he will find that the words "restricting the methods of raising men for military service" modify the word "commitments," and that the commitments were made in relation to sending men overseas. The adding of the four words "in any theatre of war" would clear the matter up, and make the position abundantly clear. I am asking the Prime Minister and the government to consider the matter over night, because it is now eleven o'clock.

Section stands.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 11.03 p.m.

Tuesday, March 3, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

WAGE CEILING

ORDER IN COUNCIL AMENDING WARTIME SALARIES ORDER AND CONSOLIDATING AMENDMENTS

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I wish to lay on the table of the house order in council P.C. 1549, of February 27, 1942, amending the wartime salaries order and consolidating these and former amendments with the original order.

The principal new amendment relates to war industries only, and gives the Minister of National Revenue power to permit, in specific cases and within prescribed limits, the adjustment of the salaries being paid to some individuals engaged in those industries, where there is good cause for such adjustment within the general principle of maintaining unchanged the generally prevailing rate for a given set of duties and responsibilities. There is also a provision for the adjustment of probationary rates of salary being paid to those who have been recently appointed or promoted at less than the normal rate for the work they are doing. The recitals of the order explain the purpose of the new amendments, which I have had marked in the copies to be tabled.

STANDING COMMITTEES

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION—BANK OF CANADA—SUGGESTED COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a question of general importance, and I crave the indulgence of the house and ask it to bear with me for a few minutes while I elaborate what I have in mind as briefly as possible.

Yesterday the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Graydon) asked the Minister of National War Services (Mr. Thorson) if the annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation would be referred to a special committee which might investigate all questions relating to the policy and management of that corporation and the minister promised that consideration would be given by the government to that suggestion. While the government is giving such consideration, I should like to have an associated but more general situation considered.

Each year the annual report of the Canadian National Railways is referred to a select special committee of this house and the affairs of that railway are investigated, but this house does not give annual consideration to the problems of other government corporations which stand in the same relationship to this house as the Canadian National Railways. My suggestion is that it become the annual and automatic practice that the reports of the Bank of Canada and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation be referred to committees of this house in the same manner as the report of the Canadian National Railways. The report of the Bank of Canada falls naturally under the jurisdiction of the standing committee on banking and commerce and I suggest to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King))) and the house that we establish a rule that that report shall each year be automatically referred to that committee, so that the committee may review the policy and management of the bank.

There is no standing committee to which the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is naturally appurtenant. We have a standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines, which formerly did a great deal of work, but which to-day has practically nothing to do. In addition, each year we appoint a select special committee on Canadian National Railways accounts. My suggestion is that we abandon the standing committee on railways, canals and telegraph lines and also the select special committee on the Canadian National Railways and create a new standing committee to be called the standing committee on communications and that each year the annual reports of the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation be automatically referred to such committee, so that the policy and management of these corporations may be subject to parliamentary review.

The creation of these government corporations in the past few years has raised an important problem of parliamentary control. In the recent past we have not exercised in respect of them the immediate and direct control which we have over government departments whose estimates must come before us. I believe it is time that we assumed that measure of control which is necessary in the public interest and I make these suggestions to the house, that the reports be automatically referred to the committees to which I have alluded, believing that it is the best means of reasserting our right to control of policy and management and the best means of assuring that the public interest is appropriately safeguarded.

These corporations are government-owned and are operated for the government. They operate on the taxpayers' money. The day-to-day management is removed from government control, but the policies of each must of necessity reflect government policy. That I think is true. Therefore it follows that the peoples' elected representatives should be afforded the opportunity of reviewing their operations and policies. I urge the government to conform to this view and refer the annual reports of these corporations to appropriate committees.

There is another aspect of this matter which is worthy of consideration. The reference of these annual reports to the suggested appropriate committees would afford to the membership of this house a useful outlet for their abilities. There is, I think, a sense of frustra-

tion in the minds of the members. They are not given under present conditions an opportunity to take the part in the national effort which their position, their abilities and their desires warrant.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I warmly support all that I heard of the statement just made by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson). I have suggested during the past few years that we should refer the operations of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation periodically to some committee, but I believe the suggestion made by the leader of the opposition is in every way a better one. As the enterprises of the dominion expand and government ownership of public corporations increases, I think it is more essential than ever that there should be some parliamentary inquiry into the operations of these corporations. Now that we have the national railways, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the Bank of Canada, and the Trans-Canada Air Lines, it seems to me that as a safeguard these corporations should be thoroughly looked into by the membership of this house. I am thoroughly of the opinion that such public corporations, while they should be subject to parliament, ought to be as they are now, corporations removed from political interference and control, but subject to parliamentary inquiry. I warmly support the suggestion of the leader of the opposition.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, without wishing to be held too closely to exact approval of all that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) has suggested, I find myself in sympathy with the point of view he has expressed, and which has also been expressed by the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party. It is true that there has been of late an increase in the number of government corporations and government-controlled corporations. There is every reason why parliament should at all times be free to exercise its right of inquiry into matters of public concern and especially matters which affect public expenditure. I would wish to look carefully into the suggestion of my hon. friend and discuss it with my colleagues before making a further statement.

PRECIOUS METALS MARKING ACT

AMENDMENTS MADE BY ORDER IN COUNCIL UNDER WAR MEASURES ACT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. A. MacKINNON (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, yesterday on the orders of the day the leader of the opposition referred to an order in council which was passed on February 23 in connection with the Precious Metals Marking Act. The hon. member asked why an amendment to the act was not brought down covering the subject matter of the order in council at the same time as other amendments to the act.

I would point out that the amendments made to the Precious Metals Marking Act by Bill No. 4, passed on February 23, are permanent alterations to the act. The amending act was planned and drawn up weeks ago and was actually given its first reading in the house on January 28. The particular matter dealt with by the order in council is an entirely different matter and was an emergency requirement due to the freezing of supplies of tin as a result of the far eastern situation. Manufacturers of silver plated hollow-ware are in the position of being unable to obtain tin due to the government restriction of this metal, and some provision had to be made immediately.

The order in council is effective only for the duration of the war and six months thereafter, and then automatically lapses. If the act had been amended to provide for this situation, not only would delays have occurred but a further amendment would have been necessary after the war to reenact the section suspended. Enactment by order in council allowed immediate action and avoids further amendment to the act after the war.

The change brought about is purely an emergency measure.

POSTAL CENSORSHIP

REGULATIONS RESPECTING MAIL ADDRESSED TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

On the orders of the day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, some days ago the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Hanson) brought up for a second time the subject of censorship in relation to the censoring of letters of members of parliament and also as to the possible use of excerpts taken from communications which had been censored. I stated at the time that I would have a full inquiry made into the whole subject and report to the house later.

I wish to express my thanks to the leader of the opposition and to other hon. members for not having made inquiries from day to day as to why this report was not being made immediately. I have been amazed at the amount of information which it has been thought necessary to place at my disposal and which I have been obliged to go through in connection with this subject; but having gone through it all, I have come to the con-

clusion that there are very strong reasons why, on the subject of censorship, too much should not be said in public. I am therefore going to suggest to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation group and the leader of the Social Credit group that they meet with me at some convenient time when I would be pleased to place before them different aspects of this question which have come to my attention.

Censorship, it will be recognized, is a phase of war activity, and if it is to serve the purpose for which it is intended, matters connected with it must necessarily be kept very largely secret. However, I wish at once to say to hon. members with respect to the censoring of letters of members of parliament that we in Canada thus far have not begun to go as far as they have in Great Britain. I think it can be shown that the censorship of letters of members of parliament in Canada is at the present time on quite a restricted basis.

I wish to say further that such censorship as there is being or has been exercised with regard to members' letters has related only to matters that are of immediate concern to Canada's war effort or to the war effort of the United States or Great Britain or to that of some of the allied countries. There has been no attempt on the part of the censors, as far as I could ascertain, to seek for any information other than that which had an immediate relationship to some war activity.

With respect to references in letters to political matters I have been informed that the censors have had very explicit instructions. Not only have they been instructed to pay no attention to matters other than matters affecting the war, but I am informed that in fact they have carefully refrained from passing on any information in any letter that related to political matters. Nothing of the kind has come to the government from any source. It has been ignored entirely.

I believe a question was asked by my hon. friend the member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce) which brought an answer from the Postmaster-General (Mr. Mulock) which seemed to imply that excerpts generally might be taken from letters and sent to heads of departments concerned. But if the entire question and the entire answer are read together, it will be seen that the only excerpts that could be taken from any letter to be sent to the head of any department were excerpts which related to some matter pertaining to the war. I am assured that such was the intention of the reply, that such in fact has been the case, and that nothing has been taken from any communications and sent to the heads of any departments of the government from censored letters other than what has related to war activities in one form or another.

The question came up in the course of discussion a day or two ago whether a certain locality was included in a defence area. Well, that question helps to illustrate the point which I am making of the necessity of the government being very indefinite about what is said on this subject of censorship. If a defence area were specifically mentioned—as for example, Halifax, a defence area—and it were to be stated that the boundaries of that were at a certain radius, immediately persons interested in sending communications in a manner which would avoid the censor would simply go outside of the area so defined and mail their communications there. That is one of the instances which help to illustrate why it is not possible to give the house full and exact particulars in regard on details of censorship.

My hon. friend also asked that the regulations regarding censorship should, if possible, be tabled. Well, that, I must say, is not possible. If they were tabled they would reveal information which relates to the United States and Britain as well as to Canada, and would certainly give sources of information or knowledge to the enemy which he should not possess.

These are some of the points which have come out of a careful study of the question. But I would add that I do not know of any aspect of the censorship matter which should not be communicated to the leaders of the parties if it will help to give confidence to hon. members as to the method in which the censorship is exercised, and I shall seek to arrange for that when we have our interview.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to the Prime Minister for the statement which he has made, and which, of course, is intended to be reassuring. I would like him and the house to feel that I appreciate that censorship is an essential part of war activity. I have never controverted that principle. I do not see how it would be possible to carry on the war without it. I will reserve any other remarks on this matter until the conference is held; perhaps I shall then have a better appreciation of the whole position. But it is naturally an irritating thing to find that a letter—a political communication, if you will, and rather harmless—had been opened by the censor although it did not come from a defence area. That is all that I have to say on this point at the moment.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

EASTER ADJOURNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): May I ask, without anticipating an immediate answer, a question of the Prime Minister which he and the government might be turning over in their minds. It has been represented to me by some hon. members that they would like to know what are the plans of the government with respect to the Easter recess. Especially interested are those members who live a long distance away and who do not get home very frequently; they would like to lay their plans for a return to their constituencies during the Easter vacation. Will the Prime Minister indicate at an appropriate time upon what date it is anticipated this house will adjourn for Easter, and how long the Easter recess will be?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I shall be pleased to give my hon. friend an answer within a day or two. I might say at once that the government has had in mind an adjournment of at least a fortnight at Easter. It will not be a brief adjournment, but one sufficiently long to enable hon. members who are some distance from Ottawa to return to their homes. In that connection we have been considering what, in connection with the taking of the plebiscite, might also be of advantage. Some little time ago I had a hope that the taking of the plebiscite would come about the time of the Easter recess and that the recess might be made sufficiently long to enable hon. members to speak on the plebiscite, not only in their own constituencies but elsewhere if they felt so inclined. It looks now, I am afraid, as though it would not be possible to have the Easter adjournment sufficiently long to cover the period which will intervene between Easter and the taking of the plebiscite. At any rate I hope that the Easter recess may serve as an opportunity to hon. members to have their constituents informed of their point of view in relation to the plebiscite. I speak of that as being among the reasons why the government has had in mind a somewhat prolonged adjournment at Easter.

MILITARY TRAINING

POSITION OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN MAPLE SUGAR AND VEGETABLE PRODUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two Mountains): I want to direct a question to the Minister of National War Services. At this time, when the production of maple sugar is about to begin and the production of vegetables is under way in hothouses, will the minister continue to call farmers and farmers' sons for military training?

Hon. J. T. THORSON (Minister of National War Services): I am afraid it will not be possible to meet the request that the calling of men for military training should be suspended. The divisional boards have power to hear applications for postponements. Each board has jurisdiction to grant a postponement order when it is of the opinion that it is in the national interest to do so; and in the case of certain occupations, such as that of agriculture, the board is required to take into account the supply of labour which is available and the importance of the individual's occupation to the national economy. I am sure that the boards will take into account the matters to which the hon. member has referred when they deal with applications for postponements.

PRAIRIE FARM ASSISTANCE

INQUIRY WITH RESPECT TO ALLEGED DELAY IN PAYMENTS OF BONUS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): I would like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I have received letters to the effect that certain claims for bonus have been passed at Edmonton and forwarded to the treasury board for payment but that no settlement has yet been made. Could the minister explain the reason for the delay?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): The plan which has been followed in connection with the making of wheat acreage reduction payments is that the Department of Agriculture shall have made inspections and rendered reports to the treasury officials, by whom, of course, the cheques are issued. Naturally, before those payments are made, there is a check with other reports which have been rendered by the farmers who have made the applications. This check is made with the prairie farm asistance returns and with the permits which have been issued by the wheat board, on both of which there are statements with regard to acreage. To speak in general terms, I would say that when the first applications came in, about forty per cent—I am speaking now from memory—of the applicants had returns on 1939 and 1940 and 1941 which were all alike.

They stated their acreages as the same for 1939, on returns made in 1941, as they did in 1939 and there was no difficulty about making these payments. Practically all these pay-

ments were made in the months of July and August and probably early in September. In about sixty per cent there were some differences. A great deal of checking has been necessary in order to explain why a man put in a different return in 1939 about the 1939 acreage from that which he put in about the same acreage in 1941, or with regard to the 1940 acreage, as the case might be; and it has been in an attempt to justify payment on the basis of the 1941 declarations which were sworn to that there has been some delay. There were 186,000 farmers who made application, and 182,000 of them had been paid about $27,000,000 down to the end of last week. Most of these have been paid their full amount, but at a recent date there were between 20,000 and 35,000 whose claims still had to be adjusted. Some of these adjustments are still being made. I think it will be agreed, however, that even if there are some 20,000 or 35,000 applications still outstanding, in which there is twenty-five per cent unpaid and with regard to which some adjustment must be made before payment, and some four or five thousand cases where no payment has been made at all, a real effort has been made by the organization, both in the treasury and in the Department of Agriculture, to get the payments out as soon as possible.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY—UNION RECOGNITION IN WINDSOR PLANT—REQUEST FOR CONCILIATION BOARD

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. W. NOSEWORTHY (York South): I wish to address some questions to the Minister of Labour. Over the week-end I was invited to attend a meeting of the automobile workers union at Windsor where they were discussing the question of union recognition in the Motor Products plant. I found a meeting of some 7,000 automobile workers protesting against the treatment which the workers of the Motor Products industry had received. My questions are: 1. What knowledge has the minister of this situation? 2. Why was the request for a conciliation board, made to the Department of Labour on December 6, not granted? 3. What does the Department of Labour propose for the settlement of that difficulty in order to avoid its spreading to other essential war industries in that section?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): The strike took place while Mr. Louis Fine of Toronto, who acted as industrial disputes inquiry commissioner to look into the dispute, was at Windsor. It was illegal under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act and under the orders in council establishing the industrial disputes inquiry commission. The employees were so informed. They indicated their willingness to return after the illegal strike. I sent a personal wire to the management suggesting that they be reinstated. The management replied that the employees in question had gone on an illegal strike and they found it was necessary to lay off some people, and they did not require their services at this time. Mr. Louis Fine is in Toronto to-day in connection with the matter in an effort to reach a satisfactory conclusion.

REPORT OF TRANSFER OF ONTARIO HARD ROCK MINERS TO NOVA SCOTIA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. CLARENCE GILLIS (Cape Breton South): Following up the question raised yesterday with reference to the proposal to transfer men from Kirkland Lake to Nova Scotia, the minister yesterday stated that he had no knowledge of that situation but would make further inquiries. Has he any further information on the question now?

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): I had further inquiries made into the question raised by the hon. members for Cape Breton South and Inverness-Richmond. These inquiries have been made through the employment service of Canada, and it is reported by that service to me that no such transfer of miners has been suggested or arranged through the employment office. Judging from the inquiries made this morning, by the official of the department located at Kirkland Lake, the information is quite untrue. No such movement has been suggested by anyone. I hope that answers the question.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): By anyone?

Mr. MITCHELL: By anyone.

SHIPPING

REPORTED RESTRICTION IN DISPATCH TO ENGLAND OF CERTAIN MATERIALS AND FOODSTUFFS

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): I wish to ask a question but I do not know to which minister it should be addressed. In a London newspaper dated about four weeks ago there appeared a statement that owing to shipping losses parcels sent to Great Britain from overseas will be very greatly restricted and foodstuffs will not in future be permitted. I was astonished that I had seen no reference to such an order in the press of Canada and I have been unable to find out whether there is any truth in it at all or whether it is merely a canard.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am sorry I have no personal knowledge of the matter. I am informed by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), who has looked into it, that he has thus far received nothing of a definite character to confirm what has been represented, but I shall speak to my colleagues in the defence departments and to the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) in an endeavour to get an exact answer.

JAPANESE NATIONALS

ENEMY PROPERTY—SALE OF JAPANESE FISHING BOATS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

On the orders of the day:

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): Yesterday on the orders of the day the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) asked a question which I advised him at the time I would inquire into, and give an immediate reply. It arises out of an advertisement that appears in the newspaper *British Columbian* published at New Westminster, which advertisement was signed by the representative of the custodian of enemy property. The particular paragraph to which the hon. gentleman called attention reads:

> Offers for fishing boats, if accepted, will be those from bona fide fishermen of fishing companies who are entitled to own vessels of Canadian registry.

On inquiry I find that the word "of" is a misprint. It should be "or", and instructions have been given to the paper to correct the impression created by the advertisement.

EVACUATION FROM PACIFIC COAST DEFENCE AREAS

Mr. F. D. SHAW (Red Deer): I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister or to the minister most directly concerned. It has to do with the evacuation of Japanese from Pacific coast defence areas. Have the British Columbia security commission and advisory committee, recently established to handle the evacuation of Japanese from Pacific coast defence areas, been authorized to handle the orderly disposal of Japanese businesses, and if not, is it the intention of the government to set up a special agency for that purpose? Further, what is the government's policy with regard to the handling of Japanese businesses which cannot be conveniently or immediately disposed of?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The hon. member asks two questions. One relates to government policy, and with respect to that I can only say that government policy will be made known in due course. With regard to the earlier portion of the question, which relates to the present position and work of the British Columbia security commission, I would say that I intimated to the house a day or two ago that great care had to be taken with respect to the powers given the commission and details relating to its work. The formal order has not yet been passed; it will, I expect, be passed to-morrow. In the meantime government departments are carrying out part of the work, and the proposed members of the commission have been conferring on the matters that the commission has been appointed to administer.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Is the Prime Minister in a position to give the names of the other two members of the commission, and of the advisory committee which I understand is to be set up, and the scope of their duties?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The other commissioners will be the assistant commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Commissioner Mead, and the assistant commissioner of provincial police of British Columbia, Mr. J. Shirras. The chairman is Mr. Austin Taylor. The names of the advisory committee I might give to the house to-morrow.

PLEBISCITE ACT

PROVISION FOR TAKING OF VOTE ON ANY QUESTION SUBMITTED BY WAY OF PLEBISCITE

The house resumed from Monday, March 2, consideration in committee of Bill No. 10, respecting the taking of a plebiscite in every electoral district in Canada and the taking of the votes at such plebiscite of Canadian service voters stationed within and without Canada—Mr. McLarty—Mr. Vien in the chair.

On section 3—Limitation.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Last evening when the Prime Minister was speaking on this question he stated, as appears on page 969 of *Hansard:*

> This question has been before the house since the house opened, and until to-night the language of it has not been questioned. . . .

I take exception to that statement, because the wording of the plebiscite was questioned when the resolution was before the house; in fact I questioned the wording of the plebiscite as well as the general ambiguity of the whole thing. I went so far as to offer an amendment which will be found at page 797 of *Hansard,* the last part of which read:

> —provide that definite direction be sought from the people on all national issues submitted to them under the terms and provisions of this proposed Plebiscite Act.

The intention was to remove the ambiguity of the wording of the question to be submitted to the people. There can be no doubt as to the ambiguity; I think even the Prime Minister himself will admit that now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not at all.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): Let me read the wording:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

In the first place, as I pointed out the other day, the government are not asking to be released from anything; they are asking the people if they, the people, are willing to release the government. The government are not committing themselves to anything whatsoever. It was pointed out as well that the wording of this question refers definitely, as the Prime Minister pointed out last night, to the commitments or obligations restricting the methods of raising men for military service. Both the leader of the opposition and the Prime Minister stated yesterday, I believe, that they were agreed that under the National Resources Mobilization Act legal authority is given the government to raise men in any manner they wish.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Pardon me; under the War Measures Act they could raise them by any method.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I thank the hon. member for the correction, but I think they can under the National Resources Mobilization Act also. But the method is not the thing we are worrying about. The method might be that which the government now use, asking men to appear before a medical board for examination. On the other hand they might say they are going to send the mounted police out to take them by the collar and bring them in. That is a method; whether or not it is a right method is not the point. The wording of the plebiscite deals with the method of raising men. Nobody is criticizing the present method.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It deals with commitments as to the method of raising men for military service. There was no commitment with respect to the use of the mounted police.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): That is the point. There is tremendous ambiguity in the wording of the question proposed to be used in the plebiscite. If hon. members themselves are not clear as to the meaning, how can the public be expected to be clear on it? I suggest to the Prime Minister that in all fairness this question should be put to the people in such manner that there will be no shadow of doubt or possibility of misunderstanding. If the Prime Minister wants to be fair with the people of Canada he should put the question to them in such form that they will know what they are doing. They should know definitely whether they are voting on the commitment or on the methods. A large number of hon. members are satisfied that the wording of this plebiscite deals with the methods.

The Prime Minister has said there are sufficient men offering for the air force and the navy, and that they are going along quite well in regard to men for the army. Therefore there should be no objection as to the method they use. Whether or not the method is a proper one is not the point.

When I was speaking on the resolution I pointed out that the Prime Minister had never in his speech at the beginning of this session made reference so far as the plebiscite is concerned to the conscription of men for overseas service. I went through his speech very carefully in an attempt to find whether there was any connection between this plebiscite and conscription for overseas service. I combed the speech pretty thoroughly, but I failed to find any reference to conscription of men for overseas service. In fact the Prime Minister said that the question which was to be put before the people had nothing to do with conscription. He made that quite definite. Let me read his words as reported on page 826 of *Hansard:*

> Hon. members have been talking about conscription, about no conscription and the like. That is not the issue in this plebiscite.

There can be no misunderstanding about that. I think the Prime Minister was quite right there. If I can interpret his thoughts I would say he had no desire whatever to bring up the question of conscription for overseas service so far as this plebiscite is concerned. That is what I tried to point out the other day. But now, apparently, the Prime Minister has changed his mind. Let me read what he said on February 2. He was speaking about the commitments made in the election of 1940. There is no question, as he pointed out, that the pledge given to the people was that there would be no conscription for overseas service. I think we are all agreed on that. Certainly in my constituency I was the one who was accused of advocating conscription for overseas service, which was quite untrue. Nevertheless, that was the issue there; that was the commitment that tied the hands of the govern-

ment. This is what the Prime Minister said in this regard, at page 970 of *Hansard:*

> The commitment was a commitment restricting the methods of raising men for military service. The restriction was as to raising men by conscription for military service overseas.

I think he is right there, but on the other hand, as I just pointed out, on February 25 the Prime Minister said that conscription was not the issue in this plebiscite. Surely one or the other must be so. On February 25 the Prime Minister said conscription was not the issue; on March 2 he says quite definitely that it is the issue, though he calls it a commitment. Then he goes on to say:

> It is that commitment that the government is asking to be freed from.

That is the commitment in regard to the conscription of men for overseas service. That is what I want to point out to you, Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out to the Secretary of State a moment ago. Then, a little further on in the Prime Minister's speech of yesterday, he said:

> The commitment was not made with respect to the protection of our own shores; it was made with respect to sending men overseas; everyone so understood it, and it was to that extent that the law and the fact was limited and that the government at the present time is limited.

Definitely the government are asking the people to release them from the commitment given in 1940, for political purposes, so that they can and presumably will put in conscription for overseas service. If that is so, then for the life of me I cannot see why the Prime Minister should object to putting in the words, definitely and clearly, so that every voter will understand what he is voting on. The thing about which I am concerned is that the people should know exactly what they are voting on, and I can tell you, sir, and the members of this committee quite plainly that if the question comes up for conscription for overseas service as such, and only such, I shall vote against it. I am definitely of the opinion that we can never prosecute this war with a maximum war effort until we have the conscription of our financial institutions so that we can issue currency and credit in terms of public need. Every minister of the crown who has spoken has laid the blame for the situation on the production end, and as I said the other day I think they are perfectly right. The thing I am concerned about is the manufacturing end of it. What is done with the guns and tanks after they are manufactured I am quite ready to leave to the discretion of the Minister of National Defence, because I think he is better able to direct their use than I could. But the thing we have been discussing and the thing on which we cannot get any information is this all important question of production, which is tied up definitely with finance. I do not want any misunderstanding on the question as far as I am concerned. I am certainly not in favour of the further conscription of manpower until we have a complete mobilization of war industry and finance, and certainly that has not been done yet.

Surely if the Prime Minister wants to be fair on this question, not only to members of this house but to the people of Canada whom he is asking to vote on it, he should not object to the amendment as worded by the hon. member for Macleod, since the Prime Minister himself now says the main issue is for conscription overseas. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Macleod would have the question read:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service in any theatre of war.

There the Prime Minister has what he wants; there is no question about it. The only words to be added are "in any theatre of war." Surely there could be no objection to that. The Prime Minister says the main question is with regard to the commitments. All right; it is there. Surely he cannot object to that; surely he cannot object to putting it into the wording of the plebiscite, upon which the people are going to vote. I cannot possibly see why the Prime Minister or anyone else should object to this amendment, so that everyone may know what he is voting on. I feel sure that since the Prime Minister has reviewed the situation, he has come to the same conclusion.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Mr. Chairman, I have tried to keep out of this discussion, because I thought the sooner we got this bill through the better for all concerned. But I cannot understand why the government could not accept the inescapable logic of the position which was placed before them last night by the hon. member for Macleod and others.

I am one of those who have taken the position that the Prime Minister, along with most other hon. members of this house, did give a definite commitment to the Canadian people; and that they, and the Prime Minister and his government in particular, have a right to use whatever method they think fit and proper to be released from that commitment. But I ask the Prime Minister to look at the question again. What was the commitment? Was it with reference to the method of raising men, which is what the plebiscite says? The question as framed says:

—arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service.

If the commitment was given with respect to the method of raising men, then the government should have taken a plebiscite in June, 1940, because at that time the government embarked upon the policy of compulsion, so that now we have the two methods.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not for overseas.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): That is the point I am coming to. The method of compulsion was adopted, and this house voted for it almost unanimously. But the Prime Minister himself has just said that the commitment was not with respect to that question. The commitment was with respect to the disposition of the men who might be raised. No commitment was ever given by the Prime Minister or any other member of this house, so far as I know, that conscription would not be introduced in this country for home defence.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): The commitment was that any men conscripted in this country would not be sent outside Canada or the terrtiorial waters thereof. Therefore the commitment which the government is asking to be relieved of is not concerned with the men but with the disposition of the men raised by a particular method. To me the logic of the position is very simple. The government would make the thing perfectly clear by accepting the amendment and adding the words "in any theatre of war." This would make it plain that the commitment was with respect to conscripting men for overseas service, and that the commitment the government ask to be released from is a particular commitment, namely, the commitment not to raise men for service outside of Canada.

May I say just a word with regard to the second point included in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Macleod. Like many others who have spoken, I am greatly concerned about this plebiscite. I am greatly concerned as to what will be the effect if it is defeated, not only the effect on the morale of the Canadian people but the effect on the other members of the united nations. I think it would be one of the most appalling things that has happened during this war. Personally I will certainly do all in my power to see that it is not defeated in any place where I have any influence.

The government itself can do more than any group of individuals to determine whether or not this plebiscite will pass. It seems to me that there is one very effective step the government can take. The Prime Minister at some time prior to the taking of the plebiscite can say to the people of Canada that he is prepared to give a solemn pledge that if any contingency arises which makes it necessary for the government to bring down to the house legislation to conscript men for service overseas, no such step will be taken unless it is accompanied by a much more drastic policy of conscription of accumulated wealth and the mobilization of the country's industries and financial institutions than has so far been taken by the government. This solemn undertaking on the part of the Prime Minister would do more to get a large affirmative vote than any effort by any group of individuals, no matter how enthusiastic or aggressive they might be.

Mr. ROY: I should like to say a few words on the wording of the question which is to be put by plebiscite to the people of Canada. The Prime Minister last night in the course of discussion of the amendment of the hon. member for Macleod admitted that we have in fact as well as in law all the methods for the recruiting and mobilization of men, but the reason for the plebiscite is to release the government from its commitments in connection with conscription for overseas. He has strongly emphasized this point, and it would seem that now it is a matter of where the men are to serve rather than how we are to proceed with mobilization. Therefore the question on the ballot would surely be more adequate for the purpose and more frankly put to the people if it were in the manner suggested in the amendment. However, as I am opposed to the principle of the bill itself I regret to say that I shall vote against the amendment as well as against the main motion.

Mr. LACOMBE: Mr. Chairman, it would be an easy matter for the government to place on this ballot the following question:

Are you in favour of conscription for service overseas?

The answer could be given yes or no. I shall vote against the principle of this bill and I shall vote also against the amendment moved by the hon. member for Macleod. I have always been opposed to conscription for overseas service, and this measure is a step toward conscription. The hon. member's amendment does not improve the situation. It does not summarize the ballot shown in the bill. In spite of the hon. member's good faith, the amended ballot would still be longer than the one now included in the bill. Once more I object to the government measure and to the amendment. I have always been opposed to conscription, and I remain so with all my might.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I understand that there is an amendment before the committee. Would you read it, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hansell has moved that the following words be added to the question appearing on the ballot: "in any theatre of war."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: First of all, a word as to the question itself. The wording of the question was given the most careful study by the government in order that there might be no possibility of its having any meaning other than the one which appears upon its face. May I say, speaking of questions generally, that if hon. members are anxious to read into a question something other than what really is there, nothing in this world can prevent them from so doing. I venture to say that however differently worded the question might be, some hon. members would find equal objection to the new wording as proposed.

It has been suggested that we add the words "in any theatre of war." I have an objection to this, which I think hon. members will see immediately I express it. It would raise at once in the minds of a number of the people of this country a suspicion with regard to what the government has in mind, a suspicion which so far has not entered their minds. Some of them would begin to say "Oh, yes, we see what the government have in mind; they want to send our people, not merely to Great Britain, but to India, to Asia; they want to send them to other far distant quarters of the globe." No thought of the kind was in the mind of the government at the time the question was framed.

Mr. FAIR: What is in the government's mind now?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It will decide what it will do with respect to the disposition of troops when it has full authority to act in the light of all the circumstances.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is admitted that the government has authority.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Full authority; moral authority as well as legal. My hon. friend the leader of the oposition throws back his head when I make mention of the word "moral," as though parliament had no moral obligation, as though the government had no moral obligation of any kind. I am afraid those who take that particular point of view are being unduly influenced by the nazi mentality and by the mentality of other nations that have thrown to the wind every obligation that may have existed between the people and their governments. I speak expressly of the nazi position because the whole nazi policy is one that is based on broken pledges, one that is based on no faith in the pledged or promised word.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I resent that implication.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend may resent it, but he has laid himself open to it. The people of this country are going to view very carefully the attitude of hon. gentlemen who say that the government has no moral obligation to the people in regard to a matter that affects their lives and which only a few weeks ago many of them were claiming was responsible for the return of the government to power. I regard what has been said by the government of this country with respect to commitments for overseas service as something that is an obligation of the most sacred character, and for that reason I intend to stand by it and the government intends to stand by it. We know that in so doing we will at least be helping to keep the confidence which exists in political institutions in Canada between the people of this country and their government, a confidence which has been completely lost in a great many other countries at the present time.

I am anxious to see this plebiscite carried. I am not anxious to add to its wording words that are going to create unwarranted suspicions in the minds of people who may be mostly attracted by certain words and attach to those words an entirely different meaning from that which should be attached to them. In that same connection may I say this? I cannot understand the attitude of hon. gentlemen who say they are anxious to see this plebiscite carried but who at the same time by their utterances—and I refer particularly to the leader of the opposition—are doing the utmost they possibly can to have the people of this country believe that there is some trick in the plebiscite which is being put before the people of this country. The leader of the opposition said last night that I was deliberately trying to fool the people, and yet he says he wants to see this plebiscite carried. Do you think people are going to turn out and support the plebiscite if they have reason to feel that they are being asked to lend themselves to some trick which the administration is seeking to put over them? I cannot understand the attitude of my hon. friend in taking that position, especially in view of what he has said in this house on more than one occasion this session, and for which I thank him. I thought he meant what he was saying when he was speaking as he did about attaching importance to the sincerity

and honour of the Prime Minister with respect to a statement which he made in this house. My hon. friend said:

I have never questioned the honour of the Prime Minister, as he knows.

A little later he said:

Certainly I had no intention of questioning the Prime Minister's bona fides. I am glad I raised the question, however, because it is now certain—

The question was the question of the plebiscite, the wording of the question and the insertion of the question in the bill. The government had met him on all these particulars, and then he said he was pleased that the whole matter was now certain, and that he never questioned the meaning I attached to the words. Yet last night, just because a few members of the Social Credit group wanted to have a chance to talk about finance in terms of public need, and to bring their particular hobby into this question, thereby confusing the issue still more, my hon. friend evidently thought the chance of making a little political capital was too good to miss, even in this time of war. Though this question of the plebiscite is a very important one, he evidently says to himself: "I cannot miss this chance; I will have to join with them."

Mr. GRAYDON: The right hon. gentleman is imputing motives to the leader of the opposition.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He is telling the exact truth with regard to the situation. Let me read what the leader of the opposition said. I think I have been courteous in my treatment of the leader of the opposition. I have never said to him at one moment that I believed what he was saying, and the next moment that I did not believe it, that I thought he was putting a trick over on the people. In the matter of this plebiscite the value which the people of this country are to attach to the word of the Prime Minister is of some concern. I might not care a rap for anything the leader of the opposition might say about me in a personal way, but when it comes to a public issue of this magnitude it is important that the people should have no reason to doubt the sincerity of the administration in so all-important a question. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition was the one that asked, not that "a" question should be set out in the bill, but that the question which I had set out in the debate on the address should be the question to be put into the bill.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Right, but I never anywhere approved the principle of the question. I never did that.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is quite aside from the point. It is the question and the wording of it that we are discussing now. The whole discussion arose on the amendment of the hon. member for Macleod that we should add certain words to the question, and the leader of the opposition's point was that we should be so certain as to the question to be put to the people, that that particular question should be inserted in the bill. Let me read what he said on the question of the plebiscite. At page 755 of *Hansard* of February 20, 1942, he said:

On the question of the plebiscite itself, I was astonished to hear the Secretary of State say that the question to be asked would not be in the bill but would be a matter of proclamation.

A little further on he said:

But certainly the Prime Minister gave the categorical undertaking that a certain question would be put to the people of this country.

A categorical undertaking that "a certain question"—that is the question which is now in the bill. It is the only question that has ever been before the house, and I did give, as my hon. friend says, a categorical declaration that that question would be the one that would be put into the bill. My hon. friend went on to say:

Why should it be left to a proclamation which may be twiddled around by the government and we may not have that question put to the people? You might have something entirely different, or something which will have a shaded meaning—

He did not wish a shaded meaning in the question. He wanted my specific question to be inserted in the bill, and this in order to avoid any question that would have a shaded meaning. He went on:

—or something which will be different in principle even, from what was stated not only in the speech from the throne but by the Prime Minister himself.

He attached value to the importance of the wording because it was given by the Prime Minister. I immediately stated that we would have the question inserted in the bill. Then my hon. friend said:

I am glad to have the Prime Minister make that statement, because I want some certainty.

And this certainty was to get that particular question into the bill.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No, to get "a" question.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not "a" question but "the" question, and I will prove it from my hon. friend's words. He said at page 755 of *Hansard:*

When I hear the Secretary of State say that it will be the subject of proclamation, over

which parliament will have no control but over which the government will have full control—

Mr. Mackenzie King: No, no.

Mr. Hanson (York-Sunbury): —I may be pardoned—

And I ask hon. members to listen to this, as to why my hon. friend wanted this specific question inserted. He said:

—I may be pardoned if I appear a little suspicious that there is some change in plan, or that there may be some change. Of course the Prime Minister—

These are the words I direct attention to:

Of course the Prime Minister now has pledged his word that the question will not be altered.

Still "the" question, that "the" question will not be altered because the Prime Minister has pledged his word with regard to it. In view of the attitude my hon. friend takes in relation to government and parliament with respect to the people, that a pledge does not amount to anything, I am not surprised that he should attach no importance whatever to whether or not I now am to be put in a position where later he can say that I went back on the pledge I gave to the House of Commons. Here are his words:

Of course the Prime Minister now has pledged his word—

Who did I pledge it to? To this house, including my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. And what did I pledge my word to, according to his own statement? That the question will not be altered. Well, I tell him that the question will not be altered because this government attaches importance to its pledged word given in this House of Commons, just as it attaches importance to the pledge that was given to the people of this country. Then my hon. friend says:

—and that, if necessary the question will be put in the bill. So that we have learned something this afternoon.

My hon. friend went further and said, and I ask hon. members if it was not within their hearing that he rose a moment ago and said, "I did not say 'the' question but 'a' question". What did he say? He said "the" exact question. Let me read his words, in the first column of page 756 of *Hansard:*

I understood that the general scope of the question would be the same, but the Prime Minister categorically placed upon the records of this house the exact question that would be asked.

How does my hon. friend expect myself and my colleagues to change the wording of this question after he has demanded that the exact question which is now a part of the record and has been all through this debate should be the one that would be inserted in the bill? A little further on the leader of the opposition says:

. . . now we certainly have got something definite on that point.

Yes, and we are going to hold to it now that we have got something definite and exact. That I think answers so far as the leader of the opposition is concerned, the necessity of the government holding to this particular question in the bill. We have pledged our word to him and to the house that the exact question which I put forward here at the time of the debate on the address would be presented to the people. We have placed it in the bill at the request of the leader of the opposition and other hon. members, and we are going to hold to that question.

Now let me come to the question itself and ask if it is capable of the kinds of interpretation which have been given to it:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation—

The hon. member for Macleod has said that he does not think that means anything.

Mr. HANSELL: It does not stop there. If it stopped there it would be all right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say that I cannot follow my hon. friends; I do not know what is in their minds when they say that they think there is some cunning back of this question, and that what the government does not want is to be released from the commitment. The hon. member says that when the people have voted we shall not know whether we are released or not.

Mr. HANSELL: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I am mistaken. I said, "the hon. member for Macleod"; I meant the hon. member sitting immediately behind him who spoke a moment ago.

An hon. MEMBER: Bow River.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. I am sorry. It was the hon. member for Bow River who said that when this question was answered it would not have any effect on the government.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): On a point of order, I do not think I ever referred to the Prime Minister as being cunning. I ask the chairman to have the Prime Minister withdraw that statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I said that my hon. friend seems to think that there is some cunning behind the question as it is framed; and, if I understood him aright, his point was

that after the people had voted the government would not be released from anything, but that we were simply asking the people if they were willing to do something.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I used the word "ambiguity", not "cunning".

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am afraid that I cannot make the English language any plainer than it is.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I am trying to help you.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Bow River): I am trying to assist.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I appreciate my hon. friend's motive, but I cannot say the same about his methods.

Now, "any obligation arising out of any past commitments. . . ." The whole question relates to past commitments. The leader of the opposition sought yesterday to have it refer to power or to fact, to some existing law. I have said over and over again that the government has power, legal power, to pass any enactment which this house is prepared to pass. It has as a matter of fact legislated with respect to raising men by voluntary enlistment and raising men by conscription, for service within Canada itself; so that there is no question about the matter of power or the question of fact.

But now my hon. friends in the far corner who have spoken raise the question that it is a matter of the disposition of troops. I may point out to them that it is not at all a matter of disposition of troops. Or let me put it in this way first so as to be clear as to the matter of methods. There are two methods of enlisting men for service overseas. One is the voluntary method, the other is the method of compulsion or conscription. With respect to the voluntary method, men raised thereby for service overseas can be sent to any quarter of the globe. Hon. members talk about the disposition of troops; the government is free to-day to dispose of these forces anywhere overseas. Those who have enlisted voluntarily may be sent for service overseas or kept at home.

Mr. LOCKHART: Will the Prime Minister permit a question? Will he at this point explain what are the restrictions on the methods of raising men in Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, that is the next point. There is one restriction and one only, and that is the restriction upon raising men for service overseas, not voluntarily—

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. LOCKHART: The "methods"?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: —but by compulsion. Compulsion is a method. That is the whole point.

Mr. QUELCH: The ballot does not say that. It merely says "military service."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There are only two methods—one voluntary, and one compulsory. With regard to raising men compulsorily for service there is no commitment when the service is confined to within Canada. But when resort is to be had to conscription, in other words, to the "method" of conscription, for raising men for service overseas, there is a commitment which binds the government, a commitment made before we entered the war, a commitment made at the time that parliament entered the war, a commitment made at the last general election, a commitment which has been made time and time again.

Now I hope that I have made clear wherein the wording is exactly correct,—"any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service." This commitment not to send men overseas under compulsion restricts the method, namely the compulsory method, of raising men for military service where it applies to overseas. I do not think that anything could be clearer than that.

The hon. member for Weyburn said something a moment ago about "inescapable logic." I would ask him as a logician and a philosopher whether there is any word in the English language which could be more comprehensive when applied to commitments than the word "any" itself? Well, now, "any . . . commitments" covers commitments with respect to sending men to any part of the earth or to any theatres of war, or to anywhere else, if such is to be found. What the government is anxious the people should understand is that we wish a perfectly free hand; we do not wish to be committed in any particular. If the word "any" were not there, it would instantly be said, "Oh yes, you are taking good care to specify a particular commitment, but you don't say anything about some other commitment or what might be construed as a commitment." We wish to make the language so broad that there can be no misgiving as to any commitment from now on, which relates to the method of raising men for service overseas. If this plebiscite carries, neither the government nor any hon. member will be free to argue that we cannot decide upon conscription or any other question with respect to our war effort because of a certain commitment.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: Would the Prime Minister be willing to take the committee into his confidence and tell us why he

insists on the question being phrased in the general term "any . . . . commitment," instead of asking to be relieved from the specific commitment which he has in mind, which we all have in mind, and which we all know this question has reference to?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I will take the committee into my confidence, and say that the whole is greater than any part; that it includes everything. This precludes the possibility of anyone saying that the government is trying to get away with one thing while keeping back conscription or something else in the nature of a commitment. It is because the government wants to be perfectly straightforward in the matter and to permit of no shadow of doubt with respect to its intentions.

Something has been said about the question of conscription not being an issue. I have pointed out, time and again, that were this house to-day to begin to discuss the question of conscription, hon. members seated on this side of the chamber who are prepared to respect the pledge which was given in the last general election and at different times would rise and say, "We are not in a position to discuss conscription on its merits, because conscription for service overseas was ruled out of consideration by the commitment which was made by the government in the last general election and at other times." So would hon. gentlemen opposite if they were to honour the pledge and the commitment which was made by their leader with respect to conscription. So that the question of conscription is not the issue. The question of conscription may come up, perhaps will come up, after the plebiscite has been passed. If it comes up, then it will become an issue which can be debated in this house, which is the proper place in which to debate it. It is not an issue to be debated by people on the hustings. If conscription were an issue in this plebiscite the government would be placing upon the people of Canada to-day the duty of making a military and political decision. Surely that is clear. That is the thing we have been seeking to avoid; we have been seeking to avoid putting upon the people a responsibility which they are not in a position to exercise. How can the people say whether or not conscription is necessary, whether it should be resorted to or not resorted to, when they do not know all the circumstances that must be taken into account in regard to a matter of the kind? But the government knows them.

Mr. ROWE: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend says "hear, hear." Certainly the government knows them and will continue to know them as the war progresses; and the government will take such action as it thinks advisable to take in the light of the knowledge which it has. But that knowledge will not be concerned with one single factor only; it will be in regard to every single factor that should be taken into account in making Canada's war effort as effective and complete as it can possibly be made.

Mr. ROWE: I did not wish to interrupt the Prime Minister but I should like to ask him a question. In view of the fact that it is generally recognized that the government has that knowledge, that no other body in the dominion has, and will have knowledge of the ever-darkening hours from now on; in view of the fact, further, that the Prime Minister has so carefully avoided telling the people of the country what he will do if they say yes to this somewhat misleading question, what will the government say?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ROWE: What will the government say, if the people say no? Will they virtually take us out of the war by putting a stop to the sending of reinforcements overseas to the boys who are fighting with their backs to the wall now, if the people say no?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ROWE: My hon. friends interrupt, but they will answer another body some day if the people say no.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The trouble with my hon. friend is that he identifies Canada's whole war effort with one single thing, namely, conscription for overseas service regardless of how much else there may be or how little needed conscription itself may be to secure the men necessary for service overseas. May I say this to him—and this is one reason why I want to get rid of the commitment that is standing where it is. That commitment stands to-day like a barn door against which my hon. friend and those who talk like him can keep on hammering and making a noise; but once that commitment which precludes the exercise of conscription, if necessary, is taken out of the way, they will be striking at an open door when they discuss what the government may or may not do. I can only say to my hon. friend, with respect to what the government will do after the plebiscite has been decided one way or the other, that the government will make its policy known in due course in the light of all circumstances as they may then exist.

Mr. ROWE: In view of the fact that my question was not answered, and the Prime

Minister was kind enough to try to clarify my remarks, I might point out that as regards a barn door against which people are pounding for the sake of the noise alone, the Prime Minister was unfair to my leader in suggesting that he felt there was a trick merely in the wording of this matter. I feel that this whole question is not only a trick on the people in the country but a trick on the boys that are serving overseas.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. When the chairman stands, hon. members must sit down. It is strictly against the rules of the house, as I ruled last night and must rule to-day, to suggest that a measure before the committee is a trick or is something misleading or something deceitful. There are a number of exemplary expressions that are given in the rules of the house, and the hon. gentleman must withdraw what he has just said.

Mr. ROWE: I certainly will withdraw the word "trick", but it has been used so often that I thought probably it might convey what I think. I must withdraw that word, but I am sorry that you, Mr. Chairman, have not observed such expressions as "nazi tactics" as well, because they have been used on different occasions by the Prime Minister and might have been withdrawn also. I do say that so far as the government—

The CHAIRMAN: I admit what the hon. gentleman has said. We very often pass a number of expressions that should be ruled out, but it is only when the limit is reached that we have to apply the rule.

Mr. ROWE: I have listened—

The CHAIRMAN: On that point, may I further point out that if the chairman forgets or omits or does not understand an expression which is against the rules, it is the privilege of every hon. member to raise a point of order. There are a number of expressions that escape the ear and attention of the chairman, and if any hon. member raises a point of order we shall try to apply the rule most impartially.

Mr. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I abide by your ruling; but a doubt not only in the minds of many who are supporting the government, but more in the minds of the people who will vote on the issue, exists nevertheless. The matter is as clear as mud across the country. People are asking every weekend, "What does it mean if we vote yes, or what will the government do if we vote no?" Nobody understands it, and the Prime Minister refuses to throw any light upon it so that people will understand it. We have been passing through the most critical days in the history of the empire, and while I am not going to delay the committee—because I believe this should be passed—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But the language my hon. friend is using is calculated to defeat it.

Mr. ROWE: I have not held up the bill as much as the Prime Minister has himself. I think my leader has come out as clearly—and I have as well—as to what we will do on the plebiscite, and many of the right hon. Prime Minister's supporters have not done so, and the men who are opposing the bill to-day are those members of the government party who will oppose it in the country and who have stated their position in the house. I say to the right hon. gentleman that he might look over his own followers before charging us with an attempt to defeat the measure, which every one of us will try to put over in the country.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps when my hon. friend is giving me an example of how to proceed he will address the chair instead of me.

Mr. ROWE: I am glad to be reminded of the rules of the house by such an old and experienced parliamentarian as the Prime Minister. I was complimented in having him make over my speech for me, and I thought I might compliment him by addressing him a little. I do say that this question is not a trick, in parliamentary language, but it is so misleading—

The CHAIRMAN: Again, that is out of order.

Mr. ROWE: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is so misunderstood by the people of the country that even a man who has been in parliament for some time cannot find English words to describe it. It is not only a reflection upon the people of the dominion, but it is a shocking surprise and disappointment to every allied force in the war. No one knows what we shall do if the people say yes, and God only knows what may happen if they say no. And when I say this empire, the empire means us as well. Some of my hon. friends may smile or feel light-hearted enough about it even to laugh. But where is Canada's first defence? We have had conscription. I have not heard in the last campaign—and I listened to many speeches; I heard the Prime Minister speak—I never heard him say he was going to have conscription right up and down the highways and byways of the country. I did not hear him

say at that time that he would take the boys off the farm even if there was no one left to feed the cattle. I have not heard any of these moral obligations brought up but I have heard minister after minister say that Canada's first line of defence was overseas.

Mr. CRERAR: If my hon. friend will pardon me, I submit that he is very distinctly out of order. What we are discussing is the form of the ballot and the question that should be asked. What my hon. friend is talking about is the general principle of the whole measure, which was decided upon when it received second reading.

Mr. ROWE: Again I thank the minister for correcting me. I think the Prime Minister also was far afield in many of his statements this afternoon. Some latitude has been given, but I shall endeavour to stick closely to the issue for the few moments I am going to speak.

The CHAIRMAN: We are discussing section 3. I understand that agreement was reached by which on the short title there should be general discussion. That has taken place and now we are on clause 3. Under standing order 58 we must stick to the section of the bill which is before the committee.

Mr. ROWE: I thought in view of the amendment we might have some latitude. However, section 3 deals with the question to be asked:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): And the amendment makes it wide open.

Mr. ROWE: Even section 3 I believe gives latitude for anything I might offer at this time. All we are trying to do is to help the government by clarifying the question. But there is no assurance, especially when they are so divided themselves on this issue, when some of their followers are the only hon. members who are going to work vigorously against the plebiscite, that it is going to carry. The people of the country should be told what is going to happen. Rather than submit to the people at this time a question worded as this is, the Prime Minister would have been much better advised to carry on without the plebiscite, whether he had compulsory service or not.

So far as moral obligation is concerned, again I refer to these men who are taken and conscripted. True, conscription was not an issue in the last election. Both sides stated there would be no conscription. But much has happened since 1940 and even since this session began. Time after time since the beginning of the session this empire has surrendered ground. We have seen the darkest days in the history of the British empire. We see still darker days threatening, and now we are asked to say to the Prime Minister: We will release you from any past commitments with reference to military service. Can anyone tell me that compulsory military service is not here if there should be an invasion? Have we not conscription for home defence? I am not one of those who says it is not just as much the duty of the farmers' sons as any other class to take part in this war, and our farmers know that. But I have received letters, as I presume every hon. member has, with regard to the position of farmers. I received one to-day with regard to a farmer who was on his back—

The CHAIRMAN: Order. The hon. gentleman must know that the question of exempting farmers' sons from military service is clearly outside the scope of section 3. Section 3 does not involve the principle of the measure, but only the form of the question to be put to the voters. Therefore hon. members should limit their remarks to the form of the question to be put in the taking of the plebiscite.

Mr. ROWE: But I notice that the amendment says:

> Are you in favour of the conscripton of the financial institutions of Canada so that the government can fulfil its commitment to issue currency and credit in terms of public need?

The CHAIRMAN: We are not on that. Amendments must be considered *seriatim*. The only amendment now before the committee is to add at the end of the question which appears in the printed ballot the words "in any theatre of war". The other amendment is not up for consideration now.

Mr. ROWE: Then I shall still not delay the committee any longer than I can help. But I wish to point out that every hon. member when he goes to explain this section to the people will be confronted, as I have been when I have asked people to vote, by the question: What does it mean? It is the first time I have ever been asked to vote when I do not know what "yes" will mean or what "no" will bring forth. If when the answer is given by the greatest jury of all, the people of this country, they say yes, heaven only knows what they may get. If they say no, nobody knows the situation; our boys will be left overseas without reinforcements except to the extent that men are available through the voluntary system. If there is need for compulsory service for home defence to get men to fight for their own country, and we

have a negative vote on this plebiscite, Canada will be virtually out of the war so far as reinforcements to the boys overseas are concerned. Words can scarcely describe the uncertainty. A plebiscite is always uncertain, but under this bill the question is put in such a way as to make it the most uncertain question that has ever been put to the Canadian people.

Mr. MacNICOL: I should like a little light. I base my question to the Prime Minister on the few words he said in reference to the amendment moved by the hon. member to my left asking that the words "in any theatre of war" be added. I am not sure whether I understood the Prime Minister aright, but I thought he himself then asked the question whether, if the people voted yes he would then be expected to say he would send troops to any theatre of war. My question is whether in the event of the country voting yes the Prime Minister would then feel free to send troops to any theatre of war. If so, I would be disposed to vote for the plebiscite.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My point in reference to the amendment which proposes to add to the question the words "in any theatre of war" was that if those words were added a large number of people would immediately begin to read into them something that had never been in the mind of the government at all. The first thought that would come to many of them is: Oh, well, the government evidently has something further in view than has ever thus far been discussed publicly, and perhaps for that reason we had better be careful before we support this plebiscite. I do not think the words would help to gain support for the question, and for that reason I do not think they should be added. I am anxious to see the question made as simple and direct as possible, and one that will not create suspicion in the mind of anyone as to the intentions of the government. All the government wants as a result of this question is to have a perfectly free hand to deal with situations as they may arise in the light of all the knowledge it possesses, with a view to having done what is most effective with respect to Canada's war effort.

As to where troops should be sent, or when they should be sent, or how many should be sent, all these questions will be dealt with by the government itself in the light of its knowledge of the world situation and of what is likely best to serve the war effort of the country, and of the allied nations, without restriction of any kind. I cannot say that the government might be disposed to send troops here, there or elsewhere. Everything will depend upon how the war develops, and what it may become most advisable to do. What the government wants is to have a free hand to do the thing that is most advisable and most necessary.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I wonder whether I could ask a question with regard to what the Prime Minister said a few moments ago. I know he compared the official opposition with nazis, and I wonder whether in the same way he would compare President Roosevelt with Hitler, having regard to his broken pledges on this point. I listened to several of the Prime Minister's broadcasts during the election campaign of 1940, but I did not hear him in any of those speeches refer to conscription for overseas. I heard him say there would be no conscription if his government were returned to power. So that when he speaks of this moral obligation I should like him to tell us just at what point during the campaign of 1940 he established the distinction between conscription and conscription for overseas service. I believe that moral obligation has been broken to some extent already, having regard to the speeches I heard him deliver. Perhaps he could establish the point during the campaign at which the distinction was made.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: First of all may I say to my hon. friend that when I spoke of nazi methods I was not reflecting on the opposition. I was setting out the difference between an attitude which takes account of moral obligations and an attitude which says, "We care nothing about moral obligations except to ignore and destroy them." I say that to-day the people are vitally concerned as to whether the former method of viewing obligations is to hold in Canadian affairs or as to whether the other method, which is the nazi method, is going to hold. I was not reflecting upon any individuals; I was speaking about methods in connection with matters of government.

With regard to the question of conscription, I would say to my hon. friend that it has always been understood, and in fact it is embedded in the Militia Act, that in time of war every man may be compulsorily called out to serve his country. That is there; it has been there from the start. Compulsion in regard to the defence of your own country is something that does not need to be referred to, because it is an obligation that the government may require to be fulfilled at any moment it pleases.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I would not think the general public would know much about that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say this to my hon. friend, and I am sure that on reflection he will agree with me. The only point in discussing the question of conscription or no conscription arose out of what took place in the last great war, when men were sent overseas under conscription. The issue then was not a question with regard to conscription for Canada; it had to do with the conscription of men for service overseas. Every time the question has been discussed, on a public platform or in parliament, it has been conscription for service overseas that people have had in mind. That is the only thing people have had in mind, I think, when that question has been discussed. Certainly I have never had any other view than that conscription might be enforced in Canada itself at any time for the defence of Canada, but that whether it should be enforced for overseas service would depend on matters such as we are discussing at the moment.

Mr. CHURCH: Section 3 limits the bill to the taking of a plebiscite on a question to be set out on the ballot, to be answered by yes or no. A person goes into the polling booth; he is handed this ballot and he reads it over. He does not know that our military forces are established by statutes such as the Militia Act, the mobilization act, and other acts. The words "military forces" apply to land forces, sea forces and air forces. Early in January I called for a return respecting military forces. On February 13 a return was brought down which should be read into this ballot. According to this return, all members of the air force have enlisted for service anywhere. That lets them out of the ballot. As to the navy, it is stated that all personnel enlisting for active service in the navy undertake to serve whereever they are required. That silent wing of the service is out. Then you come to the army, which is the only branch of the service left, and according to the return brought down by the minister the army is not under this limitation at all. We have the Army Act, the Militia Act to read into the ballot, and the National War Services Act. The return states that there are about 8,000 enlistments for home defence; that as of December 31 total enlistments for service anywhere numbered 299,375, and that all the army come under the National Resources Mobilization Act. That is the position of the army, the navy and the air force, so that two branches of the service do not come within this ballot.

Then the question contained in the ballot goes on to ask whether the voter is in favour of releasing the government from any obligation or past commitment for war, and so on. What does this bill mean by an obligation or commitment? What is an obligation or commitment? We have entered into a great many obligations and commitments with foreign powers in a military way both before and since this war started. We have entered into pledges, which should be read into this ballot, with a foreign military power, a friend, neighbour and ally of ours, the United States. We entered into an obligation with them by means of two or three notes and boards which will commit this country forever. We did not object to the Atlantic conference; we did not protest the giving away of bases from Newfoundland to British Guiana, although bound by them in a military way immediately. Surely those are obligations and commitments affecting this country, and we have been pledged to them and their consequences, because when Britain is at war Canada is at war. We gave away bases all the way from Newfoundland to British Guiana; and whether or not Canada consented to that agreement, and did not object, but aided, we are bound by it for all time. That is one obligation in a military sense and parliament and the voters of this country who knew not of it are committed to it, notwithstanding the fact that it was not discussed in this parliament though during some of it parliament was sitting.

We have also made commitments in the Pacific. In 1938 a member of the government told us that all the enclosed money $35,000,000, was being spent for two conditional purposes, first for home defence and second to protect our neutrality in case the United States should be attacked. We are bound by it to the United States. That was an obligation and commitment which could entail military service and bring us to the edge of war, and we knew it in 1938; and only the other night the Prime Minister referred to "adjacent territory," after the leader of the opposition had mentioned it. There was another commitment. Will the voters and the press understand that the government is released from all these commitments as well if we vote yes, but we are bound forever, vote or no vote? That is the question I should like to ask, because whether we like it or not we are committed to all these things forever, and also to war.

The ballot goes on to refer to the fact that we are restricted in our methods of raising men for military service. We are not. It is the duty and function alone of the government. This ballot, I am afraid, is going to cause a great deal of confusion and spoiled ballots. After all, the entire onus for these commitments and obligations is upon the government of the day and the whole conduct of the war is theirs. Why should they try to shift that onus to private members and to us in the opposition? I do not know. I ran as a

straight Conservative. I was never anything but a straight Conservative. I was never consulted by my late leader; I never saw him during the whole election campaign, and he did not bind me . The voluntary system is the best and only system, and we would have had a million men under it and rendered compulsion unnecessary. I never saw our former leader during the whole election of 1940.

The form of this ballot is limited by section 3, but you have to consider the background of the thing and the cause and effect it will have upon the average voter. When he comes to mark his ballot he will be confused. First we had the statement before the house met, and in the speech from the throne that it was all about conscription and nothing else. Then we had the statement by the Prime Minister last Thursday about adjacent territory. The voter will be confused because there is no clarity about it. So far as asking members of parliament to go out in their constituencies to advocate this ballot is concerned, I can say that I shall not advocate it or go out or have anything to do with it. I supported rearmament in 1936. I shall not give my constituents any advice as to how to vote. It is none of my business, duty or function. That is not the duty of a private member. That responsibility is upon the government of the day as long as they are the government of the day. It is none of my duty, business or function. It is their obligation to save this country, and look after the defence of the realm. There has never yet been a proper and adequate defence of the realm of this country, and the government is now trying to shift this off on to the private members and the electors by side-stepping their own responsibilities, duty and functions under the constitution of this country.

Mr. DUPUIS: I crave the indulgence of the committee to make a few remarks following what has been said by the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe) and the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church). They seem to think that if the question proposed in section 3 is answered in the negative the Canadian nation will go out of the war. I obtained from the bureau of statistics certain returns obtained in the census. These show that there are about 1,200,000 single men between the ages of 18 and 45 years, and approximately 1,000,000 married men between the same ages, or a total of 2,200,000 men of military age. If we deduct the twenty per cent that would be medically unfit, we have left 1,800,000 men who would be fit for military service.

[Mr. Church.]

Hon. gentlemen know that these 1,800,000 men of military age would have to be placed into the three categories of national defence, war industries and the production of foodstuffs.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, but I must direct the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that we are dealing with section 3 which is concerned exclusively with the form of the question to be put to the voters.

Mr. DUPUIS: I am sure that you are right, but I ask the indulgence of the committee in order that I may answer hon. gentlemen opposite. I hope I shall be allowed to put on record the statistics I have. I shall not be long. As I say, these 1,800,000 men of military age must be divided into the three categories of national defence, war industry and agriculture. We thus have 600,000 for national defence. National defence must be divided into home service and overseas service; dividing 600,000 by two gives us 300,000 for overseas service. We already have compulsory service for home defence. The 300,000 men must again be divided into three branches: the army, the navy and the air force. I think in the long run we shall have an equal number of men in each branch of national defence. By dividing these 300,000 men into three, we have 100,000 for the army. It will be recalled that men who enlist in the navy or the air force are bound to go anywhere in the world. Compulsory service is limited to the army.

Suppose that the government on some future date should see, as the people may see themselves, that danger is getting nearer to our shores. I submit that at that time the people of Canada will be the first ones to ask the government to adopt any measure to protect this country and help our allies. We have only 100,000 men who would be available for compulsory enlistment in the army. Look at the results we have already. A total of 410,000 men have enlisted voluntarily to go anywhere in the world. I would tell the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe and the hon. member for Broadview that the empire will not be in danger if the people of this country should answer no to this question. The war will go on just the same. With compulsory service the results will be much less than they are now. That is the way I understand the question.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, but I cannot permit the hon. gentleman to continue.

Mr. DUPUIS: I am finished, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman has been too long already. The rules of the house

cannot be enforced unless hon. members are ready to abide by them. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. HANSELL: I am not going into a long dissertation in this connection, but the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has spoken on my amendment and I feel I should say a few words. I said yesterday that I was confused with respect to the question, but I think it would have been better if the Prime Minister had not spoken. I am worse off now than ever. I am not only confused; I am befooled, befuddled, bemused, bewildered, perplexed and confounded. I do not know what explanation can be given to the question now. I am so confused I won't attempt to answer the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister has said that the proposed amendment will give rise to unwarranted suspicion. That is the term used. I contend that the question as it now appears on the ballot paper is bound to give rise to unwarranted suspicion. The amendment clarifies the situation so that the people will know exactly what they are voting for.

The Prime Minister also made the charge—perhaps I should not say it was a charge, but he said that in the discussion of this matter some of us wanted to make out that there was some trick or trickery in the question. I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is the question as it is now worded that gives rise to suspicions that there might be some trickery. We are not claiming that. We simply want to relieve the minds of the people of Canada from that very thing by having them vote on a definite question. The Prime Minister has talked a good deal about being released from any past commitments, any past commitments, "any" past commitments. If he said that once, he said it a dozen times. Then why not simply put a period after the word "commitments" and strike out the rest of the question?

I believe that the government should be given a free hand in time of war, subject of course to parliament and to proper legislation. We do not desire the government's hands to be tied. We simply want to clarify the question that is to be submitted in the plebiscite.

I did not quite catch the implication of the Prime Minister's remarks with regard to what he termed a nazi mentality. I am not going to speak of that now, but I shall read *Hansard* to-morrow to see just exactly what was meant by it. He was looking at me when he said it. I do believe this, that there was no reason for the Prime Minister bringing any such thing into the discussion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may say that my hon. friend flatters himself when he says I was looking at him when I said that. I was not even thinking of my hon. friend or of his mentality. I was thinking of the methods.

Mr. HANSELL: Thank you. I could really see no reason for bringing such a thing into the debate. I do not want to capitalize on this but I have two sons in the air force. I said that the other day. I have only three sons, and I have a letter now saying that the third son has enlisted. That is more than the Prime Minister can say.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question, question.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have not taken up very much time on this question, and perhaps those who are calling "question" will bear with me for a few minutes.

This afternoon the Prime Minister gave a lecture to the leader of the opposition. I think that at a time like this personalities are altogether out of place. The leader of the opposition, throughout the last two years that he has occupied this position, has not desired any of us to give eulogies to him, nor does he now. But let me say to the Prime Minister that the leadership which the leader of the opposition has given has been of material benefit to the war effort of this dominion, and his record has been one of cooperation with the government to improve the war effort in an earnest desire to give patriotic service, and I think the time has come for us on this side of the house to pay a tribute to the work he has done.

This afternoon the Prime Minister defined the meaning of the question to be submitted in the plebiscite. As the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Douglas) said, where is the logic in this question? What does it mean? The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) asked the Prime Minister the question as to when he ever made a commitment to the people of Canada during the last election campaign that distinguished between conscription in Canada and conscription beyond the confines of Canada. The answer of the Prime Minister was not a categorical one. His answer was, in effect, that everybody was thinking about conscription as it existed in 1917. I have looked over the speeches of the Prime Minister, and while I am not saying that they have been read sufficiently carefully for me to be able to say definitely that he never distinguished between conscription for service within Canada and conscription for service beyond Canada, I have not been able to find any such distinction. Certainly there was a pledge made before parliament, but the Prime Minister pointed out the other day that so

far as the pledge made before parliament was concerned, parliament could release him from that pledge, but that he could only get release from a pledge made to the people of Canada during an election campaign by asking the people to release the government from the moral obligation created thereby. Then I ask the Prime Minister, why not ask the people a direct, unequivocal question? Why make things even more confusing by asking a question that is capable of interpretation according to the feelings of the individual voter?

The Prime Minister claims that to change the wording of the plebiscite would create unwarranted suspicions. I wonder in whose minds would there be suspicion. If you are going to ask a person, "Will you do this or that?" you ask that very question. You do not clothe it in words that permit of equivocation in the interpretation placed thereon by the person being questioned or the one who asks the question.

So far as the last election campaign is concerned—I am speaking of western Canada —a minister of the crown who spoke there, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner), throughout the campaign pointed out that the difference between the three political parties in the field, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, the Conservatives and the Liberals, was this:

> . . . the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party, from whose platform he (the Minister of Agriculture) read a number of clauses, referred particularly to the call for the conscription of wealth for war. In the second group was the party headed by Hon. R. J. Manion that opposed the conscription of men to be sent out of Canada; they did not mind conscripting men for the defence of Canada.
>
> The Liberals, through their leader, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, had already taken their stand, no conscription of men, and no direct conscription of wealth, but men and money for the prosecution of the war.

In other words the Minister of Agriculture meant to convey to the people that the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party stood for the conscription of wealth; the Conservative party did not stand for the conscription of man-power for overseas service but for conscription of man-power for service within Canada; and the Liberal party stood for neither. But in June, 1940, when conditions made necessary the raising of men, that pledge given by a minister of the Prime Minister's own government was departed from and conscription was brought in of man-power for service within Canada because of the need for men and the then prevailing war exigencies. Who was then asked to decide on that matter? It was parliament. The pledge that was given to the people of Canada in the words quoted above was that no conscription whether for service within Canada or beyond Canada would be introduced by the government. But in June, 1940, the government in effect secured a release from its pledge not to bring in conscription for service in Canada by introducing and securing the passage through parliament of the National Resources Mobilization Act. Why cannot the same course be followed to-day?

If, however, the government is going on with the submission of the plebiscite, I ask the Prime Minister to change the wording of the question, so that there will be no possible misunderstanding as to the meaning of the question. As it stands to-day, it reads:

> Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

I urge the government to make this question clear. We on this side of the house are not trying to hold up the matter. We want action too, and to secure that, all we ask is that the people of Canada be given an opportunity of voting on something regarding which they will know what question they are voting on, and that they will have some idea of the responsibility for action which will rest on this government and on parliament in the event that there is an affirmative vote.

Mr. BRUCE: I do not intend to delay the committee for more than a moment or two, but I think it will be very apparent to those who have listened to the speeches in this chamber and have read the press of the country that there is much confusion as to what is meant by the question which is to be submitted to the people in the plebiscite. The hon. member for Macleod has used a great many adjectives to indicate the extent of the confusion. I would say it is "confusion worse confounded". Nobody seems to know exactly what is meant by this question, in spite of the explanations given by the Prime Minister in a considerable speech a week ago, again yesterday, and to-day. I believe that if we adopted the amendment of the hon. member for Macleod and clarified the situation by the addition of the five words, "in any theatre of war," everybody would be satisfied, at least with the question which is being submitted.

I wonder whether this plebiscite would be gone on with if the Japanese landed on Vancouver island, or if the city of Quebec or some of the cities of the maritime provinces were subjected to bombing or shelling. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that, before there is a chance of submitting this question to the people, we in Canada shall be in a very serious and dangerous position.

I wonder also whether the Prime Minister would suggest that his moral obligation is greater than that of his friend, Mr. Roosevelt. This is what Mr. Roosevelt said during the 1940 election campaign to the people of the United States—giving them quite as definite a pledge as was made by the Prime Minister of Canada:

> While I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I will say it again and again and again, your boys are not going to be sent to fight in foreign wars.

This pledge was not only made by Mr. Roosevelt but supported by every member of congress. After the treacherous attack of Japan Mr. Roosevelt and congress had no hesitation in breaking the election pledge and legislating to send American boys to every part of the globe.

I should like to submit this question to the Prime Minister: Will he and his government put forth the same effort to ensure a favourable vote on the plebiscite as they did to ensure the success of the victory loan?

May I add just a word as to my own position in respect of this plebiscite. While I think it is very improper to shift to the electorate the responsibility which belongs to parliament, I shall vote yes on the plebiscite, and do my utmost to secure as many votes in the affirmative as I can, my reason being that it will relieve the government from what it considers to be a commitment; and because I greatly fear what will result if this plebiscite is defeated, as it very well may be.

Mr. POULIOT: Mr. Chairman, just one word. I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Parkdale upon the statement he has just made about the possibility of the invasion of Canada. It shows the necessity of doing all we can for the defence of this country.

I have been a supporter of the government for seventeen years, and I am still a supporter of the government. On the other hand I find it pretty hard to give them a blank cheque by releasing them from all pledges which may have been made to the Canadian people. Not only was there a pledge regarding compulsory military service overseas, but there was also a pledge that there would be no amalgamation of railways.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The question is on section 3, which determines the form of the question to be put to the voters. The remarks of the hon. gentleman are irrelevant.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to argue my case, and I will point out to you only one thing. The obligation is not specified; the word "obligation" is preceded by the word "any", which means that to answer yes to the question implies that in the opinion of the voter the government is released from any pledge which has been made to the people.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The wording of the question is, "obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service".

Mr. POULIOT: Well, I will not insist upon it. But there is another point: to whom has this pledge been made? In the first place it was made to those who were in favour of the neutrality of Canada. When Canada entered into war some Canadians were opposed to that and favoured the neutrality of Canada, and a certain pledge was then made to them, that there would be no compulsory military service. Afterwards, when conscription for home defence was established, there was a second pledge given to those who were against conscription of any kind. Then at the last election the pledge was made; it was made in the house and also by leading politicians when they travelled throughout the country. Now, suppose that in a constituency forty per cent of the people were against conscription and sixty per cent were for conscription. The pledge was not made to those who were for conscription; it was made to those who were against conscription. It is therefore up to the latter to release the government from any obligation incurred thereby. Take a constituency in which the proportion is forty per cent against conscription and sixty per cent for conscription. For one reason or another some of the sixty per cent may have supported the government candidate notwithstanding the question of conscription for overseas service. They supported him because he was a personal friend or had obliged them, or for some other reason which did not enter into consideration of the pledge. Is it fair to take the majority of any constituency, even the vote of those who were not interested in the pledge, to release the government from all responsibility in the matter. Of course, it is the majority that rules, but in some constituencies the majority were against conscription. It may have happened in the constituencies of hon. gentlemen—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is discussing the principle of the bill. His remarks are not directed to the form of question to be put. Section 3 of the bill is exclusively concerned with the form of question.

Mr. POULIOT: Yes, sir, but I am not discussing the principle of the bill, but the pledge.

The CHAIRMAN: Even that is not now before the chair. The matter before the chair is only the form of question to be put to the voter, and of course there is the amendment.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We are only dealing with section 3, subsection 1?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. LACOMBE: The Prime Minister said a moment ago that the wording of the ballot is the clearest in the world. The wording of the pledge and the commitments against conscription, made to the people of Canada in 1940, were also very plain and clear. Consequently, why does the government not withdraw this bill?

Amendment (Mr. Hansell) negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: There is another amendment moved by Mr. Hansell.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is it in order for an hon. member to move two amendments at once?

The CHAIRMAN: No. When several amendments are submitted to the chair they are taken one after the other in the order determined by the Chairman. I am taking the second amendment that has been moved, as follows:

That a second question be placed upon the ballot paper as follows:

Are you in favour of the conscription of the financial institutions of Canada so that the government can fulfil its commitment to issue currency and credit in terms of public need?

I declare this amendment out of order for the reason that it is inconsistent and goes far beyond the principle of the bill which is now before the committee. The question is on section 3, subsection 1.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I understood that the minister had a new ballot and I compliment him upon it. Is this not the time when we should have an amendment introduced in that regard?

Mr. McLARTY: I was just on the point of moving for adoption of the new ballot which we discussed last night. We do not need to discuss it at length again. It has been simplified in a way which I think will recommend itself to the committee. I will ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) to move the necessary amendment to section 3, subsection 1, to insert the ballot which has now been distributed in place of the one that appears in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mulock moves that the ballot form which appears in the printed bill be deleted, and that the ballot form which is now submitted be substituted in lieu thereof. Therefore the words "every person qualified to vote at the plebiscite" on the ballot form will disappear and the following will be substituted in lieu thereof: "Vote by making a cross thus X after the word yes or after the word no."

[Mr. Chairman.]

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think the ballot is a great improvement. I only rise to suggest, however, that there be no instructions on the ballot. These are posted at the polling booth and everyone will know then. My experience is that the returning officer invariably instructs the voter how to mark his ballot, although he is not required to do so in every case. I suggest that the words "vote by making a cross thus X after the word yes or after the word no" be stricken out. However, I do not press the point, although I think that is the proper thing to do having regard to the form of ballot in dominion elections.

Mr. SLAGHT: I fear that might cause confusion. I think these words should remain. We know that in other elections voters sometimes write something on their ballot. If this ballot is presented to them as a bare ballot, it seems to me you ought to tell them in that short sentence to make a cross opposite yes or opposite no. You open the door to much confusion if you do not.

Mr. HANSELL: Before this subsection carries, may I impose upon your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, to explain the ruling which you gave a short time ago. You ruled my amendment out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: The ruling of the chair can be appealed from, but it is not open to discussion. Moreover, the time to appeal from it has long passed.

Section agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

On section 4—Qualifications of ordinary voters.

Mr. McLARTY: A motion will be required to make two amendments. In line 36 the second word "a" is to be changed to "the"; and in line 37, after the words "provisions of", paragraphs should be inserted—

The CHAIRMAN: Concerning the question that arose last night as to how we should deal with the amendments which have been made in the special committee to which the bill was referred; I have studied that question, and I find that amendments made in the special commitee are not to be proposed as amendments to the bill when it is considered in committee of the whole. They are to be taken up as part of the bill, and they must be submitted together with the clauses to which they refer, but no separate motion needs to be made for their adoption because the committee of the whole is not vested with the power to revise the work of the special committee.

On second reading the principle of the bill was all that was passed, the details being left

for the special committee to settle. The house has not approved a single section of this bill, and the special committee has made changes in its clauses. The adoption of these changes in the special committee is complete as far as it goes. They are now incorporated in the bill referred to the committee of the whole, and they must be considered as if they were original sections. This, I am advised, has always been the practice in committee of the whole in the Canadian House of Commons.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That may be true if concurrence in the report of the committee had been moved, but concurrence in the report of this committee was not moved. That being so, I wonder whether that ruling is still applicable.

The CHAIRMAN: There has never been a motion for concurrence in the amendments made by a special committee on a bill referred not to the committee of the whole but to a special committee. The bill is read a second time, then referred to a special committee; the special committee deals with it and then reports the bill as amended by it, or without amendments, as the case may be. When the bill comes back to the committee of the whole it is taken in the form in which it has been reported on by the special committee, and there is no concurrence in the amendments of the special committee; but of course the committee of the whole, when the sections of the bill so amended are taken up, can always amend it further as it deems advisable.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That procedure was not followed on the unemployment insurance bill. When that bill came back from the special committee the members of the administration moved time and again to have certain amendments made in it. I do not know whether we were wrong then, but my understanding is that the amendments have to be made one by one.

Mr. McLARTY: I think I explained last evening regarding the procedure on the unemployment insurance bill that I was speaking purely from recollection. I believe your honour has gone into it carefully now—

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. Furthermore, the amendments are before the committee, because the bill has been reprinted. I have no objection at any hon. member's request, to read in what particulars the bill has been amended in the special committee. But I am ruling now that there is no necessity for a motion of concurrence in the amendments.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It is not an important matter, but one of ways and means of doing a thing and the established practice. I am not questioning how it is being done, but I think we should stick to one rule.

Mr. MacINNIS: I think the chairman is quite in order even considering the practice followed in connection with the unemployment insurance bill. My recollection is that that bill was not reprinted. We had the typewritten amendments made by the committee, and then those amendments were moved when the bill was discussed in committee of the whole. I see no reason why, with a reprinted bill before us, we should not deal with it as a bill which has received second reading.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): May I ask that it be taken up one subsection at a time.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

On section 4, subsection 1.

Mr. RAYMOND: I desire to move, seconded by the hon. member for Témiscouata:

That section 4 of subsection 1 be amended by inserting in subparagraph (a) after the words "twenty-one years" in the second line the following words: "in the case of a woman and eighteen years in the case of a man."

The object of this amendment is to qualify to vote men of eighteen, nineteen and twenty years of age.

What is the purpose of this plebiscite? I refer to the question to be asked of the public in the plebiscite and certain declarations which were made by the Prime Minister when speaking on Wednesday last. The question to be submitted is as follows:

Are you in favour of releasing the government from any obligation arising out of any past commitments restricting the methods of raising men for military service?

The Prime Minister said:

If the answer is in the affirmative it will mean that the government according to the opinion expressed by the people has been released from commitments that have been made.

Released from what commitments? The only commitment made with respect to military service is the pledge given that no conscription would be imposed for service overseas. If the answer is in the affirmative, it will mean that the government will be free to impose conscription for service overseas. In other words, it will mean that the government will have a mandate from the people to impose conscription for overseas service if and when it thinks it desirable.

Then a very important question arises: Who should vote to give such a mandate?

My answer is this: All those who will be liable to be called for service overseas, if conscription is imposed, should be entitled to vote on the plebiscite.

The Prime Minister said that he wants to know the opinion of the people, and the Secretary of State also said it is the desire of the government that the fullest possible opportunity should be accorded the people of Canada to express their view upon the particular question which will be submitted.

It is only reasonable that those who will be called upon to pay the bill should be the first to be asked their opinion. The youth of military age, who are directly involved because they are the ones who will be called upon to pay the blood tax, should have something to say. According to the Militia Act all male inhabitants of Canada between the ages of eighteen and sixty, except those exempted, are liable to military service. Consequently all those people should be entitled to vote in the plebiscite. There is a well known principle in the British constitution: No taxation without representation. The Prime Minister rightly said that parliament derived its power from the people, and it has been emphasized that this is the most democratic measure that has ever been introduced in this parliament. Yet some of those most concerned, because they will have to pay the consequences of this measure with their blood, will be deprived of an opportunity of expressing their opinion. The Prime Minister has said that the millions of dollars required are coming from the people, but those who pay those millions have been consulted. The man-power is also coming from the people, and all those who are liable to be conscripted should be consulted. It would be a poor democracy which would have one law for human life and an entirely preferential law for property and wealth.

I do not intend to say any more in support of this amendment, but in conclusion I should like to quote the final words used by the Secretary of State when he introduced the resolution which preceded this bill, as reported at page 754 of *Hansard:*

> At a time when we are fighting to maintain the democratic way of life throughout the world, let us endeavour in every way to maintain it in our own country.

Mr. LACOMBE: Youth, as much as any other category of electors, should be entitled to vote in the coming plebiscite. These are the men who will have to bear all the sacrifices called for by the government. They will have to fulfil the obligation to serve. They also will have to pay, in the years to come, the terrific costs of this war. The government cannot assign them duties without granting them equivalent rights. Every Canadian youth who has reached the age of eighteen should have an opportunity of voting in the coming plebiscite, not only those who are serving but also all those who will reach the age of eighteen on or before the date when the plebiscite will be held. For the youth of my country I request this act of justice. I request parliament and the government to fulfil the magnificent duty toward the youth of Canada which may be mobilized for the defence of Canada and even for overseas service, if ever—and may God prevent it—the government is released from its sacred pledges and its solemn commitments.

Therefore I readily second the amendment of the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie, but I suggest that every man and every woman over eighteen years of age should have the privilege of voting in the plebiscite.

Amendment negatived on division.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall subsection 1 of section 4 carry?

Mr. MacNICOL: If we are not taking the paragraphs separately, I should like to ask a question about paragraph (b), which reads:

> (b) is a British subject by birth or naturalization.

I wanted to inquire if, when the enumerators are compiling the lists, they will have to be shown the naturalization papers of those who are not of British birth.

Mr. McLARTY: I believe there is no oath required by the enumerator to show that a person is a naturalized subject, or that the production of papers or production of naturalization paper is necessary, if he is resident within that polling subdivision.

Mr. MacNICOL: The empire is in a life and death struggle, you know.

Mr. McLARTY: Perhaps we might call it six o'clock, and I will check the regulations carefully.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 4.

Mr. McLARTY: When the committee rose the hon. member for Davenport (Mr. MacNicol) was inquiring whether enumerators would require some evidence of a person being a British subject, especially if he were naturalized; whether the naturalization papers would be required to be produced. The provisions under the regulations are the same

as those under the Dominion Elections Act. Consequently, naturalization papers are not required to be produced, but of course the right to challenge at the poll is still left open.

Mr. MacNICOL: There are quite a number of people in my riding who are of non-British origin but are naturalized Canadians. Many of them have sons in the army, in the air force and on the sea, and I am glad to hear that they are not going to be annoyed. I think it is imperative that every effort should be made to preserve harmony among those who go to make up the people of Canada. Nothing should be done to annoy those who are naturalized but not of British birth when they are visited by the enumerators. They will know whether they have a right to put down their names.

Mr. HANSELL: Has the minister considered those who were naturalized some years ago but who, since the readjustment of the naturalization laws, have had to take out further papers? I think the minister knows to what I have reference. Supposing a man cannot produce a naturalization certificate although he was naturalized years ago; will he have difficulty at the polls? There are quite a number of citizens in that position. They are not fully aware of the new regulations and they would have to get further papers. I have had a few inquiries recently along this line, not with respect to voting but with respect to naturalization.

Mr. McLARTY: The provisions under the regulations as to naturalization are the same as under the elections act. I know what the hon. member has in mind. If a man has lost his naturalization papers, or if he is affected by the amendment to the Naturalization Act of 1915, it would not be a difficult matter for him to obtain new naturalization papers.

Mr. HANSELL: It would be too late when he goes to vote to get new naturalization papers.

Mr. McLARTY: Every voter will have to take some precaution to see that his status as a voter is maintained. That is the duty of every citizen. But there will be no difficulty placed in his way in doing that.

Mr. HANSELL: If a man does not have the new papers, will he be eligible to vote?

Mr. McLARTY: Under section 7, undoubtedly he would. The same provision applies as applies under the elections act.

Mr. COLDWELL: I have often wondered why our citizens are always described as British subjects by birth or naturalization. Under the terminology of our statutes we have Canadian nationals or Canadian citizens. I have wondered why the terminology found in this bill is invariably used elsewhere. I think it is wise to preserve the terminology of British subjects, but I think our people in Canada should become more and more conscious of the fact that they are citizens of Canada, whether they have been born in this country or have come here and become domiciled or naturalized. It seems to me that the time has come when we should endeavour to teach our people that they are Canadian citizens. For example, during this debate I have felt that we have not had the consciousness of national unity that we ought to have. Until we teach our boys and girls in our schools, until we teach our men and women that we are not only subjects of His Majesty the King of Canada but Canadian citizens as well, we shall not achieve that Canadian unity we ought to have.

Mr. REID: What about those with dual citizenship?

Mr. MacINNIS: They are only the Japanese.

Mr. REID: Do not fly off so quickly; there are others with dual citizenship besides the Japanese.

Mr. COLDWELL: As far as dual citizenship is concerned, you will find they are naturalized British citizens, although the naturalization may not be recognized by their former country. I am speaking of British subjects who are domiciled in Canada. Our statutes, such as the Immigration Act and the Canadian Nationals Act, which provides also for the renunciation of Canadian citizenship, use the terminology to which I have referred. Why not use it in our other statutes? Why not use it in our elections act on voters' lists and so on? We would thus inculcate in our people the idea that they are citizens of this country. When we were travelling in Great Britain last autumn invariably we signed ourselves as British citizens; there was no distinction as to what part of the British commonwealth we had come from.

I want to preserve my British connection; but, speaking as one who became a citizen of this country by domicile, I think it is time that our children and our people were taught that there is a loyalty due to the Dominion of Canada as such. One way to do that is to write into our statutes and our regulations the terminology that will bring that fact forcibly before them. I am not going to move an amendment tonight; I am simply bringing this before the committee at this time. I do not want to prolong a discussion which has been too long already. This plebiscite was discussed for four weeks on the address, and the present

discussion has occupied several days. Because I do not want to prolong the discussion, I am not going to move an amendment. As I say, I think the time has come when we should try to inculcate in our people the idea that we are not French Canadians, English Canadians, Scottish Canadians or some other type of Canadians, but that we are Canadian citizens.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): This raises a very important problem, and I am glad to hear the hon. member say that he is not going to pursue it now. In connection with those who are naturalized and those with dual nationality, referred to by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid), I should like to call attention to a decision of the privy council. This was the case of Cunningham versus Tomey Homma, which is reported in 1903 appeal cases. In this case the right of a naturalized citizen to vote was specifically raised, and the case went to the privy council. If hon. gentlemen have any interest in the matter, they can refer to the decision of the Lord Chancellor to be found at page 156. This case was referred to by the minister during the resolution stage.

Mr. McLARTY: If I remember correctly, it was in connection with section 5 of the Naturalization Act.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It was in connection with the interpretation of subsection 25 of section 91 of the British North America Act which reserves to the exclusive jurisdiction of the dominion parliament the subject of naturalization. The provincial legislature has the right to determine, under section 92, what privileges, as distinguished from necessary consequences, shall be attached to it. At page 156 the Lord Chancellor makes this observation:

> The extent to which naturalization will confer privileges has varied both in this country and elsewhere.
>
> From the time of William III down to Queen Victoria no naturalization was permitted which did not exclude the alien naturalized from sitting in parliament or in the privy council.

And further down:

> The term "political rights" used in the Canadian Naturalization Act is, as Walkem J. very justly says—

That was a judge of the Supreme Court of British Columbia:

> —a very wide phrase, and their lordships concur in his observation that, whatever it means, it cannot be held to give necessarily a right to the suffrage in all or any of the provinces.

This means that the mere fact of naturalization under federal jurisdiction does not per se give the right to vote in the province because that right lies within the jurisdiction of the provinces themselves.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Mr. REID: Did not Great Britain at one time disfranchise many classes of our citizens?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes. The franchise has been a matter of continual growth and the subject of many reform bills. Their lordships continued:

> In the history of this country the right to the franchise has been granted and withheld on a great number of grounds, conspicuously upon grounds of religious faith, yet no one has ever suggested that a person excluded from the franchise was not under allegiance to the sovereign.

That is not quite apposite to the point raised by my hon. friend, but it is a matter of information which I think the committee should have before them.

Mr. NEILL: Was not the case to which the leader of the opposition referred that of a suit brought by a Japanese against the election registrar who refused to put him on the list?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Right.

Mr. NEILL: And it was decided by Lord Haldane that the province could make any kind of franchise they wished. For instance, Catholics at one time were not allowed to have the vote. In the particular case referred to, it was definitely decided that British Columbia could have any kind of franchise they liked.

Mr. COLDWELL: While I see the point that has been raised, I do not see how it affects the general argument that, even if it would involve a change in the law, we should provide for a Canadian citizenship, definite legal terminology which would embrace Canadian nationals and distinguish them as British subjects of Canadian nationality.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is a very much wider question.

Mr. McLARTY: As the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar did not think it was necessary to move an amendment, I was not going to make any reply, except to say that this question was raised in the special committee and there was sympathy with the view he advances. However, this is a particular bill dealing with one plebiscite, and one only, and therefore a measure of limited application. If the change which he suggests were contemplated, I would suggest that it should be in connection with a wider measure than this particular enactment.

In the Tomey Homma case my recollection is that the effect of the decision of the judicial committee was this: Whereas by section 5 of the Naturalization Act political rights are given to those who are naturalized under that

act, there is no inherent giving of the right of franchise in connection with it. That question may arise a little later on one of the subsequent sections, but I do not think we need consider it until we come to subsequent sections under which certain disfranchisement does take place.

Mr. GREEN: Before we leave the question of naturalization I would ask the minister whether it is the intention to set up at this session a committee to consider the whole question of naturalization? If he will remember, two special committees appointed to review the defence of Canada regulations in 1940 and 1941 recommended that there should be a special committee of this house to consider naturalization. Would not this present session be an appropriate time to have that done?

Mr. McLARTY: I would reply that, while it is hardly germane to the particular subject now under consideration, I am aware that the committee recommended that a naturalization committee should be set up, and all I can say at the moment is that while that matter has not been finally dealt with, it is receiving very careful consideration.

Mr. HANSELL: In reference to those who are qualified to vote, it has already been mentioned that there are certain citizens of this country who refused to register in the national registration that was held about a year and a half ago. I cannot bring myself to see how a citizen who refuses to register under a specific law of this country should be permitted to vote on an issue of this kind which, after all, is an issue concerning the carrying on of the war. I believe that at the time of the national registration it was intended to become effective in the mobilization of our human and material resources. At least we can say that as a result of the mobilization act a new ministry was created, ostensibly at least to look after the registration and the calling up of our human resources for war service. But here are citizens who absolutely refused to register, and yet we are permitting them to vote on this plebiscite. I do not think that is right. I know of certain individuals who did register but who, because of some little discrepancy in the answers they gave to the questions asked, have been arrested and punished. I have myself taken up one or two cases of this kind with the proper authorities. Then surely the person who refused to register at all and regarded it as of no importance should not be free to vote on a question of this kind. I do not think it is right, and I therefore move, Mr. Chairman, that section 4, subsection 1, be amended by adding at the end thereof as paragraph (d) the following:

who produces his registration card at the time of voting.

Mr. COLDWELL: There is a great deal of merit in what the hon. member for Macleod says, but on the other hand I would point out that the registration certificate which we received was not of a kind that would keep permanently. I doubt very much whether our farmers of the west, who wear an ordinary pair of overalls, and sometimes a rather ragged pair of overalls under the conditions under which they have had to live in recent years, could produce their certificates immediately. They may have mislaid them or left them at home, or they may have become worn and been destroyed. I know that when someone made a similar suggestion I wondered whether I had my own registration certificate with me. I remembered that I had taken it from my pocket when I went to Great Britain last November, and I wondered whether I had it with me at that moment. Fortunately I had slipped it into a corner of my pocket book and was able to put my hand on it. I am convinced that while the suggestion of the hon. member for Macleod has a great deal of merit, it would lead to the disfranchising of many people. Many would not even go to the trouble of looking for their registration certificates, and many others probably would not be able to put their hands on those flimsy bits of paper which were given us as certificates a year ago last August.

Mr. REID: Perhaps you would not have to go far in this house, either.

Mr. COLDWELL: Probably the hon. member for New Westminster is right, that if we of this house were suddenly asked to produce our registration certificates—

Mr. REID: Oh, I have mine.

Mr. COLDWELL: —some of us might have difficulty in doing so. Like the hon. member for New Westminster, I have mine, I know, because I happened to look for it the other day.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hansell moves:

That section 4, subsection 1, be amended by adding at the end thereof after paragraph (c) another paragraph:

(d) who produces his registration card at the time of voting.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Chairman, I think I had the honour of making the suggestion in the house on the resolution stage, although, I suppose, my hon. friends on

the left are now going to claim the credit. I have no objection to that. The suggestion is a good one. There are people in this country who have not registered, who deliberately did not register, yet we are going to allow them all the rights of citizenship. The excuses, if I may so term them, raised by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar are not impressive. Everybody in this country knows it is the law that you must be registered and carry a registration certificate with you, and the absence of it is not excused. Supposing any one of these men wants to get a job; he has to produce his registration certificate if it is demanded.

Mr. COLDWELL: He is not asked for it nowadays.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I wonder just how the hon. member knows that.

Mr. MacNICOL: He doesn't know.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): He cannot possibly know it. He should not make the statement. It may be within his own personal knowledge—

Mr. COLDWELL: I rise to a point of order. I object to that. I have heard it stated authoritatively that many business firms have discontinued asking for the registration certificate, and I am speaking from knowledge that I possess. I am not going to allow the leader of the opposition to give any other implication to my remarks.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Of course the hon. member can speak of what is within his own knowledge, but of necessity it must be, as mine would be, a very limited knowledge. It would not warrant such a general statement as he has made. The fact is that the registration, the issue of a registration certificate, and the carrying of the registration certificate are to-day prerequisites of citizenship in this country. We absolutely ignore that fact in this bill. Either it is the law, and is binding on you and me and every one who is obliged to register; or it is not the law. I cannot see any possible objection to carrying out the suggestion except that it might be an inconvenience to somebody. It will be known, if it is incorporated in this law, that people must, if requested, produce their registration certificates; those who vote, loyal citizens, will have them, and if they do not have them they can get duplicates of them.

I had not thought of moving an amendment because, after the expression of opinion from the committee itself, and no one among the members of the government having taken up the suggestion with approval, I knew it would not carry. It cannot possibly carry without the concurrence of the government. But I have some hope that the government will approve the suggestion made by the hon. member for Lake Centre who, I understand, will speak to the matter under section 7, that it be a prerequisite in the case of a man asking to be vouched for that he should produce his registration certificate.

Mr. REID: But are they not two different things—the right to vote and the right to be registered?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): We make it compulsory to be registered, but we do not make it compulsory to vote. We have not gone so far in this country as to make voting compulsory, although from time to time the idea has been considered. I have often thought that we ought to adopt it and that we shall come to it some day. Men who are running for parliament would find themselves relieved of a good deal of the trouble they now have in getting people to perform the highest function of citizenship, namely the exercise of their franchise. The burden would be transferred from the candidate who wants the vote to the citizen himself, who ought to perform that function without having to be urged to do it. There is a great deal to be said for the principle of compulsion; we are just afraid to enact it, that is all. They have done it in Australia with good success. I happened some time in the late twenties to be a member of the privileges and elections committee when the Hon. John C. Elliott was chairman of that committee, and we discussed that question. The statistics then were that in Australia, where non-voters were subject to penalty, ninety per cent of the people voted. Here is the broad principle: the hon. member for New Westminster has brought it out by his interjection. We make it a condition of good citizenship in this country that a man shall be registered; it is compulsory; but we do not make it obligatory upon him to produce that registration certificate when he is exercising the franchise. Now, do not the two things seem to be incompatible in principle? I am going to support the amendment of the hon. member for Macleod. It is my own child. I did not intend to try to give it birth; but I may say—without carrying the analogy any further—that it is a good suggestion and should appeal to the membership of this committee. To refuse to give effect to it is to put a premium on disloyalty on the part of some people who have refused to carry out a function of citizenship by registering. You are going to give them all the benefits of citizenship, but you refuse to put any obligation on them in this connection.

I appeal to the minister to give further consideration to this suggestion. I do not want him to pass a snap judgment at this moment. I think the idea has merit, or I never would have proposed it. A man who exercised the right of the franchise should produce evidence of his bona fides, of his identity. What better identification could there be than the production of his registration card? In certain cities they had a system whereby, before a man could exercise the municipal ballot, he had to produce a certificate of some kind of registration with his photograph on it. What in the world is the good of a registration certificate if we do not use it in a given case where it would be applicable? I beg the minister to accept this proposal, to incorporate in the bill at this place, where it seems appropriate, a provision that every person shall produce his registration certificate. The idea is commendable and should appeal to all members of this house. I hope the minister will not lightly turn down this suggestion. If needs be, he could hold over this section.

Mr. LOCKHART: Would the minister or someone in the government inform this committee whether the registration certificate has to be produced at the time a man gets employment, or whether it is a joke, like many of the other regulations now in effect? Could we have that definite information? As I have already indicated to the committee, I know of two firms which over the weekend were in need of men; when certain men came for employment they could not produce their registration certificates, and these employers felt in duty bound not to hire them unless they could produce the certificates. Is that the law, or is it not?

Mr. McLARTY: I regret I cannot advise the hon. member as to the necessity, but I shall be glad to get him that information. Possibly that is not germane to the matter which we are now discussing—that is as to the requirement to produce a registration card for the purpose of getting employment—this being a question of voting on the plebiscite which will be held following the passage of this bill. I appreciate that the leader of the opposition raised the point some time ago, and if it were a matter of answering his remarks, my reply would appear somewhat ill-considered if I dealt with them without having the advantage of his previous suggestion, now followed by what the hon. member for Macleod has said. But the matter was discussed by the special committee, namely, the necessity of producing the registration card as a condition precedent to voting. The hon. member for Lake Centre mentioned the proposal the other night, and I think it will appeal to the members of the committee that those who have to be vouched for might properly be required, in urban areas, to produce the registration certificate. I believe the general principle of this legislation will recommend itself to the committee. We do not want to stifle any voting; we want as free and frank an expression of opinion as can be obtained. I would say unhesitatingly, I agree that in the case of vouching in urban municipalities the registration card should be necessary. But the leader of the opposition says that the registration card is a condition of citizenship. The registration card is made under a particular act of this parliament, and for failure to register there are particular penalties that are imposed. Are you going to use the right of franchise as a penalty for the non-performance of a duty which an act makes mandatory that you shall do and which has its own penalties if you fail to do it? It might be that some would register who had not done so, but each act should stand on its own feet. If you pass compulsory legislation, then I doubt your right in a new act to place a penalty which the act that originally compelled a certain thing to be done does not impose.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is the fault of that act, then.

Mr. McLARTY: No, it is not the fault of the act. The act has its penalties. It might be the fault of some enforcement of the act, but not of the act itself.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Is there any penalty imposed upon the individual if he is unable to produce the registration certificate when required at the present time under the act?

Mr. McLARTY: Under the regulations under the act there is a definite penalty, and the act itself provides a penalty.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Is the penalty carried out? Is the act a farce, or is the penalty carried out?

Mr. McLARTY: The hon. member for St. Paul's asks whether the act is a farce, or whether the penalty is carried out. All I will say is that to the best of my knowledge it is carried out. The act is not one that falls within my particular department, but I believe it is fairly carried out; at least an endeavour is made to carry it out. But when it is suggested that the registration card is the surest means of identification, that is scarcely correct. Since the last election—I cannot say since the registration took place—there has been a movement of the general population of Canada, involving about a million people.

Mr. GRAYDON: I hope the minister will not fall into the habit of calling it a card. If it were a card it would not be so bad, but it is a piece of tissue paper which the government gave us a year or two ago, and it is hard to keep it in one's pocket.

Mr. McLARTY: I am not going to argue as to the quality of the paper used. I still have mine, fortunately. I have it on me. The point I was going to make was this. While the registrants are required to report any change of address, there is no change of address endorsed on the registration certificate. In view of the fact that it is not as effective an identification certificate as it might otherwise be—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): It has the registrant's signature and that is some identification.

Mr. McLARTY: There is no question it would be some identifying mark of the particular registrant; but when you consider the shifting of the population in the intervening time, I question very much if it would be of any great value. In addition to that, it would involve this: each enumerator making his enumeration would have to see individually the registration card of every registrant he put on his enumerator's list.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): No.

Mr. McLARTY: Each enumerator putting a man on the list would have to do that if you made it a condition, as suggested in this amendment. He would have to see the individual whom he was putting on his list.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That does not follow.

Mr. GRAYDON: It is only for voting at the polling booth.

Mr. McLARTY: I withdraw that. The amendment says at the time of voting. I do suggest, however, that, especially in the rural areas, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar suggested, there would be quite a large number disfranchised by reason of their inability to produce the registration card. We argued in this committee yesterday about the ballot being a difficult one. If that is a fact, would it not be fair to leave penalties to the registration act itself, rather than make this act to some extent in the nature of a penalty by disfranchising men who are supposed to be punished under the original act.

Mr. NEILL: The minister has taken the line that if we compel a man to produce his registration card as a condition of voting, we are using the loss of his franchise as a penalty under the registration act. That is his argument. I submit that we had a precedent in the last war. We had to produce our registration card on almost every occasion when we played any public part. For instance, if I wanted to travel and wanted a railway ticket I had to produce the registration card, and if I did not do so I did not get the railway ticket. It might be held that the right to travel is a very important liberty of the subject, the liberty to move around as he likes; nevertheless it was held that one had to produce the registration card because it was considered that in a time of war it was essential to weed out those who did not have registration cards. I think the same applied to getting money orders, although I am not certain about that. At any rate we have a precedent to go by. Mr. Bennett had a very logical way of putting forward the argument on both sides and then adding, "on balance I favour so and so". I think it would be fair to say that, on balance, it would be fair to put this condition in; it may disenfranchise some but, on balance, it will have the great advantage of catching a number of people who had not the manliness or patriotism or obedience to law to register.

Amendment (Mr. Hansell) negatived.

Section 4, subsection 1, agreed to.

On section 4, subsection 2—Disqualifications of ordinary voters.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Would the minister state concretely and explicitly the disqualifications of ordinary voters contemplated by this subsection? At the moment I am not raising any objection to the clauses of this bill. I think I understand part of them; part of them I do not understand. Subsection 2 provides:

> The persons disqualified from voting as ordinary voters at the plebiscite shall be those persons disqualified from voting under the provisions of paragraphs (d) to (k), both inclusive, and paragraph (m) of subsection 2 of section 14 of the Dominion Elections Act, 1938. . . .

They are all set out; paragraph (m) is included to cover every person who is disqualified from voting under any law relating to the disqualification of electors for illegal practices. Those are quite clear. I call attention to paragraph (i):

> (i) every person who is disqualified by reason of race from voting at an election of a member of the legislative assembly of the province in which he or she resides and who did not serve in the military, naval or air forces of Canada in the war of 1914-1918.

Paragraph (j) refers to the order in council of 1898; I think that relates to the Doukhobors.

In particular I should like to know what provinces have passed legislation which would

debar anybody of Japanese, Italian, Finnish nationality, or any of the nations with which this country is at war. The only province I can recall is British Columbia, but I do not pretend that my information is complete. I should like the minister to give us concretely what the effect of this subsection is. Who specifically will be debarred from voting under it?

Mr. McLARTY: I wonder whether my hon. friend requires me to read the paragraphs of section 14 of the elections act. I think they pretty well speak for themselves.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have all that, but I am speaking particularly of paragraphs (b) and (c). What is their effect?

Mr. McLARTY: The effect of paragraph (b) is, it applies only to those who have applied or who shall, prior to the taking of the vote, apply under the national war services regulations, sections 18 and 19, for exemption or postponement of military training. If my hon. friend will refer to those regulations, I believe he will find that section 18 applies to Doukhobors and Mennonites, and section 19 to conscientious objectors. It was deemed desirable to follow that form so as to identify clearly those affected by this disqualification.

In connection with the matter of race, or who would be covered by paragraph (c), I would say there is only one province in Canada which has passed legislation disqualifying any person whose origin is in a country at present at war with Canada: that province is British Columbia, and my hon. friend is quite correct in his interpretation of it. I do not think I can be more specific than that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then this refers concretely only to those whose racial origin is Japanese?

Mr. McLARTY: Correct.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But there is an exception to that, namely, those who served in the military, naval or air forces of Canada in the war of 1914-1918. Is there any information as to how many Japanese nationals there are who would have the right to vote under that?

Mr. McLARTY: That matter was brought up in the special committee by the hon. member for Cariboo. He went to some trouble to find the number who would be involved. He advises me that the number involved is 43.

Mr. TURGEON: And they will not be at their own polling division and therefore not entitled to vote.

Mr. NEILL: It applies to Chinamen in some provinces.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): With respect to section 18 of the national war services regulations 1940, which applies to Doukhobors and Mennonites, if a young Doukhobor is called up under the regulations and applies for postponement, under those regulations he gets postponement but he has to perform certain other services or duties. If he applies for a ballot in this plebiscite he will get the ballot.

Mr. STIRLING: In eight provinces.

Mr. McLARTY: Under section 5.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But there is some regulation in British Columbia.

Mr. STIRLING: Yes. Paragraph (j) cuts him out.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Then in eight of nine provinces if he applies for the ballot he gets it and is entitled to vote, but loses his right to postponement. There is not one chance in a hundred that that young man will ever ask for a ballot, but it is left wide open for his father and his mother and his sisters and his cousins and his aunts to get a ballot and do all the dirty work he might have done.

Mr. McLARTY: If I might interject a remark there, this subsection to which my hon. friend is referring applies only to the extent that the application has already been made, or will be made before the plebiscite is held. I think the argument he intends to direct to the committee might come appropriately under section 5.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): But I think we have to read the two together. The young Doukhobor is unlikely to come forward and vote, but all his relatives who are of non-military age will have the right to vote. Did the minister consider excluding those people? They are now excluded in British Columbia by virtue of provincial legislation, but I am thinking of other provinces. These people are conscientious objectors. It is against their religious tenets to fight. Why should they be allowed to vote on a question of war? Has the minister thought of that; and, if so, what is the answer? Why should they be allowed to vote? Why should the relatives of that young man who will not fight, who will not ask for a ballot for fear he will lose his postponement, be allowed to vote on a question of this kind?

Mr. TURGEON: May I say a word before the minister does. I have personal knowledge of one case—and I should think there would be

more—of a young man who is a conscientious objector. His father is a seriously wounded veteran of the last war. Because that young lad is a conscientious objector you would not stop that seriously wounded veteran and his wife from voting?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is not the case I have in mind at all. That is not under section 18; that is under section 19, and I am not referring to section 19. I am referring to the sect known as the Doukhobors. Why should they be allowed to vote?

Mr. TURGEON: They are not in British Columbia.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am told they are in eight out of nine provinces.

Mr. POWER: No one has ever defined what a Doukhobor is. I have been trying to find that out for years. It is not a race; it is not a religion; it is not a sect—

Mr. NEILL: Oh, yes, it is.

Mr. POWER: I have not been able to get anyone to tell me just what a Doukhobor is.

Mr. STIRLING: Surely that is the reason why this description was given some years ago, with the orders in council enumerated. Unquestionably it is a sect.

Mr. BOUCHER: It seems to me there is something of an anomaly as between (b) of subsection 2 of section 4, and section 5. It will be noticed that section 5 refers to any person who shall have voted at the plebiscite taken under the provisions of this bill, and provides that such person shall be ineligible to apply for or to be granted, on his application or on the application of another, postponement under the regulations. Paragraph (b) of subsection 2 of section 4 provides that every person who shall have applied personally —the word "personally" is not there, but that is the meaning—for a postponement, shall not be eligible to vote. In other words, we have one section saying that a man who has personally applied for postponement shall not be allowed to vote. Then in another section we say that a man who personally, or through an agent, has applied for a postponement, is in a different category. Therefore I say that if the wording of section 5 conveys the intention of this house, the same wording should be inserted in paragraph (b), which should provide that every person who shall have applied personally, or through someone else, for postponement, shall be ineligible to vote. I think the argument in the one case applies equally to the other. I should like to bring that to the attention of the minister, and to ask why the wording of the two sections should be different.

[Mr. Turgeon.]

Mr. McLARTY: Under paragraph (b) of subsection 2 of section 4 it is provided that the application for postponement either is in now or will be in before the vote on the plebiscite. It does not matter whether the application is made by the man himself or by another person; the application is in. In section 5 the provision relates to those who, subsequently to the taking of the plebiscite, may apply for postponement notwithstanding the fact that they voted.

Mr. BOUCHER: If that were the meaning I would quite agree with the Secretary of State, but actually paragraph (b) says, "every person who shall have applied." I say a man may not have applied himself but someone else may have applied on his behalf, and under this section he would not be disqualified. That is the point that is brought out in section 5.

Mr. McLARTY: I think under paragraph (b) the man has to apply personally, bearing in mind the very grounds that are laid down for postponement. An application would have to be made on those grounds, and it would have to be made personally. I wonder whether my hon. friend would object if, instead of dealing with section 5 at the moment, we leave the point he has raised for the time being, and I shall endeavour to deal with it when we come to section 5.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Very good.

Mr. MacNICOL: Some time ago I asked the minister a question with regard to Japanese nationals. Under this bill are Japanese barred from voting in Ontario, Quebec, or any other province?

Mr. McLARTY: The answer would be yes.

Mrs. NIELSEN: Paragraph (a) of subsection 2 of section 4 provides that those disqualified from voting shall include:

(a) every person who at the date fixed as polling day at the plebiscite is detained or interned under the defence of Canada regulations.

I think every hon. member will realize that those who are detained or interned under the defence of Canada regulations fall roughly into two groups, those more or less pro-fascist and those more or less anti-fascist in their ideas. It is with particular reference to the anti-fascists that I should like to ask a question. These anti-fascists, who have already presented a petition to this house, have stated in no uncertain terms their desire to support the government's plebiscite, to vote in the affirmative on the question. These

particular anti-fascists are neither enemies nor aliens. They are Canadian citizens; and I should feel that it was a serious miscarriage of justice if these men were not allowed the privilege of voting in the affirmative on this plebiscite. I wonder whether the minister could give me any assurance that this particular group of men, interned under these regulations, would have the privilege of voting affirmatively on this plebiscite.

Mr. McLARTY: I am afraid I would be unable to give the assurance for which the hon. member asks. I am afraid I could not give any assurance as to who would vote in the affirmative on the ballot that will be submitted. However, I know the hon. member will realize—and I am not trying to take lightly her question—that, after all, if a person is interned, irrespective of the nature of his sympathies which caused him to be interned, it would scarcely be a regular or proper procedure to allow him to vote on a question of such serious import.

Mr. FAIR: Subsection 2 of section 4 reads:

(2) The persons disqualified from voting as ordinary voters at the plebiscite shall be those persons disqualified from voting under the provisions of paragraphs (d) to (k), both inclusive, and paragraph (m) of subsection two of section fourteen of the Dominion Elections Act 1938. . . .

I have particular reference to paragraph (k) of section 14 of the Dominion Elections Act, which reads as follows:

(k) in any province, every person who is an inmate of an institution which is maintained by any government or municipality for the housing and maintenance of the poor, if such person is by the law of that province disqualified from voting at an election of a member of the legislative assembly of that province, and did not serve in the military, naval or air forces of Canada in the war of 1914-1918.

I was born poor, as I believe we all were. When we die we shall all be in the same class again. But some of us to-day are in fairly comfortable circumstances, while others are fabulously rich. Others again are so poor that they have to be crowded together in institutions and supported by some government or municipality. I do not feel that we are dealing justly with these people. As I have pointed out on other occasions, if they had been given that to which they were entitled during their lifetime, they would not now have to be in institutions of this kind. We are sending men and materials overseas to fight for democracy, and I should like to see democracy practised at home so that those who come back will have something worth coming back to. They should not have the spectacle of seeing perhaps their fathers, mothers, brothers or sisters put away in these institutions and being deprived of their right to vote. In order to bring this matter before the committee—and I hope to get a favourable decision—I move, seconded by the hon. member for Camrose (Mr. Marshall):

That line 21 in subsection 2 of section 4 be amended to read:
"under the provisions of paragraph (d) to (j), both inclusive."

If this amendment is carried—and I earnestly hope it will be—it will have the effect of giving to the people of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and British Columbia the same rights as are extended to the citizens of the other five provinces.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What provinces permit persons in the institutions referred to in paragraph (k) to vote?

Mr. McLARTY: They are estopped from voting in the provinces mentioned by the hon. member.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The other five provinces allow them to vote.

Amendment (Mr. Fair) negatived: yeas, 12; nays, 57.

Mr. STIRLING: I think it was agreed that paragraph (i) of subsection 2 of section 14 of the Dominion Elections Act refers to the Japanese race so far as it is effective in Canada. If that is the case, to whom does paragraph (c) in this section refer?

Mr. McLARTY: Paragraph (i) of subsection 2 of section 14 of the elections act applies to Japanese in British Columbia. By virtue of the additional section in this bill it is extended to those throughout Canada whose origin is that of an enemy country.

Mr. STIRLING: Paragraph (i) will apply to all nine provinces.

Subsection 2 agreed to.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Persons who have voted not to be exempted from military service.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister was going to make a statement on this section.

Mr. McLARTY: There may be other hon. members who wish to speak on this section, but if not, I should like to deal somewhat carefully with the point raised by the leader of the opposition and to give an exact explanation in answer to his inquiry. It will be noted that this section does not exclude anyone from voting; but, on the other hand, if any person does vote, he is precluded from any subsequent postponement or exemption

on the grounds set out in sections 18 and 19 of the national war services regulations. It leaves it optional with any voter whether he shall or shall not vote.

I think I should put this on the record because information was asked for by the leader of the opposition. I have no objection whatever to doing it, but of course I do not want to delay the passage of my own bill. It is urged, on the one hand, that the section is too rigorous in that it precludes any subsequent claim for exemption to anyone who has voted and who may be liable for service under the national war services regulations. On the other hand, it is claimed that it is too generous. I think that is the suggestion by the leader of the opposition.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Not for the man himself, but for his kin.

Mr. McLARTY: I was going to follow that up. It allows to vote those of a particular religious faith or who are conscientious objectors but who, on other grounds, are not capable of performing military service.

I should like to deal with the first suggestion. I believe it can be well admitted that those who are conscientious objectors are so because of their unwillingness to take human life and that they are willing to perform all other services, except this one, which might be required of any citizen. But in dealing with this phase of the matter, if you refer to the specific question itself you will find that there is only one particular pledge which the government has entered into and from which it seeks relief, namely, the matter of military service. This military service does, unfortunately, involve the taking of human life.

This is not a general election. Other considerations would apply in a general election which do not apply here. This is a plebiscite on one definite and specific question, and that question relates to military service, which those of military age might require to answer, but in the answering of which they are not vitally affected. For example, if the answer given by such were yes, what does it mean? It means that those who themselves are able to perform military service, but who on account of religious beliefs do not feel free to do so, are allowed to determine whether or not the government shall be freed from its pledge given in regard to one specific matter. In other words, the answer yes means that while they themselves are not involved, they are quite willing that those who do not hold the same religious beliefs might be compelled to assume obligations which they themselves are not prepared to assume.

On the other hand, if the answer is no, what does that involve? It involves this: Those who are capable of bearing arms, but who on account of their religious beliefs believe that the taking of human life even in war time is unwarranted, simply say, "while that is our belief, at the same time we wish to restrain the government from breaking a pledge given to those who do not enjoy similar beliefs and whose convictions in the matter of military service are not the same as our own." Consequently, it would be unfair to allow the vote to those of military age who, while enjoying military capacity, are still free to claim exemption, no matter what the outcome of the vote may be. Therefore, the section has been framed in the manner in which it appears.

On the other hand it is urged that everyone whose religious belief, irrespective of whether he or she is capable of military service, bars them from military service, should be barred from voting as well. It has been pointed out to this committee that many of those who hold these beliefs are willing to do any other service, but they object to the taking of human life. That means this: Those incapable of bearing arms are willing to do everything that is physically within their power to do. They are in the same position as those other classes of the community who are incapable of bearing arms by reason of age or physical weakness.

To deprive them of voting would be contrary to the provisions of the Naturalization Act. That act may be more or less regarded as a contract between the Dominion of Canada and those who become citizens of this country. Let me read section 5 of that act:

> A person to whom a certificate of naturalization is granted by the minister shall, subject to the provisions of this act, be entitled to all political and other rights, powers and privileges, be subject to all obligations, duties and liabilities, to which a natural-born British subject is entitled or subject, and as from the date of his naturalization have to all intents and purposes the status of a natural-born British subject.

The basis for this provision is that those who vote shall be subject to all the obligations, duties and liabilities to which a natural-born British subject is entitled or subject. On the other hand, the obligations, duties and liabilities will be no greater on those enjoying such obligations, duties and liabilities than they are on a natural-born British subject. In other words, in placing this section in the bill, the government is not breaking faith but keeping faith. That is why the negative provision is put therein. It is not disfranchising those who will be subject to the obligations, duties and liabilities but it is saying that those who assume the right of franchise will be subject to the obligations, duties and liabilities.

Mr. POULIOT: I agree to a certain extent with the principle which the minister has just enunciated, but the same principle should apply to all those who are described as ordinarily resident in Canada. Although it is not so provided in specific terms, the mobilization act is not applied to those young men, refugees and others, who are British citizens but are not domiciled in Canada; in other words, they are here only for the duration of the war. I do not see why those people should have the right to vote if they are not themselves to be subject to conscription. It is the rule with all military boards not to put these British subjects into the Canadian army by virtue of the mobilization act. Therefore, how could they have the right to vote to send others overseas by virtue of any conscription law? That would be most unfair. I have already spoken on this subject on other occasions, and I now bring it to the attention of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State who, I hope, will reach the same decision with regard to these refugees or British citizens temporarily resident in Canada as they do with respect to Mennonites, Doukhobors and conscientious objectors. I hope that the section will be made to apply to them so that they will have the right to vote only if they are to be available to the army. I should like to have an answer from the minister.

Mr. McLARTY: I did not quite catch the remarks of the hon. member for Témiscouata. I am afraid that it would be extremely difficult for me to amplify what I have already said on this particular section. It is not that I wish in any way to evade an answer, but I find that it is a little difficult for me to give one.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: In his explanation of the rights of conscientious objectors, Doukhobors and Mennonites the minister made the statement that while they are not required to give military service they are required to give a like amount of service of a non-military character. I would point out that that is not my interpretation of the regulations, as I read the regulations, those who are conscientious objectors, Mennonites and Doukhobors enjoy a higher right of citizenship than do any other British subjects in Canada in that when they are called up under the mobilization act they are required to serve, building roads and the like, for a period of not more than four months and then they are through, although all others who are called up to serve in the military forces have to serve for the duration of the war. As a matter of fact, that very circumstance is causing a great deal of difficulty throughout western Canada in that conscientious objectors, by serving for a few months in a camp or in one of the national parks, have finished their service to the state for the duration of the war, whereas the man who is not a conscientious objector must serve as long as the war lasts.

Mr. POULIOT: I should just like to make this clear. The mobilization act, of course, applies to all British subjects in this country except those who are not ordinarily resident in Canada, which means that those who are domiciled here are subject to conscription and those who are here but not domiciled in Canada are not subject to conscription. That is the real distinction that exists, although the language of the statute itself is rather vague. My point cannot be evaded. It is just as clear as crystal or spring water. It is that when these young blokes of military age come here to get away from their own country or from any theatre of war and be secure in Canada, I do not see why they should have the right to vote to send others to fight overseas in their stead. That is my point.

Mr. MacNICOL: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. POULIOT: I would ask my hon. friend the member for Davenport to sit down and wait until I am through.

Mr. MacNICOL: I was going to ask, Mr. Chairman, if "blokes" is a proper appellation to apply to people coming here from England to train for service.

Mr. POULIOT: I am fond of cockneys but I do not like blokes. I have no objection to giving shelter to any man who needs it, but on the other hand I do not want our Canadian citizens to be controlled by those who are afraid to defend their own country, and who come here for shelter and are given the privilege of citizenship, when they are not at the same time willing to assume the obligations and duties of British subjects. That is my point. To allow them to vote would be unfair, and I know I can rely on my leader the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State to take time to weigh this consideration. You cannot have a two-way policy, a policy of good citizenship for the men who are willing to fight for England, and another policy for those who do not want to fight for their country and come here for shelter. It is time that this should come to a stop, and I rely on the fairness of the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State, and their colleagues to settle the matter in justice to the parties concerned.

Mr. MacNICOL: Mr. Chairman, may I have your ruling whether an hon. member is right in calling young men coming—

Mr. POULIOT: The word is found in the dictionary.

Mr. MacNICOL: I ask you, sir, if the hon. member is right—

Mr. POULIOT: It does not apply to any race in particular.

Mr. MacNICOL: —in calling young men from the old country who come out here to train by the name "bloke"?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman was not speaking of the chair or of any member of the house. I refer to May's Parliamentary Practice, twelfth edition, page 99, and citation 294:

> If a member should say nothing disrespectful to the house or the chair, or personally approbrious to other members, or in violation of other rules of the house he may state whatever he thinks fit in debate, however offensive it may be to the feelings, or injurious to the character, of individuals.

That is why, I am afraid, I cannot rule out of order the remarks addressed to somebody outside this house.

Mr. COLDWELL: I would ask the hon. member for Témiscouata if he can give us any particulars of the people to whom he refers. I have this in mind, that over the last two years, since the war broke out, or shortly afterwards, people have not been permitted to leave Great Britain without a special licence or special permit. I wondered whether he had any knowledge of any number of persons of this description to whom he referred, because I must say that if there are people who have come to this country to escape military or other duties in Great Britain, of course they should not be permitted to vote here if our own conscientious objectors are not permitted to vote—and they are not—and they should be treated on all fours with our own people. I should like to know whether the hon. member for Témiscouata has any definite knowledge of people of that description.

An hon. MEMBER: He has not.

Mr. POULIOT: I thank my hon. friend for his remarks—he spoke with fairness—and I will give him any information that he wants. If we were to go together to the eastern townships, and many other places, we could see many of these people. But I will speak to him later about it.

Mr. LEADER: I feel that I shall have to support the contention of the hon. member for Lake Centre and our old friend the hon. member for Témiscouata. There are in my constituency a number of Mennonites—I do not believe we have any Doukhobors—and I feel that if these people, who have come to Canada and now enjoy the rights of citizenship under the protection of our government, refuse to fight for their adopted country, they are not entitled to a vote on a matter of this importance. I believe they are amply protected under the clause—

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege; I did not make any such statement. I think the hon. gentleman must have misunderstood me. I was not dealing with the question of voting; I was dealing entirely with the question of conscientious objectors completing their service by four months' work instead of being required to do work throughout the period of the war. I did not touch upon the question of the propriety of their right to vote.

Mr. LEADER: I am sorry. I did not mean to misinterpret the remarks of the hon. member. But I feel I am right in offering the suggestion that these men are amply protected. They can vote if they want to, but they lose their right to appeal for exemption, and I think that is using them fairly.

Section agreed to.

Section 6 agreed to.

On section 7—Manner of voting by qualified voter whose name is not on the official list of voters.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I spoke on this section yesterday, and suggested that as the section stands it provides a wide-open door for potential wrongdoers. It provides that those whose names are not on the voters' lists have, on the day the plebiscite vote is taken, as a result of being vouched for by someone ordinarily resident within the polling division, the right to vote. The penalty section leaves the person committing an offence under this section quite an easy way of escape, in that it says:

> (3) Any voter who vouches for an applicant voter knowing that such applicant voter for any reason is disqualified. . . .

—is guilty of an offence. In other words, any wrongdoer who wants to assist in getting large numbers of individuals to vote on the plebiscite would simply be required to swear a declaration, and he would be guilty of no offence under subsection 3 unless the prosecution could affirmatively establish that he knew that such applicant voter was disqualified, although he would be liable to perjury. In the discussion this evening as to the necessity of the production of the national

registration certificate, the committee decided that such should not generally be necessary. I suggested yesterday, and I repeat, that in order to close the door against the possibility of any wrongdoing, or any general wrongdoing, being committed under this section, all who desire to vote and whose names are not on the voters' list should be required to produce their national registration certificates before the poll clerk or the returning officer. Many abuses which might otherwise arise under this section would thereby be avoided to a great extent. I trust the minister will see fit to consent to an amendment to this section, making it a prerequisite that those whose names are not on the voters' list shall be required to produce their national registration certificates before being granted the right to vote.

Mr. McLARTY: I thank the hon. member for Lake Centre for having called this matter to my attention earlier in the evening. I stated that I thought that when we came to section 7 the suggestion which had been made to this committee, namely, that those who had to be vouched for should produce registration certificates, would be a commendable proposal. I do believe, however, that we would be wise to limit the provision to urban centres, that is, where the population is over 3,500. I do not need to repeat the argument which was advanced by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar as to the rural areas. I suggest:

> That section 7, subsection (2), be amended by adding, after the word "oath" in subparagraph (b), the word "and", and by adding another clause as follows:
>
> (c) in urban polling divisions only upon producing for inspection the registration certificate issued to such person under the National Registration Regulations, 1940.

I would ask the Minister of Agriculture if he would be good enough to move that.

Mr. GARDINER: I so move.

Mr. CHURCH: This is a most dangerous innovation to have in any plebiscite or elections act. It was tried in New York state a few years ago and led to all kinds of impersonation and intimidation, especially among voters who had been only a short time in the country, some of whom could neither read nor write. The section is one that should never be in the act. In the first place, there is nothing to prevent a voter from voting in every riding in Toronto, going from one riding to another, as long as he can find a man who knows him and vouches for him, taking an affidavit or making a declaration. We know what that means. The returning officer has no jurisdiction. I have never seen such a thing in any elections act. The registration card is required in municipal elections; otherwise you cannot vote. As I say, I have never seen such a provision in any elections act and I have read a great many statutes.

Mr. McLARTY: I wonder whether the hon. member just heard the amendment that was moved. If they are vouched for in urban areas, they will have to produce registration cards.

Mr. CHURCH: Even admitting what the minister says, the principle is all wrong, of having such a clause in an elections act. It will lead to all sorts of confusion and it is an innovation that should not be allowed in any British legislature. Any man who has not been living in a polling subdivision for more time than this is not entitled to vote. Taking into account those who are on relief and those who are away, besides those who have moved out of the subdivision, I suggest that this provision should not be allowed. It is not allowed in connection with voting on property rights. Why should it be inserted in such a measure as this? It is beyond my understanding. I suggest that it is a grave mistake for this legislature to adopt such a principle.

Mr. MacNICOL: Before section 7 passes, I should like the minister to tell the committee why the present elections act has been departed from in this particular as applied to the cities. I understand that in the rural areas if an elector is off the voters' list he can be vouched for by someone who is on the list, which I presume would conform to paragraph (a) of section 2. But I do not know of any elections act which allows a man not on the voters' list to be given a ballot on taking the appropriate oath himself. I do not know what the appropriate oath is. There is some merit in section 7, because it does provide for folks who are left off the list. In the recent York South by-election there were thousands who were left off the list, whole streets, whole apartment houses, and the residents there were not able to vote. Perhaps it should have been their duty to see that they were on the list. Had they done so, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation candidate might have been defeated. However, one cannot tell how people would have voted. The hon. member interrupts me, but he does not know. He got 10,000 to 12,000 Liberal votes and that is why he is here, but he will not get them in a general election. I may say, Mr. Chairman, I am a little fed up with having it said that York South voted C.C.F. It did not; it voted Liberal plus C.C.F. However, coming back to the question, I would ask the minister why the regular urban qualifications of voters have been abandoned in this section.

Mr. McLARTY: I can give the reasons very briefly and they are extremely practical ones. The first one is to save time, and the second is to save expense. There is nothing new in this procedure. It was adopted in rural sections and has been in existence for some time, being applied to municipalities up to 10,000 population. Prior to 1923 it applied in such cities as Edmonton and Calgary—rather substantial ones—and worked satisfactorily. When the matter was being considered in committee the chief electoral officer estimated that it would save at least a week in the taking of the plebiscite if this system were followed. He now advises me it would save a longer time than that. In addition, it will eliminate the necessity of a court of revision, the cost of which would be $200,000 extra; and if the list were printed after the court of revision was held, there would be an additional cost of $350,000. The penalties provided by the section are severe—at least as severe as the penalties provided in the elections act—and I suggest that with the amendment which has now been moved, the requirment of vouching and the necessary declaration, and the production of the registration card, the opportunities for fraudulent voting are pretty well reduced to a minimum. However, the main reasons, in answer to the hon. member for Davenport, are the two that I have mentioned—time and expense.

Mr. CHURCH: Is a man allowed to vote only once? In the declaration is he required to state that he has not voted before? In the old electoral law a man could vote where he had property. In my first vote I voted in York South because I had a vacant lot and I voted in East Toronto as a resident. Is it a case of one man, only one vote?

Mr. McLARTY: The answer is yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Notice of result of plebiscite published in *Canada Gazette.*

Mrs. CASSELMAN: Is any provision being made for members of this house to vote? If the house is in session, many members will be away from their polling divisions.

Mr. McLARTY: The situation will pretty well take care of itself. If they reside in Ottawa for twenty-eight days before the plebiscite, they will be entitled to vote in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. GRAYDON: The sections have been carried pretty rapidly, and I should like to ask a question on clause 6. I have no doubt it must be covered by the language of the clause, but it is not clear to me. There are a number of nurses in England at the moment attached to some part of the corps there, and I am wondering whether this language would cover those nursing sisters over there.

Mr. McLARTY: Clause 6 to which the hon. member refers was very carefully drawn in consultation with the judge advocate general in the Department of National Defence. It was drawn broadly enough so that all branches of the service would be covered, and I am advised that the classes to which he refers would be covered by this section.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Notice of result of plebiscite published in *Canada Gazette.*

Mr. CHURCH: Is that to be just an obituary notice before its final burial in the archives? I think so.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—Regulations by governor in council.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): This I think is the section under which the regulations may be discussed. I have gone through the regulations for ordinary voters but confess that I have not been able to go over the service regulations. I have one suggestion to press, about the numbered ballots. I think the minister agreed to look after that. I do not think it can be done by way of amendment. Will he give an undertaking that the regulations will be changed in some manner, and put that on the record?

Mr. McLARTY: I shall be glad to do so. I gave an undertaking last night to the hon. leader of the opposition. If he would like to have it placed on the record, I will see that it is placed on *Hansard.*

Mr. ROSS (Souris): In connection with the hours of voting, regulation 18, for ordinary voters, clause 5, provides that the voting hours shall be from eight to six, but I think it was stated yesterday that they would be extended to seven o'clock in the evening. There was some discussion from the industrial point of view and that of the farmers of rural Canada that the hours should be extended until eight in the evening. Many of these industrial workers and farmers are labouring under a handicap in producing food and materials for the war effort, all of which are very necessary. We should do all we can to assist them, and extending the time until eight o'clock in the evening would help them in many respects to cast their votes. Has the minister given thought to that?

Mr. McLARTY: Yes, it was given consideration. I might mention that in the original bill the voting hours had been fixed at eight to six, and the special committee after consideration decided it would be wise to extend the time until seven o'clock at night. That makes a rather long day, and the pay for poll clerks is not as large as at a general election. The thought was that unless we are prepared for a substantial increase in expense, the hours should not be extended further.

Mr. NOSEWORTHY: I call attention to the fact that in a great many of the war industries men work until six o'clock at night. These industries are so far from their homes and polling subdivisions that it would be impossible for thousands of them to reach the polling subdivision in one hour. I know that the law allows them two hours in which to vote, but that provision is seldom invoked, and I doubt if it would be in this case. If you close the polls at seven o'clock, you will automatically disfranchise a great many of those working in war industries.

Mr. McLARTY: In view of the observations made and the fact that the government is anxious to secure the largest possible vote, I am agreeable to having the regulations amended to keep the polls open from eight in the morning until eight at night.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): In the draft regulations for service voters, No. 23 provides:

(1) The vote of every Canadian service voter shall be cast before any commissioned officer. . . .

What about a soldier on leave? He is an ordinary voter, but some deputy returning officers might say he cannot vote except before his commissioned officer.

Mr. McLARTY: My advice is that the man on leave can vote as an ordinary voter at home.

Mr. CHURCH: That is a most dangerous principle.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Should not that be changed, because the minister knows, as we all do, that some deputy returning officers might take exception to that?

Mr. McLARTY: I assure the hon. member that consideration will be given to his suggestion. After all, the regulations are not being passed to-night.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): On page 4 of the same regulations provision is made that there shall be six scrutineers to count the votes; the Prime Minister to appoint two, the leader of the opposition two, and the other groups two between them. It also says that two have to be for the negative and two for the affirmative. The leader of the opposition says he is for it. What about the Prime Minister?

Mr. McLARTY: I think he has made the same declaration.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): What kind of box are you in?

Mr. McLARTY: As far as possible the appointment of scrutineers will be the same as for the taking of the overseas vote at the last election. There may be some difficulty, but I do not think the leader of the opposition will be embarrassed about finding some man overseas who may not agree with him but still could act as a proper scrutineer. I do not think there will be any practical difficulty.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The matter of scrutineers at civilian polls is also important. As I recall the regulations, those who are supporting the affirmative are entitled to have two representatives present, and those supporting the negative are entitled to have two. Does the minister think that is going to be very effective? I know the question of scrutineers at the civilian polls is rather difficult. I do not think it is my duty to suggest scrutineers. I should like the minister to give consideration to this. In my province at all events the men appointed deputy returning officers are usually of a very good type. If a man is considered to be below par, shall I say, people know about it; representations are quietly made to the returning officer, and he looks into it and in many cases will agree that that man should not be a deputy returning officer. I think the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Hill), at whom I am looking, will agree with that. And we have practically no election frauds.

Mr. GRAYDON: Of course that is New Brunswick.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am speaking only of my personal experience. They do not countenance personation. I am sure that the two deputy returning officers at the poll where I am accustomed to work on election day would not allow anything like that.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): That applies to all Canada.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Well, I would hope so; I cannot say except from my own personal information. The suggestion I have made is that in the absence of anyone appearing as scrutineer for or against, perhaps the deputy returning officer could be instructed to appoint two competent, qualified voters, to

act as scrutineers. That is just a suggestion I throw out, but it is something to which I have given some thought. In an ordinary party election, of course, we all have our own men on whom we rely to see that the law is carried out. Here it is not going to be the duty of any particular person to see that scrutineers are appointed, and I am afraid that in many rural polls no one will be appointed. Certainly they are not going to be paid under this schedule, and they will not spend the whole day there of their own accord. Would the minister give consideration to the appointment of qualified voters at a given poll by the deputy returning officer, in the event that no one is appointed to represent the affirmatives or the negatives? I point out to him, of course, that this may involve a demand for payment. I do not like the idea of paying scrutineers. It ought not to be done; it is a duty that men owe their party, but I am afraid in some cases it is not so considered. However, I just throw that out as a suggestion.

Mr. McLARTY: I quite agree with the leader of the opposition that the method suggested is by no means ideal, and subject to the qualification he offers in regard to the matter of payment I think his suggestion is one to which we can give very serious consideration when the regulations are being drawn up.

Mr. CHURCH: Section 9 gives the governor in council power to make rules and regulations under this statute which will have the force and effect of law. That has been condemned all along the line in Lord Hewart's work, "The New Despotism". Here we have a statute fixing dates, establishing methods, giving the text of the question, stating those who are excepted, providing for the votes of soldiers and so on, and now we are going to hem in this statute with a provision which will permit the governor in council to pass regulations which will have the force of law, under which fines, penalties or imprisonment may be imposed, outside the whole scope of the measure. Do you see where we are heading, Mr. Chairman? We have about four hundred different controllers and boards operating to-day under the War Measures Act. Each of these boards can fine anyone up to $5,000 or impose a year's imprisonment for the breach of a regulation passed by order in council. That is what we have in Canada to-day, government by the bureaucrats. I say we must beware of them, because this is a principle which never should be adopted by any British legislature. Why, the governor in council can change the whole intent of the statute. It can pass rules and regulations, having the force of law, varying everything contained in the first eight sections of this bill, and I wish to protest against it. Under this bureaucratic government these various controllers and boards can impose fines and imprisonment without this high court of parliament knowing anything about it. I do not see the need for this provision. Those who may vote are set out clearly; the time of the vote, the appointment of officers and all that sort of thing are already settled, under the elections act. I think it is all wrong.

Mr. McGREGOR: Will the overseas vote be credited to provinces or ridings, or what has the government in mind in that connection?

Mr. McLARTY: It will be dealt with as suggested the other day, as one vote.

Mr. MacINNIS: Are all the regulations to be passed under this bill included in these two volumes I have in my hand?

Mr. McLARTY: I should think they would be complete. Certainly they are as complete as they can be, bearing in mind the suggestions which have been made to-night, which might lead to some amendment of them.

Mr. MacINNIS: I think that is important, because it has been a very well-known policy of the Liberal party that parliament should decide in all these matters. Here we have a bill composed of ten sections, which are not very long. Then, after the bill is passed by the house, we have a volume of regulations covering one hundred pages, together with a second volume of some thirty pages, and section 9 of this bill states that "the governor in council may, for the purpose of this act, make such regulations as are expedient for the effectual taking of the plebiscite," and so on. Then subsection 3 of section 9 provides:

> Any regulations made under this act shall have the same force and effect as if enacted in this act.

Usually there is a phrase included in sections of this kind providing that such regulations as are made must not be inconsistent with the act itself, but there is no such limiting clause here. The minister has not been listening to me; he has been in a very earnest conversation with the two hon. gentlemen sitting in front of him. That may be quite interesting, but for the moment I think the sections of this bill are more important. I have been pointing out that there is no limit on the regulations which

may be passed by the governor in council under this bill. They may pass regulations that are inconsistent with it.

Mr. McLARTY: If my hon. friend will refer to subsection 2, he will see a limitation there.

Mr. MacINNIS: Subsection 2 reads:

Such regulations shall, as near as may be—

That is pretty wide, isn't it?

—conform to the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act, 1938, with such additions and modifications as may be deemed necessary, and shall include special provisions for the taking of the votes of Canadian service voters.

If the regulations were included in these two volumes, and if they had come before the committee, then there would be no great objection to them, but here we are passing a short bill in which we give the governor in council power to extend it to whatever extent they may deem fit. As I have pointed out already, the usual phrase, "regulations not inconsistent with this act" is not included in the section at all. I claim that this power is too wide to give any government, particularly a government that is continually claiming that parliament is going to decide. Parliament certainly is not deciding here. Parliament is getting a mere outline of the bill, and the government takes the power to extend it as far and as wide as it may deem fit.

Mr. McLARTY: May I say just a word in reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver East, and especially his specific reference to inserting the words "not inconsistent with this act." I suggest that that would have very little, if any, meaning if put in the bill. What he probably has in mind as to the regulations would not be inconsistent with the elections act in which those regulations occur. The intention to cover that is clearly stated in subsection 2 of section 9, which states:

Such regulations shall, as near as may be—

Mr. MacINNIS: How near is "as near as may be"?

Mr. McLARTY: That is about as approximate as you can come, keeping in mind that one is an election and the other is a plebiscite. In other words, in this case there are not candidates running, and it is necessary that there be some variation by reason of the changed circumstances. This is the clause that was inserted in the 1898 act. When my hon. friend deals with penalties, I suggest that there is not a single penalty under the regulations which has not been passed upon by the parliament of Canada. In other words, the objection which has been raised that penalties are included without parliamentary sanction cannot apply in this case. I believe that there is no intention of amending those regulations which have already been placed before the special committee of this house except to the extent that may be necessary in order to make the same workable arrangement, or within the limitations of the undertakings given to this committee to-night.

Mr. GLADSTONE: To revert for a moment to the hours of voting, in federal, provincial and municipal elections the vote polled between eight and nine c'clock in the morning is practically negligible; in fact there is only a small vote cast during the entire forenoon. From eight in the morning until eight in the evening makes a long day. The remuneration for deputy returning officers and poll clerks is to be less for this plebiscite, and since many people are employed on war work who were available on previous occasions, there may be difficulty in securing help. It will be especially hard on women who are occupying these positions to have to work a twelve-hour day. I would suggest that it would be better to have the opening hour at nine o'clock. There is no necessity with this plebiscite of having a compilation of the returns the same evening as is the case with other elections. I think an eleven-hour day would be more advantageous.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I should like to ask just why the government has decided that the soldier vote shall be counted en bloc. In the last dominion election the soldier vote was counted according to constituency. We over here think it is desirable to know how the soldiers vote by constituencies. I should like to know how my soldier constituents vote. If the soldier vote is counted en bloc, it will not be possible to know how the sentiment of the soldiers is spread. No good reason has been given why this is being done. In fact I do not think any good reason can be given. I ask the minister to give some further consideration to this matter. I shall want to say something on subsection 3 when he has given me an explanation.

Mr. McLARTY: The only reason that was suggested was to have a practicable working out of the plan for taking the vote of the soldiers. In an ordinary election where candidates are running, the votes would necessarily have to be referable to a particular constituency, but in this plebiscite it is simply a matter of answering yes

or no. As I suggested the other day, the procedure contemplated is to segregate them in lots of 500, take out the inner envelope and put it in the ballot box. I wonder whether the effort of obtaining the information desired by the hon. gentleman is worth the trouble it entails. There was no subtle reason for not doing it the other way; it was just a matter of convenience.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I quite appreciate the argument the minister has made with regard to constituencies, but that would not hold good with regard to provinces. Why could we not have the vote summarized by provinces? That would not be quite as difficult, and it should be possible to do it. I ask the minister to give consideration to this when he is considering the regulations.

Mr. McLARTY: I shall be glad to. I do not know just exactly what it would involve, but it certainly would be more simple to do it by provinces than by constituencies.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That would be a compromise anyway.

Mr. McLARTY: I assure my hon. friend that consideration will be given to it.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That is about all I can ask. Then on the question of regulations by order in council, I pointed out long ago that this power of making legislative regulations is wrong. The power to make regulations for instructional and interpretative reasons is quite proper, and that is the principle in the elections act. Subsection 2 reads:

> Such regulations shall, as near as may be, conform to the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act, 1938, with such additions and modifications as may be deemed necessary, and shall include special provisions for the taking of the votes of Canadian service voters.

Necessarily there will be some substantive enactments under these regulations as they are now. They may be changed at any time. Is there any finality to these regulations? When they are once proclaimed, they may be changed. I do not suggest that they would be changed for any ulterior purposes; it might be necessary to change them to make them completely operative. That is just the danger of having this sort of thing in regulations, and I want to register once more my protest against doing it in this way. Under the elections act the regulations are largely directional or instructive. The great bulk of the law surrounding the taking of this plebiscite, for both the civilian and the soldier vote, is to be found in the regulations. The statute that we are considering to-day is merely an enabling statute giving the power. That is all it is, with certain limitations as to qualification, disqualification, the character of the ballot and that sort of thing. The whole procedure is provided for in the regulations which do not come before parliament. They are enacting regulations, and therefore they are objectionable. I do not intend to hold up the bill, but I think this is the third time that I have pointed out that this is an objectionable principle in legislation. For a party that used to howl against government by order in council, as hon. gentlemen opposite did from 1930 to 1935, it is a complete reversal of form. It is not correct, but I do not have any hopes that my protest will be of any avail.

Mr. GRAYDON: May I ask the minister for a clarification of one point in connection with the appointment of enumerators, deputy returning officers and poll clerks? Do I understand that the regulations here with respect to these appointments follow in every respect the appointments made in 1940 under the Dominion Elections Act? If so, I would ask this further question. I have not the particular section under my hand, but I recall that there was a special section in the act whereby the chief electoral officer was empowered, in cases where there was a floating population and for other special reasons, to declare a certain municipality or division to be an urban section in what otherwise was a rural constituency. During the 1940 election a number of these urban municipalities were created by virtue of the latitude thus allowed to the chief electoral officer. I would ask the minister if in taking the vote on the plebiscite the same procedure will be followed as in the 1940 election with respect to creating these urban municipalities in rural divisions, or will someone have to make application to the chief plebiscite officer for the purpose of having a particular division made an urban one instead of a rural one as in 1940?

Mr. McLARTY: I understand that the procedure included in the regulations is the same as for the election of 1940.

Mr. GRAYDON: Does that mean that we shall have to go through the same procedure again in order to have a particular part of a rural constituency declared urban after it has already been so declared in the election of 1940, upon evidence submitted?

Mr. McLARTY: I understand that the procedure will not have to be repeated, but that if the divison was urban in 1940, it will be urban for the purpose of taking this plebiscite.

Mr. MacNICOL: Some days ago the newspapers had the statement that the northwest

territories, particularly the settlement of Yellowknife, would vote on the plebiscite, but I do not notice it in the bill.

Mr. McLARTY: That is provided in section 2, paragraph (d).

Mr. SHAW: I do not want to prolong the debate unnecessarily, but I do feel that there is one other matter which has thus far not been discussed and which should be given consideration. I am not sure that what I am about to say deals particularly with section 9, but it seems to be a case of either section 9 or never. I have in mind the question of an educational campaign and regulations that may be brought down regarding, say, a government-sponsored campaign. A few weeks ago the press dispatches indicated that the government was at that time contemplating purchasing radio time from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as was done in the last general election, and that certain time periods would be allocated to the various groups in this house for the purpose of expressing their views on the plebiscite to the people of Canada. I have not heard the matter discussed since then, but if the government are contemplating such a step, there are a number of things which should be borne in mind.

First, if moneys are to be taken out of public funds for the purpose of sponsoring any type of educational campaign the radio time should not be allotted only to government leaders, but all other groups in this house should be allotted a certain portion of time—I might even go so far as to say an equal amount of time. I would ask the Secretary of State if it is the government's intention to purchase time on the Canadian broadcasting network for the purpose of carrying on an educational campaign and, if so, what method is to be followed in allocating time to the various groups in this house?

Mr. McLARTY: I think the only reply I can give to the hon. member is that so far no consideration has been given to the point which he raises or the campaign he suggests, but I have no doubt that when consideration is given, if it is given, his observations will be borne in mind.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Section 9 says that the regulations for the taking of the plebiscite shall conform as nearly as possible to the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act. Will the procedure under the Dominion Elections Act be used in setting up the machinery for taking the vote? I have in mind the selection of returning officers for the various constituencies. Will the 1940 returning officers be used, or has the government in mind selecting a fresh list? Has the government considered asking the Canadian Legion and other national organizations to make suggestions? I would also ask the minister how he proposes to select the deputy returning officers for the various polls. In the 1940 election a lot of voluntary service was given by service clubs and similar organizations, and I am quite sure it would be possible to get a lot of voluntary service on this occasion. Does the government propose to accept voluntary service, or does it propose to set up a lot of election machinery pretty well on a patronage basis? The public, I am sure, will be resentful if, when a war is on, we propose to spend one and a half million dollars, a large part of which is to be spent on a patronage basis. If the Canadian Legion, service clubs and other organizations interested in public welfare were approached, I believe they would be glad to make suggestions, and their membership might even be willing to give voluntary service in taking the plebiscite vote. How will the election machinery be set up?

Mr. McLARTY: The intention is to have the same returning officers as acted in the election of 1940. There necessarily are some changes under section 8 of the elections act. The returning officers have the appointment of the deputy returning officers, and the deputy returning officers appoint the poll clerks. I believe the suggestion made by the hon. member for Weyburn is one that has been drawn to the attention of this committee, namely, the advantage that will accrue if we take the opportunity of employing as much voluntary help as is available, and I understand that steps are being considered whereby advantage will be taken of that.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That just means that all the returning officers are political appointments. They are now. Everyone in New Brunswick is a political supporter of the government, and they will all be paid out of public funds. They will make political appointments. They are there in most cases entirely because of their politics. They are not there because of any special qualifications. The returning officers will appoint the deputy returning officers, who will also be political appointees, and the poll clerks will also be political appointees.

There was an effort made prior to the last federal election to have the nominations of returning officers divided up in a measure. In some constituencies there was, I believe, a break. My colleague tells me that there was. In mine, in the rural districts, the returning officer absolutely refused to appoint

anybody but a man of his own selection. In a city or an urban district, I believe there was a provision in the law whereby there was a fifty-fifty break or something like that. Of course, this is a political patronage system, and the government must get away from that, in this connection, just as quickly and as far as they can, if they want to obtain wholehearted support in favour of this plebiscite. I hear some hon. members laugh. I mean every word I say about that. The more partisan a tinge you give to this, the less likely it is to receive the cooperation of the public.

An hon. MEMBER: That is right.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): I believe there will be a good deal of disappointment at the statement we have just had from the minister. For all that he has tried to make it sound as pleasant as possible, the fact remains that, as the leader of the opposition has said, what we are going to have is a political set-up in the taking of this plebiscite, and it will not be received in a very kindly fashion. I believe that one of the most successful things which was ever done in this country was handled on a cooperative and largely voluntary basis, when the registration was taken in June or July, 1940, at a cost of less than $900,000, over a period of three days. It was done at so low a figure because hundreds of people, irrespective of politics, race or creed, gave their services, thinking they were performing a national duty. That sort of thing should be capitalized upon again. But apparently it is not to be. Some members of the public resent the plebiscite now; they will resent it a great deal more if they have reason to believe that public funds are being used very largely to support patronage. That is what it is going to mean. I have no objection to the same returning officers being used as were employed in 1940, if some attempt is made to pick the deputy returning officers on a non-party basis. Why not ask them to set up non-partisan committees representing different viewpoints in the community, and so get a cooperative endeavour in the district? But if, as the Prime Minister has been asking them to do, all groups in this house go out and try to rally the people of Canada to give a preponderantly affirmative vote, and at the same time the machinery is set up on a purely patronage partisan basis, the two things will gibe very poorly, and a very bad impression will be created throughout the country. To talk of asking a few people here and there to do the work on a voluntary basis is not enough. You must either set it up on a non-partisan basis, and then form representative non-partisan committees in the different districts, or leave it the way the minister has outlined it—which would be a purely pork-barrel affair, and would disappoint the public generally.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In the same connection may I say just one word before the Prime Minister speaks. There is the position of enumerator, which is much more important than the others, because that is worth the most money. Are those positions to be filled on a political partisan basis? I suggest to the Prime Minister that he give some consideration to this question if he wants the plebiscite helped along.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I was just rising to say that there is nothing that I should deplore more than that anything connected with the taking of the plebiscite could be made an instrument of political patronage. I agree with those who say that it would completely defeat the purpose of obtaining the kind of cooperation which is most desirable. I see no necessity for it, and personally, if it were done in that way, I should abhor the whole business. I did not hear what the Secretary of State said, but I am quite sure that he had not in mind anything of the kind. His references were, I understand, to the appointment of the returning officers, and there has to be consideration given to the selection of certain officers who are already known.

But when it comes to choosing persons for such positions as that of enumerator, of which the leader of the opposition has just spoken, I can see no reason in the world why some arrangement should not be made between the different parties in the house which would satisfy everyone that we desire to have a perfectly impartial administration of the machinery of the plebiscite. Personally I think the citizens of Canada ought to welcome the opportunity of giving their services very largely, if not completely, voluntarily in connection with the taking of the plebiscite. I suggested the other evening that those who are appointed to any position might be told that while there is, perhaps, a fee attached to their services, the government would welcome receiving it back from them as an expression of patriotism in connection with that part of our war effort. I do not think that is too much to ask of the kind of persons who would be best qualified to fill the different offices under this measure. There should be in connection with it as much in the way of voluntary effort as can be obtained with a sense of security, and as much as possible in

the way of cooperation of all parties in respect to it. The details of working that out might require a conference between the leaders of the different groups. Certainly, whenever I have heard the matter discussed and in discussing the matter with my colleagues on a prior occasion, that is the view we all had. Reference was made to some recent election in which the enumerators were chosen by the different parties—some from one party, some from the other.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That was, I believe, in urban districts, and only in urban districts.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Only in urban districts.

Mr. STIRLING: And, in rural districts, in the old-fashioned way, as in these regulations.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, I think we must try to introduce a new fashion if we can, as far as this proposed plebiscite is concerned. At any rate I have no hesitancy whatever in expressing emphatically my opinion on this matter. I should deplore seeing it made in any sense of the word a political patronage affair. I shall do all on my part to impress upon those who have to do with it that it be made as largely as possible a matter for voluntary effort, so administered as to ensure cooperation between all parties on the understanding that it is intended to be as fair and square as may be possible.

Mr. ROWE: I am glad to be able to agree with the Prime Minister when he is taking that attitude. Would he consider urging the returning officer to use for deputy returning officers, wherever possible, returned soldiers of the last great war?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think the suggestion is a very good one. I should not like to commit the minister who is in charge of the bill, or any of my colleagues, without a conference on the matter, but the kind of suggestion which the hon. member has just made appeals very strongly to me personally and will, I believe, appeal equally strongly to others.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I suggest to the Prime Minister that this be carried out as far as possible on a non-partisan basis? I do not think we can call it wholly non-partisan, but let us endeavour to get all the parties to agree as far as possible to the appointment of the officers. At the present time most, if not all of the returning officers, are Liberal appointees and, I believe, Liberals. If that is the case, they will remain so, but let the other political parties appoint either the deputy returning officer, or the poll clerk, alternately, as the case may be. I think then a large measure of cooperation could be obtained, it being recognized that the government would appoint the returning officers. The other officers might be appointed alternatively by the political parties interested or represented in constituencies. In my opinion, as far as possible this should govern not only in this particular matter but in other matters during the war. There is a great deal of resentment, in constituencies represented by members who are not on the government side of the house, at the petty political patronage shown here and there, and it does interfere with the war effort. I believe the Prime Minister sincerely wishes to avoid that. He does not want to have that obtain during the war. He said so early in the war and I take his word. But in my own province of Saskatchewan there is a great deal of criticism of the political appointments that have been made of inspectors and others, and if we tried to carry this out on an all-party basis we would do much to unite our people and obtain a good vote, and probably a vote that would be more likely to be the vote which the Prime Minister wants in this plebiscite—an affirmative vote. I am certainly strongly in favour of trying to eliminate that kind of politics from our effort during these war years.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am reassured by the Prime Minister's statement and I thank him for going as far as he has. The returning officer is the key man all the way through, and if he is not directed to conform, in many instances he will not do so. I remember trying in the last election to get a returning officer to eliminate a certain deputy returning officer who, in my opinion, was not qualified or fit. My recollection is that I even went so far as to telegraph to the chief electoral officer. The chief electoral officer did what he could, but he had no authority. I suggest to the Prime Minister that he go the whole way and review the returning officers, because, after all, they are the key to the whole situation, and if they are partisan it is difficult to eliminate partisanship down through the ranks.

Mr. MacNICOL: At the time the registration was taken, the minister in charge, who, I believe, was at the time the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) was, I may say, quite fair. As far as my riding was concerned—and I believe this extended pretty well to other cities and towns, though I cannot speak for

the rural districts—I found his administration in the taking of the registration eminently fair. In Davenport the appointments were divided between Liberals and Conservatives, because in the previous election there had been only two parties running in that riding. In some other ridings where there were three parties running in the previous election, the appointments were divided up after that manner. I am glad to hear hon. members endorsing the recommendation I made at the time the elections act was enacted. I strongly advocated then—and I was very much disappointed that my recommendation was not carried out—that the government of the day name the returning officer in the ridings, and that the opposition, or the other parties as the case might be, name the clerk. I suggested that the government of the day name the returning officer and the deputy returning officers in the polls, and the opposition or the candidate of the party which was next highest in the previous election name the clerks, so as to eliminate politics. I am glad to hear hon. members recommending the same thing, and I hope that if there is an amendment to the elections act, that suggestion will be followed.

Mr. CLEAVER: I wish to add my support to the suggestion which has been made that the vote should be taken on a strictly non-partisan basis, and I would go further and suggest that we should not leave the matter in the air merely as a pious hope. I think definite instructions should issue from the cabinet minister in charge to the election officer explicitly informing him that all of the officers, deputy returning officers and clerks, are to be appointed on a strictly non-partisan basis; that is to say, that each of the major political parties in all the ridings should definitely make one-half of the appointments of deputy returning officers and one-half of the appointments of clerks. I would further urge that this entire work should be done on a strictly voluntary basis as a war service. The national registration in my riding was done on a straight fifty-fifty basis. The Conservative party appointed half of the officials and the Liberal party half, and all did the work without cost to the government, even for the hiring of halls. I would urge that that practice be followed on this occasion, and that the entire cost of the plebiscite, the entire work in connection with it, be on a voluntary basis, with the exception, of course, of the printing.

Mr. CASSELMAN: There is one difficulty that presents itself to me. I have not had an opportunity to look at the regulations; but according to the instructions under the Dominion Elections Act, the chief returning officer appoints the deputy returning officer, and the chief returning officer has nothing whatever to do with the appointment of the clerk. The deputy returning officer has the right to appoint the clerk. I say this because I had occasion to look it up at the time of the last election. I did have an arrangement with the chief returning officer for the district, but the arrangement fell down because at the last minute it was pointed out to me that under the law he had nothing to do with the appointment of the clerk—that was the duty of the deputy returning officer. These regulations, based on the instructions under the elections act, will place that in the same position as it is in the elections act, and unless the regulation is changed I do not see how there will be a division of appointment as far as clerks are concerned.

Mr. WHITE: May I say a word with regard to what the Prime Minister has said about having appointments on a non-partisan basis. Unless the instructions are followed out, it may work out in the same way as it did at the time of the taking of the census, because at that time the Minister of Trade and Commerce issued instructions to the census commissioner in each riding that the appointments were to be on a non-partisan basis, divided between the major political parties. He also pointed out that returned soldiers were to have the preference, and so on. The census commissioner in my riding refused to answer a letter or to give me any information. I submitted to him a list covering all the polling divisions. He would not appoint a single man I suggested, and in the village in which I reside he appointed a man who had obtained exemption from military service in 1914 as a conscientious objector. I communicated with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who replied that he was much disturbed at my letter and would look into the matter at once. I received no further communication from him, and that man who was a conscientious objector in 1918 proceeded to take the census in my village. If instructions are given, unless they are followed up and it is seen to that they are carried out, the whole thing will be a farce, just as it was at the time of the taking of the census. I suggest to the committee that returned soldiers and returned soldiers only, where available, be appointed as enumerators, deputy returning officers and poll clerks.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I was pleased to hear the Prime Minister express himself as he did. But I had exactly the same experience in my riding as a previous speaker during the taking of the census; the lists we submitted were entirely ignored. I go back to the time of the national registration. The then Minister

of National War Services was very fair in his suggestions, but in the province from which I come there were only two hon. members who carried out those suggestions. In the other fourteen ridings the appointments of both registrars and deputy registrars were made on a partisan basis. Therefore the minister will have to take this matter in hand and issue definite instructions, if it is to be done on a non-partisan basis. I believe the Canadian Legion have undertaken to do all they can to see that a large vote is got out, and an affirmative vote; I think it behooves the department in charge to do all they can to employ these men, who probably need a little assistance.

Mr. ROEBUCK: On this matter of partisanship, I am reminded of the old saying that:

The devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
The devil was well, the devil a monk was he.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Are you not feeling very well?

Mr. ROEBUCK: I am feeling fine. I have had experience with my hon. friends across the way on a good many occasions and never in my experience have I known a Conservative government, when they were in power, to do anything except on the most strictly partisan basis.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): In my constituency, at my request, when we were in power, the sheriff was appointed returning officer. He was an old-time Liberal, and a very fine man.

Mr. ROEBUCK: My hon. friend is an outstanding exception. In connection with the national registration, as far as the city of Toronto was concerned there was a gentleman's agreement that we would divide up the so-called patronage in that way. I did it to the very last letter, to the *n*th degree, to the crossing of the t's and the dotting of the i's. I appointed the president, I think, or the secretary of the Conservative association as assistant to the registrar, and that gentleman has been kind enough to say that the matter was carried out in a splendid non-partisan way. But unfortunately those conditions did not prevail in some of the constituencies over which hon. gentlemen opposite presided; we had strict partisanship to the full extent of their ability to apply it against us. It is very nice for hon. gentlemen opposite to take these lofty attitudes when they are not in power. I hope if they ever do come to power—

Mr. ROWE: We won't have a plebiscite.

Mr. ROEBUCK: —they will remember their exalted statements of the present time. It may be a long time, so perhaps we need not consider it.

There is another thing I want to say. It is very fine to talk about patriotism and giving time to the public interest and that sort of thing. The public is doing that, and I hope a considerable amount of it will be done in the riding which I represent. At the same time I feel sure that if we ask the poor people, the very poor people, of most of these constituencies to give their time free of charge, while we are paying everyone else the full value of their services—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Including ourselves.

Mr. ROEBUCK: Including ourselves and including the leader of the opposition—

Mr. ROWE: He is earning his.

Mr. ROEBUCK: —we shall receive criticism for our pains. I do not see why we should ask poor people to be the only ones to give their services free. When the manufacturers, for instance, refused to accept a five per cent limitation on their profits in the early stages of the war, I am not particularly enthusiastic over asking common people who perhaps need the money to give their day's time free. If they wish to do it, all right, but I am not in favour of pressing them unduly and taking advantage of their patriotism.

Section agreed to.

Section 10 agreed to.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Vien in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

42. Grant to the International Red Cross committee, $10,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The purpose of calling this item to-night is simply to have the department get into committee of supply. The item may stand.

Item stands.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like if possible to get another item—

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): You have three now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It relates only to giving the ministers who happen to be here on Thursday or Friday an opportunity to take up their estimates. If my hon. friend would not object to allowing a post office item to be called—

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Pensions and Other Benefits.

249. To provide for the payment of compassionate allowances to employees injured while in the performance of their duties, or to other persons injured while performing duties in any way connected with the postal service, or in protecting his majesty's mails, or to the dependents of such employees or other persons who may be killed while so engaged; payments to be made only on the specific authority of the governor in council, $5,000.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

CHILE, BRAZIL, AND THE ARGENTINE—MOTIONS FOR APPROVAL

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should like to call item No. 9 on the order paper and then take up the two resolutions under government notices of motion with regard to trade with the south American republics. I think the matter has been fully discussed. This particular order was held over because of a special reason which I think does not obtain at the moment. I move:

That it is expedient that the Senate and House of Commons do approve the trade agreement between Canada and Chile signed September 10, 1941, and that this house do approve the same.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If we may return to government notices of motion and call the first two resolutions, one relating to trade with Brazil, the other to trade with the Argentine republic. It will be recalled that we discussed those two resolutions at the same time as the resolution with respect to trade between Canada and Chile. I move:

That it is expedient that the Senate and House of Commons do approve the trade agreement between Canada and Brazil signed October 17, 1941, and that this house do approve the same.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved:

That it is expedient that the Senate and House of Commons do approve the trade agreement between Canada and the Argentine republic signed October 2, 1941, and that this house do approve the same.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this house has approved trade agreements entered into with Chile, Brazil and the Argentine Republic, and to ask their concurrence in the said approval.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the house adjourned at 10.54 p.m.

Wednesday, March 4, 1942

The house met at three o'clock.

JAPANESE NATIONALS

BRITISH COLUMBIA SECURITY COMMISSION

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I lay on the table of the house a copy of the order in council appointing the British Columbia Security Commission, setting forth its powers and duties; also copy of the order in council setting forth the names of the advisory committee to the British Columbia security commission.

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): May I ask whether they will be printed in *Votes and Proceedings*?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It has been requested that the orders in council with respect to the British Columbia Security Commission be printed in *Votes and Proceedings* as in previous years. I would ask His Honour the Speaker if he would direct the Clerk accordingly.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT—SASKATCHEWAN*

Mr. CASTLEDEN:

1. What is the number of soldier settlers who settled in Saskatchewan under the soldier settlement board?
2. What was the total original indebtedness of these settlers to the soldier settlement board?
3. How many of such original settlers are still on their land?
4. What was the original indebtedness of the settlers who are still on the land?
5. What are the total payments made by those who are still on the land?
6. What is the present indebtedness of those who are still on the land?

Mr. CRERAR: This question is answered, Mr. Speaker, but I wish to make a comment upon the answer. It was found that answers to questions 4 and 5 would involve a great deal of work, and I understand that the director of soldier settlement has had some communication with the hon. member who asked the question and has taken a cross-section of the accounts which will probably give a very fair reflection of the position as a whole. With that qualification the question is answered as follows:

1. 6,164.

2. Land, $14,044,899.88; removal of encumbrance, $834,755.50; permanent improvements, $3,011,253.57; stock and equipment, $7,685,423.06; total, $25,576,332.

3. 2,308.

4. For 750 accounts only, amount is $2,859,837.95.

5. For the same 750 accounts as referred to in reply to question No. 5, amount is $1,508,534.69.

6. As of January 31, 1942, $3,864,905.40.

MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY—1941 CONTRACTS

Mr. MAYBANK:

1. What was the total value of all munitions and supply contracts placed in Canada in 1941, prime contracts only?

2. How were such contracts distributed, province by province?

Mr. HOWE:

1. $1,641,853,758.

2. It is impossible to give a money breakdown by provinces that will properly reveal the extent to which each province is participating in war contracts. A contract placed with a firm in one province may require manufacture or purchase of component parts from firms in other provinces. Also, contracts may be placed with companies whose head offices and administration are in one province, and whose factories for production are in one or more other provinces.

SHELLS FOR BREN GUNS AND VALENTINE TANKS*

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

1. What is the per unit cost to the government of Bren machine guns?

2. What is the per unit cost of twenty-five pounder guns?

3. What is the per unit cost of Valentine tanks?

4. What is the per unit cost of shells in each of the different sizes manufactured?

5. Are these unit prices the same as charged on British account for war material manufactured in Canada for the United Kingdom?

Mr. HOWE: It is not in the public interest to reply to this question. We have never disclosed our financial arrangements respecting contracts held by the British government, and it does not seem in the public interest to disclose the cost of war munitions.

COMPENSATION FOR HOG CHOLERA

Mr. GRAYDON:

1. How much was paid to hog producers in 1941 by way of compensation for loss from cholera?

2. What areas, if any, in Canada are presently under quarantine?

3. How many hogs died from the disease in 1941, (a) in Canada, (b) in Ontario?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. $60,485.67.

2. None.

3. Figures are not available regarding hogs that died from hog cholera. The number of hogs slaughtered in controlling this disease in 1941 was: (a) In Canada—9,257; (b) In Ontario—7,468.

WAR SAVINGS STAMPS AND CERTIFICATES

Mr. GRAYDON:

1. How much have the people of Canada invested to date in war savings stamps and certificates?

2. What amount have the citizens of each province so invested?

Mr. ILSLEY:

Sales of war savings certificates, May 27, 1940, to February 28, 1942

Province	Purchase Value
Prince Edward Island	$ 455,675
Nova Scotia	6,208,875
New Brunswick	3,356,084
Quebec	23,375,713
Ontario	60,910,021
Manitoba	8,548,614
Saskatchewan	5,864,328
Alberta	7,052,833
British Columbia	10,554,293
	$126,326,436

The total of sales amounting to $126,326,436 is before deduction for certificates redeemed or received for redemption, the aggregate of which to February 28, 1942, was $3,820,022.

The amount of unredeemed war savings stamps in the hands of the public on January 31, 1942, totalled $3,896,957.75. Statistics are not available to indicate the distribution by provinces of the unsurrendered stamps in the hands of the public.

NATIONAL STEEL CAR SHELL SHOP

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

1. Has the shell shop of the National Steel Car at Hamilton been closed?

2. If so, for what reason?

3. What type of shell was being produced in this shop?

Mr. HOWE:

1. The National Steel Car Corporation Limited, Hamilton, is making 4 types of shell: 25-pounder, 3·7AA, 75-mm. HE, and 4·5AA.

A section of the 4·5AA shell shop was closed from February 12 to February 23, 1942.

2. For lack of steel billets and difficulty in securing tonnage of steel to the extent required.

3. Answered by No. 1.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

SAVINGS DEPOSITS BY PROVINCES

Mr. PURDY:

What were the aggregate savings deposits in Canada, by provinces, at the end of each month for the year ending February 28, 1942, in (a) chartered banks, (b) other recognized saving institutions, including government agencies?

SALE OF SCRAP METALS TO DEALERS IN SECONDARY MATERIALS

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

1. Has the government sold any scrap metal to junk dealers during the calendar year 1941?
2. If so, how much and at what price?
3. What are the names and addresses of the concerns to which scrap metal was sold?

PAYMENTS TO JOHN INGLIS COMPANY

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn):

1. What is the total amount of money that has been paid to the John Inglis Company as at December 31, 1941?
2. How much of this was paid on the Bren gun account?
3. How much has been paid on other items manufactured by the John Inglis Company?

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

HALEY STATION, ONT., MAGNESIUM PLANT

Mr. WRIGHT:

For a copy of all agreements, correspondence, telegrams and other communications exchanged between the government and any individual or company, regarding the erection and/or operation of a magnesium plant located near Haley station, Ontario.

DOMINION BOND ISSUES AND REDEMPTIONS

Mr. QUELCH:

For a statement showing the various issues of bonds by the dominion government since the outbreak of war, sold to (a) the public, (b) the chartered banks, (c) the Bank of Canada, showing the date of issue, date of maturity and rate of interest in each case?

Also a statement showing (a) Dominion of Canada bond redemptions since the outbreak of war, (b) holdings of dominion and provincial direct and guaranteed bonds by chartered banks of Canada, (c) holdings of dominion and provincial direct and guaranteed bonds by Bank of Canada.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AGREEMENTS WITH PROVINCES—ADVISORY COUNCIL

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour) moved that the house go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following resolution:

[Mr. Howe.]

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide for the promotion of vocational training projects, the entering into financial assistance agreements with the provinces in connection therewith, the appointment of a vocational training advisory council and of such officers, clerks and other employees necessary for the administration of the act.

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.

Motion agreed to.

JAPANESE NATIONALS

INFILTRATION FROM PROTECTED AREAS—RADIO SETS AND OTHER ARTICLES—SUPPORT OF NATIONALS TRANSFERRED

On the orders of the day:

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Yale): In view of information received from British Columbia with regard to the infiltration of persons of Japanese origin from the protected areas, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice what steps he proposes to take to prohibit the ownership of radio broadcasting and short-wave receiving sets, automobiles and other articles now prohibited within protected areas, and in view of the public meetings which are about to be held in parts of British Columbia outside the protected areas, what in general the government proposes to do to prevent settlement of persons of Japanese origin, except in work camps on highways under rigid supervision?

Hon. L. S. ST. LAURENT (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the hon. member addressed a notice of this question to my office. I was not able to receive it; it was communicated to me just a few minutes ago over the telephone.

Under the regulations as they exist at present, the Department of Justice has no authority to deal with Canadian citizens residing outside protected areas. Whether or not additional provisions should be made in the regulations is under consideration; and it was hoped that the matter might not be so urgent as not to give us the opportunity of having the advice of the British Columbia security commission upon such further provisions as should be inserted in the defence of Canada regulations.

With respect to the second part of the question; the regulations as they exist at present would empower the department to make some order with respect to the future residence, temporary or permanent, of persons

of the Japanese race who were ordinarily resident in the protected areas when such protected areas were proclaimed. That also is something which is under consideration, and it had been hoped that we might have the opportunity of getting the advice of the British Columbia security commission as to what agency should have the determining of the portions of the province of British Columbia where these persons of Japanese origin might not go, even temporarily.

I trust that it will be possible to get at a very early date the advice of the British Columbia security commission upon those two points.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to direct a question to the Minister of Justice relating to this Japanese situation. If he is not able to answer to-day, it may stand as a notice.

In a communication which I received to-day from British Columbia the question is raised as to who is to support the Japanese population now being removed from the protected area. They have been spoken of as being wards of the government. Will the Minister of Justice throw some light on this question, having regard to the allegation which has reached me that many of these Japanese are well able to take care of their own requirements with respect to food and clothing? If they are to be interned in the ordinary sense, I understand what the position would be. If they are not to be interned in the strict sense of the word, of course they might be expected to look after some of their own requirements. I should like to know what the position is in this respect.

Mr. ST. LAURENT: I shall be glad if this question may stand as a notice, for further consideration.

PROVISION FOR GUARDING THOSE IN WORK CAMPS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. FRASER (Peterborough West): Will the Minister of Labour explain what provision is being made to guard the Japanese in the government work camps?

Mr. MITCHELL: That is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice. Ample protection is being provided through that department and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Is it just the police who are guarding the Japanese, or are soldiers put on that work also?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

IRRIGATION

ST. MARY AND MILK RIVERS WATER DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): I desire to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Resources. Has the St. Mary and Milk rivers water development committee, appointed to consider the Lethbridge Southeastern water conservation project, yet submitted its report to the minister? If not, why not? Will the minister inform the house when, approximately, we may expect this report to be tabled?

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Mines and Resources): I understand that the committee held its last meeting on February 16 for the preparation of the report, which is now in draft form. That is going forward to Mr. George Spence, a member of the committee, and director of prairie farm rehabilitation operations in Saskatchewan, who is now in western Canada. It is expected that the report will be ready within a few weeks.

COST OF LIVING BONUS

ORDER IN COUNCIL P.C. 8253—POLICY AND PROCEDURE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. GORDON GRAYDON (Peel): I should like to direct an inquiry to the Minister of Labour. There seems to be confusion in the minds of some wage-earners in Canada over the government's policy relating to the cost of living bonus. Some are paid it. Some are not. The reasons for the distinction in such cases are not always clear to the workers or to the public. The Ottawa *Journal* of last Wednesday cited the Minister of Labour as indicating that no general policy is being applied, and that each case is being dealt with on its merits. There may be good reasons for the lack of a general policy in this regard, but I wish to ask the minister if he will make a brief statement to the house clarifying the situation so that our working folk may clearly understand the policy which is now being pursued and the procedure to which they must conform in order to seek its application to their individual cases.

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labour): A definite general policy in this regard is being applied by the government. That policy is set forth in an order in council, P.C. 8253 of October 24, 1941.

The principal mandatory features concerning cost of living bonus are:

1. Employers paying a cost of living bonus prior to November 15, 1941, must continue to pay it and must increase it or decrease it by the amount of 25 cents per point for every point of change in the cost of living index from the index number for October, 1941. The changes are to be announced quarterly by the national war labour board. In February the board announced that there would be no change for the time being because the index did not change one whole point or more from October, 1941, to January, 1942, which was the primary requirement.

This in effect indicated that at least in the first quarter the government prices policy was functioning on all six cylinders, and we hope it will continue to do so.

2. Employers not paying a bonus prior to November 15, 1941, are mandatorily required to begin paying one as soon as the national board announces that the cost of living index has risen by one whole point or more.

3. An employer in the foregoing group may not pay a larger amount of bonus than the announced amount, or begin to pay one in any amount before an announcemet is made by the board, unless he applies for and is given permission to do so, or unless he is directed by the board to do so as the result of an investigation of his situation.

Provision is made in the order whereby an employer or an employee or any association or group of employees may apply in writing to a war labour board—that, of course, includes the regional boards as well as the national board, if it is a regional employer—for an authorization that a cost of living bonus be paid in such amount as the board may find fair and reasonable.

The reason why it was not made mandatory for all employers to pay a cost of living bonus of any amount larger than the amount dictated by the future movements of the cost of living index is this: that many employees have received wage increases since the outbreak of the war which have compensated them in whole or in part, for the rise which has taken place in the index to date. Furthermore, the government could not order a general payment of bonus without regard to the financial condition of a business which may be operating on a reduced margin owing to the price ceiling. On the other hand, the payment of maximum bonuses by all employers able to pay it, without regard to wage increases granted, would release taxable corporation earnings into channels of consumer purchasing at a time when the government is interested in restricting purchasing power for civilian goods.

[Mr. Mitchell.]

The house will appreciate, too, that some industries today are existing on government funds in the form of subsidy.

Employers required to pay future mandatory bonuses or who, having already paid a bonus, find that as a result the business cannot operate, have the right to apply for permission to reduce the amount of bonus or to defer the payment. In such cases, an audited financial statement is required by the board.

I think it was just as well to deal with this at length at the moment so that hon. members would have an indication of the policy.

When an application for bonus payment is received, consideration is given to all the factors mentioned. The board is limited in its authority in that it may not direct that a bonus be calculated in the rise in the cost of living index from a month earlier than the month in which the last general increase in wage rates was granted. The board has absolutely no authority to order that a bonus be paid retroactively, although, as stated, it may order calculation of the rate of bonus from an earlier date than October.

Although the hon. member asked only for remarks with respect to the cost of living bonus, this opportunity to remark in the wage control side of the order in council should not be foregone.

It has been stated in various quarters that wages are frozen and that, in consequence, injustices as between wage rates have become "frozen" also. This is not true. Just as in the case of bonuses, provision is made for application by employees of a revision in wage rates in cases where it can be shown that wages are low compared with the wage paid for similar or comparable work in a locality or a comparable locality.

Many workers do not know or have forgotten, but I have not and many members of this house will recall the situation of the wage-earner after the last war when his enhanced earnings bought far less than they did before that war, because in an uncontrolled economy wages always lag behind rises in the cost of living.

Mr. MacINNIS: That is the argument for a planned economy.

Mr. MITCHELL: You have been asking for a planned economy for many years and now you have it.

To-day there is a formula which protects workers to some degree against rises in the cost of living. It was designed to be applied, and will be applied, to anyone who can show justification for it. It is feared that many workers not receiving a bonus—but often in

receipt of increased wage earnings—do not recognize how much better off they are not to get a bonus for the reason that the cost of living does not justify it, owing to the effect of the government's policies on prices, salaries and wages. On the other hand, they would be playing leap-frog with a continually out of reach cost of living level to which a completely adequate bonus formula could not be applied without wrecking many business institutions.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

DIVISIONAL WAR SERVICES BOARDS—DETERMINATION OF POSTPONEMENTS

Mr. J. G. DIEFENBAKER (Lake Centre): I should like to direct a number of questions to the Minister of National War Services based on communications which, in common with members of rural constituencies, I have been receiving daily from those who have been called up for service during the coming month, who desire to claim exemption on the ground that they are necessary in agriculture and who mistakenly believe that members of parliament may intercede on their behalf.

The questions are: 1. Is not the decision of each of the provincial national war services boards on the question whether or not a person is liable for service, final under the regulations now in effect? 2. What directions if any, additional to the provisions of regulations, have been given to the various provincial boards as to the particular circumstances that these boards should take into consideration in determining the question as to granting or refusing postponements? Finally, will the government give consideration to the appointment of a special government representative for agriculture, additional to the provision that now appears in the regulations providing for the fact that agriculture may have its own representative in each of the provinces, whose duty it would be to appear in all cases before the various provincial boards so that the imperative needs of labour and agriculture will be assured, with due regard, of course, at all times to the need of man-power in the army?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): With great reluctance I rise to a point of order. A year ago Your Honour ruled on the limitations that must be placed on questions asked on the orders of the day. At that time Your Honour gave a considered ruling on the question. I suggest that the rule is being broken every single day in this house.

Mr. LOCKHART: These are emergency times.

Mr. SPEAKER: I find that many questions of the kind suggested by the minister are being asked on the orders of the day, when they should rightly be on the order paper. I also find, however, that many of these questions have been sent to ministers and are replied to in the house. It seems to me that there is one way by which these matters could be regulated, namely, that if a member is sending a notice to a minister with regard to a question concerning his department, which question the minister considers to be out of order on the orders of the day and one that should properly be placed on the order paper, the member proposing to ask that question on the orders of the day should be notified accordingly, and the question would then appear on the order paper in the regular form. If that were done it would obviate such discussions as have been taking place recently on questions which are followed by supplementary questions, and further supplementary questions, until the proportions of a debate are reached. I suggest that the matter is one which is really in the hands of those asking the questions and of the ministers replying thereto.

Hon. J. T. THORSON (Minister of National War Services): I am prepared to answer the questions asked by the hon. member for Lake Centre (Mr. Diefenbaker), who was kind enough to give me notice of his intention to ask them. The questions relate to matters that are giving a great deal of concern to members of parliament, particularly at this time, and likewise to the members of the government.

As my hon. friend knows, the question of postponement of military training is vested in divisional boards.

There are thirteen of these divisional boards across Canada, each one of them headed by a judge of a superior court or other court in the province in which the board is located. These boards deal with all applications for postponement of the call for military training, and have exclusive jurisdiction to deal with such applications. It is not within the power of the Minister of National War Services or of the Department of National War Services or of any other person to bring about a postponement. That question is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the divisional board; the decision of the divisional board in respect of the matter is final, there is no appeal from their decision. That answers the first question of my hon. friend.

With regard to his second question, the matter is dealt with by the regulations; I would refer my hon. friend and other members of the house to section 14 of the National

War Services Regulations as amended. This section gives directions to the divisional board. The divisional board may grant a postponement whenever it is of the opinion that it is in the national interest to do so.

Then in the case of applications for postponement from persons engaged in certain occupations such as agriculture, the board is specifically directed to take into account the supply of labour that is available and the importance of the applicant's occupation to the national economy. Those are factors which the board is directed to take into account.

With regard to the third question raised by my hon. friend, I should tell him that the government has already acted in connection with this matter. Until recently a representative of the Department of National Defence and a representative of the national labour supply council had the right to appear before the divisional boards and make representations to those boards. Recently the regulations were amended, giving the same right to representatives of agriculture.

Mr. CHURCH: Conscription for some and not for others under the minister's department. It should be abolished altogether.

Mr. ROWE: Referring to the statement of the Minister of National War Services in reference to giving directions to the boards in Ontario, did I rightly understand him to say that they were asked to take their recommendations from the agricultural representative in the district?

Mr. THORSON: No, I did not say agricultural representative; I said amendments had been made to the regulations giving a representative of agriculture the same right to appear before the divisional boards and to make representations to such divisional boards as is now possessed under those regulations by the representative of the Department of National Defence and the representative of the national labour supply council.

Mr. ROWE: Would the minister take into consideration—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: When a question has been put to a minister and an answer given the asking of supplementary questions bearing on the answer that has already been given is objectionable, and should not be practised.

Mr. ROWE: I leave it to Your Honour to say whether my question is in order. It is whether in view of the embarrassment of agricultural representatives throughout Ontario the minister would give consideration to having some other representative, a judge or someone in some other capacity to make representations to the board.

[Mr. Thorson.]

Mr. THORSON: I said nothing about the "agricultural representatives." It does not necessarily follow that the agricultural representative in any particular place is the representative of agriculture.

Mr. ROWE: No, but they are the ones who are being embarrassed at the present time.

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERIES

POLICY WITH RESPECT TO ESTABLISHMENT OF FISH TRAPS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. OLOF HANSON (Skeena): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Has representation been made to the government this year for the establishment of fish traps in British Columbia waters, not including the Sooke area? If so, will he give the names and addresses of the applicants? What would be the government's policy in this respect.

Hon. J. E. MICHAUD (Minister of Fisheries): The answer to the first question is no. The answer to the last question is that the government's policy will be considered in due course.

PLEBISCITE ACT

PROVISION FOR TAKING OF VOTE ON ANY QUESTION SUBMITTED BY WAY OF PLEBISCITE

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State) moved the third reading of Bill No. 10, respecting the taking of a plebiscite in every electoral district in Canada and the taking of the votes at such plebiscite of Canadian service voters stationed within and without Canada.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata): This is no time for speeches. It is time for immediate action to assure and complete the defence of Canada. Therefore the question being proposed that Bill No. 10 respecting the taking of a plebiscite be now read a third time, I move, seconded by Mr. Parent (Quebec West and South):

That the word "now" be left out and the words "this day six months" be added at the end of the question.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Pouliot) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Bourget	Lizotte
Church	McGregor
Crète	Parent
D'Anjou	Pouliot
Gauthier	Raymond
Lacombe	Roy—13.
Lacroix (Beauce)	

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott	Green
Authier	Gregory
Aylesworth	Hansell
Bence	Hanson (Skeena)
Bercovitch	Hanson (York-Sunbury)
Bertrand (Prescott)	Harris (Danforth)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)	Hazen
Black (Cumberland)	Healy
Black (Yukon)	Henderson
Blackmore	Hill
Blair	Hlynka
Blanchette	Howe
Boucher	Hurtubise
Bradette	Ilsley
Breithaupt	Isnor
Bruce	Jean
Cardiff	Johnston (Bow River)
Cardin	King, Mackenzie
Casselman, Mrs. (Edmonton East)	Kirk
Casselman (Grenville-Dundas)	Kuhl
Castleden	Laflamme
Chevrier	Lafontaine
Claxton	Lalonde
Cleaver	Leader
Cloutier	Leduc
Coldwell	Leger
Corman	Little
Coté	Lockhart
Crerar	McCann
Cruickshank	McCubbin
Davidson	McCulloch
Dechene	MacDiarmid
Diefenbaker	Macdonald (Brantford City)
Donnelly	Macdonald (Halifax)
Douglas (Weyburn)	McDonald (Pontiac)
Dubois	McGarry
Dubuc	McGibbon
Dupuis	McIlraith
Durocher	MacInnis
Edwards	McIvor
Emmerson	MacKenzie (Lambton-Kent)
Esling	Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)
Eudes	MacKinnon (Edmonton West)
Evans	MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
Fair	McLarty
Farquhar	MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
Fauteux	McLean (Simcoe East)
Ferland	Macmillan
Ferron	McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
Fleming	McNiven (Regina City)
Fontaine	MacNicol
Fournier (Hull)	Marshall
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)	Martin
Fraser (Northumberland, Ont.)	Matthews
Fraser (Peterborough West)	Mayhew
Fulford	Michaud
Furniss	Mitchell
Gardiner	Mullins
Gershaw	Mulock
Gillis	Mutch
Gladstone	Nicholson
Golding	Nielsen, Mrs.
Goulet	Noseworthy
Graham	O'Neill
Grant	Perley
Gray	Pinard
Graydon	Pottier
	Purdy
	Quelch
	Reid
	Rhéaume
	Roebuck
	Ross (Calgary East)
	Ross (Hamilton East)
	Ross (Middlesex East)
	Ross (Moose Jaw)
	Ross (St. Paul's)
	Ross (Souris)
	Rowe
	Ryan
	St. Laurent
	Sanderson
	Shaw
	Sissons
	Slaght
	Soper
	Stirling
	Stokes
	Sylvestre
	Taylor
	Telford
	Thauvette
	Thorson
	Tripp
	Tucker
	Turgeon
	Turner
	Tustin
	Veniot
	Vien
	Ward
	Warren
	Weir
	White
	Whitman
	Winkler
	Wood—174.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have just a word to add on the main motion. I had not intended making any observations on the third reading of the bill, but quite unexpectedly the amendment asking six months' hoist, which has just now been voted upon, was moved. I believe a word is in order with respect to my position on the vote.

I opposed the principle of the bill on the ground that there was no necessity for a plebiscite. That is over. The government carried the second reading of the bill; it has been carried through committee, now stands for third reading and, after it goes to the other place, is to become law. I accept the will of the majority. Let us get this plebiscite over as quickly as possible and, in the meantime, let us get on with the war effort.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, before the bill is read a third time I want to say that I have opposed the principle of the bill at every stage, and the plebiscite policy to the end. For ten years in this house I have at times stood almost alone in urging immediate rearmament, cooperation and coordination with Great Britain, as I saw this war coming on us. The enemy now is right at our door, in the Pacific. As has been said by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, we have lost command of the sea in the Pacific and our government should manage this war over here itself. I am not going to put party first, but the country, no matter who moves this resolution. I do not think I have ever voted against this party over here since I have been a member of the House of Commons first elected in 1921. But at the present time the matter of life and death for the empire and the defence of the realm is at stake and, as one who has urged for ten years rearmament at a time when it was unfashionable and unpopular to do so, I

cannot see my way clear now to change my view, turn around and vote for such a measure in which I do not believe, and which is not war to beat Hitler.

I am not one who has sat in power for years and passed pacifist measures and votes and supported pacifist measures now to turn around and pose as a super patriot. While I have great respect for my leader, who has done so well in the house, and great respect for his views, I cannot accept any measure so fatal to a total war effort as a plebiscite, which shifts responsibility for the defence of our country over to a vote which will hurt our war effort. That is why I voted for the six months' hoist—not because I am in sympathy with the movers, or anybody who voted for that amendment. I dealt with that a week ago, and showed I was out of sympathy with those who moved the six months' hoist to-day. I have a duty to perform, and I have done it to the best of my ability. I am not a yes-man or nodder, and "your leader is your policy; follow your leader," is not my way. I have already given my views at various stages in opposition to this bill, consistently and strongly.

Mr. ROBERT FAIR (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, before the main motion carries, I want to say a few words on subsection 2 of section 4 which reads in part as follows:

(2) The persons disqualified from voting as ordinary voters at the plebiscite shall be those persons disqualified from voting under the provisions of paragraphs (d) to (k), both inclusive, and paragraph (m) of subsection 2 of section 14 of the Dominion Elections Act, 1938. . . .

In order that the house may know what I am talking about, I will read paragraph (k) of subsection 2 of section 14 of the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot hear what the hon. member is saying. Is he speaking to a particular part of the bill?

Mr. FAIR: After explaining my point, Mr. Speaker, I intend to move an amendment. Paragraph (k) reads:

(k) in any province, every person who is an inmate of an institution which is maintained by any government or municipality for the housing and maintenance of the poor, if such person is by the law of that province disqualified from voting at an election of a member of the legislative assembly of that province, and did not serve in the military, naval or air forces of Canada in the war of 1914-1918.

I am quite satisfied that this provision excluding inmates of a poorhouse from voting is unfair, unjust and undemocratic. We have been told on numerous occasions that after this war is over we are going to have a New Order. In my opinion it is not necessary to wait until the war is over to bring at least some part of this New Order into effect, and I believe that the exclusion from this bill of the provisions of paragraph (k) which I have just read would be one of the best ways in which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) could show the country his good faith in the New Order he proposes. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Camrose (Mr. Marshall):

That this bill be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole with the instruction that they have power to amend it as follows: by striking out the words, "under the provisions of paragraphs (d) to (k)", in line 21 of section 4, paragraph 2, and substituting therefor the words, "under the provisions of paragraphs (d) to (j)."

I noticed on another occasion that a number of the members of this house were uncertain whether to vote for or against the amendment. Having had time to consult their conscience since then, they now have an opportunity to let us know their considered opinion. I should like very much to see the amendment I have proposed adopted unanimously.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not quite sure whether I caught the point my hon. friend was making, but I gathered he was referring to persons in poorhouses being given the right to vote. If I recollect aright, that very point was brought up in committee of the whole and has already been voted on. In these circumstances I am inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment is out of order. The point of order is that it has been voted upon already and disposed of.

Mr. HANSELL: Do I understand the Prime Minister to say that the amendment is out of order because a similar amendment was passed on in committee of the whole?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It had already been voted on and disposed of in committee of the whole.

Mr. HANSELL: I do not appreciate that point. If it is well taken, no one can propose on the third reading an amendment that has been proposed in committee.

Mr. MacINNIS: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the rules are quite clear, so clear that I do not think there need be any misunderstanding. Standing order 77, citation 813, reads:

When a bill comes up for third reading a member may move that it be not now read a third time but that it be referred back to the committee of the whole for the purpose of amending it in any particular. The motion for third reading is debatable under standing order 38.

I need not read any further. There is no limitation in the paragraph I have just cited, and whether or not the amendment now proposed was moved at any previous stage of the bill no member is debarred from proposing an amendment again at this stage. This is his last opportunity to amend the bill, and I submit that this amendment, whether or not it was discussed before, is quite in order to be moved now.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Speaker, if we are to have a ruling sustained that an amendment cannot be moved on the third reading because it has already been decided in committee, there is no occasion whatever to vote at all on the third reading; in fact, it would be quite out of order because the principle of the bill has already been voted on and approved on the second reading. Moreover I would point to the whole history of Canada with respect to the rule on this point. Such an amendment has been moved dozens of times.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Hundreds of times.

Mr. NEILL: Yes, hundreds, and if we are going to accept a ruling such as has been suggested, I do not see what use our rules are at all, because after a bill has been accepted in principle on the second reading, if we are not allowed to amend it subsequently, we do not need to take a vote on the third reading.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker I should like to support the argument of the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Neill). The third reading is the last point of attack which a member has on a bill, by moving that it be referred back. I can recall dozens and dozens of instances in which that has been done in the last twenty years. I submit that the amendment is quite in order. I would be astonished if it were not.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I agree with the hon. gentlemen who have taken a view opposite to the one I expressed. What I really had in mind was an amendment that had been considered by the whole house, but this particular amendment was moved in committee. Hon. gentlemen are quite right in saying that the proposed amendment is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I had intended so to rule.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): I should like to say a few words on the main motion, Mr. Speaker, to explain the vote I propose to give on it. My views have been very largely, if not entirely, expressed by the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church). It is not for me to criticize the actions of any hon. gentleman. I can only express my surprise that a large body of creditable men have spent six weeks here arguing strongly, logically and well, I think, against the principle of this bill and are now prepared to vote for it. I have pondered it carefully and cannot see my way to do so. Once the bill becomes an act of parliament and the plebiscite is put before the people, I shall do my utmost to get the people to vote in the affirmative because I think, once the question is submitted, that that would be the best thing for the country. But I was and am opposed to the introduction of the plebiscite at this time for reasons which have been stated scores, yes five score of times, and I cannot see my way to vote for it on this occasion.

Mr. M. J. COLDWELL (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment. It seems to me quite invidious that in a war which is being fought for democratic rights we should disqualify any person in the Dominion of Canada from voting on this plebiscite merely because he or she is poor. This is a dominion plebiscite. The law under which this plebiscite is to be taken is a dominion law. While we should recognize the rights of a province to legislate in all matters which directly concern the province or provincial rights, this parliament ought to be and is supreme in the election of members to this House of Commons.

In the same manner, therefore, it is supreme in the granting of a dominion franchise and the taking of a plebiscite for all the people of Canada; and I contend that the objectionable provision is one which takes us back to the dark ages. Why, this is a relic of the Elizabethan poor law of over three hundred years ago. It is the sort of thing which Charles Dickens railed against in Great Britain until the disabilities of those who were poor were removed. I appeal to this house not to make ourselves a laughing-stock of democratic people, not only in our own country, but in other countries if they hear of what we propose to do this afternoon, but to give those who are poor the right, equally with those who are better off, to express themselves.

None of us knows what the future has in store for those of us who are members of this house. These are days of rapid and stupendous change, and it is not without the bounds of possibility that even we who occupy these seats may at some time in the future find ourselves under limitations of this description, and therefore unable to cast our votes in relation to matters which vitally affect the future of this dominion. I appeal particularly to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), whose long career in this country has been that of an advocate of democracy and of the rights of the ordinary man. He has

given a great deal of time, study, and—at least—lip-service to the cause of democracy, and I appeal to him now to reconsider this provision of the bill, and to give those who by circumstances are poor the right to exercise their citizenship in this matter as fully as any other people in our dominion. I strongly support the amendment of the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Fair).

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): I rise to support this amendment. It was written long ago, "Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land". Many of the people who are in these institutions are fathers and mothers; they are to be deprived of the vote; they are thereby being dishonoured.

Considerable care, I take it, has been used in drafting this bill to eliminate as voters those people who might have a particularly strong selfish interest in voting against the plebiscite. The people who are in our institutions have had very great experience in this country; they have been through many campaigns; they know more than most of us know of what is to be learned from experience. To deprive such people of the vote on a matter of this kind seems to me clearly wrong. Many who are in these institutions are pioneers of this country. It makes my blood boil to think of our neglecting men and women who have gone out into the wilds and hewn out of those wilds the communities and provinces which constitute this dominion. Because of the fact that we are likely to be disfranchising many of the pioneers of this country, I would oppose the bill as it stands, and support the amendment.

Finally, let me point out that these people are least likely to be actuated by selfish motives. It is improbable that they have sons eligible for military service, although they may have grandsons. They are in the best position, I believe, to pass impartially on the question.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment.

Mr. McLARTY: It may be appropriate to say a few words and to clear up, perhaps, a little misunderstanding which appears to have arisen in connection with section 4 of the bill.

The amendment which has been suggested is an amendment to subsection 2 of section 4 of the bill. It has been suggested that people are being disqualified from voting merely by reason that they are in what, for lack of a better term, I call a poorhouse. That is not correct. The point is that in framing this bill we adopted section 14, subsection 2 of the elections act, which clause has continuously been in the elections act for some time prior to the passing of the 1938 act, and have adopted in the matter of disqualifications—and it was the wish to make disqualifications as few as possible—the provisions of the various provincial laws dealing with disqualification of voters. It was not anything put in this bill with the thought of disqualifying those voters to whom reference has been made; it was purely to adopt the general provincial plan of disqualifications that this provision was inserted in the bill.

In other words, the special committee, in dealing with the matter, felt that there might be some argument made on one side or another regarding various classes, and it was felt that as the general scheme of the bill was to adopt provincial disqualifications, the exceptions should be and are very small and inconsiderable.

In certain provinces provision is made that this class of persons can vote; they were not restricted in voting in such provinces at all; it is only in the provinces where the province itself has enacted the legislation that there is any suggestion that this right of franchise will not be extended.

This provision is identical with the provision in the elections act which received the assent of this house four years ago.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I wonder whether there are not in this bill three or four very marked exceptions to the rule that, generally, the provincial laws are being observed. For example, in section 4, subsection 2, paragraphs (a), (b)—particularly (b)—and (c) are marked exceptions which have been definitely designed in view of the war.

Mr. McLARTY: We are on the third reading of the bill, and I do not wish to consume the time of the house; but what the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) says is quite correct, that they are there by reason of the fact that we are at war. If hon. members will read paragraphs (a), (b) and (c), those in internment camps, those debarred by reason of having claimed postponement, those affected by what we may as well frankly refer to as Japanese, are there, but the exceptions are all by virtue of the fact that we are at war.

Mr. MacINNIS: I think the reasons given by the Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty) are very lame indeed. In the Dominion Elections Act we have never closely followed the election laws of the provinces. We followed them where it suited us to do so and departed from them where it did not. For years in the province of Quebec women were not allowed to vote in provincial elections, but ever since we have had universal franchise in Canada women in that province have been allowed

to vote in federal elections. To take the position that the Secretary of State (Mr. McLarty) takes would mean that if a province should put a prohibitory clause in its elections act, this parliament would be bound to adopt that provision in its election acts. That does not make sense. This is a sovereign parliament, and in enacting this measure we can put in it any provision we wish. I would urge that this house put content into our assertions about building a new social order, by extending the benefits of that new order to the least among us.

Mr. LIGUORI LACOMBE (Laval-Two Mountains): This is a dominion plebiscite, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) said a moment ago. The hon. member is perfectly right in supporting the amendment. I will do so. The poor must have the privilege of voting on this plebiscite; consequently I am deeply pleased to support the amendment. Why disqualify the poor, who are making greater sacrifices than the rich in this war?

Hon. H. A. BRUCE (Parkdale): I only wish to say a word as to my position in regard to the bill that is before the house. My leader (Mr. Hanson) has expressed my views as to why it is consistent to vote with the government at this time, because over a period of some weeks nearly all the members of the house have expressed themselves and some of us have stated our views in opposition to the bill. I still find the bill as abhorrent as I did at the beginning, but if we must have this measure let us get it over quickly. That is why I am voting with the government to-day.

May I suggest, before the last rites have been performed over the remains of parliamentary government in Canada, that the members of this house observe the usual two minutes of silence for contemplation and that the Prime Minister and his cabinet apply to themselves the message that was brought to Canada yesterday in speaking before the Rotary club, Montreal, by a very distinguished brain surgeon, Doctor Penfield, who has just returned from Great Britain: "Get your heads out of the sand; you are not doing enough; it is later than you think."

The new Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) a few weeks ago spoke of the Prime Minister as the captain of the ship. I would carry the simile a little further and say that we members of the house are the crew, and now that the ship of state is hopelessly adrift in a terrific gale, we find the captain ignoring the crew and calling upon the passengers to help him guide the ship.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I had not intended to take part in the discussion of this amendment, but it might be proper to say a word in view of the remarks of the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Bruce). It is, I think, of interest, certainly to the country, if not to hon. members who are fully aware of the fact, to know that on the second reading the principle of the bill is always the main consideration. I would direct attention to the fact that all members of this house supported the second reading. There was no division, nor was any division even called for; every hon. member therefore, according to the records of parliament, was in support of the principle of the bill.

The hon. member for Parkdale has said something about the message brought by a distinguished gentleman to the people of Canada to the effect that they should get their heads out of the sand. I hope my hon. friend's head was not in the sand at the time of the division on the second reading, because certainly he supported the second reading of the bill or else was absent from the house and did not indicate any position. But, according to the records, his position is that he supported the principle of the bill, or at any rate did not oppose it. I am at a loss, therefore, to understand how, when all parties in this house have supported, and I think wisely and rightly supported, the principle of the bill, and members generally are now advocating that when the plebiscite is taken it be supported by the people of Canada generally, some hon. gentlemen opposite should continue, as the hon. member for Parkdale has sought to do this afternoon, in the remarks which he has just made, to cast ridicule not only upon the bill and the purposes of the bill but upon parliament itself.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Fair) which was negatived on the following division.

YEAS

Messrs:

Black (Cumberland)	Lacombe
Blackmore	Lockhart
Bruce	McGregor
Cardiff	MacInnis
Castleden	MacKinnon (Kootenay East)
Church	MacNicol
Coldwell	Marshall
Diefenbaker	Nicholson
Douglas (Weyburn)	Nielsen, Mrs.
Esling	Noseworthy
Fair	Perley
Fraser (Peterborough West)	Quelch
Gillis	Ross (St. Paul's)
Green	Ross (Souris)
Hansell	Rowe
Harris (Danforth)	Roy
Hlynka	Shaw
Johnston (Bow River)	White—37.
Kuhl	

NAYS

Messrs:

Abbott	McCubbin
Authier	McCulloch
Bercovitch	MacDiarmid
Bertrand (Prescott)	Macdonald (Brantford City)
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)	Macdonald (Halifax)
Black (Yukon)	Macdonald (Kingston City)
Blair	McDonald (Pontiac)
Blanchette	McGarry
Bradette	McGibbon
Breithaupt	McIlraith
Cardin	McIvor
Chevrier	Mackenzie (Vancouver Centre)
Cleaver	MacKinnon (Edmonton West)
Cloutier	McLarty
Corman	MacLean (Cape Breton North-Victoria)
Coté	McLean (Simcoe East)
Crerar	Macmillan
Créte	McNevin (Victoria, Ont.)
Cruickshank	McNiven (Regina City)
Davidson	Matthews
Dechene	Michaud
Donnelly	Mitchell
Dubuc	Mullins
Dupuis	Mulock
Durocher	Mutch
Edwards	Neill
Emmerson	O'Neill
Eudes	Pinard
Evans	Pottier
Farquhar	Power
Fauteux	Purdy
Ferland	Reid
Ferron	Rhéaume
Fleming	Roebuck
Fontaine	Ross (Calgary East)
Fournier (Hull)	Ross (Hamilton East)
Fournier (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)	Ross (Middlesex East)
Fraser (Northumberland, Ont.)	Ross (Moose Jaw)
Fulford	Ryan
Furniss	St. Laurent
Gardiner	Sanderson
Gershaw	Sissons
Gladstone	Soper
Golding	Stirling
Goulet	Sylvestre
Graham	Taylor
Grant	Telford
Gregory	Thauvette
Hanson (Skeena)	Thorson
Hanson (York-Sunbury)	Tripp
Henderson	Tucker
Hill	Turgeon
Howe	Turner
Hurtubise	Veniot
Ilsley	Vien
Isnor	Ward
Jean	Warren
King, Mackenzie	Weir
Laflamme	Whitman
Lafontaine	Winkler
Leduc	Wood—125.
Leger	
Little	
McCann	

Motion (Mr. McLarty) agreed to, and bill read the third time and passed, on division.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

CANADIAN FORCES

REINSTATEMENT IN CIVIL EMPLOYMENT OF PERSONS WHO ENLIST IN HIS MAJESTY'S FORCES

The house resumed from Monday, February 23, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mitchell for the second reading of Bill No. 5, to provide for the reinstatement in civil employment of individuals who enlist for service in his majesty's forces or who perform essential war employment.

Mr. J. R. MacNICOL (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity of congratulating the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) upon having risen from the ranks of labour to his present high position, in which I wish him every success. He follows in the footsteps of distinguished men in his office; in fact I believe no less a person than the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was the first Minister of Labour and had the honour of organizing the department. That is a mark for the new minister to keep in sight.

As one who for years served with many hundreds and thousands of working men, many of whom served in the first world war and many of whose sons and grandsons are serving in the present war, I not only rise to support this bill, but I will support any other bill that may be introduced providing for the reestablishment or rehabilitation of our soldiers on completion of their service. For years I was associated with working men and shared their joys and sorrows. I experienced with them their satisfaction at having full-time employment with reasonable working conditions and adequate wages, to all of which the workers are entitled. I experienced with them their grief and distress when they and their families had to suffer through unemployment. Naturally any bill that has for its object the provision of employment will have my support; and while this bill does not by any means go far enough to suit me, at least it is a step in the right direction. I hope that what I and others who take part in this debate may say will encourage the minister to go further, if not in this bill then perhaps in other measures. As I have said, the minister has risen from the ranks of labour, as I did; he has been a union man, as I was, in my early days having belonged to a transport union. I am confident that his mind is sympathetic to improving the conditions of our working men, and as a rule, though not always, our soldiers are working men.

Everyone is not in accord on this bill. Recently I read two articles in which the writers took this house to task for proposing

to discuss rehabilitation and reestablishment measures instead of proceeding with measures designed to prosecute the war. They argued that if we lose the war, any rehabilitation plans we may adopt will be of no avail. I do not agree with that attitude. I am not a defeatist, and that is a defeatist attitude. We will win the war; I am confident of that. I know that in the long history of the British empire on many occasions she has lost serious battles, but always she has won the decisive victory and dictated the terms of peace. I remember that in the first great war Admiral Cradock lost a whole squadron, except one ship, in the reverse at Coronel. We were driven out of Gallipoli with great loss. General Townshend lost a whole army at Kut al Imara, but we experienced the satisfaction of Scapa Flow. In this war our first great loss was at Dunkirk, then Hong Kong and then Singapore. But I have implicit belief that God in His infinite mercy will again vouchsafe victory to our arms, and that again we will have the pleasure and honour of the equivalent of a Scapa Flow. I say therefore that the minister is doing a worth-while service when he brings in a bill looking to the rehabilitation of our returning soldiers. Through its plans the government is making at least a start in that direction.

The cabinet has set up a special committee consisting of five of its ministers to study demobilization and reestablishment after the war. It has set up also an interdepartmental committee on demobilization and reestablishment. And outside—I do not know whether or not the government is responsible for this, but it may have had something to do with it—a committee on reconstruction has been formed, to consist of educationists, labour leaders, leading industrialists, business men and others. In addition there is the British dominions immigration society which I hope will cooperate with the objective of the bill later to be introduced by the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie). I refer to the measure to settle returned soldiers on the land.

I should hope that after the war we would be in a position to bring out hundreds of thousands of those heroic soldiers from the old country, and that we might settle as many as possible of them on the land. Then, there is the British Empire Service League reconstruction committee. It would seem therefore that the work of these groups or committees, when added to the operation of the bill which is later to be introduced by the Minister of Pensions and National Health, and the operation of this bill, ought to develop something which would make impossible the dire conditions which followed the last war—conditions about which I shall speak a little later.

When the minister moved second reading of the bill on February 23, he made a brief statement to which for a moment I should like to refer. These were his words, as reported at page 807 of *Hansard:*

> In my opinion the measure will provide for the orderly reinstatement of tens of thousands of men.

I hope that was just an expression of opinion, because we will have to provide not for tens of thousands but for hundreds of thousands of men. I suggest the word should have been "hundreds" instead of "tens". The minister nods his head, and I am pleased to note that he agrees with me.

Then he spoke about the British bill, the National Service Act of 1939, and made particular reference to that portion of the bill dealing with the armed forces. I have read that bill carefully, and I am convinced that in some particulars the bill now before us is a little better. There are one or two points however in the British bill to which I shall direct the attention of hon. members, and which seem to me to be a little better than our bill. Then, the minister may be able to tell me a section in the bill now before us which would be equivalent to the enforcement section in the British bill.

As I said at the outset, however, in my view this measure should go a great deal further. Conditions in Great Britain are to a great extent different from what they are in Canada. In the first place, Great Britain is a highly industrialized country. I should think that there is a greater population within a radius of twenty-five miles from St. Paul's cathedral than there is in the whole of Canada. They have thousands upon thousands of factories, some of which I have visited. Conditions are different in Canada, because we have only a few highly industrialized areas, and the majority of our people live outside the industrial areas.

I observe that in the United States a programme of works has been introduced, and I should hope that if not in this bill, then later, the minister might institute similar projects. I shall make further observations along these lines at the proper time. In other words, the government of the United States through its department of labour is planning means to provide hundreds of thousands of jobs apart altogether from those offered in industry. I am sure the minister has that in mind for discussion later.

I should like now to refer briefly to the bill itself, and shall deal only with the

principle of the bill. In the first part it appears to deal with almost any returned soldier. It is an act to provide for the reinstatement in civil employment of individuals who enlist for service in His Majesty's forces. That is the first part. And then, the second: to provide for the reinstatement in civil employment of individuals who perform essential war employment.

The bill deals with the first classification, namely, the reinstatement in civil employment of individuals who enlist for service in His Majesty's forces, and it contains the expression "service in His Majesty's forces" sixteen times. So far as I can see this measure pertains almost wholly to individuals enlisting for service in the armed forces. There may be a portion of it—and I must confess I have not been able to find that portion—which pertains to individuals who perform essential war employment. I assume that expression refers to individuals engaged in industrial plants.

Let us for a moment consider the soldiers who worked in the iron and steel business, with which I am more familiar, and include the men right back to the miners in the iron mine.

Mr. MITCHELL: The words "or who perform essential war employment" are to be stricken out. It was an error in drafting. I shall move an amendment for that purpose.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am sorry to hear that those words are to be struck out, unless the minister is to introduce another bill to provide for these.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): What did the minister say?

Mr. MITCHELL: That those words are to be struck out of the title, and I am to incorporate a measure of that kind in another bill.

Mr. MacNICOL: I am glad to hear that.

The bill pertains largely to industry, and I call particular attention to these words:

> And whereas many employers of persons who have enlisted to serve in His Majesty's forces in the present war have voluntarily undertaken to reinstate in employment such persons, following their honourable discharge or demobilization from His Majesty's forces . . . and whereas it is deemed expedient for the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada that provision should be made for the orderly reinstatement in their previous employment of such persons aforesaid.

Let me say that the minister can depend on industry, almost to the extent of one hundred per cent, reinstating their men when they come back from overseas. I had something to do with that matter at the end of the last war, and I know the problems which must be overcome. It is a tremendous problem, and some time will be required to solve it. No one need doubt what industry will do, despite the scurrilous statements I have heard in the house frequently by men whose statements indicate that they know little or nothing about industry or employment in industry.

Industry will do its part. I have been through that phase, and I know it. But I hope when the bill is changed, as the minister indicated, there will be something in it for the government to do. Industry cannot do it all. I do not find anything in the bill outlining what the government itself may do thus to provide reemployment.

May I say a word about my experience following the last war. The plant with which I was associated had about one thousand employees, more or less, in the first week of November, 1918. Within a month or at all events within a reasonable time after the war, employment had dropped from one thousand to one hundred, more or less. I myself expected every day to be advised that my services were no longer required. Holding an executive position, I knew I was not earning my salary and could hardly look the paymaster in the face and take my salary. My point is that industry will not be able to rehabilitate and reestablish quickly large numbers of returning men, and I want that point to be considered if the bill is to be changed in any way. That interim period between the close of the war and the time when it might be possible for plants to take their men back is a more or less indefinite period, and later I shall suggest some provision to take care of that period.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I point out to the hon. gentleman that on the second reading of the bill, while a brief reference may be made to the subject matter of its sections, he should stick to the principle of the bill.

Mr. MacNICOL: The principle is the reemployment of returning service men. I had just started to say that the minister has intimated that there will be changes made in reference to those performing essential war employment; and that will be a very large number to be provided for in the bill.

There is another group of men about whom I am worrying. The bill by section 2, paragraphs (b), (i) and (ii), applies to returned men who had employee status on September 9, 1939, and to those who had employment for six months after September 9, 1939. I should like to inquire, where will a great many of the men who enlisted in the first, the second and perhaps the third divisions come in? When these divisions were being mobilized, great numbers of young men from my own

riding who had never had any employee status in their lifetime rushed to join the colours. They had been out of work for years before the war and were trudging round the streets looking for work. When war broke out, thousands of these young men rushed to enlist. I do not for a moment suggest that they enlisted because they were out of work. I say that they are patriotic, and I cannot find anything in the bill which would cover many of these young men who enlisted in the first, the second and perhaps the third divisions and who were not employed either before or after September 9, 1939. I know that the minister would be the last man in this house to bar them from employment. It may be an oversight that the bill does not cover them, and I hope that when it is in committee provision will be made for the thousands of young men who rushed to the colours when war broke out but did not have employee status. It would be manifestly most unfair if they were debarred from employment under this bill, and I hope that the minister will take that into consideration when the bill is in committee.

The British bill has something to say about enforcement. The returning men who did have employee status may be turned down when they go back to the plants where they worked to seek employment, and somebody should be ready to assist them in getting reinstated. There may be something in this bill to that effect. Perhaps I am not sufficiently qualified to understand its legal terms, but I do know that the British bill specifically provides for that contingency. The British bill, chapter 81, George VI, by section 14, subsection 4—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): What is the date of that bill?

Mr. MacNICOL: It is the National Service (Armed Forces) Act, 1939, and is contained in Public General Acts and Measures, 2 and 3 and part of 3 and 4, George VI, 1938-39, Volume 11.

Mr. MACDONALD (Brantford City): That was before the war.

Mr. MacNICOL: No. The bill is entitled the National Service (Armed Forces) Act, 1939, and subsection 4 of section 14 reads:

(4) If the minister is satisfied that it is necessary to restrain employers from terminating the employment of their employees by reason of any duties or liabilities which they are or may become liable to perform or discharge by reason of their having been called from their civil employment for service connected with the present emergency, or to make provision for the prevention of evasion of the provisions of this section, he may make regulations for those purposes. . . .

There may be something in the present bill providing for the enforcement of its provisions. I trust that is so, because from my long association with working men—and I know the minister, too, has had a long association with working men—I know and he knows that working men would be diffident about enforcing their rights to return to work. If a working man went to get the help of a lawyer, he might be scared as soon as he got inside the door of his office and saw the desks, easy chairs and all the rest of the paraphernalia of a lawyer's office, and might at once back out again. So I hope the bill will contain some provision that will make it somebody's business to receive representations from the soldiers and to see that they get fair play in the matter of reinstatement.

Having had a lot to do with unemployment following the last war, I look forward with a very great deal of interest to what is going to take place after this war. As I said at the commencement of my remarks, I am hopeful, from the plans which the government is making, that the same conditions will not prevail after this war as after 1918, when soldiers returning to their home town were compelled to walk the streets for months and months looking for work, and often were turned away from the plants where some of them had worked before. I am most anxious, so far as I can assist, to see that the returned soldiers become reestablished.

The fundamentals in dealing with labour are clear and simple. I always think of what Mr. Herbert Hoover said in 1919, when he was chairman of the reconstruction committee in the United States, and later president of the republic. I have not his exact words, but they impressed themselves on me in my days of closer association with labour than I perhaps have now, and I remembered them as long as I had anything to do with actual labour. He said (1) that any man desiring to work should have the opportunity to work; (2) that his working conditions should be reasonable; (3) that his health should be protected while he was employed; (4) that he should have adequate wages or return for his labour to enable him to keep his family in reasonable comfort and provide for their education. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that nine out of ten members of this house have come from humble working-men's homes. I did, and I am proud of it. The minister did, and he is proud of it. So the education of the working-man's child is all-important.

Mr. Hoover's fifth point was that he should be able to pay for his home. I hope that after this war there will be no such conditions as

obtained following the last war. I remember the cases of many workmen who had paid their all into their little homes, and then, after a period of unemployment, became sick and died or their wives died, their families became scattered and their homes were lost. The present Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) has a long connection with sane labour organization; he never was an agitator. I remember that when he was in this house before, he invariably talked from a sane point of view on behalf of labour; and I have always tried to do the same.

I trust that these fundamentals will be before every hon. member in considering this bill, so that, after the present war, the humble labouring man will have, what he has not had as long as I have known him, constant employment, fair wages, and reasonable working conditions—all of which are his just due. I speak from experience. I have been out of work; I know what it means. The average working man is, after all, the best buyer, the best consumer, because God usually blesses him with a large family. When he is not able to buy, the purchasing power of the country goes down and down. If he is thrown out of work for any length of time—as happened after the last war, during the depression—he becomes a charge on his family, his friends, or his relations, and loses all he has. I hope that the minister, in this and other legislation, will see to it that these conditions do not recur, otherwise the war will have been fought in vain.

Mr. REID: Do not forget the workman's old age.

Mr. MacNICOL: I said a few moments ago that I would suggest some other things for the minister to do in this bill, because men have to be provided jobs—that is the purpose of the bill. All of them cannot be reemployed in industry in any reasonable length of time I know; I have been through it. A number of industries will close their doors when the war is over. All the large munition plants will cease operations unless they have other demands to meet. Those old line industries which have transferred their activities from their own products to the making of war material will require some time to reestablish their plants on the former basis. In the meantime there will be an interim for which provision must be made.

According to what I have read, the United States department of labour proposes to set aside this year $550,000,000 for after-war rehabilitation in just one line, the building of power dams and plants in the western states. Many individual states are also making preparations. Either Iowa, Kansas or Nebraska, I am not sure which, is appropriating from three to four million dollars a year for after-war rehabilitation. I suggest to the minister that he double up his good strong hand and come out boldly for full after-war rehabilitation. The Prime Minister, having himself administered that department, is perhaps more inclined to be sympathetic to its needs than are some ministers who are less familiar with labour, so the minister should be able to count upon his support in asking that a large annual vote be placed aside until the war is over, in order that the department responsible for seeing that every man who wants work shall have work will be able to discharge his fundamental duty. If in the United States they are doing it, we can do it here. There is ample opportunity.

After my last trip to Germany, a trip which thoroughly convinced me that war was in the offing, I speeded up my travelling across Canada until to-day, I believe, I have covered the greater part of the dominion south of the 58th parallel and much of it between the 58th and the 63rd parallels. I know that no other country in the world has such resources as we have, resources lying wide open for development. Development is necessary to keep men employed; and once they obtain their wages they circulate those wages.

I never could see why men should not be provided with employment by the government. I remember that some years ago the previous government brought in a bill to vote $20,000,000 for the alleviation of unemployment. The amount was a mere bagatelle. Had the government brought in a bill to spend $100,000,000, it would have got through this house just as easily as the smaller sum, and the result might well have been to have started a programme of rehabilitation which would have prevented the depression. I say to the minister, do likewise; ask for large sums of money. It may keep you in power for years and years. I am not particularly interested in whether I am on this side of the house or the other side. But I am and always have been interested, since I was a young man, in providing jobs for men, and I have provided or assisted in providing many jobs for men. There is nothing which delights one's heart more than to be able to do that. Our main duty here is to provide jobs. It matters little whether we are on one side of the chamber or the other, but it does matter that men and women shall have employment for reasonable hours and at reasonable wages, so that they may adequately take care of their wives and families.

During the last war the nations of Europe, the United States and ourselves spent a hundred billion dollars in destroying each other and destroying the treasure of the ages.

It is not much to ask the government to vote millions of dollars to keep men employed. It is a thousand times better to keep them employed than to vote millions of dollars to destroy them.

Therefore I say to the minister, in conclusion, take a big bold stand for the provision of opportunities for men to work. Industry cannot absorb them all; it will help; then the government must provide works, and there is ample opportunity in Canada for works. If the United States can spend $550,000,000 on building power plants, we in Canada can do something. Last summer I saw a great power opportunity on the Slave river, and another one on the Peace river; the two combined would produce over a million horse-power, and if we could provide the horse-power we might invite industry to make use of it.

The Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) will undoubtedly have in view, for the settlement of some returned soldiers on the land, the country north of the Peace river, but we must not do what was done in the past, some thirty or forty years ago. We must not send men into parts of the country seventy miles away from any railway. As some pioneers north of Peace River told me, for thirty-five or forty years they looked in vain for railway transportation which they never got, and they were obliged to cart their grain by truck or horses. At one place, Notikewin, they were seventy miles away from any railway. There is ample opportunity to give thousands of men jobs which will provide abundant employment.

I suggest that the minister set up a committee. I shall be glad to serve on any research committee free of charge in connection with the job of providing jobs. The munitions plants should be kept going if at all possible. Surely there must be thousands of things that can be made in them and that should be made after the war. I suggest, therefore, that some research board or committee be put into operation to look for opportunities to keep these plants going, which ordinarily will cease production at the end of the war and consequently throw men on the streets. We must do something to keep these plants in operation so as to provide employment for men in the making of things which people will buy if only they have money. There is nothing like putting money into men's pockets. They will circulate it.

I am wondering what about the men returning now. When I go home on Saturdays I am besieged by returned men asking for employment. I cannot give it to them, and in that regard I would say to the minister that he should keep the men in khaki for a reasonable length of time after demobilization, or at any rate after their retirement from service, so that they will have some income to look forward to in the interim before being regularly established.

Mr. D. G. ROSS (St. Paul's): I have a few words to say in connection with this bill. We all know what national problems present themselves after every war. That is a matter of history. We must see to it that we shall not have a repetition after this war, of the condition that prevailed after the last war, the condition that has prevailed after other wars. Employers should be enabled to take back men after the war. That is a good idea and it is one that should be in the bill. It is admirable on the part of a great many employers to-day that they have made it a condition that men who have enlisted in the army shall be reinstated after they come back.

After the last war we had a depression resulting in unemployment, with men walking the streets. There was despondency among the people, who were wondering whether, after all, the fighting that had taken place had been worth while when men came back to the condition they found existing then. The government looked after men by way of pensions and so on, to the extent of a certain amount of money. We had not had a great deal of experience in those days, but we have experience now, and that experience must be put into practice after this war.

The bill is certainly a step in the right direction. We want to have a bill which will not be a deterrent to the enlistment of men in the army but one that will tend towards increasing the enlistment of men. The men returning to-day are to a great extent being absorbed in industry. Employers have done a good deal in the way of taking men back wherever possible, and where men have come back with disabilities they have been absorbed to a large extent. But it is in the time that will follow the cessation of the war that we shall have the tremendous problem on our hands. It is all very well to have a bill which has a compulsory feature such as this; but no matter how much you compel, you cannot compel people to do something they simply cannot do, and if it is impossible for employers to reemploy these men it cannot be done and no amount of compulsion through a bill such as this will be any good unless we have planning.

I want to give a warning to the government and to the house. When this war is over we must demobilize men slowly, both our armed forces and also the workers in industry. We shall have to continue making munitions long after we have need for them; we shall

have to keep a large army long after we have need for it. Neither must demobilization be precipitate. That is one of the great faults we have to avoid, and no amount of cry from the taxpayers should be allowed to interfere with any programme in that regard. The cry of taxpayers should not be an inducement to any government at that time to shut down industry and to demobilize the army too rapidly, or anything of the sort. It must be done gradually.

What will be the position after this war? It will be different from the position after the last war. We shall have an army of technical people highly trained—because there will be both men and women. These people must be looked after, and therefore technical jobs must be provided for them. The bill will not be any good unless some of these things are thought of. The employees of the country are all highly trained technically, and that is the kind of employment that must be provided. There is no use talking about vast programmes of public works, and so on. We must have something more than that. We must readjust the industries that we shall have at that time to the needs of the future in order to keep up production. Everything that can possibly be done must be done for these people who come out of the army, and we must do the same for those who are in civilian life and who are technically trained. There is no reason why it cannot be done. The one thing to do is to keep always in mind the factor of importance, on which the prosperity of any country really depends, and that is the rapidity of exchange of goods and services among the individuals of the country. We must keep that rapidity in the exchange of goods and services on an even keel, not allowing it to go either away up or away down. There are a good many things that can be done.

After the war is over we shall need to replenish the supply we have of consumption goods, but we must not allow the increase in the supply of consumption goods to accumulate too fast. We shall have exploitation if we do. It must grow gradually. We shall still have a great many war controls such as we have to-day in connection with prices and trade and wages and so on. We must keep these controls on and loosen them only gradually; otherwise we shall have chaos. Unless the government of the day take into consideration all these factors, and remember that we must have a gradual transition from war-time to peace-time industries; unless they plan far enough ahead, we shall have the same conditions as we had after the last war.

There are other things that must be taken into consideration. When the war is over there is no doubt we shall have a very large increase in foreign trade. The question how the goods are to be paid for will be a matter for arrangement. We must not let the people of the country receive too quickly the benefits of that trade so that there will be too much prosperity all at once. It has to be done gradually. Then as time goes on we shall have the opportunity for creating new desires, for such things as labour-saving devices; opportunities for increasing the standard of living; public works will not take care of everything, although there will be plenty of public works to be done. But we must not allow too much prosperity too quickly; that is the warning I give now.

There is no use in just having a bill like this; it is a good gesture, but to my mind there is a good deal of eyewash in it. Unless we do all these other things it will be only a scrap of paper, just the same as anything else that is not thought out far enough ahead. Therefore I suggest to the Minister of Labour that now is the time to set up a parliamentary committee which will have the time and can give a good deal of thought to the matter, and can call in economic experts to help them so that they can plan comprehensively for the future. That would be far and away ahead of trying to compel something, as this bill would do, which you cannot compel unless you take into consideration all the factors of which I have just spoken. It is a tremendous problem.

People say to-day; Oh, we cannot do anything else now but think of the war. It is true that the war effort demands our utmost power, but there is no reason why the government should not be putting its best foot forward and preparing a plan for the future. This will aid our war effort. Anything that can be done to provide for our men when they return is all to the good. I am all in favour of it, but we should go further than that.

Another aspect of a situation such as this is that of contributory old age pensions.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would call the hon. member's attention to the fact that old age pensions do not come within the purview of this bill and are not germane to the matter before the house.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I submit that it is quite in order for the hon. member to suggest them as an additional remedy for the condition he has in mind.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will allow a certain latitude so long as I can see some

connection with the subject matter before the house, but old age pensions is a subject by itself.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): May I suggest that if the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with the bill in principle, he should suggest something better.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): I did not hear what the minister said. All I am saying is that we do not want charity for these men when they come back, and because old age pensions are not on a contributory basis they are looked upon as charity. We do not want people as they grow old to be objects of charity. Therefore I suggest old age pensions as another factor to be considered. The minister seems to think that I disagree with the principle of the bill. I am trying to say that I agree with the principle, but that is no good unless we have something more.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): I wish to say a few words on the principle of this bill. It is entitled:

An act to provide for the reinstatement in civil employment of individuals who enlist for service in his majesty's forces or who perform essential war employment.

It goes on to define employer and employee and contract and the duty of employers and so on. On second reading the clauses cannot be taken up clause by clause. I believe that this bill is going to be largely a scrap of paper except as it applies to government employees. In the last war the city of Toronto was a pioneer in this matter. When any employee enlisted he was guaranteed that his position would be open for him when he returned from the war. We had several thousand employees, including outside boards. Everyone who enlisted was notified that his position, as far as the city and the various outside boards were concerned, would be held for him until he came back, and that was carried out. The practice spread to the province and to some departments of the federal government.

The principle is all right, but under this bill I point out that the classification of federal employees herein is hardly proper. It is all right for those who go overseas or serve time in training, but to apply it to a few who just leave one department to get better pay in the Department of National Defence is all wrong. This matter was discussed in England, as the minister said. We have the cart before the horse in this bill, because the government must decide what it is going to do with industry in this country. The definition of a civil employer is given, a man who engages people by contract, sometimes written, sometimes verbal. But what is the position of industry in this country to-day? They do not know. In England it is the same. Take the small retail business man, having ten or fifteen or twenty employees; where does he come in? Under this bill and with the barriers and restraints of trade and artificial burdens imposed by these various bureaucratic bodies and the government, the small independent business man is being put out of business, so that when the employee comes back there is no business, the store is closed. Take, for example, one large industry in Toronto of which the minister knows; to-day the key is turned in the door. I will give the name of the industry to the minister privately. That industry was ruined by the abolition of the British preference and the war. The result is that a number of men who joined up quickly, went overseas and enlisted in the British forces are to-day out on the street.

If the government want to enact this bill, let them first decide upon their policy in regard to industry after this war, and not appoint boards to destroy all competitive industry. That is the first duty. The way things are going both here and in England no one will be able to conduct a business. A certain amount of bureaucratic legislation may be all right, but when you have a small industry trying to compete with a department store, for instance, what is going to happen? A man cannot carry on his small, independent business with all the artificial burdens and barriers that have been established.

I believe in protection, and so do hon. gentlemen opposite. That will have to be the backbone of this bill. If not, there will be nothing to support it; it will be just a paper charter, just a scrap of paper. No one will want to be an employer under these conditions, though perhaps they are necessary in time of war. Once the war is over, however, these same dollar-a-year men and boards will want to continue these policies for a great many years, and as a result no one will be able to qualify and keep a contract made with his employees under this bill.

I protest against this sort of thing. I would refer to only one industry that might come under this employer and employee arrangement. That is the building and construction industry, which is practically standing still to-day. I think, shortly after the present minister came into this house, a committee was appointed to try and place the construction and building industry on a proper basis; that was in 1935. During the depression that industry was put on the shelf, and it went to ruin. The government embarked upon a housing scheme; my former leader, Viscount Bennett, who was then Prime Minister, went ahead and revived

that industry by promoting housing, reconstruction, the building of roads and so on. To-day there is no construction going on. The Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) is trying to build some houses, but that will not relieve the situation. If the minister wants to give this bill some basis, let him revive the original housing scheme and see that some funds are made available for housing after the war.

I notice one defect in this bill. What about these apprentices? In the British bill there is a provision concerning apprentices which I do not see here. Large numbers of young people were learning trades in many different branches of industry. After war broke out, some of these industries were driven to the wall because they were not war industries, but there are many key industries which have numbers of apprentices, who would qualify under the bill if they had a chance. I should like to read a short quotation from the British *Hansard* of February 20:

> Mr. Parker: asked the Minister of Labour whether he has made arrangements, or will do so, for young men in reserved occupations who, in response to public advertisements, volunteer and are accepted for air crews to complete their interrupted training and apprenticeships after the war in order that those who survive may not be penalized for their patriotism?

This was the reply of the minister:

> Mr. Bevin: In cooperation with the British Employers' Confederation and the Trade Union Congress an invitation is being addressed to organizations of employers and work people and to joint industrial councils and trade boards asking them to consider now the post-war position of apprentices and others whose training has been interrupted by war service.

In his last sentence the minister said:

> The problem arising can best be considered in the first place by the appropriate organization and by joint machinery in each industry, and the result of this examination will be reported to me. No doubt the industries concerned will pay regard in the course of their examination to the special position of the men referred to by my hon. friend, as well as to other special circumstances.

I do hope the minister will consider the position of these young people from seventeen to twenty years of age who have given up their jobs and enlisted.

There is one other matter, with which I shall conclude my remarks. I want to refer to the position of trade and commerce to-day, inasmuch as the government has not laid down any policy in that connection. The success of this whole scheme will depend upon the rebuilding of industry in this country, so that after the war is over, it may be in a position to employ some labour. If an employer has no work and his trade is taken away from him, how can he carry out any agreement of this kind? I have referred to one particular industry. I could refer to small retail stores, larger establishments, and all that sort of thing.

I believe the government must consider the whole question of trade and commerce. The other day my respected leader referred to a remark made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Michaud) in regard to the trade agreements then under consideration. One of the main things upon which the minister should rely for the success of this measure after the war is the balance of trade between this country and Great Britain, which now is not what it should be. One of the ministers (Mr. Michaud) is reported to have said that after the war we would not have to sell anything to Britain. In the past Great Britain has been our best customer. We never shall be able to make a success of this measure, and employers and employees who come under it will get no benefit, unless we get back that trade. But we may have some difficulty in getting it back because these agreements we are making with other countries are going practically to establish free trade and so injure those businesses which might qualify under this measure. The British preference, the preference to our most reliable customer, has been abrogated. During the five years it was in effect it increased trade between Britain and Canada by forty-five per cent, creating work for employees and employers in the large industries, which had to expand and build additions all over the country. Where are those industries to-day? They are not here now, but they would have benefited substantially under this measure.

I hope the minister will consider some of these suggestions. First of all, he will have to revive and reestablish industry. There is no use in just passing an act and having it remain a mere scrap of paper. You can go on and talk for the next three months or six months about what you will do when peace comes, but we do not know anything about it. All the countries that have been invaded by Germany will have a say in the peace treaty. All the countries that have been ruined by the axis powers will have something to say. There is the United States; there is Russia, and all the other countries I could mention. Here we are passing rules and regulations and considering what should be done after the war, but in the end it will be only moonshine, and we shall have to start all over again. Let the government look into its own business, with the large number of employees it now has. Why should there be some few people wearing uniforms all over Canada, for which

the country must pay, going about the streets taking salutes, while some of them are nothing more than filing clerks? They leave one branch of the government and go into the army; then they stay in offices here, fighting Hitler at home and drawing higher salaries. I think this bill is going to protect them instead of protecting those who are overseas serving in actual theatres of war.

Therefore I believe the first thing the government should do in this connection is to lay down a definite policy in connection with trade and commerce, not just socialism. What are we going to do about it? Are we going to do as the socialists say we should, and have everyone working for the government, with the farmers getting $15 a week and all that sort of thing? Are we going to adopt a policy of that kind, or are we going back to the old days of protection; are we going to have a real trade and commerce, built on thrift and on sound economies, and all that sort of thing? We must read into this bill clauses 4 and 8 of the Atlantic charter, which proposes to abolish all tariffs on the continents of North and South America. This charter has never been before this parliament, but it is binding upon us.

As I said yesterday, the Atlantic charter will interfere with and kill Bill No. 5 in the manner I have indicated, because it proposes the abolition of tariffs on the south and north American continents. Let the government, which never yet had a foreign policy but drift, give us a policy for trade and commerce, one which will stabilize and help us during the war and after it, and protect industry. Let it try to remove the artificial burdens put on by the dollar-a-year men, unnecessary in many cases. I know that some of those dollar-a-year men who were engaged in the clothing business never had any experience in any actual competitive business except as clerks and office boys. Yet they are imposing artificial burdens and barriers on the small independent retail storekeepers along some of the retail streets of Toronto, and putting those men out of business.

On motion of Mr. Roebuck the debate was adjourned.

At six o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

END OF VOLUME I