

Irishmen and do not accept as binding decisions that may be taken by the London government if they are against their interests.

Further, as the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains (Mr. Lacombe) so aptly said, what mandate has the present government to thus commit the future of our country? It has no such mandate. And I am convinced that notwithstanding the statements made by the Prime Minister the decisions which will be reached at San Francisco will be submitted to the new parliament as a fait accompli. Can we expect that the three groups present in this house will refuse to ratify them? I do not think so, for the present Prime Minister has become as much of a Tory as the staunchest of the imperialists who sit opposite him, and although he had about 160 supporters in the present house, he readily yielded to all the demands of the 39 Conservative members opposite, in spite of the most formal pledges which had been given to the electors of my province, and in such a flagrant manner that all the Liberals who sit in the Quebec legislature, headed by the former premier, the Hon. Mr. Godbout, could not refrain from passing a motion which was unanimously adopted in which the Quebec legislature vehemently protests against the enforcement in Canada of conscription for overseas service and deeply regrets that the right hon. the Prime Minister of Canada has broken his most sacred pledges. Therefore, the legislative assembly unanimously instructed its clerk to forward copy of this resolution to the Prime Minister of Canada and to the other ministers of the cabinet for the province if any still remain.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, how could we rely on future promises on the part of the Prime Minister, when he has completely broken his past pledges? If he had kept the promises he had already made, we would not have now a whole province which has lost faith in a man who owes it his present standing.

Will it be possible for us, at the time of ratifying the treaty, to have confidence in the Progressive Conservative group? No, for their imperialistic and reactionary doctrines together with their electioneering methods of continuous mud-slinging against the province of Quebec, inspire me, as a Canadian, with the greatest contempt.

Could we rely, in these circumstances, on the C.C.F. group? Again no; for I have noticed, in the eight years I have spent in this house, that they have never failed to support the views of the Russian government in the field of international politics.

[Mr. LaCroix.]

What will be needed in this house, after the next elections, for I doubt that any of the three parties I have just mentioned will have a working majority, is a group of members strong enough to force the other parties to follow a truly Canadian policy.

In a talk delivered recently before the Cercle des Femmes Canadiennes, in Quebec the British High Commissioner to Canada stated that we remained masters of our fate and that each of the dominions was free to decide for participation or neutrality on the declaration of war and that no imperial edict, originating in London should or could influence our decision or force us into the struggle. But, Mr. Speaker, all the speeches made in this house by the government supporters before the declaration of war, were based on the assumption that neutrality was impossible because we were a British dominion. However, the attitude of Ireland proved that this was not true. The simple truth was that an order had been given in London and we had to obey. The same thing will apply when the time comes to ratify the decisions taken at San Francisco for then, unless the Canadian people is sufficiently wide awake to think of their own interests, as at the declaration of war, we shall be confronted with a situation and an accomplished fact arranged in London and not in Ottawa. All the attractive promises that may be offered to us during the next electoral campaign will not be worth much more than the pledges taken in the past and we shall be irrevocably launched in a policy of internationalism and cooperation in the establishment of a programme of world security dependent on the good will of Stalin, the dictator or, which would still be worse, of international high finance.

For these reasons I shall vote against the motion before the house, for I believe it to be my duty to prevent Canada from being drawn into another war and at the same time to protest against the wanton annexation by Russia of one third of Poland, and of the Baltic States, without mentioning the moral occupation of Yugoslavia and part of the Balkan countries.

Mr. W. E. HARRIS (Grey-Bruce): Twice in my lifetime Canada has been plunged in an European war and to add to it, on the second occasion, we have had a Pacific war and in which we are still engaged. It seems to me that, next to the declaration of war, the most important measure that has come before parliament is the present resolution, and we should take steps immediately to do what we can to prevent a recurrence and our being involved in a third world war. I believe we should take these steps at once, because it