

propaganda are flourishing amongst the capitalist and fascist powers. The change from capitalism to a socialist economy planned in the interest of the people will be the best protection against war.

It is however clear that a properly organized league of nations can be of great help in organizing world opinion against war and in establishing a system of collective security to prevent aggression. The present league has failed because imperialist governments have used it as a screen behind which to play the old game of power politics. To be effective the league must provide machinery for the peaceful change of treaties; it must deal fearlessly with economic conflicts arising from trade rivalries and from the struggle for raw materials; it must work out in advance a clear policy for collective action against an aggressor; and its members must disarm. The C.C.F. will actively support any policy which aims at such developments in the league.

Neutrality: The C.C.F. believes that Canada should remain strictly neutral in case of imperialist wars, regardless of who the belligerents may be. The Canadian government should avoid all commitments in any schemes of imperial defence and should confine its defence policy to local Canadian needs.

Mr. Speaker, if the house will bear with me for just a few minutes more—and I appreciate the courtesy it has extended—I shall indicate in a few words my own personal convictions. Perhaps those convictions are more akin to a religious faith than to a political program. Yet I am convinced that they will ultimately prove to be more practical than those generally held.

I should like to adopt as my own, some words I came across written by Lord Lothian:

The lesson of the last war is that you cannot get democracy, nor liberty, nor peace, out of a world war however noble the ends for which it is fought.

I am firmly convinced that that is true. We cannot get democracy, liberty or peace from war. Again I am firmly convinced that war settles nothing. As I said earlier in my remarks, the impending war is a direct result of the last great war. Then, one other thing—and some may not agree with me—armaments are no insurance against war. If we have a loaded gun, it is likely to go off.

I believe that there are other and more effective methods of dealing with outlaw nations. When the Prime Minister speaks of economic sanctions leading inevitably to war, I commend to him the following statement which appeared in the *New York Times* of November 30, 1937:

Understandings on trade, money, and credit will serve as certain weapons against treaty breakers. . . . The sure shadow of economic starvation on spendthrift governments which cannot wage war unless we supply them, and deny supplies to their victims, can be made sufficiently effective as a deterrent without resort to the substance of sanctions or war.

I believe that to be true. We have not tried out such a policy and since the league has failed we have no machinery by which we can apply it to-day.

I urge a scientific approach to this whole problem. We are living in a scientific age and we are accustomed to get at the causes of things. There are very definite causes of war, either psychological or economic. We can do something to avoid the psychological causes of war by speaking cautiously, as the Prime Minister has advised, or by not setting up barriers to trade and immigration, as we have all been more or less forced to do. We can avoid regarding other people as lesser breeds without the law and so on, but undoubtedly the main causes of war are economic in character. It is all very well for us to be proud of the British Empire; it is all very well for us to denounce little Japan—I denounce her with the rest—but after all Japan is doing only what most nations did a little earlier.

The western powers control 84 per cent of the earth's surface. Just think what that means. Great Britain controls 25 per cent of the world's population. Do we imagine that situation can go on forever? What should be our policy? First, let me urge that we must set our own house in order. Mr. Harold Burtler, director of the international labour office, says:

War is not caused only or mainly by lust for territory or booty or prestige; it is also caused by low standards of living, by the feeling of economic insecurity, by the desire for moral or social emancipation. The founders of the organization were right when they discerned an indissoluble connection between peace and social justice.

There you have it in a nutshell—we cannot have peace until we have social justice. As the Prime Minister said recently:

In all that pertains to justice, we must look to reason rather than to force. Let us never forget that there can be no genuine democracy where the doctrine of force prevails; neither can there be a Christian civilization.

Second, I suggest that we must act as a good neighbour. Canada has refused to submit to any scheme looking to a more equitable distribution of the world's raw materials. Canada, like most other nations, has imposed trade restrictions, which are always the cause of friction. Further, we have allowed certain groups of Canadians to profit out of the troubles of others and apparently are proposing to permit this on a more extended scale. Recently Stephen Leacock is reported as saying: "Europe's preparation for war in a cold, mean, business sense helps us immensely." Something more than a recognition that this