

have followed very closely. The founders of the League of Nations hoped to make the world safe for democracy by laying the foundation of a world order based upon the democratic ideals of social and economic justice. They underestimated, as many people did, the vested interests and powerful economic and social groups whose interest lay in the maintenance of colonialism and armaments. The league idea was based upon the moral revolution that men believed had occurred, and the revulsion against what seemed to be the results of the great war itself. It is fundamental, however, it seems to me, to an understanding of the present situation that we must realize that the idea which has governed the foreign policies directed by the ruling classes in European countries is the preservation of the status quo within those countries, the preservation of the social and economic structure which has developed in those lands. Mr. Gladstone once said that in order to understand a country's foreign policy it was necessary to examine its domestic affairs and policies; and the chief purpose of most of the European governments since the great war has been the preservation of the interests of what we often call the capitalist economy and the class which controls the wealth of those countries.

Might I remind hon. members that the national government of Great Britain was formed to do this very thing in the domestic field in 1931, and its foreign policy ever since has been based upon exactly the same principle. This explains why in 1931 the Japanese aggression in Manchuria was actually condoned by the foreign minister of Great Britain; for it was Sir John Simon who was complimented by the Japanese representative upon having placed the Japanese case before the League of Nations assembly better than he could have done it himself. On February 29, 1933, Mr. Amery, in the House of Commons in London, said:

When you look at the fact that Japan needs markets and that it is imperative for her, in the world in which she lives, that there should be some sort of peace and order, then who is there among us to cast the first stone and to say that Japan ought not to have acted with the object of creating peace and order in Manchuria and defending herself against the continual aggression of vigorous Chinese nationalism? Our whole policy in India, our whole policy in Egypt, stands condemned if we condemn Japan.

So the first member of the League of Nations, China, was sacrificed and Japan was allowed a free hand in the vain hope that some bargain could be made with the aggressor for the protection of certain economic interests in the far east.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Mr. NEILL: If the hon. member will allow me a question, did not the League of Nations set up a commission under Lord Lytton, which investigated the matter and brought in a complete condemnation of Japan?

Mr. COLDWELL: That is quite correct; as a matter of fact, I have the report under my hand; but I am pointing out that in spite of the fact that the Lytton commission condemned Japanese aggression, the British foreign minister condoned that aggression, and no action was taken to prevent or end it.

Mr. NEILL: That is not fair. It was the League of Nations that fell down.

Mr. COLDWELL: Collective security fell down, and the minister who was complimented by Japan for the defence of Japanese aggression in Manchuria was Sir John Simon. The potential aggressor nations then realized that in spite of the league covenant aggression would be tolerated, and that it had paid. When Japan was allowed to seize Manchuria, it was clear that the world had taken its first step away from collective security and towards power politics and war.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

FOREIGN POLICY

DECLARATION OF THE STATUS OF CANADA IN TIME OF WAR

Mr. J. T. THORSON (Selkirk) moved the second reading of Bill No 16, respecting the status of Canada in time of war.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to move the second reading of the bill which stands in my name. It is entitled, "an act respecting the status of Canada in time of war." The bill reads as follows:

Whereas it is expedient that the status of Canada in time of war should be made clear and declared by the parliament of Canada: Therefore his majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

1. Canada shall not assume the status of belligerent otherwise than by a declaration of war made by his majesty with specific reference to Canada and only on the advice of his majesty's government in Canada.

It is impossible in the short space of time at my disposal to discuss all the questions that arise in this connection. I shall, therefore, confine myself to the fundamental principles upon which it is based.

Before I proceed to the discussion of the bill itself, I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my very deep thanks to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and to the government of Canada for the great honour which was shown to me and to the constituency which I represent by my appointment as one of the members of the Canadian delegation to the assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva.

I shall not at this time review the controversy which took place last summer and last fall in Czechoslovakia between the Sudeten Germans and the Czechs, for this subject has been fully discussed by the Prime Minister and other hon. members. Nor shall I describe at any length the situation as I saw it at Geneva, except to say that the air was full of controversies. Newspapers were received from every land, radio broadcasts in many languages were of hourly occurrence, and there was much confusion of thought and great uncertainty. However, it was my opinion that great as was the uncertainty, there would not be a world-wide war because of Czechoslovakia. I felt that there could not be a war, that there should not be a war, over that issue.

I was in London on the eventful day upon which the Munich agreement was signed, and I shall never forget the great sigh of relief that rose from that city when it was known that war had been averted and that peace was still in the land.

When I came back to Canada I was astonished at the state of mind into which the people of Canada had been whipped. I found a state of hysteria. There was thankfulness, it is true, that war had been averted, but it seemed to me that at times there was a sort of indignation that war had not taken place. There seemed to be fierce resentment against Great Britain and France for the attitude they had taken. Perhaps one of the greatest needs in Canada to-day is a clearer knowledge and understanding of foreign affairs and a greater appreciation of the trend of events in Europe. We must have a greater understanding of the fundamental principles which the leaders of Great Britain and France have been trying to follow. We should develop resistance against the forces of hysteria based upon international hatred. We should develop anti-bodies in our body politic against the virulence of such hysteria.

It was said that Great Britain and France should have stood up against Hitler, that they should have delivered an ultimatum

that there would be war if he marched into Czechoslovakia. I am convinced that if such an ultimatum had been delivered there would have been war. What a war that would have been! It would not have been a short war; it would have been a very long one. It would not have been won by bombardment from the air, or by troops on the battlefield or by a preponderance of armaments; it would have been won as the last war was won, by that group of nations which had the greatest access to food and raw materials. It would have been a war of attrition. Is it any wonder that Mr. Chamberlain hesitated about plunging the world into a war of that kind? If he had played international bluff with the civilization of the world as the stakes, he would have committed a grave crime against humanity. He did not do that, but stood steadfast for the cause of peace.

I do not believe that Great Britain and France hesitated about going into war because they were unprepared. I am convinced that Great Britain and France have an overwhelming superiority over the totalitarian states combined. If my opinion is right, that a world war between the democracies, on the one hand, and the totalitarian states, on the other, will be won by that group that has the greatest access to food and raw materials, then there is an overwhelming advantage on the side of Great Britain and France. That is an advantage which Great Britain and France have not lost in the least degree. They have access to Canada; they have access to the United States; they have access to South America; indeed, they have access to the whole world. I am not so sure that Germany's present eastward thrust is not the first public acknowledgment of her economic necessities. That may well be so.

Therefore, I am convinced that it was not because of lack of preparation that Great Britain and France did not go into war. There were more important principles involved. I remember the dramatic speech that Mr. Chamberlain made the day after Herr Hitler had made his speech in Berlin. The hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) and I listened together to the remarks of the British Prime Minister. That day was the only time at which I wavered in my opinion that there would not be war; after I heard Mr. Chamberlain's speech I was convinced that there would not be war. In his remarks yesterday the Prime Minister quoted a portion of that dramatic speech, I shall refer to it again because I think it enunciates the cardinal principle which Mr. Chamberlain, and his