

failed to win the peace because the people wanted peace so badly that they were not willing to risk peace for its own achievement. The desire of the moment for peace was so great that we refused to face the dangers confronting us or to see the growing menace of our enemies arming and rising up around us. I say—and I believe it is a necessary contribution to our thinking in approaching this question—we ought to realize that the same reactions may follow at the end of this war; that there may again be a desire for peace so strong as to defeat its accomplishment. If we have peace it will not be because we are gentle and forgiving and meek, but because these peace-loving nations, of which we are one, are practical and realistic and strong. I have high authority for what I am saying: "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it."

In this plan which we are to set up on the foundation and background of an understanding between the great nations there are some things which should not be included. It is all right to have them collateral to the plan, it is essential that they should be looked forward to as an outcome of peace; but some of them certainly should not be tied in as part of the essential plan for peace.

One person will say to you, "Why, the thing is simple! Let us ascertain the basic cause of war and root it out." Well, what is the basic cause of war? It is the "cussedness" of human nature. I do not believe we should attempt the high ideal that peace must wait on the regeneration of man, but rather hope that regeneration may some day follow peace.

Another subject which should not be a part of our peace plans is that of international boundaries in Europe. This question will be dealt with primarily in the Treaty of Victory rather than at the San Francisco conference. For the sake of peace, I sincerely hope the problem of these boundaries is not interwoven with the essentials of the arrangement for peace. Honourable members who read any of the authoritative books on the complications of boundary lines and the difficulties that arise from racial and religious differences and national hatreds will appreciate what may happen to our proposals if these collateral issues are tied in as part of the peace plan.

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN: That was the trouble with the League of Nations.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: Then there is the question of freedom of trade. The honourable senator from Shelburne (Hon. Mr. Robertson)

Hon. Mr. FARRIS.

made a most interesting speech on that subject. I was brought up in the belief of freer trade, and I still hold it as an ideal; but you and I, practical men of experience, know that nothing involves more of human selfishness than protection and free trade. Every change in the tariff which helps one man may adversely affect the business of another. Then there is trouble. So it is between nations. Tariff reform should be kept in its right place and right sequence. If we ever get this world welded together on a peace basis, we may then try to help the "have-not" nations, we may even try to help ourselves by more freedom in trade, but in the name of peace, the thing we now seek, let us divorce these proposals from immediate association with our plans for peace. We talk about the "four freedoms". There are other freedoms than those contained in the Atlantic Charter. We all have faith that over the years progress will be made by the peoples of the world. I for one believe that if we are not any better in our hearts, we are at least more intelligent, and with intelligence will come achievement.

But all these things, a better world, more equitable boundaries between nations, freedom of trade, the four freedoms, and many other reforms will come not as the basis of peace but as the result of a peace permanent and enduring.

Then there is the question of democracy as a basis of world peace. An editorial in the Ottawa Journal of April 3, discussing this subject, said:

Many do not like, and understandably, the idea of a great power overlordship; nor much relish the idea of membership in an organization which in one of its chief characteristics seems to violate the fundamental democratic principle of taxation without representation.

The editorial proceeds:

In some future, distant or near, the dominance of the great powers may be reduced, but to attempt that now, to argue that some small, weak country must have as much influence in a world security organization as Russia, the United States or Britain, is to argue nonsense. It is a condition the world faces, not a theory.

I want to say a word or two about democracy. In the first place, let us keep this in mind: The issue now is not democracy; it is peace. If honourable members will stop to think they will agree with me that democracy is the most highly specialized form of government the world has ever known.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: The achievement of successful democracy requires not merely an educated ruler, but also a highly developed and educated nation.

Some Hon. SENATORS: That is right.