

1914-18, but the war did none of these things; on the contrary, it left us with the seeds of the present conflict.

Some of us at the close of the great war saw in the League of Nations an instrument to preserve peace and to establish a better world order. We saw it undermined by the very leaders who to-day are faced with war. When collective action could have been used to prevent war it was not used, and one of the first acts of our own government, I am sorry to say, was the one to which the Prime Minister himself referred yesterday, namely, the withdrawal of oil sanctions against Italy in the Ethiopian difficulty in 1935. I am not going to enter into recriminations, but before we are asked to vote for the speech from the throne and its implications, which have been further clarified this afternoon, we ought to be told what the war aims really are so far as Canada is concerned. Without such a statement we can scarcely be expected to vote for the address, even though for other reasons we might like to do so.

In an article in the *Christian Science Monitor* of September 6 Sir Norman Angell has something to say on this point—the point that collective security against violence is the basis of all civilization and of all organized society. I quote:

Will a victory of Britain and France mean a victory for that constitutional principle, so that henceforth it will be evident to aggressors that they will have to meet not merely the power of their intended victim, but the power of a large part of civilization? If that is indeed the principle for which our countries are fighting and it triumphs, then their triumph will in a very exact sense save civilization; will help the world to end that anarchy, that absence in the international field of all law against violence which lies at the root of war; will give to force in the international field the office which it has within nations—the office of withstanding violence by collective defence of the victim so that law and reason may prevail.

But that triumph depends upon a condition which should be of especial interest to readers of the *Christian Science Monitor*, the condition namely of believing deeply that this is indeed the purpose of our arms. If we think that the mere defeat of Germany will of itself give the peace we shall, of course, fail, for we defeated Germany twenty-one years ago and that defeat and our victory has not given peace. That costly victory proved futile because afterwards, although each was willing to use force to defend himself, we were not willing to use it to defend law when others and not ourselves happened to be the victim of its violation. If as a result of this war we are brought to realize that only so can force be made an instrument of peace, security, and justice, and the lesson is carried to the world, then our agonies will not have been in vain.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

As one who has always opposed war, who until very recently believed that all international problems could be settled by conference rather than by force, I am of the opinion that if we reconstitute the League of Nations it will involve the surrender perhaps of that portion of national sovereignty which involves the use of force; but, as in every civilized community, we shall have to recognize the fact that a reconstituted, reorganized league for law will require some power placed behind it which will enable that society to enforce its decisions upon an aggressor nation.

Where does Canada stand in relation to this problem? Before we are asked to approve the speech from the throne we should be informed, it seems to me, without evasion, without equivocation or mental reservation, what our peace aims are—because I prefer so to describe them. That brings me to another thought: what of our domestic policy during the war? Are we going to permit one group in our land to profit at the expense of all the rest of us? Already fortunes are being made out of the rise in price of certain stocks on the speculative market. Prices of commodities have risen also. The price of flour has risen without warrant, because the Canadian carry-over of wheat was all disposed of to the millers, exporters or speculators at least a month before this crisis developed, and at a very low price. The 100,000,000 bushels or so, speaking in round figures, of our carry-over of wheat was still mainly in Canada. Neither our government nor our farmers who produced it will reap any gain from that wheat. Only those who to-day stand between us and those who need it will make rich gains. I submit that the government should take effective steps to see that this does not happen. The same with sugar. In this city over the last week-end butter went up 7 cents per pound in the course of a day or two, and the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Blackmore) last night gave the increase in the price of lard.

I have had letters from constituents of my own pointing out to me that almost immediately the price of flour went up; and we all know what has happened to the price of sugar. These profits are being taken by middlemen of various types and, incidentally, on the instructions of large monopolistic distributors, at least in some instances. We urge, indeed we have the right to demand, that in view of what is happening the government should do what is being done in some other countries when it becomes necessary; it should exercise its power to commandeer these supplies and fix prices as a symbol of good faith with respect to its promises. That should be done