

to prevent the acquiring of armaments by aggressors, an organization to prevent and stop war, and a world court of international justice:

An organization to prevent the acquiring of armaments, and an organization to prevent war! It seems so simple, honourable senators; and it is logical. We have been brought up on the doctrine that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. As I have already said, our experience within our own nation demonstrates the value of prevention. In the Criminal Code of Canada we have laws not only against acts of violence and disturbances of the peace, but very drastic laws against the carrying of certain kinds of weapons. Why? Not because we are an unlawful community, but because in Canada, as in every other lawful community, there are certain people who, unless kept within check, will commit deprecations. The same thing is true of nations. In this debate an honourable member quoted President Roosevelt or Prime Minister Churchill—I have forgotten which—as having said that not ten per cent of the people of the world wanted war. The simple, the logical and the practical thing to do is to take care of the unruly and the unlawful in world relations as we do in our domestic relations.

Let us look at our problem from the point of view of experience. History is a great guide. Without elaborating upon them, I will mention a few dates and incidents, just as a reminder of what happened in the recent past because of the failure of peace-loving nations to take appropriate action against aggressors. In 1931 Japan invaded Manchuria. China, a member of the League of Nations, appealed to that body, which appointed a committee of experts. It was, I think, two years before the committee brought in its report, which gave Japan a slap on the wrist, whereupon Japan retired from the League. In 1935 Abyssinia was invaded, and sanctions were applied against Italy. These things are coming home to us. If I had my way I should take that word "sanctions" out of the new arrangement, for in my opinion sanctions are only a source of aggravation and irritation. In international relations you either mean business or you do not. If you apply sanctions with respect to cloth and odds and ends, but not with respect to the oil which enables the aggressor to wage war, you simply create a source of irritation to the aggressor and of aggravation to yourself.

There was a man standing on the sidelines in 1935, watching to see what the peace-loving world would do to check Italy. What happened in 1936? That man, the greatest enemy of humanity who has ever lived, invaded and occupied the Rhineland. In

July of the same year the Spanish civil war broke out. I read the other day that Captain Liddell Hart said that the second Great War began in July, 1936. In 1937 the war between Japan and China started. What do we remember about that war? Well, we did not object to the shipment to Japan of scrap iron and other goods useful in the waging of war. We also remember that later on the Burma road was closed. In 1938 came Germany's annexation of Austria. Things began to move faster then. In that same year there occurred the partition of Czechoslovakia, and next year, 1939, the second World War began.

It would be unfair and idle to indulge in recriminations about these things, but there is every reason why each of us should look into his own heart and say: "Just what was my attitude at that time? To what degree did I, by voice or influence or in any other way, endeavour to contribute to a different situation?" They who can give favourable answers to these questions are very rare. Those who attempted anything are mighty few. Two men did. Anthony Eden resigned from the British Government. Churchill during the years from 1932 to 1938 made many speeches warning his country and the world of Germany's re-arming, and the imminence of war. His son assembled and published those speeches under the title of *Arms and the Covenant*. I have the book before me, and I recommend it to every senator, and also to the members of our delegation. If time was not going so fast I should like to read a page or two from this book; I will not do so. Churchill gave ample warning of the threat of war, but his warning was not heeded.

An Hon. SENATOR: That is right.

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: To-day, with a conviction born of reality, we know that over those years the world, including Canada, was the victim of a state of pacifism, which is an illogical desire for peace that blinds man to realities and makes him believe that what he does not see will not hurt him. This is a characteristic which the pacifist holds in common with the ostrich. When trouble comes the ostrich sticks his head in the sand; the pacifist hides his head under the blankets. All that we have gone through from the time of the last war up to 1939 has brought home to us some wholesome truths that we should do well to remember, whether we can make our children remember them or not. It is a fact that too great a desire for peace defeats its own end. Peace at any price means no peace at all. Looking back, we can see clearly that we