

the free-trading England, which was content to take Cobden as its guide, has given place to the expansionist, militarist, financially-minded Imperialism of to-day . . . . Both our navy and our army overseas are an insurance provided and maintained by the nation at large for the capital owned abroad by our business class. The formal rights of control which the House of Commons enjoys are exceedingly limited. . . . Its assent is not required for a declaration of war, which means that it cannot interfere effectually before the event to delay a rupture to enforce arbitration, or to overthrow a minister who has failed to exhaust on behalf of peace all the resources of diplomacy. . . . A secret treaty is for us no less binding than a public instrument.

Mr. A. G. Gardiner, the great publicist, the great Liberal of England, complained bitterly of the development which had taken place in British procedure when he said that the authority of the British House of Commons with regard to foreign affairs was little more than that of a village debating society. Now, if that is the development which has taken place in Great Britain, I say that we in Canada shall be very foolish indeed if we place ourselves in such a position that we must endorse, or feel in honour bound to endorse, the policies that may be carried out over there in the interests of a very small group. I think we are not encouraged to give easy endorsement to what may be said from London when we consider the last war. I say frankly that this country was tricked, as other countries were, with regard to the real causes of the last war. At the Conference held August 4, 1917, Mr. Lloyd George declared:

What are we fighting for? To defeat the most dangerous conspiracy ever plotted against the liberty of nation, carefully, skilfully insidiously, clandestinely plotted in every detail with ruthless, cynical determination.

That was the idea given to the world at large, but Mr. Lloyd George himself, after the war was over, says—on December 23, 1920:

The more one reads memoirs and books written in the various countries of what happened before August 1st, 1914, the more one realizes that no one at the head of affairs quite meant war at that stage. It was something into which they glided, or rather staggered and stumbled, perhaps through folly, and a discussion, I have no doubt, would have averted it.

Mr. Lloyd George tells us afterwards—after thousands and tens of thousands and millions of men had laid down their lives—that a discussion would have averted the war. In a book, "Peaceless Europe," which is really great in that it reveals much of the war, Francesco S. Nitti tells us:

I cannot say that Germany and her Allies were solely responsible for the war which devastated Europe. . . . That statement which we all made during the war was a weapon to be used at the time. Now that the war is over, it cannot be used as a serious argument. . . .

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

When it will be possible to examine carefully the diplomatic documents of the war and time will allow us to judge them calmly, it will be seen that Russia's attitude was the real and underlying cause of the world conflict.

Thus we perceive very clearly that the fairy stories that were told us concerning the war were told us simply to keep up the morale of the people at that particular time. We were deceived as to the causes of the war; we were deceived during the war as to the real aims of the allies. Secret treaties were made which are only now being brought to light. And then, by that infamous Treaty of Versailles, it was possible to carry on the war after the war. Some of the leaders of a great many of the European nations to-day are recognizing that we are not going to have permanent peace in Europe until we have a revision of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Some of you remember Mr. Maynard Keynes's characterization of that treaty. We remember that it violated the terms on which our enemy laid down their arms. The best statesmen have recognized that it has led to the chaos that exists in Europe to-day.

I wish to place on record a policy which I might almost call a world policy, given, as it was, to the peoples of Europe by the great Trades Union Congress which met recently at the Hague, and concerning which I have seen very little in our Canadian papers. In his opening speech on December 9, J. H. Thomas, from the chair, stated that this Trade Union Congress represented, due allowance having been made for overlapping, no less than forty millions of people. What do the workers in Europe believe? The main points which the congress supported were the following:

- (1) Revision of the peace treaties.
- (2) Resistance to militarism and armaments, and control of the armament industry.
- (3) Admission of Germany and all nations into a revised league of peoples.
- (4) The suppression of secret treaties and secret diplomacy.
- (5) The use of all means to combat war, including the general strike if the outbreak of war is actually threatened.
- (6) Educational efforts in all directions to ingeminate ideas of peace and internationalism.
- (7) Opposition to the occupation of the Ruhr and all coercive action to secure reparations.
- (8) Acceptance of the German promise to repair the devastated areas of France and Belgium.
- (9) Submission to the League of Nations of the proposal for an international loan to supersede debts and indemnities.

Yesterday we heard the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) urge that we should give sureties for peace. Mr. Speaker, I submit that guarantees for the peace of Europe and for the world are not military guarantees. It is only as we bring