

At this time of anxiety occasioned by the most astounding threats to our liberty and freedom—yes, to our civilization itself—we can do no better than listen again to these words and embrace their meaning.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (Broadview): Mr. Chairman, there is no use in repeating the debate of the past two or three days. I should not have taken part in this present debate had it not been for the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis), of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. The present condition of Europe is due to pacifism and the disarmament of Britain which has occurred in recent years. No section of this house is more responsible for this condition than the section made up of the hon. gentlemen who have taken part in the debate this afternoon. The end of all things came at Munich. At Munich there was a beginning of a new era in Europe. When Mr. Chamberlain and the president of France signed the pact at Munich, it was the death warrant of the League of Nations and collective security. Europe is now governed by a four-power pact signed by Germany, Italy, France and Great Britain. Collective security is dead. It has never been anything else in the history of the world but a sham. Collective security led Great Britain to disarm the finest army, the finest navy and the finest air force the world had ever seen. It almost ruined the democracies and established the dictators.

The result of all this was the state of affairs we saw in Ethiopia, in Spain, in Czechoslovakia and in many other small countries of Europe. This is due to pacifism. I thought we would have seen the end of pacifism after Munich. After Ethiopia I thought we would never hear any more about pacifism in this country. What is the policy of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation? What would the members of that group have done if they had been in Mr. Chamberlain's place? They probably would have declared war. They probably would have declared war on Italy over Ethiopia. They would probably have declared war on Germany. What is their policy. What would they do? If Great Britain had declared war in connection with sanctions against Italy, if Great Britain had declared war on Germany because of Czechoslovakia, would the hon. gentlemen themselves of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation have enlisted to stop these dictators? No, they would not have enlisted. They would have said to our soldiers, "Get over to the war and fight for us while we stay at home and preach pacifism." That is the policy of hon. gentlemen.

[Mr. Massey.]

Only two years ago the London, England, school board would not allow the royal air force to use the schools of that city. They said it would be considered as a military action. They would not allow Lord Jellicoe's speech to be circulated throughout the schools of London. In this country certain pacifist school boards also have abolished cadet training. That was not an agency of war; it promoted peace. It was an effort to train cadets for the militia of this country. When these trouble makers at Geneva had a chance to do something, they did not do it. The league sat by and watched continuous slave raids on the Red sea area from Ethiopia, and did nothing. Steamers, some of them as large as the Niagara boats, were being filled with slaves and sent across the Red sea to Arabia and other countries, but nothing was done about it. The league was simply a debating society. Only a few weeks before Munich a delegation from Canada was sent to the League of Nations, although we all knew that the Munich pact was the death warrant of the league and that such a mission could only be sent in vain.

Coming closer to home, let me say that the hon. member for Vancouver East made about the same speech he made this afternoon on May 26, 1938. At that time he was criticizing the government. It had imposed sanctions against Italy and then repealed them. His policy would, if put into action, have led to war with our old ally, Italy. He did not agree with the embargo which had been placed on the shipment of munitions to Spain, and all that sort of thing. I think we should take as an example what occurred yesterday in the British House of Commons. All the parties of that house decided that there should be a union of spirit in the house of all political parties, and a minimum of criticism of the new forward policy to stop Germany and her march to world domination. That is what we should have in this house to-day. We have had two days of debate on this matter and the question has been gone into very fully. Why repeat it now?

While I do not agree with some of the things the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said, I am ready to admit that he has a very hard task. I hope that this item will pass immediately. I realize that the Prime Minister and the Department of External Affairs have an onerous trust and a difficult task to perform, but I should like to see more publicity in connection with the matters covered by this debate, and in connection with external affairs. I am not claiming to know as much about these matters as the Prime

Minister, but I should like to see more information given to hon. members and to the country. We should not be forced to rely upon United States chain newspapers and upon some of the affiliations of the Canadian radio stations for information about Great Britain and foreign affairs. I should like to see a policy adopted by which the leader of the opposition (Mr. Manion) and other leaders in the house would be informed of things from day to day, as is done in the old country.

Hon. gentlemen are saying that Canada did not interfere in Spain. Why did not the United States interfere in that conflict? Why did not the United States interfere in Czechoslovakia? They did not interfere because they could not under the Johnson resolution, which resolution prohibits them from shipping arms to any belligerent. That resolution treats the attacker and the attacked in the same way. The people in Spain who have suffered so would be treated just the same as the attackers. Then there is also the Ludlow resolution, which did not pass but which set out what is really the policy of the present government. That is the policy of Andrew Jackson and George Washington, namely, that the nation shall not take part in any foreign war unless it is attacked. I see no reason why on these items in the estimates there should be any further repetition of the discussion which has taken place. True, the hon. member for Vancouver East has stated his case very fully, with his attitude to-day showing some variations which the Spanish situation has brought about. I hope that during the coming year the house and the country will be taken more into the confidence of the government and the Department of External Affairs. They are not conducting their own personal business; they have a trust—they are conducting business which is of vital importance to the defence and security of this country.

Mr. P. J. ROWE (Athabaska): Because it is my belief that modern wars are largely economic in origin, I desire from that point of view to discuss our relationships with other nations through the Department of External Affairs. The hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) has criticized the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation for idealism, impractical theories, and so on, but I suggest that a time has arrived in human history when a man cannot claim to be a realist merely because he insists upon repeating the errors of his ancestors, the methods which have been tried, weighed in the scales of human experience, and found wanting. We should become realistic, I believe, in the sense

59—1939—21

that we undertake a scientific analysis of the existing situation and then proceed to apply measures which will really solve the problem.

To my mind most if not all of the so-called moral diseases of mankind are a result of the abnormal conditions, past and present, under which people have been and are compelled to live, and the cure for those diseases necessarily involves the removal of the cause.

Speakers so far in this debate, and, indeed, all the leaders of mankind to-day, agree in that they believe in peace and want peace; they differ only as to how peace may be achieved. Most economists to-day agree, I think, that the problem of war is largely rooted in the economic system under which we live. In other words, war is a disease, and like all other diseases it cannot be fought until the origins of the disease are discovered and it cannot be cured until they are removed. A world war to-day would be similar to an earthquake, and nobody wins in an earthquake. We cannot expect to win a war any more than we can expect to win an epidemic. If war is a disease we must fight it with scientific methods.

I believe that enduring peace can never come to the world until we establish conditions in which peace can take root, grow and flourish. Those conditions do not exist at present. But they can be made to exist, not by denunciation, abuse, calling names, threats of force or organized murder, but by calmly and quietly facing the facts and then, through a series of conferences in which all nations would take part, setting about to make the necessary changes.

What are the principal causes of war? In my opinion, there are two. Of course there are a number of contributory causes, such as political nationalism, but the two major causes are the maldistribution of vital natural resources in the world and the economic system of producing and distributing wealth.

Six nations of the world, commonly known as the "have nations," to-day control seventy-five per cent of the earth's surface and eighty-five per cent of its raw materials, while sixty-eight other nations have to be content with twenty-five per cent of the earth's surface and fifteen per cent of its raw materials. I quote an extract from the *Ottawa Citizen* of March 22, 1938, reporting an address made to a service club in Montreal by Professor F. G. Stanley, of Mount Allison university, Sackville, New Brunswick:

The "have" nations of the world should get together in a friendly spirit of understanding and cooperation with the "have-nots" if peace is to be maintained. Great Britain, France and Russia control half the world's surface, and with the United States, China and Brazil they