

Supply—External Affairs

The minister of external affairs has a great public trust in his hands. Not only have we assisted the mother country in throwing away her means of defence, but we have thrown over our friends. Canada was represented at the Brussels conference, but it was a complete failure. The speech that President Roosevelt made at Chicago was filled with platitudes. When Sir Ronald Lindsay, the British ambassador at Washington, went to see Mr. Hull to ask if the United States would join in sending a note to Japan, he was told that the United States would act alone. The policy of that country has been isolationist since the days of Washington. The people of Canada are now becoming alarmed.

War will never be abolished until we make a much better job of peace than we have in the past. War would be further off if all the sham in Geneva was eliminated. When men are ready to do their duty by their neighbours, war will go. What is the use of talking, as they do at Geneva, about the mote in war's eye and the beam in the eyes of Geneva and peace? Did we not say in 1914 that it was a war to end war? Let us look at the economic aspects of peace and war. Peace as we have it with all its suffering, all its unemployment and misery, is as dreadful as war in many ways. Those things which are as terrible and evil as war in times of peace are social wars, unemployment, fratricidal wars, every form of racketeering, whether industrial, political or in lines of trade, and other conflicts which are a part of human life. Wars are generally started as the last means of settling a dispute. The League of Nations was formed to avert war; it provoked it. If war could be abolished by a simple formula, it would have been abolished two thousand years ago. Similar leagues in history have failed before.

I have asked in vain: Has Canada a defence policy? Has Canada a foreign policy? Is Canada a member of the league? Is the league still in existence? If so, for what purpose? We have spent nearly \$4,000,000 on the league and have got nowhere. I should like to quote from a dispatch from Douglas Oliver when he interviewed the Prime Minister on his arrival at Quebec, returning from the coronation. This dispatch is dated July 8, and reads in part:

Canada's defence policy has not apparently changed one bit as a result of all the recent imperial conference deliberation over the serious international situation, Prime Minister MacKenzie King indicated to-day.

In Germany, he had an interview with Chancellor Hitler.

[Mr. Church.]

It is said that it is intended to extend our diplomatic corps abroad. I think the best thing that could be done would be to close up this service altogether. Adequate armaments in this country are necessary, but adequate armaments without adequate man power are ineffective. As the Secretary of State for war in Great Britain said, every gun and every soldier to man a gun bring closer not war but peace. Canada's policy in foreign affairs should be cooperation and coordination with the mother country and with the mother country alone, and should fit in with the policy of the mother country on land and sea and in the air as a distinct unit correlated and interwoven.

We have been told that as a country we shall have to depend for our defence in the future on the people of the United States. That is some of the advice that has been given in the house. There is such a division among Quebec members supporting the government that two of them even read us out of the empire altogether, and one wanted us to cooperate with the United States in a joint defence policy.

I have already said that the policies of Washington have been reasserted by Mr. Hull. That policy is: No entangling alliances. The American people feel that the leaders in Washington may have been listening to war propaganda, and the ex-Secretary of State said that the United States has no such alliances, that their policy is, as it has been in the past from the days of Washington, to go it alone.

Let us look for a moment or two at how the people of the mother country have depended on the United States, and see what it has cost the motherland to have surrendered its own view on national problems and on the peace of the world to the views of the United States. It is well to remember this. It is no criticism of the great people to the south of us. They are thinking only of America first. They are our own kith and kin. But they have an isolation policy, and there are many people in the United States, millions of foreign origin, who think that the policy of the United States has been wrong since Washington laid down the principle that the United States should keep out of European troubles. Let us see how Great Britain has surrendered its views for the benefit of the people of the United States.

The first occasion since the war was the establishment of the League of Nations as part of the treaty of Versailles. Great Britain agreed to this at the behest of President Wilson. France would consent only if Britain