

frankly that the present regulations create hardships, but I think that on balance we must agree that the establishing of these controls created a great deal more security than we would have had if there had not been controls. Until we have adequate housing units for all the people in Canada who want them, taking into account the effect that removing controls would have on the cost of living, I think the administration must continue these controls for a longer period.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the members of the house for permitting me to make these few comments.

Mr. E. D. FULTON (Kamloops): It is not my purpose this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to debate specific issues of foreign policy, nor is it my place to suggest what should be our policy on specific questions. But as I indicated last night, the reason that I participate in this debate at this stage is that I feel that the question of foreign policy generally and the situation confronting the world is so important, so fraught with possible consequences for good or ill, requires positive action on Canada's part to such an extent, that we should request once again that the government make a statement on foreign policy to the house and to the country so that people of Canada and the world at large will know where we stand. What I intend to do this afternoon is to indicate some of the dangers and disadvantages, inherent in maintaining the present silence, which dictate that we should have a foreign policy known to all the world, and to press again for a statement at an early moment.

The background of events from 1935 to 1939 has already been referred to, and it has been stated that recent events in Europe bear a disturbing, an almost frightening, resemblance to what took place between 1935 and 1939. There is one event particularly which took place in 1935 to which I wish to refer in order to emphasize why that background for events today and the background for events in the past is so similar. It was an event which no Canadian can recall with pride. It took place at Geneva at the time when, the Canadian delegate having espoused the cause of oil sanctions against Italy, that attitude was repudiated by the Canadian government. It has been alleged, and I certainly believe, that this was the beginning of the end of collective security. From there on the smaller free nations of Europe and other continents were picked off one by one. No one believed there was any point in standing together or that any action would be taken to preserve them. There was no collective security. So the scene was laid, the

stage was set for the drama of the aggression and rise to power of Hitler and Mussolini. And because that death knell was sounded then; because the results were so tragic and disastrous, we cannot afford to let history repeat itself and allow the impression to go abroad once more that the countries of the west, the democracies, are not going to act together against aggression.

That immediately raises the question: what, then, is Canada's attitude? What is Canada's policy in the light of these circumstances? In effect, Mr. Speaker, it raises the question directly: has Canada a foreign policy? That is a question which so far the government has not answered. We took pride, and a just pride, in our position as a leader among the middle powers. We achieved that position largely as a result of the efforts made by our armed forces during the war. At that time it was easy to have a foreign policy. Canada's voice was certain and sure, and was understood and respected by all powers, particularly the middle powers. But it is very doubtful if any middle power, particularly, could answer the question which they must be asking themselves at the moment: where does Canada stand? What is Canada's foreign policy? One has only to ask where the countries of South America or such of the democracies of central and western Europe as still survive can find an answer to that question. What will Canada do in any given set of circumstances? Has Canada a foreign policy? Will Canada help? After recent events in Czechoslovakia it is quite certain those countries could not find an answer to that question because our attitude—and this is the great objection to it—looks like the acceptance of a *fait accompli*. We have made no protest; we have barely even referred to the coup in Czechoslovakia. The Czechoslovakian minister in this country has made his protest, one which I think might well evoke some response from Canada. The events now taking place in Europe with respect to Finland and Germany have raised the same question: what is Canada's policy? What is Canada's attitude with respect to those developments?

I should like to make this point, perhaps just in passing. The present government, as a matter of policy, has opposed any move toward the development of a united commonwealth voice on foreign policy. At the moment I am not prepared to enter into a debate on the merits of that position, but I think that can be stated as a fact. However one may view that fact, unfortunately the government have not taken the other step which they might have been expected to take