

ing the goods and services which it needs to supply its people with a desirable standard of living, the freer that state is, and the more likely it is to be strong and prosperous.

Liberals in the house as well as a great many Conservatives will be somewhat interested in the observations made by Mr. W. H. Moore, who was for a long time the member for Ontario in this house, in his recent book "Grey Days", which I fancy most hon. members have read. Mr. Moore had established a reputation for being a thorough student, a careful thinker and a cautious speaker. On page 100 of his book, he makes this observation concerning economic policy:

It is a dogmatic phrase, "There is nothing else to do"; but I have not coined it; the admonition to balance our economy arises out of the requirements of human welfare in a changed world.

So I make no bones about suggesting that the country should have its economy, its way of life based upon the principle of economic self-sufficiency. Let us have our own oil produced in this country; let us have our own coal; let us have our own sugar and our own rubber; let us produce as many essential products as we possible can.

With the details of human rights as listed in the section which I read from the eminent committee's report there will be, I presume, but negligible disagreement in the house. May we seek now to arrive at a united opinion as regards what causes make human rights so hard to guarantee, and what this parliament can do toward remedying or even eliminating those causes.

The main causes of the miscarriage of justice in respect of human rights arise from insufficiency and insecurity of income—poverty—and from war.

The main causes of war are economic. Men fight because of commercial rivalries. Commercial rivalry results from shortage of purchasing power in home markets, from adverse trade balances, and the fear of adverse trade balances—and consequent irreparable international debt. Men fight also for markets and for access to raw materials, which is only another way of saying what I have just said. Practically all these causes would efface themselves if the nations would recognize and adopt certain fundamental principles upon which the state ought to base its way of life internationally; that is, in its relations with its neighbour states.

These international principles involve the establishment of a world peace organization under which, first, each nation retains its complete sovereignty to order its affairs in

accordance with the will of its people. I opposed the formation of the united nations. There are hon. members in this house who will remember that in March and April, 1945, I rose and opposed that organization, and I am convinced the day will come when members will realize that the whole San Francisco agreement was based upon false principles and has done more harm in the world than good.

But that does not mean that I am opposed to having an international organization. Mr. Anthony Eden, as I recall it, stood in this house and advocated the formation of an international organization based upon the blueprint of the British commonwealth. We British nations did not need to have a central organization established in London to order Canada to go to war when Britain was in danger, to order Australia or New Zealand to go to war. Those nations were fully aware of the danger which threatened them and they rushed into the conflict as quickly as did the motherland. Will anyone tell me that the nations of the world would not do a similar thing?

Why should there be an international police force with power to order nations to war, to order them to conscript men to be sent to it? The whole idea is so contrary to our democratic way of thinking that I stand astounded that hon. members were ever deluded by the concept. But that does not mean that I am opposed to an international organization based upon the complete sovereignty of every state, so that the state would be free to go into the struggle or stay out, as *Eire* did in this war. If the struggle is not of such a nature as would commend itself to the states concerned, then they could pretty well count on a good many states remaining out.

Second, each state undertakes to maintain adequate armed forces. Third, each power undertakes to go to the aid of any other member of the association of nations who is the victim of armed aggression.

Mr. JAENICKE: Who would decide that, if there were no central organization?

Mr. BLACKMORE: Who decided it in the British commonwealth?

Mr. JAENICKE: The world is not all British.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Who decided that Great Britain, France and the others should be united in the struggle? There was no central body with the power to command.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: There was a war.

Mr. BLACKMORE: During peace there is a war against poverty and there is a war