

C276018

from whatever part of the country we may come; whether we live under the shelter of the common law or of the civil code; whether we express those ideals in one language or in another; whether our spiritual guidance comes from one church or from another, our basic conceptions and ideals remain the same, founded as they are upon a Christian faith in the dignity and importance of the individual.

In contrast to this point of view is the tenet of faith of the totalitarian state, where the central authority is the state itself and the one at the head of the state is the lord and master of his people. Under such ideology the state is deified, and there is complete subjugation of the individual, who is forced into a bullied mass of his fellows, the servant of his lord and dictator, and the master of none, not even himself. In what sharp contradistinction is our conception of individual worth under the ideology that has inspired our society, under a democracy where the importance of the individual is paramount, wherein we conceive the state to be made by man and for him, and not man for the state. Yes, and we go further and believe that tantamount to the successful acceptance of our Christian belief is a recognition of the supreme importance of the individual himself.

It must therefore be of the greatest possible concern to us that the people of Great Britain, who share and hold that faith as firmly as we do ourselves, should contemplate the possibility that we may have no alternative but to defend it with force. That would be the situation, it seems to me, on what might be described as purely ideological grounds. But when we consider the strong bonds of loyalty, of law, and even of selfish economic interest by which we are tied to the people of the British Isles, I find it hard to believe that any of us would fail to realize that the destruction and subjugation of that people would be a calamity for this country scarcely less serious than that of actual invasion of our shores. I can conceive of no greater catastrophe that could befall this dominion than the defeat of Great Britain by a powerful enemy, and no greater drastic damage or injury could be done this country as a nation than would be done by such a totally catastrophic event.

During the course of the debate on foreign affairs we have heard something of the ties of loyalty and of law that bind Canada to the commonwealth and to the crown. We have also heard strong expressions of opinion, notably from the Minister of Justice and the leader of the opposition as to the grave danger inherent in any suggestion that

[Mr. Massey.]

those ties might be weakened or destroyed. With the views to which I refer I need scarcely say I find myself in hearty accord.

I hope no one will imagine that I fail to give to such considerations the predominant importance due them, and fail to put first things first, if I turn for a moment to say something of the economic importance to Canada of our trade relationship to the other members of the commonwealth, and particularly to Great Britain. Rightly or wrongly—and I for one profoundly believe, rightly—as we all know this country has been organized economically as well as politically upon the assumed existence of a strong, wealthy and independent Britain, with whom we should be able to continue to carry on a large volume of trade, I sometimes wonder whether we all fully appreciate how fundamental this assumption of a strong, wealthy, independent Britain is to the whole structure of the Canadian economic system.

It is often pointed out that, in an economic as well as in a political sense, Canada occupies an intermediate position between Great Britain and the United States, and is extremely sensitive to changes in the economic conditions in either country. Such a position is in many respects a favourable one, but it does mean that we are peculiarly vulnerable to any grave economic disturbance in either country. Now under present-day conditions the greatest economic disturbance of all is that which results from defeat in war. And next to our own defeat, no single event can be imagined that would be so completely destructive of the economic well-being of this country as the defeat in war of Great Britain or of the United States. Imagination is not equal to the task of picturing the situation in which the people of this country would find themselves, should they suddenly be faced with the reality of a conquered and prostrate British empire.

But one thing at least is clear: that situation would impose at once a strain and stress upon our whole business, agricultural and economic system that would make the troubles of 1932 and 1933 seem like a mild spring shower compared to a tropical tornado. Perhaps some hon. members in the debate have concentrated their attention upon the stress and strain set up within our economic system as a result of actual conflict, stress and strain occasioned by the carrying on of a war—which condition, of course, is bad enough. But have they gone farther and considered what would be the result to us were Great Britain defeated in such a war. Yes, war itself is bad enough, but defeat in war is the

C276019

ultimate in disaster. Thus in our deliberations at the present time let us not be blinded by the fantastic and horrible contemplation of actual conflict and our abhorrence of it, and neglect entirely in our thinking the possible consequences of defeat in such a conflict. From such a situation no one can tell what sort of Canada would ultimately emerge, but certainly it would be a very different Canada from this country as we now know it. I question whether the inevitable readjustments would be made without the destruction of our most cherished institutions and liberties. There may be some communists or others who could view this prospect with equanimity or even with enthusiasm. But so far as concerns the vast mass of the Canadian people I believe that they would realize at once the extent to which their own vital interests were involved, and would not willingly contemplate the defeat and subjugation of the British people until we had exhausted every strength and resource in a determined effort to prevent such a catastrophe.

I really believe that this is true almost to the same extent of the United States of America, that if the people of the United States ever came to believe that the freedom and integrity of Great Britain were about to be destroyed, and the British people likely to become a subject race, they too would intervene to prevent it, with every means in their power. Can anyone doubt that if those who apparently now seek to achieve the domination of Europe were to succeed in the destruction of the power of Great Britain and of France they would not inevitably be brought into conflict with the vital interests of the United States, whose ideals and conceptions are so essentially the same as ours?

When I express these points of view I hope and trust they will be accepted by all hon. members as wholly Canadian and dictated solely by the view I hold of what constitutes the vital interests of the people of Canada. Within Canada we have our minor differences and conflicts of opinion in lesser matters. We have extremists at both ends of the scale on many subjects. There are those in all parts of the dominion who sometimes appear to believe that no one is entitled to call himself a Canadian unless his ancestors have been in this country for two hundred years. But after all, this is not the time to debate the past, or to theorize in connection with it. We are dealing with a present situation, vivid and real, and I firmly believe that this is a time when we should as far as possible neglect internal differences of opinion on sectional or national matters and completely devote ourselves to the welfare of this whole country,

59—1939—2

actuated by no other determination but that of defending its vital interests. If there is any difference between us, it is only in opinions we may hold as to the limitations to be placed upon these vital interests, and as to the steps it may be necessary to take in order to defend them.

Let me say that I do not see any irreconcilable conflict of opinion as inevitable upon these matters. I do not believe there is any member of the house who, if he came to believe that without the help and support of Canada, Great Britain was about to be defeated by a major European power whose avowed intention it was to destroy the basic liberties of the British people—I do not believe, I say, that there is any one of us who in that event would still adhere to a determination that we should hold our hand and refuse our aid.

Is it not true that many of our differences are coloured by the recollection of bitterness in which many of us had no part, and which there is no reason to believe need ever be caused again? There is a temperamental unwillingness in each of us to concur in an opinion which is supported by the threat of coercion. Surely the statements made by the right hon. the Prime Minister, by the right hon. the Minister of Justice and by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition should be sufficient to convince everyone that no such threat exists. In those circumstances is it too much to hope that after earnest consideration and reconsideration of the position of our country, in a state of world uncertainty that seems to amount almost to a condition of perpetual emergency, we shall as a nation be able to achieve that full measure of unanimity of opinion with respect to our own position in the world and the protection of our vital interests without which it is not possible for any country to make an effective effort to defend them?

In concluding, Mr. Chairman, may we turn our minds back to Christmas day, 1934, and Christmas day, 1935, and hear again the voice of his late majesty, King George V, speaking to us:

I would like to think that you who are listening to me now, in whatever part of the world you may be, and all the peoples of this realm and empire, are bound to me and to one another, by the spirit of one great family. My desire and hope is that the same spirit may become ever stronger in its hold and wider in its range.

The world is still restless and troubled. . . . I am convinced that if we meet them (our anxieties) in the spirit of one family we shall overcome them. . . .

United by bonds of willing service, let us prove ourselves both strong to endure and resolute to overcome.