

going to be made by the Department of National Defence to take the profit out of war, this is the time to be doing it. The minister says that a survey is being made. A few nights ago I moved in the house a motion asking the government in the event of war to bring down the necessary legislation to conscript automatically all the industrial, financial and natural resources of the nation to meet the event of war. The government took no steps to accept that resolution; it was talked out. If the government is perfectly sincere, it has a great deal more to do than merely make a survey. It ought to take steps now to see to it that in the event of war we shall go out and not conscript men only but the materials with which to equip the men who go out to do their duty.

May I now state the three reasons why I cannot vote for the increase in armaments. First, I do not feel that the government has shown that we are in any way more menaced this year than we were last year. This group has not said that it is not in favour of defence, but we are opposed to an increase in the defence estimates because it has not yet been demonstrated that the danger has become any greater now than it was twelve months or twenty-four months ago.

Against whom are we arming? What potential aggressor is more aggressive to-day? Oh, I know that bogeymen have been trotted out in this chamber. It has been suggested that it might be Italy, it might be Germany, it might be Japan. I cannot suppose that the government has any real fear of the intentions of these nations, for I noticed in the figures I have just read that Canada is shipping nickel to them. Knowing that we control the major part of the world's nickel supplies, I cannot believe that we would ship to them material which we feared would be returned to us in the form of high explosives. Surely those who talked about the Italians bombing this House of Commons did not imagine that the government of the day would allow us to send them the nickel with which to make those bombs, or did they?

The second reason why I cannot support these increased expenditures is that I am convinced they will not be used purely for national defence but will inevitably lead us to participation in war. I know this has been categorically denied by the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Defence. I am sure that they are sincere. But may I point out that, no matter how sincere governments may be, there are understandings and obligations which are very difficult to avoid when a country once starts on a program of armaments. On April 1, 1935, at

page 2307 of Hansard, I find the following statement:

It is quite easy to say that we would stay out of the war, that we would not send men to fight in Europe, but after the experience I had of the pressure which was exerted at the time of the Chanak incident... I have very grave doubts as to what might happen in Canada if war were to break out again in any part of the world.

That is the statement of the present Prime Minister of Canada, then the leader of the opposition. He then doubted if in the event of a world war Canada could stay out. I wonder whether he has changed his mind to-day? Those who have read the memoirs of Viscount Grey of Fallodon, who was Sir Edward Grey, foreign secretary of Great Britain, at the outbreak of the war, will remember that he says that, unknown to the cabinet, understandings had been made between the British and French naval staffs, with the result that Mr. Asquith seriously thought of resigning because commitments had been made without the knowledge either of the cabinet or of parliament. The Prime Minister says that Canada will pursue at the imperial conference the same policy it has pursued in days gone by. I hope that is true. I am sure that hon. members on this side of the house were very glad to hear that statement. But the fact remains that the statements of Sir Samuel Hoare, Mr. Neville Chamberlain, and the minister for co-ordination of defence show that a great rearmament program is going on in Great Britain. To me it seems no accident that coincident with the increased armament program in other parts of the British Empire there is an increased expenditure for armaments in Canada. It seems to me we are preparing a program that will fit neatly into the great jigsaw of imperial defence.

The third reason why I cannot support these increased estimates is that I feel they are the price the Canadian people are being called upon to pay for the weakness and spinelessness of those who have been responsible for Canada's foreign policy, particularly during the past eighteen months. A great deal has been said about bogeymen in Europe and the rearmament that is going on. Why is it going on? Because every country to-day has lost confidence in collective action based upon collective security. Why? Because the whole ideal of collective security has been sabotaged. It started when Japan was allowed with impunity to ravish Manchukuo. At that time Sir John Simon, British foreign secretary, made an impassioned defence of Japan's action at the Assembly of the League of Nations. In 1935 Italy embarked on a similar program in Ethiopia.