

that conversations carried on by him are on the ambassadorial level and are subject to other limitations. Consultation to be effective must take place at all levels and be of far more constant nature than it is at the present time.

To emphasize this, I should like to point out that the hereditary policy of England in foreign affairs has been based on the balance of power. Generations of foreign officials have been steeped in this idea. I hope I shall not be considered as criticizing the United Kingdom government when I say that this policy has inevitably led to war. It first of all leads to appeasement, then to sacrificing your friends to placate your enemies and subsequently to war. With the shrinkage of the world owing to transportation and industrial developments, wars are becoming more frequent and infinitely more destructive. There is a saying that we will lose the third war. We very nearly lost the first great war. When the history of this war is written it will appear that our nearness to defeat was so much closer than in 1914-18 that it will send chills down the backs of those who read it. We must see that there is no third time, and now is the time to start.

For a moment I should like to discuss the policy of the United Kingdom government and the issues of the last general election, which election was responsible for the present parliament at Westminster. Through the depression years the government of the United Kingdom was, like governments all over the world, faced with an almost impossible task. World discontent was rife and the tragedy of unemployment was universal in the civilized world. Therefore it was unlikely that the government would be reelected, particularly if they appealed on domestic issues. Leaders of political parties endeavour to choose issues on which their parties may be reelected. There is nothing surprising about that, and certainly there is nothing surprising that this should be the case in the United Kingdom. There was the Baldwin government, with an unpopular record on domestic affairs, looking for an issue. The proof of its unpopularity was that in the by-elections between the years 1931 and 1935 the government fought forty-nine by-elections and won only six.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, I said that I would not interrupt my hon. friend, but I think I ought to draw his attention to the fact that this House of Commons is not the place to discuss the affairs of another parliament. I believe the rules of the house are quite clear on that point. The

[Mr. Adamson.]

Baldwin government has not a representative here to defend it unless some hon. gentlemen take that task in hand.

Mr. ADAMSON: I am not attacking the Baldwin government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend said that he was going to discuss a British election and the parliament which resulted from it, and so forth. That has not anything to do with the external affairs of Canada.

Mr. ADAMSON: Well, unfortunately I believe it has.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Again I say that I do not want to have any controversy with my hon. friend, but I should like it to be quite clear that the rule is, that the internal affairs of the government of another country should not be discussed on the floor of this House of Commons; also there is the rule of relevancy. If my hon. friend wishes to proceed to discuss these matters further, of course I will not say anything further.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): The point made by the Prime Minister is correct.

Mr. CASSELMAN: What is the rule?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): I trust the hon. member will not carry on.

Mr. CASSELMAN: What is the rule?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have stated the rule in general terms.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Just as the Prime Minister has stated—it has nothing to do with this item which is before the committee.

Mr. ADAMSON: I hope the Prime Minister will allow me to discuss the League of Nations because that was discussed definitely this afternoon, but the point I wish to make in this debate is merely this. Because we did not raise our voice at that time, we lost the opportunity to make ourselves an effective instrument for the preservation of peace. The evidence I wish to put on the record does not concern the United Kingdom government. I am going to deal with the League of Nations and the abrogation of the Locarno pact. That was the last opportunity the world had for the preservation of peace, and I think it is very important that we should discuss it here and now because it was the last and inevitable step to war. In a debate on external affairs that is of vital importance. The British government at that time was a party to the abrogation—not a party, but it allowed the