

Mr. ST. LAURENT: Such is my understanding of this section, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAYMOND: Thank you. With the reservations I have already mentioned, provided, the charter may be amended for the better; and provided Canada may end its membership in this organization if it does not correspond to its ideals; provided also that no agreement for the sending of armed forces may be entered into without Parliament's ratification, I would not dare to oppose the formation of such an organization designed to maintain international peace and security even were its chances of success very small. Be it ever so little, it is better than nothing.

Mr. JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT (Témiscouata) (Text): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond) on his speech. He delivered it with serenity; what he said was to the point, and I appreciate it. I congratulate also all the other hon. members who have taken part in this debate. They are fed up with war and hope to have everlasting peace based upon justice and charity.

That is easy to say but hard to bring about. What has struck me from the beginning of this united nations organization is the complete lack of imagination. Everyone complains of the futility of what was done after the last war to prevent the recurrence of war; yet the same path has been followed. The new organization will not be called a league of nations, but it will be the same thing. We are to have an international court of justice, and exactly the same system which we hope will prevent war. Let us see now why we had war again. It was not so much because of the inefficiency of the league of nations or the incapacity of the court of justice established at the Hague. It was precisely due to the greed of a few people that Hitler became what he was. It was due to the nations who subscribed to the radical socialist party of France, which held the hand of France when that country was about to expel Hitler from the Ruhr.

We have responsibilities. There is an American who was mixed up in some financial deals to make Hitler what he was. There were Englishmen who were interested in German industry. They financed it and made him what he was. They financed Austria, Italy and all those countries, and they said, "We propose that we must have international good understanding, international good will and co-operation." They did not realize that the mushrooms they were growing were venomous.

We have suffered from that. Hitler has probably been killed; Mussolini is surely dead—we got rid of them. Hirohito is beginning to

[Mr. Raymond.]

have manners and is calling upon MacArthur. This is supposed to be great progress.

But what about those who are really responsible for the war? What about the Munich men? There are two on this continent. There is little "Jockey" MacDonald, High Commissioner for Great Britain in Ottawa. He is a Munich man, and the son of a man who did not increase the military strength of England while he was Prime Minister of that country. Then we have another Munich man, who is the representative of the United Kingdom in the United States—Lord Halifax. So that we have two Munich men representing the United Kingdom in North America. Nobody complains about it; they are taken for granted—"Mr. MacDonald, how do you do?" "Lord Halifax, ho, ho." It is not "Lord Haw-Haw"; it is "Lord Ho. ho." And they are taken for granted. Those who are responsible for Munich are here to represent Great Britain, which has been bled white.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There is a definite rule in the house that high persons should not be referred to in the debates.

Mr. POULIOT: What is the matter? The rules of the house are clear. I have great respect for the royal family, and I have given evidence of my admiration for it. I have great respect for my colleagues in the house and in the senate. I have great respect for the governor-general and his family. But, according to the rules of the house, it ends there. If we are to have freedom of speech—and I do not know whether or not Canada is a democratic country—why can I not express my feelings about Munich? I want the support of the house on that. I defend the freedom of hon. members who wish to express their views here, whether I agree with them or not. I hope that in turn I shall have the support of hon. members when I express my views, and I am not alone when I think in that way.

I will not infringe the rules when I speak in the house. But I want to enjoy freedom, if Canada is really a democratic country. If I hold these views, it is not because I know those gentlemen. I do not know them and I am not interested in them. But I have enough respect for England to hope that England will be respected by other than Munich men in Canada and the United States. That is all I have to say about that.

I now come to the real business. What has been done by the united nations? Perhaps we might call them the disunited nations, after what we have heard over the radio, and after what we have read in the press as to