

is a cold, mean, business proposition is necessary if we would avoid the inevitable consequences of such a policy. "Be not deceived, God is not mocked." That nation which permits its citizens to profit through the miseries and bloodshed of others is headed for disaster and deserves its doom. If we want peace, we must be prepared to pay the price of peace.

Specifically with regard to the league, I would suggest that although it has been a miserable failure, we must try to build up slowly and painfully a reconstructed league. Nations must surrender what they now regard as their sovereignty. I think the hon. member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) pointed that out not long ago in a speech which he made. We can no longer maintain absolute sovereignty in a world where we are living in community. We must seek to remove the causes of friction. I do not know whether an international police force would help greatly, but I would rather have an international police force than national armies. Arrangements of this kind must be very temporary because we must depend upon something else.

With regard to the empire, it does seem to me we must recognize that the empire as we have known it was built largely on conquest. Only recently I came across an almost prophetic statement by Sir Thomas More. He said:

Everywhere do I perceive a certain conspiracy of rich men seeking their own advantage under the name and pretext of a commonwealth.

Read J. A. Hobson's considered statement:

The decades of imperialism have been prolific in wars; most of these wars have been directly motivated by aggression of white races upon lower races by forcible seizure of territory. Every one of the steps of expansion in Africa, Asia and the Pacific has been accompanied by bloodshed.

If I can do anything to prevent it, our Canadian boys shall not shed their blood in any more imperialistic schemes—all under the guise of patriotism.

We must claim our right to be neutral. I have not time to develop this point.

Lastly, as I said before, we must be willing to pay the price of peace. We have been paying an enormous price in attempting to get security through war. Canada is one of the least armed nations, and yet we are paying an amount for war that would largely settle the problem of the unemployed in this country. We are loaded down with debt, a no small portion of which was incurred in the last war. Why cannot we learn the lessons of the past and at least seek a new way? We should be prepared to pay the price of peace.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

The thing that most distresses me in my own country to-day is the fact that if we can get orders for raw materials from Japan or for aeroplanes and there is money in it, we propose to get the money. If we can get orders for British munitions, we are willing to head straight into that sort of enterprise. We want to keep out ourselves, but we are not willing to pay the price of losing any trade. It may prove to be a costly price that will have to be paid in order that we can win peace.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Whom does my hon. friend mean by "we."

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We in Canada. This government has it in its power to control the activities of industry in this country. In my judgment they should be controlled.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend says that we must find a new way, but is not that exactly what the League of Nations sought to do? If the new way was the best and it had the support that it had, why did it not succeed?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think we all recognize that the League of Nations did not have the support of the nations. Mr. Woodrow Wilson, who was so largely instrumental in forming the league, could not carry his own country with him. The great nations of England and France for many a year after the war took the stand that Germany must be punished. I do not need to go into all that. There were the forces on the Rhine, the ships that were sunk, the trade that was destroyed and the colonies that were taken. We were out to punish Germany. In my judgment it was the action of the great empires towards Germany that produced Hitler. One thing has led to another. If we had been a little bit stronger in the case of Manchuria, we should not have had the difficulty which to-day exists in China. However, I do not intend to go into these matters; the house has been very patient.

Undoubtedly the league has failed. The league was based on the idea of force. Perhaps centralized force for such a purpose would be preferable to the national armies which are being set up to-day, although I do not think that primarily the league should have been based upon force. However, if the league has failed, why cannot we reconstitute it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend says "we." That is the point I am trying to get at. Who is "we"?