

*National Defence—Mr. Duffus*

increasing efforts to avert war. I think it can be truly said that she was the last great nation to follow this rearmament policy.

Let it be distinctly understood that I am definitely opposed to war, and that I consider it my duty to do everything in my power to this end. Moreover, I am unalterably against everything in the nature of increased taxation, where it can be judiciously and economically avoided. If I thought the amount in the estimates was to be voted for the purpose of sending our men and boys and resources overseas, or out of Canada, I would vote against it. But the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Mackenzie) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) have reiterated time and again most emphatically that not one dollar of the estimates is for defence other than in our own country and for the security of our homes, our families, our cities, our industries, our trade routes, our canals, our harbours and coastlines, our self-respect, and the preservation of her vast area, rich on the surface and underneath, which is the envy of all the warring nations of the world.

Moreover, everyone in Canada knows it is the policy, written and implied, of this government, that not one soldier will be called upon to serve out of Canada without the sanction of parliament being first obtained. Furthermore, the people have implicit confidence that these commitments will be carried out—that is, if there is sufficient time for that to be done. My reason for the last observation is that we must not overlook the fact that fleets of bombing aeroplanes could leave Europe at this time to-night and have these parliament buildings blown to pieces by this time to-morrow. Does anyone in the house or elsewhere believe that we shall be immune from danger of attack simply because we provide nothing for our protection? If that principle be true, why not apply it to our police protection in the municipalities throughout the country. Why do we retain officers all through these buildings and on government property in Ottawa and elsewhere? We do so because there is possibility of some insidious act on the part of ill-disposed persons. Self-preservation is the first law of nature.

For these and many other reasons I could mention, had I not the keen desire to conserve the time of the house, I intend to vote against the amendment which, after all, is little more than a motion of want of confidence in the government. It also involves condemnation of the government for the inadequacy of its social security program. Just why the hon. members for Vancouver (Mr. MacNeil) and Rosetown-Biggan (Mr. Coldwell) presented

[Mr. Duffus.]

the amendment in its present form and saw fit to precipitate a long debate costing the taxpayers of Canada tens of thousands of dollars, is beyond my comprehension.

On Tuesday, February 16, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth), referring to the amendment, is reported at page 961 of Hansard as follows:

It is well worded; I have no objection to the wording of it.

My well-considered opinion is that the amendment is drafted in its present scientific form so as to make it impossible to obtain the support of the members of both the Liberal and the Conservative party in the house, so that when hon. members of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation party have an opportunity of later discussing the matter on the public platform they will reiterate their oft-repeated accusation that neither of the older parties mentioned has the interests of our people at heart.

Whatever may be the opinion of the people of Canada as to whether the amount in the estimates is too great or too little, I am sure they are all opposed to this expensive and futile debate, more particularly since it is quite obvious to all that the amendment will obtain the support of only a handful of the members of the house.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, over and over in my life have I found the thing that I ought to do not at all the thing that I liked to do. On this occasion I once more find it so. With the minds of people throughout Canada so filled with doubt, disagreement and fear, who is there that, if his conscience would let him, would not in connection with anything pertaining to war, gladly hold his peace? And yet in these so critical times, with all of yesterday's glowing achievement and all of to-morrow's glorious promise trembling in hazard, one must speak, prayerful that his remarks be wise.

May I say at the outset that no socialist in this building or out of it hates war more heartily than I do. I will grant with anyone, that war never settles anything, that no peace ever satisfies any of the people who make it. Let any treaty be made as wisely as possible, the next generation will likely rise up and curse it. Every modern treaty contains the seeds of a greater war than it closes. I will grant all that. These things are freely and heartily conceded, but I cannot and will not entirely blame the delegates who made or must make that peace. The deficiencies in any given treaty are there not necessarily because