

Among the fourteen points of the Liberal platform I notice that regarding the last one, referring to our foreign relations, he said, "We would seek to further the League of Nations in its work." Unfortunately that part of the program has not been fulfilled, any more than that dealing with unemployment insurance. Almost the first thing they did after coming into office was to sabotage the league, and to a great extent the Canadian government is responsible for the position the League of Nations is in to-day.

The Minister of National Defence told us there was no new policy and there were no increases; then he went on to tell us what the increases were. I have often wondered what are the uses of those increases in arms, planes and military equipment and supplies at the present time. I wonder how much protection the men who line up at Hamilton Hall, in my hon. friend's constituency, every day in order to get their handout of clothes are going to get under this scheme. In British Columbia we are going to be protected from the Japanese. In the prairie provinces we need aeroplanes to protect us against sporadic raids on our sources of food supply. In Quebec we are going to be protected from subversive elements. In a speech delivered in this city on February 10 of last year the Minister of National Defence said:

There are two cardinal and guiding principles to be borne in mind when establishing a system of national defence; first, we must have the defence forces sufficient to control subversive elements from within and sufficient to repel attacks from without.

It is rather strange that in his address in the house on Monday evening of this week the minister made no reference at all to subversive elements. We were told that these increases in the military forces of the country were necessary in order to maintain our neutrality. Yet when the question of Canada remaining neutral in any future war was brought up in the house some weeks ago the government took the position that it would be impossible for Canada to say in advance that she would remain neutral under any circumstances, that no one could say whether or not we could remain neutral.

Now I should like to know what are the subversive elements for which we require such enormous increases. Evidently in 1936 this was the important point in the program of the Minister of National Defence, because he put it first. Is there any indication that the present forces in the country are inadequate to cope with any situation that may develop? In my opinion there is no more to fear from disorder within this country to-day than there has been at any time within

the last twenty years; in fact I think there is less to fear. But who are the subversive elements against which we are going to guard ourselves, and can it be shown that an increased military force is a satisfactory way of dealing with them? Does the Minister of National Defence take the position that what he is pleased to call subversive elements "just grew" like Topsy in Uncle Tom's Cabin? Should he not take the modern view that cause and effect follow each other as a natural sequence? The modern way of dealing with unrest within a country is to try to find the causes of the unrest. If the minister would take a little time to associate himself with the people who do the work of this country he would soon find that there is reason enough for social unrest. If he would take time to read the briefs that have been presented before the textile inquiry he would acquire a better understanding of why sometimes people are driven to action which may be considered illegal, in an effort to remove their economic difficulties.

The textile commission was investigating conditions largely in the province of Quebec. Is it merely an accident that on the part of members from that province we find emphasis placed on the necessity of increasing armaments in order to preserve the country from subversive elements?—as one of those hon. members said the other evening, communist and labour troubles? For myself, after I read certain sections of the brief presented to the commissioner investigating the textile companies I came to the conclusion that if there are subversive elements at work within the province of Quebec those elements are not the communists or the labour organizations. They are the textile companies themselves. But I doubt very much if a bomber would be sent by this government to protect the workers from exploitation by those companies. I would point out also that, in our fast moving world, those who to-day are crying loudly for the putting down of subversive elements, to-morrow may find themselves to be the subversive elements. In consequence it behooves us to get busy and make an attempt to remove the conditions which generate subversive activities rather than to prepare to suppress such activities, which are more or less protests against intolerable conditions.

We are arming for defence. As the minister mentioned each increase in armaments, he told the house that they were for defence. The speakers on the government side of the house, when they attempted to defend the policy of the government at all, took the same line. Of course there is nothing new in that;