

like other forms of government," and of whom Mussolini said at the end of 1934: "I owe what I am to Georges Sorel."

That which concerns the internal affairs of a country is much less visible than that which relates to external affairs. In the latter case, the part ministers play greatly resembles, even in a democracy, that of an absolute sovereign. Once a conversation is started with the representatives of a foreign power, no obstacle can paralyse a responsible minister. A diplomatic conversation is a sort of battle in which the most unforeseen factors suddenly crop up, and a minister who would telephone every ten minutes to the Speaker of a house before answering his colleagues would be quickly put out of action.

With respect to the management of affairs, one must resign oneself to accept that those who are charged with same enjoy freedom of movement, lacking which they cannot do anything. The error of democracies consists in wanting to control government in all its acts, but control implies acknowledgment of an act after that act has taken place. If harm has been done one consoles oneself by the dismissal of a minister, but it is a poor consolation and the country derives no effective reparation from it.

What was known of yore as "the prince's secret" exists nowadays with all the added complications and niceties of modern international politics; and, admitting, for a moment, that there is a state without "prince's secrets," the ministers of that state will have to deal with other nations which do have "prince's secrets." As a consequence, secret diplomacy will hold sway and the ministers of that state will have to bear it without being able to do anything whatever about it. Hence, they will be compelled, if they wish to serve their country profitably, to subscribe to views of which the parliamentarian, their judge, and the voter who elected their judge, cannot form the least idea.

The political conditions of a nation, its industrial and commercial interests, its fiscal revenues, the obligations of its neighbourhoods, the maintenance of its influence, are so many skeins that unwind into extremely complicated ramifications which the gentleman reading his newspaper in the tram-car could not possibly suspect by the widest stretch of the imagination.

Hence, Mr. Speaker, there is not the slightest shadow of doubt that events which will arise will control the decision of the ministry, a decision compelling rapid action with respect to the interests of what is called to-day the Commonwealth of British Nations; but that is probably where the Canadian people will not find themselves in agreement with the men then in power, and one must not, as I see it, overlook any security factor as regards our eventual non-participation in wars wherein the interest of the United Kingdom, alone, may be involved.

We are told that the League of Nations is an agency for peace; I have grave doubts as to that, for, in the event of a war in which the League of Nations would declare Japan the aggressor country, the economic sanction

[Mr. Verville.]

machinery of the League of Nations would function immediately in favour of Russia; and as for us, members of the league, we would be compelled, as in the case of Ethiopia, to give effect to the covenants we signed as a member of the league: I say the League of Nations would compel us to apply economic sanctions to Japan. There is not a shadow of doubt that the adoption by our country of such economic sanctions with respect to Japan would be considered by that nation an act that would justify it in invading our country; and we would be face to face with the distressing situation of a country such as ours which holds communism in horror, aligning itself with a nation whose ideal is absolutely contrary to that of our Canadian people; for, in this country, our history, our traditions, our very existence rest on a belief that is the corner-stone of any society that aims to live and respect itself, that is to say, belief in God. Now, Russian communism involves the complete negation of God, the basis of our social structure. No, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the League of Nations as constituted, is an instrument for peace. I look upon Geneva, its magnificent lake, the luxuriant verdure surrounding the palace of the League of Nations simply as a place well-suited for politicians who are holiday-bent.

We are told that should we vote the increased military estimates which are presently submitted to our approval, such sums will never be utilized beyond our country. Now, if I turn to the Canada Militia Act, I find that Section 64 reads in part as follows:

The Governor in Council may place the militia or any part thereof in active service anywhere in Canada and also beyond Canada for the defence thereof, at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

Who tells us that the government then holding office will not apply that clause of the Militia Act which empowers the cabinet, by a simple order in council, to use our military organization beyond Canada?

No, Mr. Speaker, I think there is only one logical course for us to follow: that is to occupy as soon as possible a seat at the Pan-American Conference to which, as a matter of fact, we were invited by that good friend of ours and lover of peace, Mr. Franklin Roosevelt. We would thus be proclaiming to all nations our desire to remain what we are actually, an essentially American nation. As a result, with the immense resources that are at our disposal, we would find ourselves free to devote, in a spirit of peace, all our efforts to the development of our country, instead of burdening our budget with a fairly