

treaty is made. My point is that it is not premature for us as one party to the contract to discuss between ourselves what might be fair and proper matters of consideration in connection with what my right hon. friend is pleased to term the bargain. My contention is, and since I have made it I do not think I should take up any further time of the committee, that when my right hon. friend is talking of mutual benefits, one of the benefits that might well accrue to us is a benefit with regard to these matters of which I have spoken, namely, the matter of entry for our products into the United States. As he has stated, the matter of fiscal policies had already been mentioned to the United States in correspondence by the previous government, and I regret that the answer seems to have discouraged my right hon. friend entirely from pursuing the matter further. I hope that that will not be so, and that when the time comes to get down to grips and discuss these matters which will be of benefit to us in return for the known benefits we will be conferring upon the other party to the bargain, the matters I have spoken of will not be overlooked.

Mr. BENNETT: I do not desire, in view of the lateness of the hour, to take up the time of the committee. I think the observations of the hon. gentleman as to the perfect propriety of offering suggestions as to what the government should keep in mind in considering the negotiation of a contract or agreement with another state are quite sound, and I do not wish for a single moment to have him think that I did not so regard them. But to contemplate the discussion of the terms of a prospective treaty is an entirely different thing, and I think my hon. friend will agree that there is a vast distinction between the two.

So far as the waterway itself is concerned, the hon. gentleman has an entirely erroneous opinion if he suggests that the benefits to be conferred are benefits to one country, and that country not our own; for it is fairly reasonably established by engineers that certain benefits might accrue to either country, without uniting their forces for the purpose of securing common benefits, because the waterway extends from lake Superior to the sea. The benefits common to the United States and Canada are covered by the terms of a treaty ensuring to both countries the free use of the waterway itself under conditions that are well understood and appreciated. It means merely the overcoming of rapids by the construction of canals and locks, thus rendering possible a continuous voyage from the lakes to the sea rather than one broken by

rapids and shoals. So if the observation suggested that there were benefits to be conferred upon one party and not upon another, it was not fair.

Mr. RALSTON: That continuous seaway exists now.

Mr. BENNETT: But not for sufficient depth.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that questions relative to our imperial or external relations are so often left until the last days of the session, a time when most members are tired and impatient to get away. In the dying hours of the session we have a very inadequate opportunity of entering into full discussion. Some hon. members seem to regard foreign affairs as so remote from us as to have no immediate concern for the majority of our people. I need hardly remind the committee, however, that to-day we are struggling with debts, pensions and all sorts of post-war troubles which came to us because of our entry into world affairs in 1914, and if in the years to come we are to avoid a similar if not a greater catastrophe we ought to be alert to the necessity of taking a more active interest in world affairs.

When, on April 7, the item concerning Canada's contribution to the expense of the League of Nations for the year 1932 came before the committee, I asked the Prime Minister a question concerning conditions in the far east, in Manchuria. His reply at that time was as follows:

I did not think it would be wise, and I certainly accept the responsibility for having so advised our delegates, that we should endeavour, with the slight knowledge that we possess as compared with those who are constantly in touch with the situation at Geneva, and those who are responsible for the investigations in Manchuria, either to blame or praise this country or the other in connection with matters so serious as those involved in the then differences between Japan and China.

I can hardly accept the attitude of the Prime Minister as outlined in that paragraph. He seems to take for granted that the League of Nations is something apart from ourselves, something that has a more or less independent existence, and that we must stand aside and wait until the league takes action. When we come to consider the matter we must recognize that, after all, the league is only a sort of forum; it is an exchange. It cannot have a life apart from that of its members; it cannot make decisions apart from the decisions of its members. We must bear in mind that we are an integral part of the league. It may be that Canada, in the size of its population, is not a