

The Minister of Justice may represent a Quebec constituency, but surely he is minister of justice for Canada. And he is minister of justice in a so-called Liberal government. Suppose that the organization which I represent is what the leader of the opposition represented it to be to the people of London, and assuming that to be communicated to Premier Duplessis, how would the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation stand in the province of Quebec? Are our public assemblies to be banned because our organization does not please the premier of Quebec province? Is that a matter of local autonomy? Is that political freedom? After the election the Prime Minister promised that we should now have political freedom in Canada, yet this government has permitted this kind of infringement of liberty to continue. In practice it is extremely difficult for private individuals successfully to bring this question before the courts.

Another matter not mentioned in the speech from the throne is the recognition of Ethiopia. From my standpoint the conquest of Ethiopia was one of the most shameful chapters in recent history. I have only to read—though it is hardly necessary—certain clauses from the covenant of the League of Nations to which Canada was a signatory. Article 10 states:

The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

And again, in article 16:

Should any member of the league resort to war in disregard of its covenants under articles 12, 13 or 15, it shall *ipso facto* be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the league. . . .

And so on. And again:

The members of the league agree, further, that they will mutually support one another in the financial and economic measures which are taken under this article. . . .

Has anything of that kind been done by the signatories of the treaty? Canada is one of those signatories. I cannot feel proud of my country when I realize that she is weakly following the lead of other nations and acquiescing in such an arrangement as this.

The speech from the throne further tells us that the government is giving "anxious and continuous consideration" to the international situation. I am not going to discuss that to-day; the Prime Minister has given us assurance that we shall have ample oppor-

tunity to discuss it later. But I should like to ask what happened at the time of the Munich crisis. Was Canada in effect committed to war? From the papers one would judge that to be so; is it true? Parliament should know. It is all very well for the Prime Minister to tell us that parliament would be called, but what is the use of calling parliament if there are certain commitments already made? It is like the calling of parliament two years ago to decide on the abdication of the king and the coronation of the new king; but before we were allowed to consider the matter in this chamber we all had to swear allegiance to the new king. What is the use of going through a pro forma affair of that kind? I ask then, what happened at the time of the Munich crisis? Is Canada in effect committed to the Chamberlain policies? Sometimes I think that Mr. Chamberlain is to all intents and purposes Canada's foreign minister. This country should know. Can we maintain our neutrality? I have introduced a resolution, and hope to have it discussed later in the session, which asserts that we in Canada ought to be free to enter upon a war or free to keep out of it. We shall see where the government stands on that matter.

We are told that Canada's defences are to be materially strengthened. So Canada enters upon the same old armament race, a bloody pathway which all through history has led to disaster. We are told now that force is the final arbiter. To me this is the supreme apostasy. Is force the final arbiter? Then it would be just as well for our Christian churches to go out of business.

Against whom are we to be prepared to defend ourselves? Germany and Japan are mentioned as possible aggressors. Well-informed people tell us that shipments of chromium are being sent to Hamburg. We all know that shipments of scrap iron and nickel are steadily going to Japan. During the last year our exports of metal to Japan nearly doubled. Is that to go on and are profits to be made out of shipments to nations which might possibly in the near future be enemy nations, or who are invading nations which under the covenant of the league we are pledged to protect? In 1937 the government took power to prevent individual Canadians from involving this country in foreign wars. We had the Foreign Enlistment Act and an amendment to the Customs Act, giving the government discretionary power in peace or war to—

—prohibit, restrict or control the exportation, generally or to any destination, directly or indirectly, or the carrying coastwise or by inland