

and the United States gave her a joint guarantee of security. The league was established, but the ink was hardly dry on the parchment when the United States congress refused to honour President Wilson's word, and they also repudiated the Versailles treaty.

The next thing to please the Americans was done at Washington in 1922, when we renounced our alliance with Japan who had been such an invaluable and faithful ally for twenty years. The result was that we lost Japanese support and gained no other benefits to make up for it.

Then there was the treaty with the Irish. We were told by British people who came over to this side that only by such a treaty would the last resentment of America against England die away. Britain gave way, and the result was that the United States became more embittered than ever, instead of more friendly.

There was another proposal which some people are of the opinion is likely to damage this country. America wants to buy gold. South Africa produces it in large quantities, and Canada and Russia are also gold producers. The motive force behind it is that they want to buy our gold so that we will buy American goods.

There has always been conflict between the United States congress and the administration in Washington. We were told by a French prime minister four years ago that Great Britain was the hardest country in the world to make a treaty with or have an understanding with owing to the dominions having so much to say, and there being so many different views to consult. It is the same in the United States. The president is called the administration, and he makes speeches and has his views, but it is only talk; there is no power over the senate to act. The power is in the senate and congress of the United States. So we have two forces in the United States in foreign affairs working in opposite directions, the administration and congressional sides. The result is that conflict often occurs. We saw it in the Abyssinian crisis, when the administration was hampered by the lack of congressional support, and its proposals met with clear defeat. I am reading three or four comments from the May number of the *National Review*, which after criticizing the new Anglo-American treaty, goes on to say:

The new policy will be as fruitless as the former policy.

It goes on to say:

The administration met with two clear defeats—the first when congress refused to make any change in the temporary "impartial" Neutrality Act then on the statute books, the second when the senate rejected a proposal to join the world

court—and suffered throughout from constant opposition. Though the administration were prevented by the Neutrality Act from bringing economic pressure to bear on Italy in co-operation with the league, they attempted during October and November of 1935 to persuade Americans voluntarily to forego "tempting trade opportunities" and not to seek profits "at the expense of human lives and human misery."

A fortnight after these official exhortations the Secretary of State had to admit that American trade with Italy in such war materials as oil, copper, trucks and scraps was increasing. The attitude of congress made it clear that nothing could be done about it.

During the crisis, as during the present crisis, the attitude of the congressional isolationist towards Great Britain was one of continued hostility. While the administration were attempting, within political limits, to embarrass the league as little as possible, the congressional spokesmen were accusing England of using the league for imperialistic ends.

That is what they said in congress the other day.

The CHAIRMAN: I must inform the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Church) that he has spoken forty minutes.

Mr. CHURCH: I was just referring—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member can proceed only by unanimous consent.

Mr. CHURCH: The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Massey) was given forty minutes more. I have not quite finished, and I have never asked for any such privilege before. As a matter of fact, I think I have been speaking for only thirty minutes, but I shall take another opportunity. It is all right; I am not objecting to your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BENNETT: I suggest that the hon. member be allowed to speak a bit further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Mr. CHURCH: I shall not break any of the rules of the house. I do not want any favours.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not a favour. It is a right.

Mr. BENNETT: You are not breaking any rules. I have spoken in between. Go on.

Mr. CHURCH: I was trying to show the futility of this country depending on the United States for our freedom and protection, or on the Monroe doctrine or pan-Americanism instead of, as always before, on the motherland. In the late war the United States could not have transported any munitions or a single soldier abroad without the assistance of the British fleet. And here we