

there in silent solemnity in the very place once occupied by Italy—and instead they cleared the way to extend the hand of good fellowship to gloating Benito Mussolini of imperial Rome.

And these were the words that were uttered before the blinded Goddess of Justice.

On the one side are set the words of Selassie, and on the other the words of Lord Halifax. At the foot of the special article appear these words from holy writ:

And He, bearing His cross, went forth into a place called the place of the skull . . . where they crucified Him.

This is one of the few times in the recent history of Canada when I have seen the public press take the stand that something like personal morality must be carried into the realm of international affairs. In that connection I am glad to say that the representative of one British dominion did not agree. Mr. Jordon of New Zealand had this to say:

This is a return to the laws of the jungle. . . . We sometimes seem to be but little different from brutes. . . . The plan is a direct denial of collective responsibilities which are a fundamental part of the league.

I do not know what part Canada took; so far that has not to my knowledge been divulged to us, but I wish I could have held up this paper to-night and said that Canada had stood out on that occasion as New Zealand did.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): There is a good explanation. Canada is not a member of the council; New Zealand is.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Would the minister give us a statement as to what the position of Canada is and has been in that regard?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Make your speech.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I am trying to make it, but I should like to know that. It would certainly help me to make my speech.

With regard to empire obligations the Prime Minister said to-day what he has said previously, that he was not in a position to bind Canada to anything; that each member of the commonwealth must decide the nature and scope of its defence policy. Yet the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Mackenzie) is prepared to accept the assistance of the British fleet, as was mentioned by the right hon. leader of the opposition. The minister declared:

. . . it is only fair to say that to-day the main deterrent against a major attack upon this country by a European power is the existence of the British fleet in north Atlantic waters. . . . Just as the British navy on the Atlantic

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

is our greatest security in that quarter so I think it might be reasonable to assume that in a major conflagration we should have friendly fleets upon the Pacific ocean. . . . Our major defensive buffer on the Pacific coast is not the Pacific ocean alone but the existence there of friendly fleets.

Last year, when I attempted to suggest that Canada was particularly favourably situated and that we need not expect an attack because we had Great Britain on the one side and the United States on the other, who in their own interests would prevent any major nation from attacking Canada, the Prime Minister said we must not sponge. If my statement was an advocacy of sponging, I wonder what about the statement of the Minister of National Defence. The Prime Minister then said:

I submit that sponging by a nation is, in the eyes of other nations, exactly the same as it is in the case of individuals.

Yet the Prime Minister, who says that, looks to Great Britain and the United States to defend us in case of emergency. I quote his words:

While it is our good fortune to have both the United States and Great Britain as close friends ready to come and help us should we ever be the victims of aggression, let us realize that if we are to look to them for help all the more we must be prepared to lend a hand ourselves, and that certainly in the defence of our country.

I should like to know exactly what the Prime Minister means by such a statement. To-day he seemed to imply that we are at the end of our "crusading in foreign countries," as he put it. Well, if we are not going to crusade in foreign countries; if we are not going to come to the aid of Great Britain in other parts of the world, now is the time to say so. I do not think it is of any great help to Great Britain if we encourage the idea that we stand behind her, while at the same time in our own minds we have decided that we will do no more crusading in foreign countries. It is these positions that seem to me so inconsistent. On another occasion the Prime Minister said, "What we are doing we are doing for Canada alone." Are we going to help the other members of the empire if they are in a tight box, or are we prepared simply to look after Canada alone? Frankly, these statements puzzle me; I cannot reconcile them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my hon. friend if he can tell us in advance what the situation is going to be six months or a year hence, or even three weeks hence? How can you possibly decide what you are