many years to take a stand for the common people, personally I cannot give my consent to anything that will drag us into another war. It may be said that the boys who stay out are cowards. I have every respect for the man who, with a sincere conviction, goes out to give his life if necessary in a cause which he believes to be right; but I have just as much respect for the man who refuses to enlist to kill his fellowmen and, as under modern conditions, to kill women and children as well, as must be done on every front. These facts

ought to be faced.

The nationalism that we have known in the past has become impossible. It was all very well in the old days for us to erect barriers round ourselves and to say that we would keep everyone off, but the old narrow boundaries are gone forever, because across those boundaries there go communications and trade with wireless and aeroplanes. We have not yet been able to partition the air. The old nationalism is an impossible thing, and the trouble with us is that we have not yet been able to rise to the position of the internationalist. We have not been able to take that position, and so long as we retain our narrow national boundaries we are not going to take that position. I am sorry that the league went by the board, but some new and better league is the only salvation of humanity. We had better recognize that fact before we sacrifice many millions more of our people. The old national sovereignty of which we have boasted is a thing of the past—the idea that each nation is free to do as it pleases. Boiled down and in plain English that is what national sovereignty means. Let us suppose a motorist in a city takes that attitude: "This is my car and I can do as I please with it; I can go ahead or stop or turn to the right or to the left as I choose." We all know a doctrine of that kind becomes impossible in a modern congested city. Well, the world is a crowded community to-day, yet we are all of us more or less inclined to act as individualists. I remember during the last war adopting as a kind of motto this phrase:

Last century made the world a neighbourhood, this century must make it a brotherhood.

more I have studied history and economics, the more I have come to the conclusion that that is profoundly true. The choice is that or the deluge.

Now I want to mention one other aspect, and I think I have excuse for doing it since the Prime Minister introduced the matter: I refer to the question of religion. He ventured to appeal to religion in this matter. Well, I left the ministry of the church during the last war because of my ideas on war. To-day I do not belong to any church organization. I

am afraid that my creed is pretty vague. But even in this assembly I venture to say that I still believe in some of the principles underlying the teachings of Jesus and the other great world teachers throughout the centuries. For me at least, and for a growing number of men and women in the churches-and we should remember there have been people all down through the years in both the Catholic and Protestant churches who held this view-war is an absolute negation of anything christian. The Prime Minister, as a great many do. trotted out the "mad-dog" idea; said that in the last analysis there must be a resort to force. It requires a great deal of courage to trust in moral force. But there was a time when people thought that there were other and higher types of force than brute force. Yes, if I may use the very quotation the Prime Minister used to-day, in spite of tyrants, tyrants as bad as ever Hitler is to-day, in spite of war makers-and every nation has them-as Lowell reminds us:

Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne,

Yet that scaffold sways the future, and, behind

the dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above his own.

That is what the church fathers used to call faith. It requires a great deal of courage to carry out our convictions; to have peace requires both courage and sacrifice. I envy for the peace people the courage possessed by the men who go to the front. I envy the department of war the huge sums that are available when war is on. Why are not these sums available in peace time?

Mr. LANDERYOU: Where is the money coming from?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Why cannot we have the same kind of courage and the same venturesome spirit during peace-time? When the call came for us to come to Ottawa, I was staying at a little summer resort near the international boundary south of Van-couver. Near Blaine there is a peace arch between the two countries. The children gathered their pennies and planted a rose garden, and they held a fine ceremony in which they interchanged national flags and sang songs and that kind of thing; a beautiful incident. Well, that is a part of our unguarded border. Ceremonies of that kind are possible in America because there is an unguarded border. If we had not had the Rush-Bagot treaty a hundred years ago we should have had many incidents of a very different character along the border. I have sometimes thought, if civilization goes down in Europe, as it may go down, that in

[Mr. Woodsworth.]