

rect statement of the situation at that time and since. I read from an address of Lord Curzon; and it was after this address was delivered that the Prime Minister joined in approbation of the fact that we had effected a peace with Turkey. Lord Curzon described the almost insuperable difficulties which had surrounded the Allies in the determination of the war and after the events of the war, and after reciting the Franklin-Bouillon agreement and the difficulties entailed thereby, he told about the success of the Turks, how they had revived national ardour, were well led in a military way, and how, taking advantage of the increasing weakness and demoralization of the Greeks, they made a sustained advance and practically drove the Hellenic forces out of Asia Minor. He continues:

This was followed by dramatic events. There was a revolution in Greece which resulted in the enforced abdication of King Constantine. The victorious Turkish army, elated by its success, conscious of Allied disunion, and resolved to push forward even at the cost of a war with Great Britain practically destroyed Smyrna and advanced towards the Straits, then held by Allied forces.

May I interpolate that this is a recital made by him who afterwards, if I understood him rightly, assumed some critical attitude as to the exact terms of a letter sent over here.

The French withdrew their troops to the European shore, being resolved in no circumstances to become involved in hostilities with the Turks. Great Britain alone saved the situation and prevented the invasion of Europe by rushing a powerful force, military, naval and air, to the Dardanelles and to Constantinople.

This is the great blunder that Britain is supposed by this sagacious government to have perpetrated.

But it was by a hair's breadth only that the renewal of war was avoided. Presently I found myself again in Paris, engaged once more in the attempt to build up Allied unity and to obtain even at the eleventh hour a pacific solution. The Mudania armistice followed in October 1922, and the stage for the peace negotiations was set.

Lord Curzon specifically attributes to the firm stand taken by Britain in 1922, in which stand she was embarrassed by the indecision and the humiliating position assumed by this dominion, alone among the dominions addressed, the fact that the situation was held steady and we were able afterwards to meet the Turk on terms which made possible even the treaty of Lausanne.

Now then, what I stated I will read now; and I find no exception, if I got it correctly, to the part directly quoted from my remarks by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe). But I read this direct from my remarks. I did not have them taken down specifically,

but I have no objection to take to the report. Referring to this communication—and I was referring to it in so far as it has been made public by the government—I said, as reported here:

There was no suggestion of sending a force overseas, so far as we can judge from the evidence we have received. What Britain sought was simply a declaration of solidarity, from the component parts of the Empire, a solidarity the existence of which we thought the late war had made abundantly evident. So far as we know, Britain, up to the present time, has received no declaration of this kind from Canada.

Then I continued:

Britain is not prepared to surrender that prize of victory—

I referred to the security which she obtained in the neutrality of the Straits, a security which we with her agreed was necessary to prevent those spoliations which had been the tragic record of the Turk in the past, a security necessary for peace.

Britain is not prepared to surrender that prize of victory because she wishes to secure that the future may belong to peace and not to war. She sends a message to the dominions, not a mere indifferent inquiry as to what was the mind of Canada, but a message to see if the dominions were solid behind the Motherland. Let there be no dispute as to where I stand. When Britain's message came, then Canada should have said: "Ready, aye, ready: we stand by you." I hope the time has not gone by when that declaration can yet be made. If that declaration is made, then I will be at the back of the government.

Now there is supposed to be something exceedingly improper, exceedingly rash when I state that in circumstances of that kind, **circumstances** just as well known to us as they were to them, to such a communication our answer should be a declaration of solidarity, and I expressed it in the language I have read. I read now from the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and perhaps I may be permitted to do so, seeing that the Minister of Justice has complimented my late leader, Sir Robert Borden, by quoting from him.

Mr. McMASTER: Reciprocity in compliments.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. I read from the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier on August 19, 1914, in this very House.

When the call comes our answer goes at once, and it goes in the classical language of the British answer to the call to duty: "Ready, aye, ready."

I desire now to make some brief references to certain criticisms of myself offered by the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice complained of contradictions in my speech. I do not think the Minister of Justice saw any single contradiction. I have since asked hon. members not of my political faith if they