

Now, sir, let us examine our position. The Dominion of Canada is a member of the League of the Nations and was a member when the league came into being. It was one of the charter members of the club. The rules of the league provide that if one of its members is found to have been guilty of an act of aggression against another member, certain results follow. Some call these results punishments, some call them sanctions, some call them penalties, but the fact is that the league with practically no dissenting voice decided that Italy had been an unwarranted aggressor against Ethiopia, also a member of the league. I say practically unanimously decided, as there were two or three members who did not so decide because of reasons which they then gave. That being so, it was not for the league to impose the punishment because the punishment followed. Sanctions followed just as when a jury brings in a verdict of murder against an accused it is the duty of the judge to sentence him to the only penalty the law provides, just as when a verdict of guilty is brought in for assault or shooting or any other offence. Upon a verdict being recorded the duty of the judge is to award punishment. What that punishment shall be is defined by the criminal code of Canada. In this case the provisions of the league provided what the sanctions might be, not necessarily should be. A committee was set up which determined what the sanctions would be and we as members were bound to take appropriate action. It was not a case of whether or not we wanted to, we either had to be welshers or nobly keep our word. We had either to repudiate or to sustain our position, we had no option.

We have been going about this country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, talking about the glories of the League of Nations. We have been appropriating moneys in this parliament and contributions have been made for the purpose of maintaining the League of Nations. In every part of Canada little organizations have grown up. Any man who understands anything about it realizes that being a member of the League of Nations is just the same as belonging to a club. A member is bound by the by-laws. If I do not like the club's by-law that provides for my being posted if I do not pay my bills, it is my duty to resign and leave that club. There is no sounder law than that laid down by Lord Elgin, that you cannot reprobate and approbate at the same time. We cannot talk about the glories of the League of Nations and our position in it, how great we are, the part we play in it; we cannot go there from year to year and take part in its deliberations, and yet when a crisis arises where one member is an aggressor

against another, where one member has gone to war against another and has bombarded his towns and cities, fail to take the action which we ourselves have agreed we would take in that eventuality.

Why are we endeavouring to belittle our own position? Why are we not saying frankly to all the world, "Yes, we are members of the League of Nations and as members of it we have asked the Canadian people, in and out of season, during successive governments, to stand behind us." What results follow from finding Italy guilty? The results are written in the covenant itself; they are economic results. There are provisions for other results. It is true, as the Minister of Justice has pointed out, that Canadians should not be called upon from time to time to take up arms for the purpose of maintaining the territorial integrity of other members of the league. But we remained in the league, that is the answer. We remained in the league and having done so we must support the league or be regarded throughout this world as repudiators. That is the position; we have no option.

I regret more than I can say that the Minister of Justice saw fit to make the observations he did. They were made in a moment of crisis, at a moment of great difficulty, at a moment when we should have stood with every other member of the league. It weakened our position to give succour and support, not physical but moral, to Italy and she was not slow to represent our attitude to all the world. I wonder if the hon. gentleman has seen the editorial that appeared in one of the leading journals of the city of Rome, a journal supposed to speak with great authority for the government of the day. In that journal it was pointed out in terms clear and certain that all Canada was doing was repudiating Mr. Riddell, that he had overstepped the bounds of his authority and was being used merely as a tool by the British authorities for the purpose of doing something which they did not care to do. Obviously that is the wrong impression to have abroad, and that more than anything else is an illustration of just what the right hon. gentleman said the other day, and with which I agreed, as to the impropriety of statements such as that being made by one of his ministers in his absence. Not only the great impropriety of it, but the great injury it did to this country in the minds of people who had seen us as a young and vigorous power on the American continent, a member of the League of Nations which came into being with the idea of the United States being a member but which is now bereft of