

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): My hon. friend is wrong in his history. "Ready, aye, ready" arose in 1923, in connection with the Chanak incident.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I believe that is correct.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): And the government of the day was not "ready, aye, ready."

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is quite true. But I say, have we reached to that point? Is that to be our policy? Let me instance another reaction to the statement of the government's policy, an editorial in the Montreal Daily Star of March 25. The article stated that we had had a formal statement of government policy, and says:

It officially recognized several definite facts which the isolationists, the purblind pacifists and the whole fat-headed fraternity of confused thinkers commonly refuse to recognize . . . it is only fair to recognize the political courage of the ministry of Mr. Mackenzie King in going as far, as fast and as steadily as it is.

So apparently the Prime Minister and French Canada are no longer isolationists, but we are going as far and as fast as we can in the imperial direction. That is apparently the view of the Star, founded upon what was said here a few weeks ago. The same issue of the Star quotes Earl Baldwin:

Our frontier no longer is at the cliffs of Dover, but at the Rhine.

I would ask, Where is Canada's frontier? Is it the Atlantic or the Pacific, or is our frontier going to the cliffs of Dover, or some other external point? Is it going to be outside of our own geographical boundaries? When I study the details of our defence estimates I have to ask myself that question: Are our frontiers to be the Atlantic and the Pacific, or are we preparing, if occasion arises, again to send troops overseas? After listening carefully to what the Prime Minister said this afternoon, I confess I am still at a loss to know just what our foreign policy is.

I read again a few weeks ago that lengthy speech which the Prime Minister made last year. I shall refer to it, if briefly, rather than to to-day's because I have not the copy of to-day's speech at hand. In truth I do not see that there is any great difference in the point of view expressed this year and last year.

The Prime Minister referred to our obligations under the League of Nations, and spoke of the failure of the league. Referring to the pact of Paris, he said that the nations which were parties to that instrument agreed from that time on to renounce war as an instrument of national policy. He considered that

our relationship to the league had become a liability rather than anything else. He took the position that certain nations put no faith in contracts. "Some nations avowedly are placing their confidence in might, not in right; in force, not in reason." He then stated, as he repeated to-day, that economic sanctions would inevitably lead to military sanctions. He spoke of the league in these words:

But a league which in the light of the developments of the last few years continues to place its reliance on force is going to be a very different institution from that which most of us have conceived the league of nations to be.

If I understand those statements aright, the Prime Minister has come to the rather curious conclusion that since it is wrong for the league to use force it is right for the individual nation to use force. He has apparently come to the conclusion that since some nations have failed to live up to their obligations we should follow suit. I recall a passage in the book of Psalms commending the man that sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not. I agree with the leader of the opposition when he deprecates the way in which Canada, with other nations, has regarded her obligations so lightly. The Prime Minister I think would take this position; that since, according to Doctor Dafoe, whose words he quotes but whose advice he does not follow, we are back to a conception that excludes all considerations of morality in international relationships, we should, to use the Prime Minister's own words, take cognizance of our obligations in the light of the world situation as it is to-day. I confess that smacks very much of the words which were used recently by Lord Halifax in rejecting the appeal of the former Emperor Haile Selassie who came to make a last plea that the nations would honour their obligations. In that connection I noticed a remarkable statement in the Winnipeg Free Press. I have not been able to get away from the set-up of this page:

Death knell of a nation.

"May God forgive them."

The garden of Gethsemane could not have been more bleak and forbidding than was the council chamber of the League of Nations yesterday when a cold and hostile "family of nations" rejected the last, cogent appeal of a fellow member for consideration at the bar of international justice—an appeal that the nations of the world keep alight the torch of collective security by withholding provision for the honourable recognition of the most dishonourable act of aggression in modern times. But the nations, with two notable exceptions—New Zealand and China—turned their backs on the pathetic, despairing figure of Emperor Haile Selassie of ravaged Ethiopia, too ill himself to deliver his speech but seated