

paratively small nation, must take a back seat with regard to the affairs of the empire and in the league at Geneva.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No; my hon. friend is quite wrong; I will tell him what is in the back of my mind. What is in the back of my mind is what I read in the dispatches I receive from day to day, sometimes many in a day, all of which emphasize over and over again the extraordinary and exceptionally critical nature of the European situation. That is what is in the back of my mind when I suggest to hon. members to be very guarded in what they say, lest the word spoken here may carry a very different or unfortunate interpretation in other parts of the world.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I quite appreciate the position taken by the Prime Minister in that regard, but I should like to emphasize what is in the back of my mind.

An hon. MEMBER: There is nothing.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Well, there may be nothing, though in that case it would be hard to express it. I do urge that if the leader of the opposition is correct—and I think he is—that if Great Britain is at war Canada is automatically at war, whether or not we participate actively, then we ought, as a more or less autonomous nation and having in our population an intelligent people—

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Not more or less, but autonomous.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Autonomous, if you like, and with a population of intelligent people. Under these circumstances we ought to be able to discuss these affairs that concern the welfare of the empire and have some part in them, at least so long as we remain a part of the empire. I do not think we can be both in and out of it; that is what I want to emphasize to-night. But as matters stand we do not quite know where we are.

So far, external affairs and military defence have been very closely related. The time may come when they will be entirely separate, when external affairs will not involve military defence; but to-day they are inextricably involved. I regret that we had the defence estimates introduced this year before we had the discussion on foreign affairs. It seems to me the proper order was reversed, and already we have had to some extent a discussion of external affairs. I will refer to some of the debates of the last few weeks. The hon. member for Beauharnois-Laprairie (Mr. Raymond) says that he will vote for the defence estimates on two grounds. In

the first place they are \$2,000,000 less than those of last year though they are still \$34,000,000. I have some sympathy with him so far as that is concerned, and choosing the lesser of two evils I should have to vote with him for the smaller estimate. He refers to the Prime Minister's stand at the imperial conference and feels confidence in voting defence supply. I wish I could be so reassured. It may be true that, as the Prime Minister has said, we are under no very definite commitments; yet I can hardly help thinking that the very close relationships which exist between our departments and the British departments must almost inevitably involve us in certain responsibilities.

Take the matter of war munitions. We are now making preparations, I understand, for our Canadian factories to ship large quantities of munitions to Great Britain. It is being quietly assumed that Canada is to become an arsenal for Great Britain. That is a very important question of foreign policy, which was not touched on by the Prime Minister and has not been considered by this house. Before long we shall have vested interests at work on the side of war; Great Britain will be looking to us to carry out certain obligations. Again, I have no definite idea why all this gold is being shipped here. I can conceive that probably credits will be needed in this country. Through these international arrangements, whether we like it or not, we are already taking on obligations. Hence it does not mean a great deal that the Prime Minister of Canada says that Canada has no definite commitments. The people of this country and parliament should know definitely where we stand in regard to these matters.

Consider the statement made by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Mackenzie). The *Globe and Mail's* summary of his speech was, "Canada must stand with Britain." I ask him, is that a fair summary of his speech? He was speaking not for himself but for the government. It is a catchy slogan. But one might ask, which Britain must Canada stand with—the Britain of Chamberlain, the Britain of Eden or the Britain of the Labour party? They represent three very different types of thought in Great Britain to-day. "Canada stands with Great Britain." Has Canada no opinion of her own? We ought to know that. Otherwise it is a case, as in the last war, of "Ready aye, ready." Is that the position at which we have arrived? Has the Liberal government taken that stand? If it has not, I would like the Liberal government to say so.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]