Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say to my hon, friend that, as he is aware, as far as the conflict in Spain is concerned several nations have been represented on a non-intervention committee which has been endeavouring to prevent a spread of the conflict in that country. They have all agreed upon nonintervention as far as Spain is concerned. While not represented on the committee of non-intervention Canada has deemed it desirable to ally herself with these other countries in the general attitude which has been taken towards the conflict in Spain. There is not thus far among the nations a similar non-intervention policy with regard to the Sino-Japanese conflict. There has not even been a declaration of a state of war. Other nations have not joined together in any declaration of concerted non-intervention in that field. When other nations have united on a policy of non-intervention, that, it would seem, would be the time for this country to consider whether or not it should adopt a similar policy.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask the Prime Minister if we have not signed solemn treaties under which we obligate ourselves to go to the help of a country that is being attacked? And may I ask a second question: Must Canada always wait until other nations take action, especially when Canadian affairs are concerned?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think we need to wait, but I think we are wise to take cognizance of our obligations in the light of the world situation as it is to-day.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Then the obligations do not mean much, do they?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Does my hon, friend advocate Canada taking part in that war?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I did not advocate that. I advocated refusing to give assistance to an aggressor nation that is mercilessly attacking another nation.

Mr. COLDWELL: If my recollection serves me right—I have not the documents before me—I think on October 5 or 6 last the League of Nations, of which we are a member, called upon its constituent members to give moral support to China in its struggle, and more recently we have had another pronouncement of the same kind. Again, speaking from memory, I believe at the Brussels conference Canada was pointed out as the nation which was supplying a large percentage of the raw material for Japan.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

If we are a signatory of the League of Nations and we have moral obligations, it seems to me—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Where does the hon. member get the information he has just given, with respect to Canada supplying Japan? I believe he mentioned the Brussels conference.

Mr. COLDWELL: I believe the statement was made by the Chinese delegate to the nine-power conference held at Brussels about six or seven weeks ago.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to see the statement before attempting to answer it.

Mr. COLDWELL: I should be glad to look it up, and send it to the Prime Minister.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Would the Prime Minister also be prepared to tell us what happened at Brussels?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Not during the debate on this bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has the report of the Brussels conference which was laid on the table of the house. That report contains the information given to the world as to what happened there. I shall be glad to answer any questions I am in a position to answer with respect to the conference, but I cannot tell the hon. member about everything that happened there.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I was referring to the attitude taken by Canada at that conference.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: At the proper time I shall answer any questions as to Canada's attitude. I doubt if this is the appropriate time.

Mr. COLDWELL: May I follow up what I was saying by asking the minister if this legislation, which applies to only one set of circumstances, and is discriminatory against Canadian shipping, ought not to be paralleled by a declaration of the kind proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, so that the provision could be applied equally to all shipping engaged in the transportation of goods which may be used for war purposes.

Mr. HOWE: This is complementary legislation. As I said in my speech on second reading, Great Britain has legislation, in exactly similar terms, applying to the Spanish conflict. The United States has a measure exactly the same as this, in general terms. While the present measure applies to only a very few ships at this time, it would at least