

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The world.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the hon. member means the world, I agree with all he says, but if in saying "we" he means Canada I fail to see the point at all.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We in Canada can give our assistance.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We always have. We have done the best we could.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: No; I'm afraid we have not. We have not done the best we could. We have followed almost slavishly the lead of other nations; we have not even been in the forefront in some matters which might be named. I hope the house will not think that I am trying simply to blame. I am not talking party politics at all. If the league has failed, instead of in desperation reverting to the old isolationist position, with the idea of certain groups of nations getting together, of achieving a preponderance of power and playing the same old game again, why should not we in Canada patiently and definitely set ourselves to try to discover some other way.

To-day we are living in peace alongside the great American republic to the south of us—a wonderful example of how nations can live in peace. I venture, however, to say that if cannon were placed on the international border along the forty-ninth parallel we should have trouble. We are at peace because of the very lack of any armaments or border patrols. Think of the effective work of our International Joint Commission. There is not a better example anywhere in the world of what can be accomplished through having a joint body to deal with troubles as they arise. I had intended to go further into that, but I have not time to-night. Why cannot we extend the application of such a principle?

Surely we can do something. If we cannot attain to a world wide league, which perhaps is too much to expect all of a sudden, at least we can build up very friendly relations with a number of the democratic nations, not with the idea of enforcing our own purposes and points of view, but with hand outstretched even to some of those nations whom to-day we must denounce because of their actions. Call this pure idealism if you will, but after the experience of the last war and the misery and tragedy which has come since, surely we ought to try to find some other way. If to-night I proposed to spend \$34,000,000 upon a peace program, setting up a peace department, people would simply laugh, and yet, in allocating this money to

defence, we are merely going along on the same old lines that in the past have led to disaster. Cannot we use our imaginations a little; cannot we begin, even though in a small way, along lines which may mean material sacrifice to us and which may even be risky? Somebody has to take risks. We take enormous risks when we go to war. Why not take some risks in an effort to bring about peace?

Mr. Speaker, I thank you. I think this is the only time that I have so far transgressed the rules of the house, but the occasion is an important one. I appreciate very much the courtesy extended to me by the house.

Right Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): I have neither the will nor the time to offer any extended observations. I merely desire to say a word in answer to one or two remarks of my right hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) and to one remark of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Woodsworth). I should not even say "in answer"; I am going to direct a word or two to my hon. friends.

First, I was surprised to hear the right hon. leader of the opposition commend in rather kindly terms the declaration of the conference of 1926, and speak of the obligations which he contends it involves, because of the "free association" which is mentioned in it. Those who were in this parliament in 1927 will remember that my right hon. leader and I were strongly criticized, not perhaps by my right hon. friend—for I do not believe he took part in that debate; he was absent from the house—but by the then leader, the Hon. Mr. Guthrie, and the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan). The description which was then made of the work of that conference was that it was a sort of separatist movement from the British commonwealth, and far from being a bond of association, as my right hon. friend has described it to-day.

Further, after the conference of 1929 on dominion legislation, when we discussed the report of that conference in 1930 I well remember the strong words of my right hon. friend at that time with regard to its work. Of course I am not proficient in the English language, and I learned some words as I listened to my right hon. friend. I clearly recall his speech at the time because it was the first occasion when I heard the word "painter." He said that we had "cut the painter and let the mooring go"; that we were drifting from the little island in the North