

settle it very quickly, and the less time that is spent in settling the row in Manchuria the sooner we shall get on to doing trade in China. . . . Right is might, and very often might is right, and the Japanese are going to carry out there what they have started, and the sooner the thing is finished the better. I do not see why we should not give Japan munitions to help her to finish it, because the sooner it is through the better for China and for everybody in that country.

That comes from a prominent member of the British Parliament.

Hon. Mr. McLENNAN: What is his name, please?

Hon. Mr. McRAE: The name is Sir Nairne Stewart Sandeman.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: He is a German.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: May I ask the honourable gentleman whether he personally subscribes to that view?

Hon. Mr. McRAE: If the honourable gentleman will hear my speech out, I am sure he will realize that I do not.

Then, in announcing his sixty-year plan, Premier Mussolini says:

To pretend to eternally keep a nation like Germany disarmed is pure illusion, unless one has the objective of preventing by force of arms Germany's eventual rearmament. This game has a supreme stake—the lives of millions of men and the destiny of Europe.

Again we have Mr. Hitler, who, in explaining his programme, says in effect that the purpose of his home policy is to forge a sword sharp enough to strike, while the purpose of his foreign policy is to gain time and lull suspicion until the sword is ready. Hitler certainly put out the flame of internationalism. These men show little desire for peace.

We frequently have assurance of peace from quarters apparently close to the war racketeers of Europe. I refer to the armament manufacturers, who are the power behind the arming and counter-arming of nations and who are said to dominate the governments of their own country. We are told that the sale of armaments through Vickers-Armstrong to foreign nations amounted to as much as \$100,000,000 last year. This would constitute a large part of the increase in British exports of steel in 1933, the revival of which industry was the source of much gratification in England. What a travesty on peace! While the British steel and iron foundries are working overtime supplying the nations of Europe and Asia with war materials, Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Baldwin are working equally long hours trying to bring about peace in Europe.

The Armament Trust of France, which is said to control 182 French companies manu-

Hon. Mr. McRAE.

facturing heavy ordnance, machine guns, tanks, shells, munitions and warfare chemicals, is said to have produced \$300,000,000 worth of war materials last year. This Trust controls the armament manufacture in Czechoslovakia, whose exports of war material were estimated last year at \$30,000,000, which constituted ten per cent of the country's total exports.

While the statesmen of various countries in Europe are holding conferences looking to disarmament, factories in the same countries are working overtime providing armaments for the next war. With such glaring inconsistencies questioning international honesty, is it any wonder that Europe is seething with suspicion and distrust and that no nation believes the professions of its neighbour? Under these conditions it can well be said that "war is a racket."

France stands for her right to security. Germany wants a revision, with a return to her of the Corridor and other territories taken from her. Poland and the Balkans want to maintain the status quo. Austria wants union with Germany. Italy wants additional territory, particularly an adjoining section of France. These territorial issues are insoluble, because the racial spirits of the people are uncompromising. Britain is as helpless to remedy this situation as she was in 1914.

So that we may all appreciate our responsibility as a member of the League of Nations, permit me to read Article 10 of the Covenant.

The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. In case of any such aggression, or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

Article 10 is a definite pledge which binds Canada as a member of the League. Mark the phrase, "this obligation"—for so it is undoubtedly the practical enforcement of the article when the time comes will mean armed intervention.

There are those who think that the League in order to enforce its decisions should have a standing army, a sort of super-force drawn from the member-nations of the League. A military-equipped League of Nations is as unthinkable as it is unworkable. It would lack a common language and a satisfactory single command. Wars would be certain and frequent. In every war the international force comprising soldiers from several nations would be called upon, some of them to fight their brothers or cousins. There would be no unity. Disloyalty and espionage in the

League force would be sure to arise. Such a force certainly can not be advocated by those who want peace. It would mean just the opposite. Then without an army to enforce the League's command what happens? Witness Japan.

Not only has the League of Nations failed to attain its original objective, world peace; it has even failed to restrain the coming eruption. The League has failed to condemn the high-handed action and appears to give the most careful consideration to the interests of its powerful members. In short, it takes no serious objection to the decisions of those who defy it.

And what is more, the League has failed to be helpful in the economic crisis which has engulfed the world for the last five years. It is as little effective in world prosperity as it is in world peace.

Torpedoed by its leading members, who now resort to secret negotiations with other nations—also members of the League—and in some instances, no doubt forced by the need for self-preservation, returning to the old pre-war plan of coalition, these members, the most powerful in the League, appear to use it only for lip service to peace.

Sensible men want facts, not fiction. Boys in Europe are being trained for war; the nations are in the spirit for war. Nationalism is growing, the air of Europe is thick with the talk of war. All old-world countries are engaged in mechanical war experiments. We hear of new explosives, new gases, new guns, new tanks, new battleships, new submarines, new aeroplanes and many other contrivances, new and still more destructive—all surpassing what has gone before, and designed to bring death to the nation against which they are first used.

Honourable senators who remember the ten years preceding the outbreak of war in 1914 will recall the then current conviction that war was inescapable. Many of us did not believe it at that time. To-day the ambitions and policies which made the World War certain exist unmodified. They are equally irreconcilable, and war is certain to result.

The horrors of the last war have not been forgotten. That the next war will be infinitely worse is generally appreciated. People, as always, have learned nothing and forgotten nothing, and in the circumstances there will be war in Europe. The situation presents this remarkable paradox, that while every nation is agreed that another war will mean the end of European civilization, the same nations are to-day preoccupied in preparing for that war! Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler says, "The safest nations in the world are

the unarmed nations, the Switzerlands, the Denmarks, the Norways and the Swedens." Let us add Canada to this list.

I have a very definite opinion that the people of Canada do not clearly understand the responsibilities we have under Article 10 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. Unless we are to regard our membership in the League as a scrap of paper, our responsibilities may mean another foreign war for Canada. Not for the veterans of the last war—who, with rare exceptions, are no longer fit for active service—but for those who have come of age since the last war; for the young men in their 'teens who are not yet of fighting age, and perhaps for some of our sons still in their cradles.

The bonusing of large families by Germany and Italy, both countries already over-populated, can only be to provide the human element still necessary to guide the modern instruments of war. It is bad enough to send our boys to kill in defence of their country. It is unthinkable that Canadian sons should be sent to Europe to war with these nation-made sons of a decaying civilization.

I wish I could arouse in the heart of every Canadian mother with a son who is of military age, or will become available for service in the next ten years, a realization of the obligation which, with our high ideals, we are liable to incur if we continue as a member of the League to sit at the European council table, surrounded as it is with distrust, disloyalty, racial hatreds and ambitions, all of which lead to war.

My remarks might well be criticized were I not to suggest to this honourable House some avenue through which I think the objective of the League of Nations might be attained. After fifteen years of futile effort for international peace there remains but one way to obtain the abolishment of war. The road is open, clear and certain, and tests the sincerity of the nations that say they want world peace. I refer to the total discontinuance by all nations of further manufacture and sale of armaments and munitions of war. Such a policy fully enforced would end war at no distant date. Armaments soon become obsolete, and if they are not replaced disarmament comes about by force of circumstances in natural course of time; for armies no longer efficiently equipped would soon disintegrate and without outside pressure reduce themselves to the strength of a national police force. This more than anything else would tend to restore confidence throughout the world. There would then be reason to expect that the present racial fears and suspicions