

would have left us and all States-Members committed to the principle of supporting a strong League in so far as was within the realm of physical possibility. Few Canadians know Europe politically as well as I do. My conviction is that our strenuous effort to knock the strong prop of Article X from under the Covenant immediately after we had insisted upon signing the latter in order to prove our full nationhood, had an unsettling effect upon the new nations and upon their older friends, Belgium and France. Our final success, in 1923, in getting the Article explained away and rendered practically ineffective surely made the exposed nations feel that they would have to count on themselves for defence rather than on the League. Some of the criticisms of Article X made by Mr. Doherty etc., appear to me (and appeared to a majority of States) rather sophistical. Article X in no way guarantees the status quo against the normal operation of Article XIX. Without the principle of mutual solidarity against physical aggression, any League strikes me as hardly worth while.

As our foremost soldier, you must feel even more keenly than I the futility of promising our fellow-members that if they are violently set upon, and the Council calls upon us to help restore order, we will convene Parliament and listen for a few weeks to rustic M.P.'s debating the pros and cons of a case of which they can know nothing whatsoever. Article X might as well have been obliterated as mutilated. Could we have