

The Journal of Commerce

Devoted to
CANADIAN INDUSTRY, COMMERCE
AND FINANCE

Published every Tuesday morning by the
Journal of Commerce Publishing
Company, Limited.

Editorial and Advertising Offices, Room 204
Drummond Building, St. Catherine and Peel
Streets, Montreal. Telephone: Uptown 7773.
Toronto Office: 1402 C.P.R. Bldg., Toronto. Tele-
phone: Adelaide 3319.

Vancouver Office: 528 Winch Building, Van-
couver.

Printed at the Garden City Press, Ste. Anne de
Bellevue, Que. Telephone: 165 St. Anne's.

HON. W. S. FIELDING,
President and Editor-in-Chief.

Subscription price, \$3.00 a year
Advertising rates on application.

Gardenvale, P. Q., November 2, 1920.

Article X

While the whole Covenant of the League of Nations is in issue in the Presidential contest in the United States, special attention is being directed to Article X, which reads as follows:

10.—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 the Council shall advise upon the means by which the obligation shall be fulfilled.

The many leading Republicans who favored the League but are now supporting Mr. Harding who is against it—Ex-President Taft, Charles E. Hughes, Herbert Hoover, Dr. A. Lawrence Lowell, G. W. Wickersham, Jacob Gould Schurman and others—are using Article X as a reason, or an excuse, for their apparent inconsistent action.

The meaning of the Article has been much disputed in all the discussions that have arisen on the League scheme. Opponents of the League have claimed that the terms of this clause commit the United States to participation in any war that might occur through any of the nations violating the provisions of the section. For this reason they proposed an amendment or reservation to the effect that the right of the Congress of the United States to determine questions of peace and war should remain unimpaired. Friends of the League argued that the right of Congress

to determine such questions was in no way affected by Article X and that therefore no amendment or reservation was required.

In our own Parliament the same question was raised, but in a less emphatic way. It was argued that as there actually was a difference of opinion among eminent authorities it would be wise, not to offer either amendment or reservation, but to accompany approval of the League with a declaration that only the Parliament of Canada could authorize participation in any war that might come as a result of Article X. Our Government held that Parliament's authority was not in any way impaired by the Article and that no declaration was needed.

The disputed point as to the meaning of Article X is now receiving much attention in the United States. The Republican leaders are insisting that the Article does commit the United States to participation in war, that President Wilson himself so understood, and that he so interpreted the Article in his intercourse with members of the Conference at Paris. It is claimed that the official records of the speeches at the Conference, if they can be made public, will show that Mr. Wilson gave the small nations particularly concerned the assurance that the United States was to join the other nations in enforcing by military power the obligation to protect against attack all the countries parties to the treaty. Senator Borah, who is one of the most vehement opponents of the President, argues that Mr. Wilson has virtually admitted this obligation. Mr. Borah, at Manchester, N. H., a few days ago, made a speech which was almost wholly devoted to this aspect of the question. He said:

"When the President was before the Foreign Relations Committee Senator Knox asked this question:

"Suppose that it is perfectly obvious that there is an external aggression against some power, and suppose it is perfectly obvious and accepted that it cannot be repelled except by force of arms, would we be under any legal obligation to participate?"

"No, sir, but we would be under an absolutely compelling moral obligation."

"I take it that it will not make very much difference to the American people, to the sons and mothers of America, whether you call it a legal obligation or a moral obligation or what you call it, if it is an obligation absolutely compelling and from the execution of which there is no escape. Is it not perfectly plain that we guarantee the settlements and the boundaries of Europe, and that if there is an actual disturbance of these boundaries we are under an absolutely

compelling moral obligation to send our armies and our navies across the sea? It is not equally plain that we are carrying out the decisions of these men representing the whole world, the divisions which they made, the boundaries which they established, and that we are doing so by the blood and treasure of America?"

There is no doubt that this part of the League scheme, as interpreted by Mr. Borah and others, has been viewed with much disapproval and that the criticism of it that has been made has had much to do with the hostility of many Americans to the scheme. If the President admits that under the conditions described there would be "an absolutely compelling moral obligation" on the United States to engage in war, it is hardly worth while disputing as to the strictly legal meaning of Article X. And if there would be such a moral obligation on the United States would not the situation be the same in Canada, which has become a party to the treaty that includes the Covenant of the League of Nations?

Four Liberal Statesmen on Ireland

The Irish question is now the most difficult one for the statesmen of the Empire and many prominent men have been moved to present to the public their views of it. Four leading English Liberals—we assume that Mr. Lloyd George will still claim to be a Liberal—have lately spoken of it from the press or platform. Lord Morley, without prescribing specific remedies, has pleaded once more for moderation and conciliation. Viscount Grey—formerly Sir Edward—takes the view that, with the exception of one or two services which must necessarily be under Imperial control, the Irish people, in a convention called for the purpose, should be allowed to devise any kind of Home Rule that will suit themselves. Mr. Asquith has followed Viscount Grey, but goes a little further. In Mr. Asquith's opinion, Ireland will not have substantial autonomy unless she is allowed to provide for an army and navy for local defence and to have control of her own fiscal affairs. In short, Mr. Asquith would give Ireland substantially the same constitution as Canada.

Mr. Lloyd George replied to these utterances from the Opposition ranks in a speech at Carnarvon, Wales, in which he made a vigorous defence of the policy of his Government on the Irish question and offered a keen criticism of the proposals of Mr. Asquith.

Mr. Lloyd George told his hearers, correctly, that he had always been a Home Ruler and that he had participated in the