

not become a member of the League in the early future.

There are those who say that Germany should be immediately included. I do not know sufficient about the matter to say whether that should be done or not; but I say that if Germany and our other enemies are not included in the league, this will inevitably happen: You cannot permanently enslave a nation of 70,000,000 people, and that nation of 70,000,000 people will become a regular cave of Adullam to which all dissatisfied nations will resort. Then what shall we be back to? We shall be back to the League of Nations on the one side and another League headed by Germany on the other, we shall be back to the old balance of power theory which is responsible in Europe for more graves, more widows, more fatherless children than any other principle that we can imagine. In saying what I say, I utter only the words which were uttered years and years ago by Richard Cobden and John Bright. There are those who are pleased to regard the Manchester school as merely concerned with the trade questions, with a favourable balance on the books, but that is not right, they were humanitarians, they were statesmen, and the ideals which they preached three-quarters of a century ago are the ideas which Wilson preaches today, are the ideals which are found in the League of Nations itself.

The next necessary condition is that Germany should, as she is bound to, disarm, and that then all other nations should follow her example. That is an absolute condition of a lasting peace. For us, who have preached that this was a war to end war,—I remember a lad who left my office, one of my law students (and he is dead now); he said to me before he went away: Mr. McMaster, I would not want to go if I did not think I was going to fight a war to end war. Well, we owe it to those generous hearts who went in that spirit to see that our professions are made good, to see that after having made those murderers who started this war, disarm, we disarm ourselves also, retaining only such military and naval power as is necessary for the proper policing of the world.

Mr. BURNHAM: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt his magnificent speech? The Babylonian Empire was overcome by the Assyrian force, is that not true? Greece was attacked by the Dorian hordes and decimated. We know that it was Xerxes

[Mr. McMaster.]

who burned Athens. Is it not true that the Roman power overcame Greece and took possession of Greece? And is it not true that the Roman Empire was overcome by force, because she was not able to defend herself?

Mr. McMASTER: This is a scheme for all nations to disarm, and if all nations disarm then there cannot be, or it is only remotely possible that there can be, such incursions as my hon. friend speaks of.

Last of all, there must be a change in the mind of the world. As Lord Robert Cecil says: "We have to lose the war-mind and we have to acquire the mind of peace." I should hate to be thought a hypocrite, and I say this in all sincerity and honesty, that the events of the last five years have driven it home to me that the only way that mankind can be saved from future wars and disasters is by the application of the principles of the New Testament. It may be a hard thing to forgive our enemies. It, no doubt, is an awfully hard thing for men who have lost sons or even daughters in the war to set aside from their hearts feelings of hatred and distrust. I may be asking too much of them, but I say that that is the way of peace, and I know of no other.

As regards the rest of the Treaty, I have very little to say. I approve the Treaty as a whole. There are many things which I do not like, but I understand that the Government does not pretend that it likes them all itself, but claims that we have to take the Treaty as a whole; that we have to accept it or reject it. I accept it; I approve the principle of self-determination which I believe has been worked out with great care and skill. I do not like the provisions about the Saar valley; I do not like the provisions as regards seizing ships and tugs, and I will tell you why I do not like them. As regards the coal mines of the Saar valley, which belong to the Prussian or the Bavarian state of the German Empire, I have no objection in the least to taking those; that is only a matter of poetic justice for the destruction of the coal mines of northern France. But the Treaty goes further than that; it takes private property and coal mines from private individuals and private companies. Are these private individuals and private companies sinners above all German sinners that their property should be taken and they referred by the Allies to a bankrupt state for reparation? I do not like the principle; I do not think it is consonant with the rest of the Treaty.

The same principle applies as to tugs and vessels. I do not like that, but I am pre-