

an attribute of sovereignty that form of war becomes at last juridically devoid of what constituted its most serious danger—its legitimacy.

Henceforth, branded with illegality, it is by mutual accord truly and regularly outlawed so that a culprit would incur the unconditional condemnation and probably the enmity of all its co-signatories. It is a direct blow to the institution of war, even to its very vitals. . .

Now, sir, at the very time when we are asked to ratify that treaty, we are surrounded by discussions just such as preceded the war of 1914. I wonder if the members of this House will take the time to go to the library and seriously read the articles and the editorials in the United States magazines and newspapers in which this word "war" appears so often. This is being done by the nation that asks us to outlaw war. The word "outlaw" has a well-defined meaning, and, sir, I do not like to see this country placed in the hypocritical position of signing a solemn treaty when the very nation that proposed it is talking in terms that are the very negation of its spirit and provisions. I realize indeed how serious these matters may be, I realize that it is just such language which creates that jingo spirit so absolutely at variance with the very thought of peace. If, sir, we are going to think in terms of peace, we cannot continually talk in terms of war. When I read those utterances, and when I saw this paragraph in the speech from the throne I decided—and in this I believe I represent the thought of a great many Canadians—that we should deprecate this discussion about war, that we should deprecate this effort of the great nation that put the treaty into concrete shape to create this dangerous war feeling by the tenor of the articles and editorials in their magazines and newspapers and of the speeches delivered by their public men. I say we should deprecate, and we do deprecate, the creation of a sentiment that is at direct variance with the very thought of peace.

Who that has studied modern democracy does not realize just where such talk leads to? You will recall the slogan, "Remember the Maine," and its results. What was the result of the great newspaper campaign initiated by Von Tirpitz in his attempt to create public opinion in favour of his measures for a greater navy? There was always one nation at which the attack was directed—Great Britain. Her navy and its supposed purpose was so presented to the German empire that it inflamed their passions, aroused suspicion and created an attitude of mind absolutely contrary to peace. Therefore, sir, I say we Canadians should do everything in our power to let it be understood we regret such expressions.

We cannot understand it; and in the light of the post knowledge we have and the discussions that have taken place we trust that we are not being placed in a hypocritical and ridiculous position with respect to the ratification of the treaty.

Sir, in my view, this country is not interested in what other countries may do to ensure freedom from attack upon their ships on the high seas or to maintain the safety of their trade routes throughout the world. We must look after ourselves and concede the right to others to do the same. If once a contest in armaments begins, whether it be on land or on sea, the end is as certain as an end can be. The history of the world bears testimony to this. The stream of time is strewn with the wrecks of nations that have engaged in a mad struggle for the maintenance of armaments. We Canadians, standing as we do between the east and the west, the greatest of the dominions between the far off east and the far west, we who live north of the forty-ninth, surely have a right to say as regards the ratification of a treaty such as this, that we regret that the discussions that have taken place subsequent to the signature of the treaty in Paris are wholly at variance with those that were antecedent thereto. It is, I think, our duty to make this clear; we would be derelict in our duty if we did not do so. This at any rate is the consideration that influences me in making these observations.

There is one remark I have to make with respect to acts which will be amended, among them the Elections Act. I do not know whether this intimation is a forerunner of an early appeal to the people, but I do say that anything that can be done to improve the Elections Act, whereby the will of the people may be made effective, should be undertaken. We who sit to the left of the Speaker realize this, in view of the fact that we received several hundred thousand votes more than did those who occupy seats to the right of the Chair. Those who sit on this side would therefore be glad to have the act amended in order to reflect more truly the will of the people.

One matter to which we shall have to give our attention is the state of the public accounts, which the faithful commoners will have an opportunity to consider. These, of course, are the accounts for the year ending March 31, 1928—not 1929. We shall, however get a budget speech, so called, which will deal with the accounts up till 1929, and it may be interesting to know—it will be pleasing, no doubt, to those who sit directly to the