

poses a new plan and because the old plan has been such a ghastly failure. I am surprised that any militarist in the world dares to open his mouth against the League of Nations. What is a militarist? Not merely a military man. There are many military men who are not militarists; those military men who are in this House, I know, are not militarists. A militarist has been defined by Bernard Shaw as one who believes that all power is armed power and that God is always with the biggest battalions. That, I think, is a good definition of a militarist. What has been the outcome of the old plan? Is it not true, Mr. Speaker, that armaments have entirely failed to protect the taxpayers who were bled white to support them? Before the war was on, what nation had a more wonderful military machine than the Germans, yet what nation suffered worse than the Germans? Great Britain was proud of her navy, and well she might be. But was the navy able to protect adequately and completely the commerce of Great Britain or even the shores of Great Britain during the war? No; over the North Sea, over the English Channel, high above the ocean, over the straits of Dover, came the death-dealing Zeppelins to rain down death and destruction not only upon soldiers, but, alas, upon women and children. By ruthless savagery and by considerable ingenuity the Germans developed an arm which operated under the sea; and if recent statements are correct there was a time when things looked desperately bad for Great Britain and for the Allied cause owing to the submarine campaign. Armaments, therefore, have not protected; not only that, they have been one of the great causes of the war. When one nation built up a great military machine another nation did the same; the thoughts of different nations centred on their respective armies; the thought of mankind was direct in too large a measure to organizing schemes for the killing of man. I grant that when one nation led the way it was almost impossible for other nations not to endeavour to keep step. I know the difficulty, therefore I welcome with all my heart this proposal which looks toward the cessation of war and the substitution of arbitration for the settlement of international disputes. We in America may be very proud of this, because Canada and the United States showed the way in the creation of the International Waterways Boundaries Commission, which was the first international tribunal set up for the settlement of international disputes.

I do not minimize the difficulties that are in the way, but these are my grounds for hope. I think mankind is sane, and I say that if mankind goes back to the former competition in armaments, mankind is not sane, mankind is mad. Surely we have had a lesson in this war; surely mankind is going to find some way out; surely the appeal to force is not going to be the ultimate arbiter. I think it was Viscount Bryce who wrote to a great meeting convened for the purpose of furthering this project of the League of Nations: "We must destroy war, or war will destroy us." Surely, that has been driven home to the minds and hearts of mankind. I am not sure whether the present civilization could stand another war like the one that has just closed. There have been wonderful civilizations in the past; Greece had a wonderful civilization; Rome had a wonderful civilization; and they are gone, because they were founded upon force and unless our civilization can be founded upon something other than force, there is a danger that our civilization will go too.

There are certain necessary conditions to the success of the league. It should include, as soon as possible, all nations. I know that is a hard saying for some to accept; I know men who have suffered in their bodies by the infamous tactics of the Germans, may find it hard to accept that view, but is there any other way out? Those who framed the Peace Treaty saw this. At page 5 of the Reply of the Allied and Associated Powers to the German delegation on the conditions of peace, we read:

The Allied and Associated Powers look forward to the time when the League of Nations established by this treaty shall extend its membership to all peoples; but they cannot abandon any of the essential conditions of an enduring league.

On page 6 they say:

The Allied and Associated Powers regard the Covenant of the League of Nations as the foundation of the Treaty of Peace. They have given careful consideration to all its terms and they are convinced that it introduces an element of progress into the relations of peoples which the future will develop and strengthen to the advantage of justice and of peace.

The text of the treaty itself makes it clear that it has never been the intention of the Allied and Associated Powers that Germany or any other power should be indefinitely excluded from the League of Nations. Provisions have accordingly been laid down which apply generally to States not members of the League and which determine the conditions of their admission subsequent to its formation.

Further on, they say:

Provided these necessary conditions are assured, they see no reason why Germany should