

When I speak of Germans I do not include one hundred per cent of the Germans, but I do mean the nazi educated hordes who constitute the great majority of people in the German nation to-day. Let me hasten to say that we have a great number of splendid German citizens in Canada. To that large number of people nothing I have said would have the slightest application. But let us recall that, in the main, they came here to escape conditions in Germany. They came to Canada to escape revolution in Germany many years ago; they came to this great land of ours to be away from those very conditions we are bound to indict.

In the last hundred years Germany has taught her youth one continuous lesson, that of the grandeur of war—the lust to kill. From their very cradles German babies have been nursed on the milk of hatred of all races other than the German race. We can remove a tiger from the jungle, put him in a cage in the zoo, and have the patience to train him. But when the keeper takes a chance some day and does something for the tiger, out comes the claw, the fang, and he becomes a killer, all over again.

Let us recall that in the last century Germany has begun and fought five separate wars of aggression. In July, 1900, the ex-kaiser made a speech at Bremerhaven to his German troops, in which he said, "When you meet the foe you will defeat him; no quarter will be given; no prisoners will be taken."

And so we find to-day that Germany has become a habitual enemy. She has abandoned Christianity, and has substituted for it the worship of one man, *der Fuehrer*. What a man to worship! When he walks he struts; when he speaks he screams. His watchword is treachery, and his lust is for blood and the will to kill.

That has been extended to the youth of Germany, to the point where we find ourselves faced now with a proposal which we hope and believe can, once and for all, stamp this monster out, beyond any possibility of future war and conflict for our children.

Let me now turn from that ugly picture and say a word or two respecting the proposals. I make the suggestions, as we were invited to do, and after having given some close study to the proposals. I ask this: Is Canada content with the present constitution of the permanent court of international justice, and content to continue it in force; or are there provisions which Canada thinks should be inserted—as the proposals invite us to insert them, if desired? My own view is that amendments are needed to the set-up of the present permanent court of international

justice. They are of a somewhat legal and detailed character, however, and I do not purpose taking the time of the house to deal with them now.

If I may be permitted, I am going to give a memorandum to the Prime Minister, so that when Canada's delegation goes to San Francisco it will have my views before it. Is it considered desirable that Canada should endeavour to have one of the six non-permanent memberships on the security council, and that she should endeavour to select her delegate for that purpose in advance—if it is believed that the San Francisco conference will go so far as actually to select the security council? Then, is it desirable that Canada secure at least one member of the eighteen to be elected on the economic and social council, and to select such proposed representative—if it is thought that the conference will reach the stage of electing those eighteen members?

Then what is an expert, as the word is used in chapter IX of the proposals? That portion of the chapter which troubles me for the moment is this:

Section D: Organization and Procedure:

1. The economic and social council should set up an economic commission, a social commission, and such other commissions as may be required. These commissions should consist of experts.

I find no definition of an expert. What occurred to me was this: In Canada there might be suggested to sit on one of those commissions a man with splendid business training, but with no university education, a man who has made a success of a large industrial venture or one who is eminently fitted to sit on a commission of that kind. Would it not be well either to interpret or to define the word "expert" so as to avoid any friction later on. I say that because, as I see it, we must make this as free from any possibility of friction as it is possible to make it, and I suggest a definition so that an expert might not be defined as one having purely academic or professional qualifications necessary to bring him within the strict definition of the word.

Then with respect to the set-up of the position of secretary-general, I suggest, for the consideration of our delegation, that under the present proposals too many jobs are placed on his back. He is declared to be chief administrative officer. That, in itself, is a big task. It is also declared that he shall sit as secretary at the meetings of the general advisory committee. Then, he is to sit as secretary at the meetings of the security council. It is conceivable that those two bodies may sit in different places, and in my view the machinery would be facilitated if it is suggested that he should be appointed—not elected—and that an assistant