

104340

be the consequences of a world struggle which lasted for more than a few weeks.

The last war brought many surprises. None of the specific predictions were verified by the events. We are as prone to minimize the consequences of the next struggle as we were of the last.

I know there are differences of opinion. There are those who feel that these engines cannot be produced in sufficient quantity and on a sufficient scale to be a serious menace to the great proportion of mankind. But I cannot understand computations which estimate the results of the next conflict at less than many times the magnitude of the horror of the last. Authorities like the three political leaders of our country, like Stanley Baldwin and Butler, like those who survived in the sphere of high statesmanship the struggle of 1918, are not far wrong when they tell us that if civilization does not wholly disappear after the next conflict, at least there is no hope of anything of the character of the present social structure surviving for an hour. Consequently the greatness of the purpose of the League is borne home to us all. That in these fourteen years it has achieved or given great promise of achieving that purpose is, I am free to admit, uncertain. I am free to admit that there is much room for criticism, perhaps for discouragement; but there is no room for despair.

The withdrawal or threatened withdrawal of two great nations is indeed a serious blow. Germany came into the League six years ago. She has now given notice of withdrawal for reasons that to the world outside do not seem to have any basis in rationality at all, for, whatever the complaint of Germany may be, it cannot be against the League. It may be against certain members of the League in respect of their attitude towards disarmament. No complaint that Germany may have on the ground that equality has been denied her can be addressed to the League of Nations, for within the framework of that institution she has had full equality. But the time certainly cannot be far distant when Germany will look to the League for the realization of some advantage. The other side of the shield is certain to appear, and Germany will probably find some reason to return to the fold of that institution for the betterment of her own position and her survival as a nation.

The conduct of Japan is, I fear, universally criticized as well. Japan claims to have kept within the provisions of the Covenant; at all events she says, "If I have not, I am prepared to leave." But how she can believe she has kept within the provisions of the major articles of the Covenant I am

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

at a loss to understand. Undoubtedly the appeal of China was made under that special article out of which there does not grow the imperative application of the sanctions called for by other articles. Whether it was by reason of pressure on the part of greater powers that China made her appeal under the article which did not call for sanctions. I do not know. At all events there was unquestionably no disposition on the part of the greater powers to take the risk of applying sanctions for the objective to be served in the case of the Manchurian conflict.

This brings to my mind the thought which, more than any other, I wish to impress upon the House at this time. I will put Great Britain, France and Italy all in the same category in this regard. They did not see fit to apply the economic and financial sanctions called for by article 16 of the Covenant. They knew, as we all must know if we study the terms of those sanctions, that such action must lead to war, and war on a grand scale, unless Japan receded. I do not quite like the spirit which seems to me too prevalent in our own country, and which I may describe in this way: We are glad to be members of the League, because under article 10 as re-interpreted, with the dissidence of Persia, we do not at any time actually need to fight. We are happy to be within the pale of the Covenant, because all we can be asked to do is to refuse to trade; and we hold up both hands for the League of Nations because of the re-interpretation which will always keep Canada out of war, no matter what may result. But we complain bitterly unless Great Britain on the one hand and France on the other take steps which they know will involve them in war and all it entails, because of the force and impingement of the Covenant of the League. Until this country is ready to take the whole consequence of membership in the League, and take its whole part in the enforcement of the Covenant, we have no right to rejoice in membership in the League at all. We stand by and say that the Allies won the War, and that it was their duty immediately afterwards to win the peace—to stand together as a league of conquerors and enforce peace against the fallen foe. We say it is no part of our duty to enforce peace; that the worst we could be called upon to do would be to refuse to trade with recalcitrant nations.

In proportion as that attitude of mind prevails among its members, the League will fail to achieve its purpose. Only in the definite knowledge that every country is ready to live up to its whole responsibility for the enforcement of compliance with the Covenant can