

order of the day in South America. While the outbreaks never became of great importance to the world at large, they perhaps acted as a safety valve for the exuberant feelings of the nations concerned. Japan, which aims to be one of the leading nations, and certainly the leading nation of the Pacific, adhered to the League and was quite agreeable that the League should function so long as it kept everyone else from fighting; but as soon as Japan desired to fight on her own account, as soon as she thought it expedient to acquire a bit of territory from her next-door neighbour, she withdrew from the League and landed an army in Manchuria, on Chinese territory, and she is there now as a sovereign power. A similar thing happened with regard to Germany. That country left the League because she was not allowed to arm to the same extent as were other European nations. So it seems that as soon as any of the powers consider that some advantage is to be gained by withdrawal from the League, they withdraw. The sad part about the organization is that it has no means to retain members against their will.

I agree with the statement by the honourable leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) that had our great neighbour to the south continued in that course in which it might reasonably have been expected to continue after the Great War, present conditions might be entirely different. In my opinion, if the United States and Great Britain were working in co-operation they would have enough moral influence, together with their military and naval forces, to keep the rest of the world in order. But the United States, for reasons of her own, which reasons we cannot criticize, did not see fit to join the League.

Now, I do not think that because of its failure, if it is a failure, the League should be abandoned; but for many years I have had the feeling that a much more effective League might be formed, one which would have far greater influence towards maintaining world peace than the League of Nations has, as it is presently constituted, and that would be a league of the whole British Empire and the United States of America.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BLACK: I am, of course, expressing merely my own opinion. Now, Great Britain, the principal country of our Empire group, is not a European country solely. She is on her own island, separated from the continent, and has more interests in Asia, America and India than in Europe; and she is in every sense of the word a world nation—indeed the only world nation of to-day.

Then the United States is a self-contained nation, occupying nearly one-half of the great continent of North America. She has a population of 110 to 125 millions, and within her own borders she has resources of almost every kind that could possibly be required. On one side the Atlantic and on the other side the Pacific separate her from the embroglios that take place in Europe and in Asia. A league formed of that country, with her great financial and numerical strength, and the British Empire, would be able to ensure the maintenance of world peace. The combined air, sea and land forces would be so powerful that such a league would be able to say to the world, "If any country starts a war which it cannot justify, we will interfere and see to it that such country shall suffer." In such circumstances we should have a safeguard which it seems to me we have not at the present time.

I would very gladly include France in a league of that kind but that I feel it would not be politic or advisable to do so, because France is a European nation and has enemies confronting her on three sides, and it would be almost impossible for French statesmen and the ordinary French citizen to see eye to eye with the people of the United States and the British Empire on many questions.

I submit for the consideration of my honourable friend opposite (Hon. Mr. Dandurand)—I am sure he has it in mind already—that such a union would constitute a peace organization very much more effective than anything we have had up to the present time. Let it not be supposed that I am antagonistic to the League of Nations. All strength to its arm! But it has not much arm. I think the League is still capable of a great deal of useful work in international affairs, and I wish it every success.

My honourable friend from De Lanaudière (Hon. Mr. Casgrain) devoted a considerable part of his address yesterday to the proposed Central Bank and the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty. I do not intend to discuss the treaty in detail until it is before us for consideration. I shall also defer any extended reference to the recommendation for a Central Bank set forth in the Macmillan Commission's report until the Bill is before this House.

With regard to the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty, however, I share my honourable friend's grave doubts as to the advisability of developing the St. Lawrence along the lines proposed. In the first place, a very great expenditure of money would be required to complete the project, and while it is all very well to be reminded that Canada will be credited for her expenditure on the New