

building. The latter suggestion may reopen the whole question of the policy which the Senate followed last year. The policy of my honourable friend was not followed by the Senate last year, because it declared the necessity of building 21 or 22 lines out of 26 submitted to us. It was decided by the Senate then, on the merits of each case, that there is such a thing as money well spent even though finances are difficult. One may be in straitened circumstances, but at the same time he may feel that it is a good thing even for him to borrow money to advance his own interests. So I say for this reason I would not be ready to adhere to a hard and fast rule that there should be no more money spent for railway branches.

There is, I know, a desire on both sides in the Senate to examine closely into the problem of the Peace River region, from which nearly half the people have already moved out because they could not sell the products of the land. This is a very rich area, and the question is whether or not having already opened that country we should do something to retain the population which is there and try to bring in tens of thousands of people who would come in if they could sell their products and send them to Vancouver, which I think is the nearest point on the seaboard.

My honourable friend has said that the Speech from the Throne failed to mention the work which was done at the Fifth Assembly of the League of Nations in Geneva last September. He added that the question was one of sufficient importance to merit attention, as the armies and navies of the world, under the new amendments to the Covenant, seemed to be put at the disposal of the League of Nations. I do not feel that the moment has come to make a statement on this matter to the Senate. The right honourable the junior member for Ottawa (Right Hon. Sir George E. Foster) has given a notice of motion which may open up the whole question. All that I desire to say is that my honourable friend's statement that the Canadian delegates adhered to the protocol would need qualification. Most of the representatives of the nations, the representatives of Canada among them, had no mandate from their Governments. They saw, however, the very great importance of this document, but they were without any power to bind their respective Governments by putting their signatures to the document. It was suggested that the resolution should contain an expression of sympathy with the

work of the Assembly and of the desire to recommend it to the serious consideration of the respective Governments. This is the resolution which was adopted. When I returned from Geneva I had occasion to explain the protocol to various public bodies. In order to understand what the Protocol is one must look at the Covenant. Before examining into the obligations that the various countries assume under the Protocol, one must look at the obligations already accepted by the countries that signed the Covenant in the Palace of Versailles on the 29th of June, 1919. This document was signed by the Right Hon. Charles J. Doherty and the Hon. Arthur L. Sifton, whose names will go down in history as representing Canada.

I can make the general statement that the underlying principles of the Protocol will be found in the Covenant. When we examine these suggested amendments we shall have to determine whether there is any increased responsibility to be assumed by Canada, and if so whether Canada should accept them. I simply desire at this moment to convey to the minds of my honourable friends the fact that the Covenant obligates the signatories to apply economic sanctions to an aggressor, to give financial contributions and military support. The Covenant furthermore declares that the Council of the Society of Nations—I am not using the exact language—will apportion among the various nations their respective shares of contributions. Under the Protocol this function of the Council of the League of Nations disappears. The Council no longer gives instructions or advice to the various countries as to what they shall contribute: it simply declares that the sanctions have become operative, and it is then for the nations themselves to come to the support of the League of Nations and to make their contributions according to their respective abilities.

Honourable gentlemen will remember that Article 10 in the Covenant declared that all the nations agreed to guarantee the integrity of each nation. An effort was made during the four first sittings of the Assembly to free Canada from that obligation, which the United States refused to accept, and in the fourth Assembly in 1923 a resolution brought in by the Canadian delegation would have been adopted but for the vote of Persia which prevented unanimity in the Assembly. That amendment was in the form of an interpretive clause, which stated that the obligations flowing from Article 10 would be limited by the geographic situation of a country, and that Parliament would be supreme in deciding the extent of the military