

morrow of defeat was, in posse, and still is, the strongest power on that continent. Great Britain and France clash nowhere. They have both attained and exceeded their objective, and they need nothing more. If there are two nations interested in maintaining the status quo, it is they; whereas Germany wants to recover its possessions and lost prestige. Now Germany is on its feet, defiant and threatening. Is the League of Nations at fault? It has no army to impose its will; it has but a moral force.

In the Manchurian conflict the League did not falter. It laid down the law, but the great powers alone could apply sanctions. In the face of the complex nature of the problem they did not choose to act or to impose economic sanctions. Who will sit in judgment on their abstention? I will not attempt to do so.

Some writers have suggested that for the maintenance of peace the world should be divided into three parts: the Orient, Europe and America, each having its League of Nations. The world is growing too small for all the nations not to be interdependent. A maharajah of India told me that the news from abroad and from all over India was circulating daily throughout his principality, and that by means of radio modern ideas were penetrating everywhere.

Now, as to the apparent failure of the League to bring about a reduction in armaments, let us examine the problem at hand. Article 8 contains the mandate to the League, which reads as follows:

The members of the League recognize that the maintenance of Peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety, and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.

The Council, taking account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each State, shall formulate plans for such reduction for the consideration and action of the several Governments.

It is evident that each nation, unless it is assured of security by common action, is the sole judge of its needs as regards its national safety. At the meeting of the League in September last it was quite apparent that Germany's position was untenable, because its policies were repugnant to all the nations; and when it realized that Great Britain, the United States, France and Italy were in agreement in regard to imposing control of armaments as a condition of disarmament, it hastened to withdraw. There is no need to look for any other cause.

Germany is bent upon re-arming, perhaps not primarily to wage war, but in order to

Hon. Mr. McRAE.

intimidate her neighbours and through constant pressure to obtain modification of the Versailles Treaty. No country threatens Germany. How can she pretend she is arming for defence? In Streseman's Memoirs is to be found a statement to the Crown Prince that the aim of Germany in entering the League was to obtain the Anschluss, the Corridor and Upper Silesia. Hitler's Bible, "Mein Kampf," states that there is but one obstacle to Germany's hegemony—the French army.

Hence the impasse in which the Conference found itself. Undoubtedly the situation is a perilous one. It contains a menace which cannot be warded off unless the advice of Sir Edward Grey and Woodrow Wilson is heeded and collective action accepted.

The British leaders have not lost faith. My honourable friend (Hon. Mr. McRae) has said that some seemed to express hostility towards the League. It was not apparent in the large meetings for peace held quite recently in London. The British leaders have not lost faith. They stand by the League. It is the only link between the nations which desire peace. The fate of Europe is to-day in the lap of Great Britain and the United States.

In his message of May, 1933, to the heads of the nations represented at the Disarmament Conference, Mr. Roosevelt gave a sharp warning to Germany that no re-armament would be permitted her. Mr. Politis, commenting on this event, writes in "International Conciliation" of last month:

After fourteen years of isolation, which has been at the root of the economic, monetary and political complications from which the world suffers at present, the United States have decided to resume their collaboration with the other nations and to bring their contribution to the organization of peace.

This reminds me of the indignation of Senator Borah, who was incensed at the statement of Mr. Stanley Baldwin that the root of the difficulties was the abstention of the United States. If he would simply look at the statements made all over the world he would find that Mr. Stanley Baldwin's statement has the approbation of all the thinking men of the rest of the world, and of a great number in the United States as well. Mr. Roosevelt recognizes the importance of the League of Nations and its good work in the realm of peace. It is my profound conviction that as the clouds gather over Europe and become more threatening the United States will draw all the closer to the League.

Power involves responsibility, and western civilization is a common heritage worth preserving. Great Britain and the United States

want peace. To assure it they need only dedicate their fleets to peace. The danger for peace lies with the great nations, because they have the might. The only hope of all the other nations reposes in the principles of the League of Nations, their only safeguard.

The honourable gentleman is fearful that Canada may be drawn into a European conflict. I may say that I gave my vote in favour of the Covenant and of the Treaty, because I assumed that the Allies, with the United States by their side, would assure the peace of the world. I should not have hesitated to vote against the Covenant if we had been confronted with the default of the United States. When the Treaty was before us in this Chamber I asked for an adjournment because the other countries had not yet passed judgment upon it, and I put the following question: "In what position would we be if the United States refused to join the League? Shall we alone in America undertake to mobilize our troops to join in establishing peace in Europe? If it withdraws, there can be no League of Nations as devised in Paris, and Canada would be guilty of criminal folly in joining it as a separate entity under those circumstances." Yet, incredible as it seemed at the time, honourable gentlemen, it came to pass. It is quite true that we have not the same League as devised in Paris; but, in spite of the betrayal of the legitimate ambition of mankind by the United States, my experience at the League, and a closer study of the Covenant, have radically altered my view and made me a firm supporter of the League as it is.

What are our legal obligations under the Covenant? They are to be found in articles 10 and 16. Article 10 reads as follows:

The members of the League undertake to respect and preserve, as against external aggression, the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the League. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the Council shall advise upon the means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

The withdrawal of the United States left Canada uncovered, and our governments—and I use the plural—looking at the stringent terms of this obligation, moved for an interpretation by the Assembly, which would take due account of the geographical situation and the special conditions of each state. This interpretative resolution reads as follows:

The Assembly, desirous of defining the scope of the obligations contained in article 10 of the Covenant so far as regards the points raised by the Canadian delegation, adopts the following resolution:

It is in conformity with the spirit of article 10 that, in the event of the Council considering

it to be its duty to recommend the application of military measures in consequence of an aggression or danger or threat of aggression, the Council shall be bound to take account more particularly of the geographical situation and of the special conditions of each state.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: And that, as far as Canada is concerned, was interpreted as the destruction of article 10. It was supposed to have wiped out the application of article 10 to Canada. That was the construction put upon it in the other House at the time.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: But the resolution was a general one. It was moved by Canada.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: So far as our obligations are concerned, we have repudiated article 10. We are not bound by it. Is not that the fact?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I have not finished reading the resolution. That resolution had the unanimous consent of the Assembly with the exception of one vote; so the President said that the resolution, although not adopted, would be transferred to the Council of the League, which might take due notice of it. The resolution continues:

It is for the constitutional authorities of each member to decide, in reference to the obligation of preserving the independence and the integrity of the territory of members, in what degree the member is bound to assure the execution of this obligation by employment of its military forces.

The recommendation made by the Council shall be regarded as being of the highest importance and shall be taken into consideration by all the members of the League with the desire to execute their engagements in good faith.

This resolution, as I have just stated, did not meet with unanimous endorsement, because of the dissidence of one member—Persia.

The Assembly has more than once recognized that the geographical position of a country had to be taken into consideration. The Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance of 1923 left each continent to defend itself against an aggressor from within, and article 11 of the Protocol of 1924 stated that when sanctions were called for, each of the signatory states would co-operate loyally in support of the Covenant and in resistance of any act of aggression to the degree which its geographical position and its particular situation as regards armaments allowed. Likewise, article 8 states that the Council, taking account of the geographical situation and the circumstances of each state, shall formulate plans for the reduction of armaments.