

would gradually give way to that neighbourly confidence and friendship which the world so sadly needs to-day.

I have read the piffle about nickel being essential to the manufacture of war equipment. There are substitutes for nickel, and in any event there are dozens of other metals equally indispensable to armament manufacturers. Why pick out the one metal whose production Canada controls? After all, nickel is entering more and more into the manufacture of domestic articles, a fact which should be very gratifying to Canadians.

Why not recognize and deal with the real trouble? If the nations believe in peace, let them outlaw the armament racketeers as they suppress other enemies of society. There are not many armament manufacturers in the world to be put out of business. The sincerity of the national profession for peace depend on this being done. Without such action we may as well sit down and accept the world's return to the pre-war policy of coalitions, which may maintain peace for a while, but in the end, as has always been the case, will bring about war.

Last month as I stood in my room and watched the veterans, in Ottawa for their annual convention, marching up to lay a wreath at the foot of the Peace Tower, I was struck by the prematurely aged appearance of the men who, less than a generation ago, were the equal of the best soldiers in the War. This was the result of war service.

So often we hear expressions of disappointment that to-day there are not more men qualified for public service in Canada. I would remind honourable members that 500,000 of the pick of our young manhood of less than twenty years ago went overseas. These were about all our physically fit young men of that generation. Many did not come back. Others were wounded and incapacitated, and virtually every ex-service man, owing to long absence from home and to life in the trenches, returned minus those years of experience in private life which educate and develop men along the lines that lead to successful, peaceful vocations. That is why to-day Canada seems so short of men between the ages of 35 and 55 years. It is one of the great immeasurable national losses due to war which are seldom, if ever, referred to.

As I thought of the urgent need of assistance for so many of those veterans of the last war, I wondered what was to become of the living victims of the next war. There is no language that can describe the horrors of war. The few real battles I saw in the last

Hon. Mr. McRAE.

war left me always with the same impression—that the world had gone mad. No words can describe a modern battle. That is perhaps why it is so seldom discussed. It is agreed that the next war will be infinitely more horrible. I am appalled at the very thought of it. Call me an international pacifist if you will, for I would have Canadian boys fight no more in foreign wars.

Hon. RAOUL DANDURAND: Honourable senators, the honourable gentleman (Hon. Mr. McRae) has given us his reasons in support of his motion.

It is quite apparent that he supported the theory of the basic principle of the League, but he has lost faith in its application. Let us withdraw from it, he concludes, and let us resolve to disinterest ourselves in the fate of Europe, so as not to be drawn into the vortex of the next conflict.

I readily admit that the League has not yet reached its objective, but I refuse to accept the conclusions of my honourable friend.

What was the object the creators of the League had in view? What was the origin of the League? It is generally affirmed and believed that President Woodrow Wilson brought the idea to Europe. In reality the suggestion came from Sir Edward Grey. We all know the persistent and heroic efforts of the Secretary for Foreign Affairs to prevent the calamity which befell the world in August, 1914, and how he failed, through the duplicity of the Wilhelmstrasse.

In the "Intimate papers of Colonel House," in his correspondence with Sir Edward Grey, I find a letter of the 26th of August, 1915, in which Sir Edward suggests that future generations should be protected against such a catastrophe. That letter is followed by an exchange of cablegrams between Sir Edward Grey and Colonel House, and by a letter from Colonel House to President Woodrow Wilson. I have taken from them the following extracts:

London, August 26, 1915.

Dear Colonel House:

... If the end of this war is arrived at through mediation, I believe it must be through that of the United States. All our efforts are of course concentrated on saving ourselves and our Allies by securing victory in the war. But it is in my mind continually that the awful sufferings of this war will, to a great extent, have been in vain unless at the end of it nations are set and determined together that future generations shall not fall into such a catastrophe again.

And though a great number of people in the United States and everywhere may be indifferent, absorbed in things of the moment

and in material interests, you have a great body of reflecting public opinion so disposed that it can give a great impulse and guidance to this idea. Therefore I look forward to the help of your country under the guidance of the President and impelled by this section of public opinion in those larger conditions of peace, which, looking to the future, interest neutrals as much as belligerents. . . .

Yours sincerely,

E. Grey.

New York, October 17, 1915.

Dear Sir Edward:

... It has occurred to me that the time may soon come when this Government should intervene between the belligerents and demand that peace parleys begin upon the broad basis of the elimination of militarism and navalism. . . .

Sincerely yours,

E. M. House.

On November 9, in a cable to the Colonel, Sir Edward Grey asked whether that proposal was to be taken in conjunction with his proposal for a League of Nations after the war, as made in his letter of September 22. To this Colonel House, with Wilson's approval, answered in the affirmative.

Then Colonel House wrote, in part, to the President:

New York, November 10, 1915.

Dear Governor:

... It seems to me that we must throw the influence of this nation in behalf of a plan by which international obligations must be kept, and in behalf of some plan by which the peace of the world may be maintained. We should do this not only for the sake of civilization, but for our own welfare—for who may say when we may be involved in such a holocaust as is now devastating Europe?

This is the part I think you are destined to play in this world tragedy, and it is the noblest part that has ever come to a son of man. This country will follow you along such a path, no matter what the cost may be.

Your affectionate,

E. M. House.

Truly Mr. Woodrow Wilson made himself the champion of the idea, and when he declared war upon Germany he declared that the United States was waging war to abolish war. All who lived through that period remember that the creation of the League of Nations for the maintenance of peace was universally acclaimed. It was the fruition of the first attempt in history at universal collective action towards peace.

"But," says the skeptic, "the ideal is unattainable. The proof lies in the failure to maintain peace in Asia and to bring about a reduction of armaments." It is indeed surprising to see the rapid discouragement of people when confronted with so formidable a problem. It is not to be expected that the habits of the world can be changed in a day.

I absolutely refuse to write the word "failure" because of difficulties and reverses encountered. Could it not as well be said that Christ's message, "Peace on earth to men of good will," had failed? Christianity has added one more form of conflict among men, unknown in pagan times—religious wars. After two thousand years nearly half the world has not yet heard His message. Yet, who would abolish Christianity?

Humanity progresses slowly, imperceptibly, from generation to generation. The League of Nations is still in the experimental and formative stage, and my experience leads me to say that it is full of promise. In their short lives men are kept at school from ten to fifteen years. Governments and nations as well must go to school, to a reformatory where traditions will be transformed, and instincts and passions curbed. The process may be slow indeed, but the world is growing smaller, and more and more it will hear and heed the voice of Geneva. All the peoples of the world want peace. Through the League of Nations they will more easily find the evil-minded.

The League aimed at universality, but was handicapped at the outset by the unpardonable egotism of the United States and the lack of co-operation of the great powers. Under the disinterested guidance of the United States that co-operation would have been assured. What was the problem? It was the execution of the Versailles treaty, the most momentous document of our age. It changed the face of Europe. Was it meant seriously, or was it simply a stop-gap agreement or a truce? Whose duty was it to see to its application if it was not that of the Allies who signed it? Germany was defeated and disarmed. What was the danger to guard against? Evidently it was Germany's re-armament. It could only be restrained by the collective will of the Allies.

Count Apponyi, the great Hungarian orator and pre-war pacifist, said more than once in my presence, in 1900 and later, that every war in the world's history was but one bloody chapter which called fatally for another. Who but Germany can long to write the next bloody chapter?

The Allies had won the war. Their elementary duty was to win peace. They could do it only by co-operation. The representatives of the United States went back home, and Lloyd George, who unfortunately was at the helm in Great Britain, decided to revert to the traditional policy of England and oppose the strongest power in Europe. We had the mistaken notion that France was the dominating power, but Germany on the