

tailed she is surrounded by countries with powerful armies, and she knows that the reduction in armaments must be a slow process. Of course, it would be rapid if the United States were to join the League or to add sanctions to the Paris Pact. Representatives of the American Government are present at Geneva and will be able to realize the situation for themselves.

Many suggestions have been made with a view to giving security to the countries that are contiguous to Germany. There was the protocol of 1924, with its principle of all for one and one for all, which was not accepted by the nations at large. In September Paul Boncour, a brilliant French orator who represented his country for some years at the League of Nations, suggested that members of the League should put a proportion of their armed forces at the disposal of the League Council, in order that wars of aggression might be averted. Last week a proposal along the same lines, for the formation of an international police, was made on behalf of France. But such a thing, I believe, is difficult of accomplishment. If honourable members will allow me to give the result of my cogitations I have a suggestion which could be more easily carried out, because the principle underlying it is already contained in the Treaty of Versailles. I will read articles 42, 43 and 213 of the treaty.

42. Germany is forbidden to maintain or construct any fortifications either on the left bank of the Rhine or on the right bank to the west of a line drawn 50 kilometres to the east of the Rhine.

43. In the area defined above the maintenance and the assembly of armed forces, either permanently or temporarily, and military manoeuvres of any kind, as well as the upkeep of all permanent works for mobilization, are in the same way forbidden.

213. So long as the present treaty remains in force Germany undertakes to give every facility for any investigation which the Council of the League of Nations, acting if need be by a majority vote, may consider necessary.

At the request of France it was agreed that 50 kilometres to the east of the Rhine should be demilitarized, yet France is not satisfied and is somewhat fearful because it does not know what is going on beyond that area. If all the nations of Europe are acting in good faith, why should not the Council of the League be given the power to inspect and control not only 50 kilometres of German territory, but the territory of every country on that continent? And, indeed, why should not that principle be extended to the whole world? If the countries have nothing to hide, why should they not open their frontiers to such an inspection? At the present time that

power of inspection operates only against German sovereignty, but if all the nations agreed to a general inspection they would be on an equal footing. If the principle of control by the League Council were accepted loyally and generally, a commission of experts chosen from neighbouring countries could constantly watch over activities in all lines in Germany.

To show what this would mean, let me illustrate. Suppose 50 inspectors from France, Belgium, Poland and Czecho-Slovakia were sent into Germany and an equal number of German inspectors were sent into those countries. It seems to me that under the regular system of surveillance and control which would result, Europeans could at last sleep on both ears, as we say in French, confident that no conspiracy would develop overnight. In my view such a system should be extended to all countries, whether members or non-members of the League, including the United States and Russia. Is something of the kind not imperative, in any event? If the countries now represented at the Conference agree to make a certain reduction in armaments, what guarantee have they of one another's good faith? Does not an engagement to reduce armaments imply a certain control on the part of the League of Nations? If the general control, such as I suggest, were put into effect, a 25 per cent reduction in armaments could perhaps be made and a term of five years fixed for a test of the result. Under such a plan, no nation could be victorious or vanquished in war.

It seems to me that at a time like this, when the peoples of every country are confronted with difficult problems and are wondering what will happen to the world if there is not a gradual reduction in armaments, everyone who has given some thought to the matter should express his views in his own country. Perhaps some suggestions made in that way may reach as far as Geneva.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: Honourable senators, when I entered this Chamber to-night I did not expect to address this honourable body, because according to the advices which I received—and a stranger or a novice must, as you know, depend much on advices—I felt that the honourable gentleman opposite, but not opposed (Hon. Mr. Dandurand), would probably move the adjournment of the debate, to which I would agree, and that if he did not do so I should be expected to make that motion. But after listening to my honourable friend the conviction has been driven home upon my mind that it would be rather inappropriate, if not