

as that of any or every other member of the League?

Mr. ROWELL: No, I do not think that is the meaning at all. It simply means that Canada and the other dominions bear such a relation to Great Britain and to each other as nations of equal status in the British Empire under a common Sovereign, that a dispute likely to lead to a rupture which may result in war, is a matter in which all are interested. Therefore, by reason of being interested, they are not entitled to vote.

Mr. BURNHAM: Do I understand that that is not a matter of right, but a matter of good taste?

Mr. ROWELL: No, it is a matter of right, because, according to the Treaty, parties interested are not entitled to vote.

Mr. FIELDING: Canada being in the Assembly as a nation, independent of and separate from Great Britain, is not Canada an independent party?

Mr. ROWELL: Canada's position is as independent as Great Britain's but she is not independent of the British Empire, she is a part of the British Empire.

Mr. BELAND: In a case where Canada would be immediately interested, as, for instance, in the Alaskan boundary question, would Canada then be precluded from registering a vote through her representative in the Assembly of the League?

Mr. ROWELL: If a dispute of that particular character arose, and it were dealt with in that way, yes. The provisions of the treaty provide for arbitration, judicial determination and conciliation. If a matter is referred to arbitration, this provision does not apply at all, and all nations agree that matters suitable for arbitration must be referred to arbitration, and all agree to accept the award of the arbitrators. Therefore, if it be a proper subject for arbitration, this provision does not apply. It may be a matter for judicial determination when the International Court of Justice is established. If it be a matter for judicial determination, then this question does not arise. It arises only in the case of a question not suitable for either arbitration or judicial determination, where it is a question for conciliation which has been referred by the council to the Assembly for report.

Mr. CANNON: Do I understand the minister aright when I interpret his opinion as having the following effect, that Canada will have a vote or have something to say

[Mr. Burnham.]

on all questions in which she is not directly interested as Canada nor a part of the British Empire, but that otherwise she will have nothing to say?

Mr. ROWELL: That is not the understanding.

Mr. BELAND: That is what it is.

Mr. ROWELL: Let us take one step at a time. If the matter be one for arbitration, then if Canada be concerned, she has full say in reference to the submission, the same as any other member. If the matter be one for judicial determination, she has exactly the same right of reference as any other country. If the matter be one for conciliation and if it be referred to the Assembly in the way I have mentioned, a report made by the Assembly with the majority I have indicated will have the same force and effect as a decision by the council concurred in by all the members except the parties to the dispute. What is the effect of a report of the Assembly under those conditions? Simply this, the report is published to the world, and the other nations bind themselves not to go to war with any nation which carries out the recommendations contained in that report. Dealing first with the Council. The dispute is investigated. If all parties, other than parties interested, reach a unanimous conclusion; they make a report and recommendation. All the nations bind themselves not to go to war with the nation that lives up to that report. That is the whole obligation. If that report is referred to the Assembly and the decision is concurred in by the members of the Assembly, who are members of the Council, and by a majority of the other members of the Assembly, then the report has the same effect and no more. In the great majority of cases, as I intimated in opening, the decision of both the Council and the Assembly must be unanimous; and Canada, as a member, if she dissents from the conclusion, by forcing her dissent, prevents the unanimity necessary to the Assembly reaching a decision on the point. In the same way in the Council, dissent by any one of the members prevents the unanimity necessary to the decision. Let me take a case which was raised last session as an illustration. If a dispute should arise and war should break out, and the Council, under the terms of the Covenant, meets to recommend what military forces should be used with a view to putting an end to that war and bringing about peace, the Council cannot make any recommendation except a unanimous one,