

six and a half million dollars a year. There is little evidence of any reduction of expenditure in keeping with the urgent need for economy throughout the nations that compose its membership. In any event, the evergrowing annual expenditure in connection with our membership in the League, aggregating now nearly \$300,000 a year, is an item which cannot be overlooked in these times of financial stringency.

There are on the pay-roll of the League 1,150 persons, in all departments. The general staff numbers about seven hundred—695, according to the 1933 report. A London dispatch refers to them as 698 who are unknown to the outer world, employed year in and year out, drawing a total salary of £534,000, of two and three-quarter million dollars. If this figure is correct, at \$5.15 to the pound it would work out roughly at \$3,900 for each member of the general staff, including office staff. This is certainly a very large average salary. I find that by pro-rating that sum over the total number of 1,150 employees, it works out at roughly \$2,400 a head, and this too, I submit, is a high average, particularly in Europe. Besides, the League is providing a pension fund for its employees. The salary list is headed by Mr. Avenol, the General Secretary, who is reported as getting an annual salary of 90,000 Swiss gold francs, with an entertaining allowance of 40,000 Swiss francs additional, a total in dollars of approximately \$26,000 a year.

Our own Canadian Advisory Officer at the League and his staff cost Canada last year the tidy sum of \$21,998.12. The figures I am quoting, many of which are taken from auditors' reports, seem to me to show that there is lacking the hand of economy with respect to the League's expenditures. It is estimated that the new Palace of the League of Nations, now under construction, will cost at least £1,500,000, or more than \$7,500,000 in our money. There is no assurance it will not cost much more. In passing, it is well to note that our expenditures on this Palace by way of dues, on the present basis of 3.58 per cent as our share, would be \$269,500, plus our share of the thirteen and one-half per cent which Japan and Germany have formally contributed, and such additional assessment as may be necessary through the failure of other members to pay their dues. Already 10,745,000 Swiss francs have been set aside for the building, of which over six million francs have been spent. Does any Canadian think that we should directly or indirectly provide \$300,000 to help erect a building in Switzerland? It is said to be questionable whether the League can afford to occupy its

Hon. Mr. McRAE.

new Palace of Nations, as the cost of heat and light alone will run into hundreds of thousands of francs. This information which I am giving to the House, I presume, accounts for Canada occasionally being referred to as "one of the small milk cows of the Geneva League."

We are a small nation of only ten million people, very far away from the European cockpit. The voice of our representatives amidst the wrangling, old-fashioned, national statesmen of Europe must sound to them like the voice of an infant, as indeed Canada is among the nations of the world. I often wonder if we are not taking ourselves entirely too seriously in this League business and spending sums of money in a way which, in street parlance, would brand us as "easy marks."

Much more could I say in connection with the financial affairs of the League, but after all, these are of secondary importance considering the object for which the League was organized. Had the objective been attained, it would have offset a thousand times and more the expenditure to date, unwarranted as some of it may be.

By busying itself with work for which it was never intended the League acknowledges its utter failure to realize its major objective, world peace. Its publications bear evidence of a desire to justify its continued existence, and include more than one hundred issues which are for sale at prices of from twenty-five cents to three guineas a copy. They would appear to be of little practical use, as many of them apparently duplicate, if they do not copy, reports issued by departments of governments already members of the League; and, in any event, being largely published in only one language, they cannot be very popular. I have before me a list of League publications, the major effort of which would appear to be an encyclopaedia on industrial hygiene that is offered in cloth cover to the public for \$20 a copy. We may take this as indicative of the work of the League. I wonder how many copies of this encyclopaedia will be purchased throughout the world. Very few indeed, I should say. It seems to me that this edition is as necessary and will serve about as useful a purpose as would a brochure on the crèche, issued by the Senate.

It has been said:

The League of Nations is purely and simply an Anglo-Saxon proposal born in chaos in Paris, laid on the doorstep in Europe by retreating Americans, to be adopted and reared under European conditions and traditions. . . . The utter divergence of opinion between the Anglo-Saxon and continental nations was soon disclosed. . . . The Versailles Treaty by its

application of the principle of self-determination passed a death sentence on a large part of Europe, including many cities, large industrial regions and huge agricultural areas. . . . dislocated transportation; resulted in the neglect of rivers that once served successfully town and country alike; meant the abandonment of great railway systems and the useless expense of constructing new railways; that it meant breaking the history and habit and brought about the abandonments of natural associations as well as lines of communication; old cities like Vienna were doomed to decay; new cities arose to fulfil their function perhaps just across the new national frontiers. . . . everywhere on the continent political frontiers have been paralleled by formidable tariff walls.

This seems to me a pretty fair statement of the facts. Anyone who studies the situation in Europe comes away with the realization of the insoluble conditions which are due in no small part to idealism, of which the Versailles Treaty is a result.

The trouble with the League is that it began at the wrong end, dealing with governments instead of educating the people. Political control shifts frequently in every country. New leaders come along, but national policies endure. The existence of politicians depends on their fulfilling the national will of their respective peoples. In the eyes of the people of any country the policies of other nations are selfish and their own the only reasonable ones. It is thus useless to give much consideration to any policy which is contrary to the will of the people.

The War did not change the peoples of the world for the better. Europe came out of the War with racial prejudices and hatreds greater than before. In fact, to-day, after fifteen years' existence of the League of Nations, conditions are worse than they have been at any other time in the last fifty years. The Versailles Treaty, by tearing up the map of Europe, breaking up nations, and creating new governments for majorities as well as minorities, greatly aggravated what was already a difficult situation. Appeals to Europe fall on deaf ears if they ask that international idealism be considered before national and racial aspirations. So far the League has not succeeded in getting a single nation to allow international peace to take precedence over national interests. Human nature remains the same.

We must take the world as we find it, not as we should like it to be. Ideals in international relations cannot take the place of certain and practical results. To-day Europe is full of racial hatreds, grievances, ambitions, suspicions and fears. Let me quote what one of our well-known British statesmen has to

say about the League in this regard. I quote Mr. Amery:

The realities of the world have not changed; they have not been changed by the Covenant of the League of Nations, and they will continue long after the Covenant has disappeared. . . . The worship of unrealities to which this country—

That is England.

—above the others, has been giving itself at Geneva since the war is not going to conduce to the peace of the world. . . . There is a good deal of conscious or unconscious hypocrisy when we talk about the League of Nations, about disarmament, and about peace.

Then, the Right Hon. Lord Dickinson in *The Contemporary Review*, London, states:

It is this that lies at the root of the trouble. The world is losing the spirit of internationalism, and, unless this can be revived, it is of little use to talk about "reforming the League." . . . Men still talk of the brotherhood of man and the federation of the world; but we are in reality farther away from that ideal than we were twenty years ago. We have assumed too rashly that when once a League of Nations was set up human nature would change of its own accord.

It is reported that even Mr. MacDonald made no secret of his aversion to the League. This it is said is borne out by his repeated and strenuous effort to revive the prewar Council of Great Powers. According to the press his recent negotiations with France may result in a treaty guaranteeing security to France.

International conferences have replaced and thereby discredited the League. With the single exception of Locarno, every international political conference is said to have ended in failure: Washington, Coolidge's conference at Genoa, the London Naval Conference and the World Conference of last year all are a record of dismal failure. In each instance the situation sought to be remedied was left worse than before the conference was held.

The prewar alliances are again the order of the day: France and her Little Entente; Italy with Austria and Hungary; Germany standing alone; Russia awaiting her opportunity; Britain not knowing which one, if any, she is going to support.

I now come to another viewpoint which is a formidable obstacle to world peace. In approaching, this side of the picture, first permit me to quote a very frank statement of a well-known British statesman. Sir Nairne Stewart Sandeman. Hansard reports him as saying:

I am frankly pro-Japanese, entirely pro-Japanese, because I believe that the Japanese will settle the question in Manchuria and