

The honourable gentleman from Vancouver criticizes the League on economic grounds—on the cost of its operations. These cannot be estimated in dollars and cents. The League is the only effective organization today to promote the settlement of international disputes by peaceful methods. If it has laid the foundation for ultimate success—and I submit it has—then it has accomplished something which humanity has hoped and longed for through the centuries.

Let us, however, look at the question from the monetary standpoint. The honourable member says that the annual cost of our membership in the League is \$278,000.18, which, after all, is only a small fraction of our interest payments on indebtedness incurred through the last war. The Finance Department charges to war and demobilization \$1,695,912,860, and war pensions to date aggregate \$592,619,334—a total of \$2,288,532,194. The interest on this huge sum is over \$100,000,000. The annual burden may become very much heavier if the League of Nations is not successful in preventing another war. This heavy interest payment is 400 times more than our yearly contribution towards the League's efforts to promote peace in the world. The man who pays \$1,000 income tax pays just one-tenth of a cent as his contribution to the League of Nations. So, after all, in relation to the cost of war the cost of organization for peace is infinitesimal.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: Does the honourable gentleman mean to say that if our total annual contribution to the League were assessed against the income taxpayers of Canada, they would each have to pay one-tenth of one per cent?

Hon. Mr. MICHENER: No. I say if a man pays \$1,000 income tax he pays only one-tenth of a cent as his contribution to the League.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: That is to say, if they were the only taxpayers?

Hon. Mr. MICHENER: Of course it amounts to a little more per capita. The cost is infinitesimal as compared with the interest on our expenditures in respect to the late war.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: I agree with that.

Hon. Mr. MICHENER: The total yearly budget of the League of Nations is £1,233,112. This, divided among fifty-seven nations, is only about one-half the cost of one battleship. The late Field-Marshal Sir Douglas Haig,
Hon. Mr. MICHENER.

shortly before his death, stated: "We have one more victory to win—the victory of peace." The "victory of peace" cannot be won for the world by criticism, indifference or inactivity. It must be fought for, struggled for. The length of time within which the victory can be accomplished will depend upon the efforts put forth by the various nations of the world through the League or some other effective agency.

To-day the only organization through which the different nations can co-operate is the League of Nations. Until a more effective organization can be created, it is the one hope of the world for a better understanding among nations, so that international disputes may be settled by Courts of International Justice instead of by brute force. We must have either international law, justice, and government as initiated by the League, or international chaos, race of armaments, and Armageddon.

I repeat, the critics of the League cannot justify their opposition on financial grounds, as the yearly cost of its peace efforts are only a small percentage of the yearly cost of preparation for war.

Let me review briefly what the League of Nations has accomplished in the fourteen years of its existence. We must bear in mind that for centuries the world had decided its international disputes by force. Therefore, if in the few short years of the League's existence it has been able to effect even a partial settlement of international disputes, I submit it has justified its incorporation and its efforts.

Since the League was organized fifty international disputes have been submitted to it, all of which but one, have been settled satisfactorily to both parties. In five cases at least war had already begun, but it was stopped by the League and a settlement effected.

One of the examples of settlement is found in the Anglo-Persian Oil dispute. On November 27, 1932, the Persian Government cancelled the concession of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, in which the British Government was a large shareholder. Britain appealed to the League under article 15. The parties agreed to suspend further action pending negotiation, and a new and satisfactory contract was arranged.

The principal criticism of the League, in my opinion, comes from armament manufacturers.

There are those, on the one hand, who think that the League devotes too much time to secondary affairs rather than to the direct promotion of international peace. The League, after the War, did a great and

effective work in the reconstruction of Europe. It looked after the repatriation of war prisoners, as well as refugees from different European countries. It also helped the financial reconstruction. It loaned, upon international guarantee, \$27,000,000 to Austria, to re-establish her finances.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Was the loan not made on the guarantee of Great Britain as a matter of fact?

Hon. Mr. MICHENER: All the members of the League joined in the guarantee. Great Britain received repayment of a debt of £2,500,000, which probably Austria would not have been able to meet but for the international guarantee of the \$27,000,000 loan. The League also made a loan to Hungary, and provided financial assistance for other international purposes.

The League organized a Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague. This to my mind is one of the most important movements in the history of the world. The court is composed of fifteen judges of the highest international repute. The first meeting was in 1922, and by December, 1933, the court handed down twenty-one judgments, twenty-five advisory opinions and nineteen orders, which form a new body of international case law.

The League also organized the International Labour Bureau, taking the view that peace could not be attained without social justice. It coordinated labour conditions in different countries and secured the adoption of labour standards to guard against abuses in international competition. This in itself is a very important work on the part of the League. During these fourteen years, by bringing about improved social conditions, it has done a great deal of humanitarian work among the nations of the world.

Now let me refer to the effectiveness of the League. In order to enforce its mandates one school of thought believes that an international police force should be set up. This would appear to be the logical means of enforcement. On the other hand, there are those who believe that only moral and educational suasion should be used. To establish an international force to back up the decisions of the League involves the question of national sovereignty. Many nations hesitate to face this issue. However, as a result of rapid transportation and improved communication, the world has in some respects virtually become one family or nation. There-

25—1934—2

fore, international law and regulation must be established among the nations to govern their actions one with another. This the League is accomplishing by its Court of International Justice and its interchange of discussion among the different member-nations of the League. Someone has said, "As nations we must now all hang together or hang separately." To "hang separately" is another term for committing national suicide. If each member-nation were to withdraw from the League, as my honourable friend recommends Canada should, then surely there would be chaos and we should be far more likely to have to defend our country from attack than if we hang together as members of the League.

No nation liveth unto itself any more than any person liveth unto himself. We must be controlled by established laws, as well internationally as nationally, if we are to have order and peace throughout the world. There is no doubt in my opinion that the League is the inspired effort and organization of the best thought throughout the world. Doubtless there will be reaction against progress towards world-government. But as nations we must be prepared to give up our sovereignty for the greater freedom and peace of the world.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: Is my honourable friend advocating a super-state?

Hon. Mr. MICHENER: I submit that if we agree to give military power to the League of Nations, we must to that extent surrender our national sovereignty in order to ensure world peace. I have not the slightest doubt that we must be willing to be governed by the majority opinion of the nations as expressed through the League. The League is only in its infancy. For centuries there was no international law or justice, and war had been the arbiter of disputes among nations. In the light of its great achievements in these few short years of human history, doubtless the historian of the future will regard the establishment of the League as the most important step towards human betterment and goodwill among nations.

I am confident there will be progressive efficiency in the development of the League as we realize its weaknesses. We must at all hazards go forward, for—

Thro' the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men age widened with
the process of the suns.