

tude of the Baldwin-Chamberlain Government at Geneva was violently assailed during the June elections in Great Britain, and after its defeat Lord Robert Cecil publicly expressed gratefulness to Canada for taking the initiative and dispelling the impression that the Dominions were opposed to compulsory arbitration.

When Mr. Ramsay MacDonald announced to the Assembly of September, 1929, that Great Britain was adhering to the optional clause, the Canadian representative stated that Canada had never faltered in leading the Commonwealth towards its position. Canada announced its decision to sign the compulsory arbitration clause on the 6th of September of that year, and next day the Winnipeg Free Press, in applauding this action, stated that in 1927 Sir Austen Chamberlain had explained at Geneva his refusal to sign on the ground that such obligations could more easily be accepted by a homogeneous state than by a great community of free and equal nations. Mr. Dafoe, the writer of that article, said it was somewhat remarkable that these difficulties had so suddenly disappeared! And he added:

This attitude was rooted in a distrust of the World Court as a foreign body that might interfere with British policy and interests. It was fitting that, with the removal of the obstacles through the defeat of the Baldwin Government, Canada should be the first of the British nations to announce to the Assembly its intention of signing the optional clause. Canada had been desirous of signing the clause, since 1925, as the record shows.

When Ramsay MacDonald announced to the House of Commons his adhesion to the optional clause on compulsory arbitration, Sir Herbert Samuel, speaking for the Liberal party, commended his action in contrast with that of the preceding administration. He cited an article on this subject by Madariaga, the brilliant Spaniard who was then professor at Oxford and is now Spanish Ambassador at Paris, from which I will read a brief extract:

The period of stagnation in the League was due to England's policy of inaction. The impetus given to the League by the MacDonald Ministry accounts for the activity we are witnessing to-day.

This spectacle should make the English understand what an enormous responsibility rests upon them in international affairs. If they halt, the League of Nations halts; if they advance, the League of Nations advances.

Not only did Great Britain and Canada adhere to the principle of compulsory arbitration in justiciable matters before the Hague Tribunal, but at the Imperial Conference of 1930 they decided to sign also the multilateral

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

treaty, called the General Act, by which they agree to submit all cases of nonjusticiable nature to an arbitral tribunal. The ratification of that treaty was moved in this Chamber by my right honourable friend (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen) in 1931, and was unanimously passed.

All these forward steps leading to peace were the work of the League of Nations. Since our relations with Great Britain are so intimate, we are perforce highly interested in Great Britain's foreign policy, which directly or indirectly may seriously affect us. As we have seen, that policy has varied in the past from one government to another. And it is apt to vary likewise in the future. Canada may have some difficulty in following these variations. Its safe and only course will be to encourage the peaceable solution of all international differences, as it is solemnly bound by treaty to do.

When Mr. Kellogg asked the world to renounce war as an instrument of national policy, Canada unhesitatingly gave its signature without cavil or reservation. But Sir Austen Chamberlain made a reservation that Great Britain should have freedom of action in certain regions, comparable to the non-interference upon which the United States insist with respect to some of their interests. This surprising reservation in a document designed for the renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy was generally commented upon at Geneva, and many diplomats claimed to find therein the reason for Sir Austen's refusal to accept the principle of compulsory arbitration. And the Senate of the United States, when it ratified that treaty, declared the Monroe Doctrine was in no wise affected by it. This goes to show that it is hard for great powers to discard their instrument of domination—force—and to accept a common measure of justice, equally distributed among the mighty and the weak.

There will have to be a long process of self-denial, of resignation and of assimilation before the necessary evolution is accomplished. Canada, free and untrammelled, will more and more, and fearlessly, raise its voice to hasten this evolution. The "Reformatory School" has just been opened, yet some people want to close it because no tangible progress is apparent. They evidently do not know what spirit animates the class, and have not followed the progress which has been made. The world is so much in need of peace that pessimism offends its natural aspirations. The League of Nations exists. All our best efforts must be to guard it and to strengthen it. To abolish it would be to abandon humanity

to fatalism and despair. The existence and the history of the world are not reckoned by decades. When asked my opinion as to the future of the League, I would suggest that the answer be postponed until the League reaches two score and ten. But it may be possible to make a satisfactory reply much earlier. We need not be impatient. We are building for generations to come. I am satisfied to let them judge.

The honourable gentleman from Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McRae) would like to economize on the annual sums which we contribute to the League. Yet we spent last year less than \$300,000 in furtherance of world peace. Our yearly budget for national defence totals \$13,000,000, exclusive of any capital expenditure. What part of that sum would be needed to ensure our domestic peace? Surely less than half that amount. Of what real use can the other half be which we spend to guard against outside danger? For our protection against foreign assault I would rather rely on the co-operation of the international gathering at Geneva, at a cost to Canada of \$300,000, than upon the millions which we spend annually for the protection of our frontiers. And I humbly suggest that my honourable friend the mover of this resolution could easily find means of saving \$300,000 in the restriction of our military, naval and air force budget. I am quite willing that we should pay the premiums for two policies of insurance. Only the future can prove which will be the more effective of the two.

Hon. E. MICHENER: Honourable members, the honourable leader on the other side of the House (Hon. Mr. Dandurand), as a former President of the Assembly of the League of Nations, speaks with authority on the subject-matter of this debate. By that appointment the Assembly did honour not only to our distinguished colleague, but as well to the Dominion which he so ably represented. In my opinion he has very effectively answered the arguments advanced by my honourable friend from Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McRae), but as I occupy the office of President of the League of Nations Society of the city of Calgary, I desire to make a few supplementary observations.

My main criticism of the honourable gentleman from Vancouver is that he made an excellent speech on the wrong side of the question. Of course the League of Nations is not above criticism, but I submit at this stage of its existence any criticism should be constructive rather than destructive. He based his main argument for our withdrawal from the League on article 10 of the Covenant, which in his

view might involve Canada in war. In my opinion that contingency is very, very remote. If any member-nation or a nation outside the League should resort to war, its members are pledged to withdraw their nationals from, and to terminate all financial and commercial intercourse with, the offending country. In other words, the League members would outlaw any nation which refused to submit the dispute to the court of the League. It can hardly be conceived that any nation would place itself in that invidious position.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: What about Japan?

Hon. Mr. MICHENER: Japan is an exception, but there were—

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STANTON: Japan was not a member of the League.

Hon. Mr. MICHENER: She was at that time; she is not now. The two great powers most vitally interested in Japan's operations in China were Russia and the United States, and the fact that they were not members made it still more difficult for the League to exercise its authority.

Hon. Mr. GRIESBACH: All the great powers had signed the Kellogg pact.

Hon. Mr. MICHENER: Yes; and if those signatory powers would regard the pact as sacred, there would be no more war. But let me say this to my honourable friend from Edmonton (Hon. Mr. Griesbach). The case of Japan and China is the only one with respect to which the League failed to bring about a settlement. As I have said, there were difficulties and complications which apparently the League could not overcome, and the sanctions under article 16 were not enforced. However, because it failed in one case out of fifty, why should we decry the League or throw up our hands in despair and cease to give it our support? If upon the first reverse of the Allied cause in the Great War we had taken the same stand and had withdrawn our forces, what would the rest of the world have thought of Canada? Likewise, what would the fifty-five nations now members of the League say if Canada, upon the first failure of the League's effort at peace, should decide to withdraw her support.

I agree with my honourable friend's contention that Canada should not engage in war, especially in Europe, without first submitting the question to the electors. War is such a serious undertaking that I think the people of a democratic country should be consulted before this extreme step is taken.