

If we examine article 16, which speaks of our obligations, it will be seen that the sanctions mentioned against an aggressor are twofold—economic and military. They read as follows:

Should any member of the League resort to war in disregard of its covenants under articles 12, 13 or 15, it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the League, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking state, and the prevention of all financial, commercial or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking state and the nationals of any other state, whether a member of the League or not.

This covers the economic sanctions.

It shall be the duty of the Council in such case to recommend to the several governments concerned what effective military, naval or air force the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the covenants of the League.

The economic sanctions would, I am quite sure, be the sole contribution that Canada would be called upon to make in the case of European war. Our country, to my mind, would not hesitate to sever all trade and financial relations with an aggressor if it were requested so to do by the Council of the League. We surely could not do less in duty to ourselves and to humanity. We would not do less under the Briand-Kellogg pact. Mr. Stimson, ex-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, intimated that the United States would be forced to apply such sanctions against a violator of the pact. It is my profound conviction that if the President and the Senate of the United States officially said as much, it would be a most potent factor for the maintenance of peace in the world.

With respect to military sanctions, our Parliament is supreme, under our interpretation of article 10. That is an opinion shared in by my honourable friend from Edmonton (Hon. Mr. Griesbach). The Council of the League must be unanimous in its decisions as to such sanctions. In a European conflagration the Council would surely not call upon the two Americas for military contribution. The United States expressed the fear that they would be called upon to intervene if they entered the League. If they did join the League there would be no conflagration in Europe. The Council contains three South-American countries which would not lightly assume military obligations in Europe. Like Canada, they would be agreeable to the imposition of economic sanctions.

Since the foundation of the League Canada has been in less danger of being drawn un-

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

wittingly into war for purely sentimental reasons, because Great Britain has accepted the obligations of the Covenant, and because we are now in a position to inform ourselves on any complication that may arise, and in due time to exert our influence towards a peaceable solution. In 1899 public opinion in England was sharply divided on the causes which led to the South African War. It is my opinion that had there then been a League of Nations, we would have been saved such a humiliating conflict.

Verily something has changed in the world. Aggressive wars will become more and more difficult because of the search light at Geneva. The fear of public opinion will curb the evildoer. We all know the efforts Germany made in 1914 to free itself from the odium of denunciation as the aggressor, and how in an attempt to save its face it manœvered in the last days of July to saddle the guilt on Russia.

Governments will henceforth have great difficulty in hiding their secret ambitions and their insincerity. A grand jury formed of fifty or more nations which all ardently want peace will not be slow to detect the false note in the special pleadings of one which has something to hide. No nation wants to appear at the bar under the slightest suspicion of evil intentions.

When the age-old policy of conquest was vetoed by Woodrow Wilson and an effort was made to provide for control over certain territories through the creation of mandates, little did the beneficiaries realize that they would be held to account by the League of Nations. Its Mandate Commission has exercised an admirable supervision. When complaints reach it, the mandataries are eager to justify themselves in open session at Geneva.

Who would hear of the complaints and grievances of minorities if there were no League of Nations? More than 25,000,000 people are under the protection of the League. Who outside of the League of Nations would have concerned themselves about hundreds of thousands of refugees? It is most interesting to watch the exertions of all the nations to show the strictest regard for moral laws and the highest ethics obtaining in a civilized world. They are all on their good behaviour in the presence of their peers. More and more the secondary and smaller nations will become conscious of their role and dare to speak their mind. There are certain questions upon which they hesitate to express themselves, fearing to displease the great powers. But that is not so with Canada. When your representative raised the question of the treatment of minorities' grievances, Mr. Motta, the then President of Switzerland, told me that no Euro-

pean nation would have dared raise such a debate, because its good faith would have been suspected and questioned.

This brings me to the rôle which Canada has played and may continue to play at Geneva. Canada is not entangled in any embarrassing situations. It has no possession nor protectorate to guard, near by nor afar, nor any ambition nor aspiration to achieve. In other words, the imperialistic microbe has not invaded our body politic. Canada has the proper perspective and a clear vision. Canadians enjoy absolute freedom and do not understand why it should be denied to other nations. They hate war and want all international differences to be solved by the peaceful means of arbitration.

All the nations which have not might to defend their just cause prefer a tribunal or an arbitral court to the battle-field. This appeared clearly in an impressive event at the Assembly of 1924. I refer to it with a double object: to show the intense feeling of all the nations gathered at Geneva in favour of peace, and to show what a factor Canada can be in furthering that cause. In September of that year the Prime Ministers of Great Britain and France, MacDonald and Herriot, agreed upon the principles of compulsory arbitration, security and disarmament. These three points formed the basis of Covenant amendments called the Protocol, which aimed at closing certain gaps in the Covenant so as to make more certain the prevention of war. That basis of understanding, towards which the Assembly had been progressing for four years, was acclaimed with enthusiasm by all the delegations.

A month later the MacDonald Government was overthrown in England, and succeeded by the Baldwin-Chamberlain Administration. That Government rejected the Protocol, as we did. But it went further and rejected as well the principle of compulsory arbitration, to the utter dismay of the Assembly, and also refused to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice. Canada's stand was different. By a dispatch of the 9th of March, 1925, the Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie King, declared this country would not adhere to the Protocol because of "the effect of the non-participation of the United States upon attempts to enforce the sanctions, in the case of a contiguous country like Canada," but that Canada would be prepared to consider acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court in justiciable disputes, and to consider methods of supplementing the provisions of the Covenant for settlement of non-justiciable disputes.

During the four years which followed, 1925 to 1929, the Assembly made yearly attempts to further the cause of compulsory arbitration, but could make no headway because of the constant obstruction by Sir Austin Chamberlain. Canada could not change its stand to suit the policy of the new government in England and the varying moods of the British electorate. On the contrary, this country more than once reaffirmed its position. In 1927 the Netherlands Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Beelaerts von Blokland, moved that the Assembly, without attempting to resurrect the Protocol, examine anew the principles underlying that instrument. Sir Austin vigorously opposed that motion because it involved compulsory arbitration. The Canadian delegate reaffirmed our position, and it was recognized on all hands that Canada was elected to the Council on account of its policy on the question of arbitration.

In June and July of that year there was a Conference on Naval Disarmament in Geneva, at which Canada was represented by Mr. Lapointe. That conference failed because the naval experts of the United States and Great Britain had disagreed. Lord Robert Cecil, who represented the British Government, was dissatisfied with the instructions he had received from London and he retired from the Government. He coined at that time this neat phrase: "The naval experts should be on tap, not on top." It was at that conference that an American delegate was accused of holding a brief for and receiving a fee from some steel or shipbuilding firm. Lord Robert Cecil informed me that Canada could give a very effective lead to the people of Great Britain if we acted upon our expressed intention of accepting the optional clause. He was most happy to learn that we were moving in that direction.

At the Imperial Conference of 1926 in London the Dominions had been led to consent not to adhere to the optional clause until they again conferred over it. This was a shrewd move of Sir Austen Chamberlain's. Sir Cecil Hurst, the then legal expert of the Foreign Office, who is now one of the judges of the International Court, expressed surprise when I informed him in the autumn of 1928 that we were about to accept the optional clause, for he thought we were bound to await another conference. I told him in a bantering tone, that he had badly drafted the 1926 resolution, and that we were conferring through the circularizing of the sister-nations, without waiting for an Imperial Conference. And in February, 1929, our Prime Minister, Mr. King, so informed the Commons. The negative atti-