

which all parties in this house share and one of the things for which the present war is being fought. Canada, as a middle power, must be assured that it can bring its case before the world assembly or world council. We must be assured that settlement by the greater powers will not be made arbitrarily at our expense. If the situation were otherwise we would find that the pattern which we have in mind would differ only in degree from the kind of regime which the axis have sought to impose in Europe.

Mention was made by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell) of the several functional organizations. He referred to the health organization, to the economic organization, to the international labour office—about which I will want to have something to say—and to the world court. The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr has suggested that we should not change the present set-up of the world court. The world court still continues to function even though it is not an active body at the moment. The statute is still operative; the treaties under which it came into being are still in existence. But I would point out to the hon. member that a very strong case can be made out—and I trust the Canadian government will take this view—for proceeding to establish a new court, preserving by way of continuity many of the features of the present court, but under a new statute which would incorporate the best features of the present statute and avoid its obsolete provisions. It must not be forgotten, having in mind that the fact all the countries of the world will not be at the conference in San Francisco, that we would outlaw participation in the world court by many nations if we were to proceed on the basis of the present statute. What I suggest is that a new statute should come into being, and new treaties should be executed to preserve decisions and actions already taken on the basis of the old treaties. We might link the new statute with the old statute, preserving as I say the features in the old statute which commend themselves to our judgment.

It must be remembered that the league of nations will come to an end once the treaty resulting from San Francisco is concluded. That means that judges of the present court will cease to be. It means also that when that happens there will be no financial support for the operations of the old court. Consequently, to proceed on the basis which the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr suggested, would, I think, in the light of the circumstances I have pointed out, render wholly inoperative the functioning of that court. The existing jurisdiction of the court over a large number

of treaties, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr mentioned, will cease once the league of nations as a body ceases to exist under the old treaties of peace. Consequently, if we are to have the advantages of several existing treaties, we must make sure that steps are taken to preserve their existence. That can be done only by treating the matter as though it had never arisen, creating a new body, and preserving desirable old features.

Questions will arise as to what kind of disputes are to go before the court. Are they to be merely justiciable disputes? Are they to be disputes which involve political matters as well as legal questions? It will be remembered that under the advisory opinion power of the old court it could deal not only with legal matters but in some cases with matters involving high political policy.

There is one matter which I think I am striking new ground in covering, and that is the relationship of the international labour office to the new general international organization. I am grateful to the government, grateful to my own minister in proposing to the government that I should represent this country and this government at the recent meeting of the governing body of the international labour organization in London. That was an opportunity for me and an experience for which, as I say, I am extremely grateful. The house may recall that I was a member of the government delegation at the plenary conference of the international labour organization in Philadelphia. I was honoured—if I may say so, or perhaps Canada was honoured, in my election as chairman of the continuing committee of the international labour organization to study the relationships between that body and the world security organization. I have on this account special competence in this one particular, if in no other, to say something which I know is in the minds of the workers and of the employers and of the governments of the world who were represented at the conference in London. The international labour office is in one sense a functional organization, functional in the sense that the agricultural and economic organizations are, but I think it is more than that. I believe that the international labour organization, the only organization of its kind on an international level, representing not only governments but workers and employers, should have a special place in relation to the general organization which is to be set up. The international labour organization is not spectacular; it is not one which readily wins acclaim in the headlines of the newspapers.