

strikes to settle matters of the kind when in dispute, but to-day before such things may occur each party involved has an opportunity to appoint its own representative on a board of investigation, to meet under the presidency of a common chairman, and the opinion of the board on the facts and merits of the dispute is given to the country before any interruption of the service or disruption of industry takes place. With what result? With the result that since the Act has been in force in the great majority of cases where disputes have been investigated no strike or lockout has ever taken place. Now, that has been Canada's experience in regard to legislation which relates to industrial relations. I should think that the experience of the world in the course of time will be identical with respect to great international problems which involve questions of right or wrong between nations. I am not at all sure that it is not a fortunate thing for mankind that at the moment the world is going to have an opportunity of demonstrating what with regard to the attitude of nations the force of international public opinion may mean in a given situation with respect to any nation which may violate the provisions of great covenants such as those of the League of Nations, and the Kellogg-Briand pact. I do not wish to say anything about the merits of the dispute in the far east beyond this, that I think this country and all other countries were entitled to know the right and wrong of the situation before a shot was fired. The machinery for such a course exists and it was due to the nations of the world, whatever the differences or causes of conflict may be that these should have been made clear to some international tribunal before the peace of the world was disturbed.

May I say this, Mr. Speaker, that I believe were it not for the League of Nations being in existence, and for the fact that public opinion has developed as it has with respect to the great question of international peace, that instead of witnessing what we have witnessed in the last few weeks in the orient, isolated encounters here and there, we would to-day have been witnessing the most unparalleled butchery that mankind has ever known. If the world has been saved a tragedy of that kind, it is, I believe, because of the respect which, no matter what the provocation may be, nations now have for the good opinion of the rest of the world of which they are also a part.

With regard to disarmament, far from the present situation being a reason why nations should seek to do more in the way of arming themselves, it affords the strongest reason why

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

disarmament should be striven for more strenuously than ever. What are we witnessing? We are witnessing air forces, land forces, naval forces, all taking part in an international conflict. Assume that the relationship between Japan and China to-day was similar to the relationship between the United States and this country, does anyone believe that there would be that kind of occurrence in the orient at the present time? I venture to say that if the orient had, as we have on this continent, something in the nature of an international joint tribunal which would deal with questions of international difference, we certainly would not be witnessing to-day what we are forced to witness. We can only hope—and I am sure that every member of this parliament will share the hope—that the nations of the orient will realize that there is such a thing as a great family of nations to which they belong, and that all the other members of the family are interested in seeing that justice is done where there is a wrong, and that if given the opportunity so to do, they will find a way of justice being made to prevail, short of the kind of conflict that is taking place at the present time.

With regard to the disarmament conference, let me repeat that this parliament will strongly support those who are representing this country at the conference. I hesitate to say anything in the way of criticism of the delegation which has been appointed by the government to represent Canada at the conference; comparisons are always invidious; but I do say—and I think it is what the country feels—that having regard to the importance of that great gathering, Canada might have sent a stronger and more representative delegation. If I may be permitted to say so, hon. gentlemen opposite might have followed the example which the previous Liberal administration set with respect to representation at Geneva at some of the international gatherings held there. When in office we appointed at one time the late Sir George Foster, a great and distinguished member of the Conservative party, to be one of our representatives at Geneva; we appointed the hon. member for Southeast Grey (Miss Macphail), a member of the party that sits in the far corner, also as a representative of Canada at the League of Nations. We did that in order that all parties might be represented as one on a matter which was not a question of political difference. I submit that having regard particularly to the fact that a petition carrying hundreds of thousands of names was carried across the sea, those names including members of all political parties in Canada. The purpose in