

of it. Both the governing body and the conference deal with questions of labour affecting Canada as well as all other countries. Now, while one may have the greatest respect for the representatives of Great Britain who attend this conference, I venture to say that neither employers nor employees of Great Britain are in a position to present the viewpoint of Canadian industry or Canadian labour, and that is of great importance, when questions come up for consideration, that the Canadian viewpoint should be presented in regard to both employers and employees.

Mr. FIELDING: With what result?

Mr. ROWELL: With the same result as would attend the representations of any other member, so far as discussion is concerned, and with the same right to vote as any other member.

Mr. FIELDING: Without power to bind the Dominion? They have merely the right to express their private opinions.

Mr. ROWELL: Not only that but they have power to take part in the proceedings.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As my hon. friend appears to be desirous that the Canadian point of view shall be presented to the Conference, I wish he would make clear to the House wherein Canada's status is changed from what it was under the old system whereby different countries sent representatives to an International Labour Conference. I remember having the privilege of representing the Government of Canada at one of the International Labour Conferences. I think that the powers given me then were quite as considerable as the powers given to any representative under the League of Nations. If there is any difference I wish my hon. friend would explain it so that the House may understand wherein Canada's status is altered one way or the other.

Mr. ROWELL: Although I will answer my hon. friend's question, I am not concerned in discussing how Canada's status is altered. What I am concerned with is to make clear Canada's status in the League of Nations and in the International Labour organization. I thought I had answered my hon. friend before by saying that the two organizations were entirely different, that one was a voluntary organization without any powers whatever except to confer and to agree if possible on certain matters submitted by their consideration. Under the labour convention the powers go beyond that. Perhaps, in view of the question

[Mr. Rowell.]

raised I had better explain what these powers are although I had not intended doing so at this time. My hon. friend will recall that under the provisions of the labour clauses of the Peace Treaty these conferences are to be held once a year and an agenda is to be prepared of the subjects which are to come up for consideration at the conference. To illustrate, I will give you some of the questions that

5 p.m. came up at the Washington Conference. The Peace Conference in Paris settled the agenda for the Washington Conference. That agenda was as follows:

1. Application of principle of the 8-hours day or of the 48-hours week.
2. Question of preventing or providing against unemployment.
3. Women's employment:
 - (a) Before and after child-birth, including the question of maternity benefit;
 - (b) During the night;
 - (c) In unhealthy processes.
4. Employment of children:
 - (a) Minimum age of employment;
 - (b) During the night;
 - (c) In unhealthy processes.
5. Extension and application of the International Conventions adopted at Berne in 1906 on the prohibition of night work for women employed in industry and the prohibition of the use of white phosphorous in the manufacture of matches.

These were the matters with which the Washington Conference had to deal.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is that agenda different in any particular from the agenda of the International Labour office? It seems to be exactly the same.

Mr. ROWELL: The International Labour office might adopt any agenda it chose.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is the agenda that the International Labour office had been adopting for years.

Mr. ROWELL: Well, they did not achieve results.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. That very matter of phosphorus, which is dealt with, was taken up at the conference held at Basle, Switzerland, and as a result of the convention arrived at a Bill was introduced into this House and passed. That was the proceeding under the old International Labour office. I would like my hon. friend to explain wherein this present body is going to act in any different way or wherein it has power to go beyond that?

Mr. ROWELL: Take the very point that my hon. friend mentions; why does it appear on this agenda?—because although