

that the decision to have a personal representative of this government and country at Washington, with a personal representative of the United States in Ottawa, has gone a long way towards furthering international good will between the two countries. In being about to take a similar step with regard to one of the countries of Europe and another country in the orient, we are but proceeding in an identical direction. We are endeavouring by personal contact to make more intelligible to the citizens of other countries on other continents the point of view of the Dominion of Canada respecting matters of concern to ourselves and to them. In this particular, I submit, the government is furthering the main objective of the resolution now under consideration.

I might go further. I might point to another instance—indeed, it was mentioned by my hon. friend this afternoon—in which this Dominion, in conjunction with the neighbouring republic, has set an example of the means by which peace and international understanding can best be promoted. We have between Canada and the United States an International Joint Commission to which, over a period of twenty years or more, have been referred as many questions any one of which was liable to create discord between the two countries. If we omit the first two questions which were referred to that commission and on which there was not a unanimous finding, it may be said, I think truly, that on every question referred for its consideration—and these questions have all presented considerable difficulties—there has been a unanimous agreement on the part of the commissioners, an agreement which has served to prevent anything in the nature of friction developing between this portion of the British Empire and the United States. The work of the International Joint Commission represents, on the part of this continent, a contribution to the civilization of the world of greater significance than the peoples of the world have yet begun to imagine. We, on this continent, have shown conclusively that the processes of investigation, of conciliation and of arbitration can be effective not only as a means of promoting peace, but also as a means of curtailing materially the expenses incidental to any preparation for possible war.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Does the Prime Minister really think that the commission would have been as effective if there had been forts along the border or warships on the lakes?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am inclined to think that what has made the whole organization effective is the fundamental idea underlying it, just as is the case with respect to the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act. There remains, through strikes and lockouts, in industrial disputes the possible use of force and coercion but the superiority of the principle of conciliation and investigation has clearly demonstrated itself. As a saying of Cicero has it: Oh, great is the power of truth which of itself so easily defends itself. I believe it is the recognition of this principle which has led to the success of the International Joint Commission: the process of investigation has been instrumental in bringing to light the essential facts and information in every case, and the justice of every finding has thereby demonstrated itself.

A great deal more should be made of the work of the International Joint Commission. As the hon. member for Southeast Grey observed this afternoon, greater note should be taken of the significance of the Rush-Bagot agreement. I agree entirely that the men who were wise enough to limit armaments on the great lakes and to prevent competitive arming on the part of this country and the United States have saved this continent vast sums of money and possibly obviated a war as a consequence of such competition. I believe that as time goes on, as the example of this continent becomes better known in other parts of the world, forts will be dismantled elsewhere and their places taken by tribunals of arbitration such as we have found so effective here.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The Prime Minister realizes, of course, that in our case it was not a matter of dismantling forts and abandoning ships. In order to be perfectly fair, should he not take that fact into account? My question if I may repeat it, was this: Would these two countries have been so successful in arbitration if we had had armaments to fall back upon in the event of arbitration failing?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not wish to evade the question, the importance of which I fully realize. But it is an extremely difficult question to answer. As to what might have occurred had armaments been maintained, no one can say. What I said a moment ago was that, had there been international competition on this continent in arms and armaments, we might have had a war. On the other hand, I am not prepared to say that notwithstanding the armaments, if the idea of international arbitration had presented itself, its superiority to armaments as a means of settling international difficulties would not

W. L. Mackenzie King Papers

Speeches-1922 - 1932

PUBLIC ARCHIVES  
ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES  
CANADA