

have been able to peruse it is that "a party to the dispute" means that the nation itself must be involved. Let me illustrate it in another way. My hon. friend will recall that there is a proposed treaty between Great Britain, France and the United States for the defence of France against an aggressive attack by Germany. There are treaties between the United States and a number of Central and South American States. If a treaty between two nations such as those I have referred to is held to disqualify the parties to the treaty from any participation, it would greatly limit the number of those who could vote.

Mr. FIELDING: It would depend upon the nature of the treaty.

Mr. ROWELL: Quite so. One would be very foolish to express a dogmatic opinion offhand as to what the situation would be under any particular clause of the treaty. All that one can say is that all nations would be treated alike in that respect.

May I refer for a few minutes to the International Labour Organization, because what I have to say with respect to voting rights and status will apply to both organizations. The organization provided under the Treaty is (1) an International Labour Conference, (2) the Governing Body, and (3) the International Labour Office.

All the members of the League, by virtue of that membership, are members of the international labour organization. Each member is entitled to representation at the International Labour Conference by two Government delegates, and by one delegate representing the employers of the country, and one representing the employees. In this case the voting differs from the voting in the Assembly of the League. In voting in the Assembly there is only one vote per member. In the International Labour Conference all the delegates from each nation are entitled to vote. They may vote together or against each other, just as they see fit. At the International Labour Conference at Washington it was a very frequent occurrence for delegates representing the same nation to vote against each other. Particularly was that the case as between the employers' delegate and the workers' delegate on a number of questions that came up.

The question of representation in the governing body came up for consideration at the Peace Conference, and there was a direct conflict of opinion as to what should be done. In the original clause relating to

[Mr. Rowell.]

the composition of the governing body, a provision was inserted that no high contracting party together with its self-governing dominions should be entitled to more than one representative on the governing body. If that clause had remained in the Treaty it would have cut down the rights of Canada and the other self-governing dominions as full members of the organization. It would have denied them eligibility to election to the governing body, which other members of the League enjoy. That governing body was composed of twelve representatives of governments, six representatives of employers and six of employees. Eight of the government representatives were to be named by the eight nations of chief industrial importance throughout the world. The other four were to be elected by the other members of the International Labour Conference, at the meeting of that conference. As Great Britain is undoubtedly one of the eight nations of chief industrial importance, she was bound to have a representative on the governing body; and if no nation, plus its self-governing dominions, could have more than one representative on the governing body, it meant that the representative of the Empire must always be a representative of Great Britain. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and his colleagues took the ground that that restrictive clause should be eliminated from the covenant because it did impair the position and status of Canada and the other Dominions, and the Prime Ministers of the other Dominions shared this view. The result was that that clause was eliminated, only, however, after the greatest pressure on the part of the representatives of Canada and the other Dominions; and the treaty as finally submitted to Germany and accepted and signed by her, contained no such provision. Canada's eligibility for election to the governing body of the International Labour Organization therefore stands in exactly the same position as her eligibility for election to the Council of the League. It is not my intention this afternoon to refer to the proceedings of the International Labour Conference at Washington, because another opportunity will arise when these matters can be more properly discussed. But I would point out, in regard to the question of status, that at the International Labour Conference at Washington, when the four other nations were selected—that is to say, the four which should be entitled to name the four additional members, Canada was chosen one of the four. Spain had been in the original