

Then there are other departments of the government which in a primary and immediate way have to do with the development of peace. I am still trying to point out to my hon. friend that I am entirely sympathetic with the object she has in view, that I even sympathize with her view that there should be a department of the government to devote attention to these matters, but I contend that one department of the government specially given over to the promotion of peace and international goodwill cannot compare with the broader conception, which is to my mind the essential one, namely that all departments of the government should keep that great objective very much in view.

Miss MACPHAIL: If that is a better way of bringing about permanent peace, if what is everybody's business is the business that is best done, which is not a fact, the logical thing to do would be to disband the Department of National Defence and let all the other departments work together in the interest of national defence.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my hon. friend has not distinguished sufficiently between all the activities of the nation. The nation is a many-sided concern, and the departments of government simply correspond to the various needs of the nation. The Department of National Defence specializes more particularly, especially in these days, in those activities which have to do with the defence on the mechanical side, if you will. The other departments have to do in a constructive way with the promotion of the larger objectives of international understanding in connection with their particular work. I was going to refer especially to two or three of the departments. The Department of Justice, for instance, has to do with the promotion of peace and international understanding. It is a department which lays emphasis on the appeal to reason rather than the appeal to force, and that, after all, is fundamental in matters which have to do with the promotion of peace and good will. The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and Health is a department which has to do with the promotion of peace. My hon. friend shakes her head. She will I think agree with me that, in connection with the League of Nations, one of the main objectives is to obtain as far as possible international co-operation on matters of health, and in so doing to promote an international understanding which is conducive to bringing together those elements in the different countries which are aiming at the great objective of maintaining the law of peace, work and health among the nations of the world.

But let me mention another department—the Department of Labour. I submit that that department is essentially interested in promoting peace and international goodwill. I was much impressed by what my hon. friend said this afternoon with respect to the educational aspect of her resolution. She stressed, I think rightly and very eloquently and forcibly, the importance of the right idea being spread abroad. She made mention, very much to the point of the change that in some particulars had come over some of the history as it is taught in the schools.

She made particular reference to the Rush-Bagot Treaty and what it signified. I agree entirely with her that education along the right lines is all-important and very necessary, and it is in this connection that I wish to speak particularly of the work of the Department of Labour.

The one great objective that I believe my hon. friend, in common with others who are seeking an international understanding, wishes to attain is the settlement of international differences by conciliation, by arbitration and by investigation rather than by force. Now, what is the fundamental idea in the legislation which this parliament has enacted and which the Department of Labour seeks to carry out with respect to industrial disputes? The fundamental idea underlying that legislation is that the resort to the strike or the lock-out, which is a form of coercion, is not as effective and is not as much to the interest of the parties immediately concerned or of society as a whole as is the method of conciliation, of arbitration and investigation. As my hon. friend knows, having regard to the total numbers of our population, the record of Canada in the matter of industrial peace is higher than that of any other country in the world.

Mr. HEAPS: If the Prime Minister will permit me, will he agree to that very form of arbitration in regard to international disputes?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am coming to that; my hon. friend is running ahead of me a little. I am trying to point out that the Department of Labour has inculcated in the minds of our people the wisdom of using the method of conciliation, arbitration and investigation, as contrasted with the method of coercion, as the most effective means of bringing about justice in industrial disputes. That is in large part the work of the Department of Labour, and that work has influenced not only the people of this country but the peoples of many countries with respect to matters with which their lives are intimately associated.

Now, may I answer my hon. friend? If the method of industrial conciliation, arbitration and investigation has proved a better method to bring about industrial peace than the method of coercion—the principles being identical, the reasons being the same in all particulars—I say that this same method applied to international relations ought to succeed infinitely better than the method of force and coercion. The fact that in Canada we have demonstrated so effectively the importance of industrial conciliation, arbitration and investigation in bringing about and maintaining industrial peace and industrial justice, gives a reason why, as a country, we should seek to do exactly what my hon. friend said in the course of her remarks we should do namely, lead the other nations forward in the same path. For my part, and speaking as a member of the government, I wish to say in regard to international questions that Canada stands, and has stood, for the promotion of conciliation and arbitration as a means of settling international differences. I hope I have made clear to my hon. friend in my reference to the

D 14217

W. L. Mackenzie King Papers

Speeches-1922 - 1932

PUBLIC ARCHIVES
ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES
CANADA