

Mr. LEMIEUX. As that affects the railways, we will let that stand.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Are the other clauses that concern railway men also to stand?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Anything in the Bill affecting the railway men stands until I have received a reply from the representative of the railway brotherhoods, Mr. Harvey Hall.

Mr. BARR. Does the minister contemplate leaving out the railway men altogether?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am expecting an answer in a day or two from Mr. Harvey Hall, before going on with these clauses.

Mr. BARR. Then it depends on Mr. Hall.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not exactly; but as he represents a number of brotherhoods, I thought it would be only right to hear their views before putting this legislation through.

On section 38—View by direction of board—Power to interrogate. Examination of factories, &c. Inspection of work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is taken from the New Zealand, New South Wales and West Australia labour legislation.

Mr. CONMEE. This seems a very useful section, but I think that it could be amended to advantage. Under the section as it is, no inspection of the works and premises, &c., can take place until the board shall have determined that there is danger that a strike or lock-out may take place. Then, the board or any member thereof, or any other person duly authorized, can exercise this power of examination of premises, and interrogation of employees or employer. Why not give this power to the registrar, so that he may act even before the board is convened?

Mr. GALLIHER. The board are in the same position as the jury in a trial going to take a view, that they may deal with the matter involved more intelligently.

Mr. CONMEE. But I do not see why it is necessary to wait until the court is convened. If evidence as to the local conditions is necessary, why should not one of the parties be able to get an order from the registrar to make investigation.

Mr. GALLIHER. It would involve all sorts of inconveniences.

Mr. CONMEE. I do not see why that should be. It seems to me it would facilitate matters.

Mr. LOGAN. This gives the board power to authorize entry upon private property which is a very serious power to grant, and it is one which should be exercised under the most conservative conditions. It seems

to me that to leave this to the registrar would be to give that official a power greater than is needed and one that should be exercised only under direction of the court.

Mr. CONMEE. But would a single member of the court be more likely to act conservatively in these matters than the registrar, who is the deputy minister of the department?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It is the board, not a single member of the board, who gives this power.

Mr. CONMEE. It says 'the board or any member thereof.'

Mr. LOGAN. But any other person must have the authority of the board in writing, as the hon. member (Mr. Conmee) will see if he reads the section.

Mr. CONMEE. It says 'The board or any member thereof, and, on being authorized in writing by the board, any other person' may enter the premises. The hon. gentleman may be right in his interpretation. But my point is that this means delay until the board is convened, and I think it will facilitate matters if the power were given to the registrar.

Mr. GALLIHER. Even when there is no dispute on?

Mr. CONMEE. There would be no request for such an examination except when there is a dispute.

Mr. GALLIHER. Then, there is no need for granting the power.

Mr. PORTER. I would call the attention of the minister (Mr. Lemieux) to the fact that there is no provision here for notice to the other parties. It authorizes the board or any member of it, or any person authorized by the board, to enter the premises at any time. This means that they would have the authority to enter a man's premises at night. It seems to me only fair that the party should have notice in some way of what is taking place.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not think it necessary that formal notice should be given that a view of the place would be directed by the board, because a view of the premises will be directed by the board in the presence of the party. Besides it is just as well that the board should be able to decide at any time to view the locality or the place where the trouble has arisen.

Mr. PORTER. I cannot understand how that order by the board can be made in the presence of the party. As soon as the board is convened it may make that direction at once in absence of the party. I think it is only fair that he should have some direct notice.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not agree with the member for Hastings (Mr. Porter) in that