

from Australia. I wonder whether he has read the judgment of the court of appeal of Manitoba in connection with the grain inquiry, in which matter I was greatly interested, because I was then occupying the position which he now does. An injunction was obtained in Manitoba against the commission proceeding with their work. Mr. Newcombe, then Deputy Minister of Justice, went to Winnipeg and argued the case with great care; and the court decided the case after reviewing all the authorities, including authorities in their own court and one in British Columbia, and a privy council case in which Lord Haldane delivered the judgment, in connection with a sugar plantation, as to the right of the federal power to issue a royal commission to deal with purely state matters, and pointed out the difference between our constitution and that of other federal unions. I had not been following the case in the press at all, but when I read this in the speech from the throne I looked into it with some degree of care. There are two or three points in that paragraph which should not be overlooked:

A royal commission has been appointed to inquire into conditions in the textile industry, as the result of the closing down on January 18 of one of the textile plants in the city of Sherbrooke, thereby occasioning, in mid-winter, and at a time of unemployment, great hardship to hundreds of employees and their families. My ministers are of the opinion that industries should recognize an obligation to cooperate in every manner possible in continuing and providing employment, and that labour and consumers have a right to have their voice heard, and influence felt, in the control of industrial policy. Where these ends cannot be effected through voluntary cooperation of all parties to industry, my ministers are of the opinion that there are the strongest of reasons for state intervention.

And so at last we have reached it—the point where the party opposite takes this attitude, the party which, sitting on this side of the house, in season and out of season condemned state intervention, condemned interference with anything that had to do with business. "Leave business alone," was the cry. That was the point: "Leave it alone." I know my hon. friend the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Mackenzie) smiles when he recalls how those vivid sentences of his found echo against the wall: "Leave business alone; give business a chance;" all those cries that went on from day to day. And now we are told that not only must there be influence felt in the control of industry, but where you cannot effect it through voluntary co-operation you are going to have the strongest reason for state intervention. I will give hon. gentlemen

something to "state intervene" about. Why limit it to the textile industry at Sherbrooke?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): It is not necessary.

Mr. BENNETT: It says here "the textile industry." I will give him something else for state intervention. I suppose one of the most powerful contributors to the Liberal cause and the success of the Liberal party was Mr. Burton of the Simpson company, during the last election and the preceding one. All I can say is that during the two months of January and February the employees of that organization are to lose six days without pay, in order that the profits may be satisfactory. Six days in the two months of January and February each employee is to lose pay, which the \$12.50 a week people find a little difficult. I suggest to the Minister of Labour that he extend the commission to cover that. Let us see what this means:

Where these ends cannot be effected through voluntary cooperation of all parties to industry, my ministers are of the opinion that there are the strongest of reasons for state intervention. Was this government consulted about that? Did they know it? Did the Minister of Labour know of it? He should. Does he know that these employees dare not complain because their places would be filled by others? Does he know that last summer this very same firm took advertising away from one newspaper because it dared to publish the truth as it came out before one of these commissions that have been sitting here? I suppose now these facts will not be known through the newspapers. That is the reason I am stating them here; they will be on Hansard at least. I suggest to the right hon. gentleman, a former Minister of Labour, with all his love of humanity, that he at once begin to care for those who are losing six days. They are no longer to find employment, but their work is to be done by their fellow labourers, that much extra. Six days in two months is to be lost. Not much, I suppose, at \$12.50 a week; it is a good deal less than at \$75,000 a year, but there is the principle. Let the commission be extended to cover that. Let it cover that if it is legal at all, and let the Minister of Labour inquire into it. Let him get busy on the telegraph and telephone wires and find out about it.

Further investigation with respect to the monopoly in coal meets, I think, commendation from everybody in this country, but how it is going to be done in Canada any more than it has been, I do not know.