

large industrial questions that arise from time to time, and in quieting the public mind as to agitations which seems to be perennial between capital and labour; but the establishment of a Department of Labour, with all the paraphernalia which has been indicated, and with all the expenses that it will entail, is not going to result in settling those difficulties which confront us from time to time, and which as between capital and labour have existed from time immemorial. Until the government of the day is sufficiently strong, and is prepared to hold the scales of justice between capital and labour entirely irrespective of the labour vote, or entirely irrespective of what pressure capital may bring to bear in the way of political influence, so long will these difficulties exist. Until the government of the day is sufficiently strong to bring down legislation making it part and parcel of our criminal law to enforce a penalty, as they do when other laws are disregarded, so long will those difficulties continue. Take for instance the Act which we know as the Lemieux Act. My right hon. friend can scarcely congratulate the country on that Act being a success at the present time in adjusting difficulties which arise between labour and capital. Shortly after its introduction, it did receive a fair trial at the hands of both parties, but the labour party to-day absolutely disregard the Lemieux Act.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—No.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—They have passed resolution after resolution in their Labour Congress expressing their entire disapproval of the Act. I speak with knowledge on the subject. It is not compulsory. It simply touches the fringe, and does not reach the centre of the difficulty which has been pointed out. I quite appreciate that the question of labour is of sufficient importance to command the attention of the government in endeavouring in every intelligent way to deal with it and the difficulties arising under it from time to time, and from which labour is undoubtedly suffering. But there must be a well defined policy. If this Department of Labour is to be established, it should be accompanied with a provision for the settlement of strikes, and not simply make provision for

a Minister of Labour with all the retinue that I have pointed out, and involving a yearly expenditure of \$35,000, as a minimum, without knowing what that Department of Labour is going to do. I regret very much that the government has not seen fit to permit the Labour Bureau, as it now exists, to exert its influence in the direction already pointed out. The Minister of Labour to-day is the Postmaster General. My right hon. friend has not pointed out to this Chamber, nor has it been pointed out in the other House, that the questions which have arisen from time to time and which would necessarily appeal to the deputy minister, have been so extraordinary in character as to render that department unable to grapple with them. The staff there has certainly not been inadequate to deal with the various questions which have arisen from time to time. The policy of the department has been, so far as I have observed, to allow strikes to practically exhaust themselves, and when both parties were absolutely exhausted from the antagonism which had existed for a considerable time, the department then intervened. The Deputy Minister of Labour appeared on the scene, and he then had no difficulty, in many cases, in settling the strikes. But it is in the inception of those difficulties that the government should act, and I must confess that in no case has my attention been directed to any important strike where the government has intervened before the difficulties had reached an acute stage.

Under the circumstances, while this Bill is bound to go through, the government has shown no good reason for the establishment of another department involving a very large expenditure of money. I regret also that the government has not considered the propriety, now that there is to be an increase under new conditions arising from time to time of government portfolios, of considering the policy which obtains in England, of appointing under secretaries. I recall the speech that the hon. member from Middlesex made upon this subject some months ago. It was full of interest, and certainly should commend itself to the attention of the government. I regret to say that under the present system our civil government is unsatisfactory; our de-