

employees and the government of Canada. At this moment a committee of the international labour office is meeting in Copenhagen, Denmark, to deal with the broader question of the welfare of men engaged on deep-sea ships. Next month another committee will meet in London at which workers and employers and the government will be represented to deal with conditions on the inland waterways of the different countries affiliated with the organization. Following that, there will be another meeting of a committee of the international labour office in London to deal with the broad question of coal mining. My hon. friend asks, "In what way?" The statistics compiled by the bureau of statistics and the Department of Labour are of a kind and character that comply in every particular with the standards laid down by the international labour organization. I think that answers my hon. friend's question.

Mr. BLACKMORE: What are the stipulations involved which would improve conditions in our mines? In general; we do not want too much detail.

Mr. MITCHELL: The whole conventions were set out in *Votes and Proceedings* early in the session. I have not them in front of me at the moment. If my hon. friend will get *Votes and Proceedings* he can study them at his leisure, if he has not done so already. I think he is asking me a difficult thing to memorize a convention of the international labour office.

Mr. A. L. SMITH (Calgary West): May I repeat what I said a moment ago because we have in this house an institution called *Hansard*. I want to make it plain that we agree most heartily with the minister who moved this resolution. We feel that by standing with other nations who are peacefully minded we are perhaps advancing the situation in world trade. I am sure if the minister ever goes back to Geneva he will build a better looking building than the labour office occupies at the present time.

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): I wish to say in a general way in commenting upon the remarks of the hon. member who has just taken his seat, that merely because a matter is accepted by an international organization is no guarantee that it is sound. The mere fact that Canada has gone many years without adopting this convention and suddenly makes up her mind to adopt it seems to me to be some indication that an explanation ought to be given.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. BLACKMORE: I would much prefer the hon. member to show his knowledge than ask me a question.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): May I ask it or not?

Mr. BLACKMORE: Certainly; ask the question.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): Does the hon. member know of any country in the world where mining conditions are better by law than they are in the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. BLACKMORE: If the hon. member will tell me how the adoption of this legislation will improve conditions in Canada, he will be giving me what I want to know.

Mr. SMITH (Calgary West): It is merely to show that we believe.

Mr. ANGUS MacINNIS (Vancouver East): I think it can be done very briefly. I am quite sure the hon. member knows the constitution of the international labour office. It is an organization where government members, employers' representatives and labour representatives meet. Conditions in various industries are considered at these conferences. A great deal of time is given to the consideration of different problems; it goes on over a period of years; nothing is done hurriedly. The conference agrees upon conditions that should prevail in the particular industry with which it is dealing. I mentioned this evening the inspection of tackle in the loading and unloading of ships, generally a most dangerous occupation. They laid down careful requirements for safety in that particular industry. When that is done it is called a convention of the international labour office and it is referred to the various nations members of the international labour office who are asked to ratify the convention in order that there may be similar conditions in all maritime countries, in this particular case. Consequently no country can say, "We will not put these conditions into effect because they are not in effect somewhere else," and thus have an advantage in a competitive industry. The purpose is to improve conditions in the industry generally.

As a matter of fact, Canada has been rather backward in the ratification of conventions. There is an additional reason for that than our desire not to do so. Perhaps we should have ratified this convention many years ago, as I understand it was passed in 1932. But we did not have a shipping act that provided for the necessary regulation and inspection. When the shipping act was passed in 1934 it was not proclaimed for some years afterward