

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Under this and preceding section, could the representative of the locomotive engineers, who happens to be in the United States, be allowed to appear before the court and present the case of the locomotive engineers?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly. But a man must be a British subject to be a member of the board, no matter where he resides. It would be humiliating for this country that a board of arbitrators should be partly composed of Americans. You might as well have an American sitting as a judge in any one of our courts of law. But suppose a union has its ablest representative an American citizen residing in the United States, there is nothing to prevent that representative from appearing before the board and presenting its case.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. It is quite possible that an officer of the board of locomotive engineers might be a practising lawyer. Could the labour organizations select a representative, whether he be an American or a British subject, to appear before the board and present the case of the men?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly, but he cannot be a member of the board unless he is a British subject.

Mr. MONK. I would be inclined to agree with my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy). If this law is to be useful, we must try and give the greatest satisfaction to the labouring men in the selection of the board. Strange to say the labour organizations lose sight entirely of territorial limits. In Europe, the international extends from country to country, and, in order to achieve their object, labour organizations are affiliated quite irrespective of national lines. My hon. friend the minister (Mr. Lemieux) knows that here in Canada,—in the province of Quebec at any rate—there has been a strong movement to nationalize our labour organizations. There are at present in Montreal two federated labour organizations, one affiliated with the organization in the United States and known in common parlance as the international, while the other is exclusively Canadian. For three or four years a strong movement has been carried on to diminish the affiliations with the United States and to make these labour organizations pure Canadian. That movement has failed and, I think that at the present moment the order affiliated with the United States is far more extensive than the purely national organization. Under these circumstances it seems to me it would be only fair that as they have only one representative on the board they should be allowed to choose freely. There are very experienced and able representatives of labour in the United States in whom our labouring classes have great confidence. They are very often invited here, while re-

presentatives of labour in Canada are very often called upon to settle disputes in the United States. I think that my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville) has, on one or more occasions been called upon to act as arbitrator in the United States, because they had confidence in him and because they felt, perhaps, that, as he was far removed from the scene of the trouble, he would be able to give a more disinterested verdict than one more closely connected with the trouble itself. I do not see what objection there could be to a man acting as a member of the board, even if he were a foreigner. He is only one member, the majority would be Canadians, and, in case he had the confidence of the labour men, the fact of his being an alien, would not be a valid objection to his acting.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I feel sure that, on second thoughts my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will see that it would seriously reflect upon Canada if we should go to any foreign country to form a board under this Act. For my part, I would very seriously resent it. And I believe my hon. friend would also resent it if he were called upon to appear before a tribunal to settle a national issue—and he will understand the sense in which I use the word 'national,' the dispute being one within our own territory—if that tribunal were composed in part of foreigners. Why, in the very humblest sphere of our judicature, in the appointment of the justices of the peace, we require that the appointees shall be British subjects.

Mr. MONK. That is for the administration of our law.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And this board is to administer our law.

Mr. MONK. It is for investigation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, investigation of matters in dispute between British subjects. And why should British subjects be called upon to appear before a board, the majority of whom may be foreigners—all of whom may be foreigners, for, if you give one side the right to choose a foreigner, you can hardly deny a similar right to the other side, and why should not these two choose a third foreigner to complete the board? My hon. friend will see that it is undignified—I think that word is not too strong. I use it not because I do not like our American friends, but because we ought to feel able to manage our own affairs. At present there is a strong public opinion against the walking delegates coming in here from abroad and sometimes causing trouble. That objection would be much stronger on the question of the formation of a board under this Act. I know that my hon. friend is as true a British subject and Canadian—as proud a British subject and