

the future. I have had in mind for years, although I have not expressed it in the House, the idea that we should have better courts for the administration, not necessarily of the Lemieux Act, but of such disputes as arise between capital and labour. Permanent, trained and continuous knowledge is required of those who deal with matters of this kind. To have one court to-day and another to-morrow and another the next day, not necessarily any one of the men who was on the first serving on the others; to have raw recruits at each court who, perhaps, have had no training in dealing with this kind of dispute and no knowledge of the law governing the practice of the court or the case they have in hand—to have a court of this kind is not the best way of dealing with such vital issues as arise between capital and labour. It has long been my view that we should have a court trained, capable and continuous, to deal with question of this kind. The minister mentioned to-night a case where his officer was on the ground and prevented an outbreak of trouble. I submit that there should have been in that place a court—not necessarily consisting of many men; one good man might do—available immediately, without the necessity of a large amount of paraphernalia and procedure, with power to hear any person coming before it and to settle the dispute in the most effective and speedy manner. I have in mind the country-wide, effective benefits which are conferred upon us by the Railway Commission. I was never before that Board, but I am told that any man can get before it and tell his story in his own way; it can be approached without any particular procedure or ceremony, and it deals with the questions submitted to it speedily and on the spot. It is some such court that I have in mind to deal with labour disputes, not necessarily as expensive and as big a court as the Board of Railway Commissioners, but a competent body that could be simply and quickly approached and that would be in a position to prevent, as much as possible, the necessity of strikes and lock-outs. Suppose there are in a mine 300 or 400 drivers, one of whom is dissatisfied. This driver, who belongs to a drivers' association, calls out all the drivers and says: the boss put me off this morning improperly, and I am going to call the men out on strike. That is the only way he can remedy his grievance. If that driver could tell his story to a competent court and be compelled by law to make no trouble until

his case had been presented to the court, his difficulties could be settled in a day. As it is now, his only remedy is the extraordinary procedure of calling all his fellow-labourers out on strike. The establishment of a court to deal with such matters would afford ample protection to the driver, prevent the necessity of a strike and secure a more peaceful settlement of the difficulty. The great aim of the country should be to get the confidence of the workingman. The great trouble is that the weaker element is inclined to think that it is imposed upon by the stronger; the workingmen think that in the eyes of the authorities they are not as important as the capitalists. We should go far to disabuse their minds of that idea and to make them understand that it is the first duty of Parliament to protect them at every point, and one of the best ways of bringing about that condition would be to establish courts of ample jurisdiction, presided over by the very best men obtainable, before which the miners could come readily and conveniently tell their story and get their remedy without the interference of lawyers or any difficult line of procedure. The man who owns a mine has his capital; the man who owns a big lumber concern or a railway enterprise has his money, but the only capital of the workingman is his head and his hands and that is all that his family and those depending upon him have to safeguard them. It is certainly as important to the workingmen that their capital should be secure as it is to the wealthy men who are interested in such industrial pursuits as I have mentioned. It is in the best interests of our country to create the best possible relations between capital and labour, and to have a business understanding between them and courts capable of carrying out that business understanding in the most effective and efficient way, so that any ideas of imposition by the one upon the other, or any lack of interest in the powers that be, as between them, should as much as possible be allayed and removed.

On the motion of Mr. Crothers that progress be reported:

Mr. McKENZIE: I presume it is understood that any remarks that any hon. member may desire to make in regard to this item may be said on other items that are not yet passed.

Mr. CROTHERS: I shall have something to say in reply to my hon. friend's speech which he has just finished, although I will