

were given to the Intercolonial management of the Intercolonial railway which, I think, have obviated the difficulty. It is questionable whether my hon. friend ought to ask for instructions passing between the management of a railway and its employees, or whether they ought to be laid on the table. However, if he will move for the documents, I will consider it carefully. The same request has been made to me half a dozen times by other people who appear interested, and I am informed that the purpose sought to be attained has been accomplished by the instructions given at that time. I thought if that was the case, then the object of laying the correspondence on the table, or even of giving it to the public, was not obvious. However, if my hon. friend will move for the correspondence, I will look into it, and will give him a further answer.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

On order for House again in committee on Bill (No. 41) to amend the Criminal Code.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not see the Minister of Agriculture present. The other day he asked this order to stand, and probably he desires it to stand yet. I am ready to go on.

Mr. FIELDING. I would be obliged if the hon. gentleman would permit it to stand until the return of the Minister of Agriculture. It would be a convenience.

INTEREST ACT AMENDMENT.

Order called for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Miller for the second reading of Bill (No. 8) to amend the Interest Act.

Mr. MILLER. I ask the permission of the House to withdraw this Bill, having given notice of the introduction of another Bill to the same purpose. I move that the order be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

On order for second reading of Bill (No. 18) to amend the Bank Act.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE. I move that this order be discharged as the purpose of the Bill is covered by another proposed Bill.

Motion agreed to.

HOURS OF LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. A. VERVILLE (Maissonneuve) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 21) respecting the hours of labour on public works. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I do not propose to go at length

into details, inasmuch as a discussion took place last year when this Bill was before the House. At that time it was proven conclusively that the hours of labour ought to be shortened. Of course, during that discussion it developed that some hon. members were in favour of the measure, and some were opposed to it; others stated that they had not had time to give to the Bill the careful study which a measure of its importance deserved. I think, Sir, that if the hon. members of this House gave as much care and as keen study to this Bill as some of them give to Bills of private interest, this measure would already have been enacted into law. Now during the discussion last year it was stated that by shortening the hours from 10 to 8, or from 9 to 8, we would probably diminish production by one-fifth. At that time the Minister of Labour, then the Postmaster General, stated that he had not studied the measure, but he believed that it would have the effect of reducing production by one-fifth. It was proven clearly by those who spoke in favour of the Bill that such was not the case. It was also shown on that occasion that the deputy Minister of Labour had made investigations in British Columbia, and recommended the adoption of an eight hour law for the miners. It was also proven that in Alberta they had adopted an eight hour day, and that a commission had been appointed in other provinces to study the question.

Of course, it may be said, that we should leave this question to the different provinces to discuss and pass laws upon. I claim that this government must be a model employer, that we should start at the head and pass a law on this subject so that we can at least study the question from observing its operation. During the discussion last year some hon. members of this House said that long hours of labour had no effect mentally or physically upon man. Is it reasonable to believe that long hours of labour, especially in some of our large industries, will not have a detrimental effect, morally, physically and otherwise, on our working people? The question of the rate of wages has nothing whatever to do with the Bill before the House. Some hon. gentlemen say that if you shorten the hours of labour organized labour will want more money. I want to know if this House has anything to do with that question. Let the working people ask what they think is right and let them discuss it with their employers. The hon. member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Girard), when we were discussing this question last year, remarked that fifteen hours of labour was not any too long for farm hands. I claim that there is a vast difference between working on a farm, or in the open air, and working in the large industries of the country. Then, some one made the statement that the best way to