

Mr. CROTHERS: I said I had no doubt he would be.

Mr. COPP: No.

Mr. CROTHERS: With a labouring man like the hon. member for Rouville or like my hon. friend.

Mr. COPP: He was not satisfied with either of you.

Mr. CROTHERS: No. I suppose not. There are men who are not satisfied with anything. I do not think the hon. member for Westmorland has treated me fairly in saying there were so many cases where complaints were made to him that labour men had applied for boards of conciliation and could not get them; and then when I asked him for one case he would not condescend to be fair enough to me to give one case so that I would have an opportunity of explaining why it was so if the board had been refused or denying the charge if the facts were not as stated. I do not think that is fair. If my hon. friend was not in a position to give a case, I do not think he should have referred to the subject at all.

Mr. COPP: I would be the very last one to say anything unfair to the Minister of Labour. I did not say that the gentleman told me of a number of cases where Boards had been refused, but he made complaint that the Labour Department did not give proper attention to the labour interests, such as they would expect from the Minister of Labour. I have no desire to throw the slightest reflection on the minister, but this is a question that is coming before the representatives very often. As the hon. members on both sides know; the labour question is becoming a serious one, and the men are looking to the representatives of the different constituencies to look after their interests as well as they possibly can. The gentleman who spoke to me was not satisfied with either the Minister of Labour or his predecessor.

Mr. CROTHERS: He was hard to please when neither of us would satisfy him.

Mr. COPP: He may be hard to please, but I can say to the Minister of Labour that if he would pay more attention to the ordinary labouring men and the claims they have upon the people generally throughout Canada, the labouring men would have a great deal more respect for the Minister of Labour. It would be better if he did not pay so much attention to the higher officials who come to him with such letters

[Mr. Copp.]

as he read to the House giving him a certificate and a reputation as being a great minister and doing his part so nobly in the interests of labour. The labour question throughout Canada, and especially down in the Maritime Provinces, is becoming more acute every day, and I think there is a very great opportunity for the Minister of Labour to go down there and spend some little time looking into matters for himself. He would find a great many complaints. I will give him the names of numbers of men in communities which he could visit with great benefit to himself, to his department, and to the Government, as well as to the labouring men in that portion of the constituency where I live.

Mr. CROTHERS: May I give some information to my hon. friend to carry to his friend? It may be of use to him. That is that the present Minister of Labour knows what it is to dig stumps and stones out of the fields, and work in the bottom of a ditch, and that he has worked for \$11 a month and his board. Tell that to your friend and he will be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. COPP: I do not think the people in my county would be satisfied; if I told them that he worked for \$11 a month, they might say he was well paid for the services which he rendered then if he did not do his work any better than he is now discharging his duties for the labouring people.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand from the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that he had some observations to make in connection with the particular item before the committee. Is it the wish of the minister that the committee should rise now?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think we ought to pass an item.

Mr. McKENZIE: I come from a part of the country, Mr. Chairman, where we have great bodies of labouring men, great industrial enterprises and a large amount of capital invested. We have our difficulties and our troubles. Sometimes we find fault with the minister—often justifiably—but I should like to have good and sufficient evidence before I tackle him directly. Just now, having no such evidence, I am not going to make any direct criticism of the minister. The Lemieux Act, as it is called, was a great step in advance of the conditions that existed before the passing of that Act. But, like every other step taken in a new direction, there is, no doubt, room for improvement and for better things in