

becomes his duty to give that information to the state. I do not know that most of us are in danger of being accused of murder because that course is open to any citizen. The fact is that if there are no abuses these charges are not likely to be laid. I do not object to the suggestion that was thrown out recently that we have these matters brought seriously before the public by way of an affidavit or something of that kind. But in any case the humblest individual in the state ought to be able to invoke the protection of the state against any of these big interests. I think I am voicing the opinion of a great many people when I say that to-day we are more afraid of the big combinations with all the prestige which they possess and all the money that is behind them than we are of the irresponsibility of a few individuals who perhaps for some private grudge might bring forward some charge that was baseless. After all, if the charge is baseless, provision is made in the bill whereby it can be investigated in a preliminary way by the registrar, before it goes on to a more thorough investigation. If the charge is baseless why should any firm or corporation fear the fullest and freest investigation? The hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler) would like also I believe, to take away the safeguards to labour which are contained in section 34. This section reads as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to combinations of workmen or employees for their own reasonable protection as such workmen or employees.

That section is much along the line of existing legislation and simply seeks to protect the workmen from action which unfortunately has been taken sometimes in the past to prevent them from organizing. In the old days professional workers had a right to combine. No one ever questioned that right, and we have combinations of lawyers, doctors, newspaper men, authors, and so on. But when the workers some one hundred years ago, began to combine it was a different story. It was said they had no right to combine, no right whatever, and so later on certain special legislation had to be introduced to safeguard their interests. I should like to ask why the workers should not be allowed the fullest right to organize? That right is in fact guaranteed under the Peace treaty of Versailles. Why should they not have that right as much as business and professional men? We have the Canadian Manufacturers' Association—a great combination which is exercising a tremendous influence and very largely, I maintain, influencing the fiscal policy of this country. We

have railway associations which, according to the reports of the recent commission, appear to have exercised their combination in such a way that there has been a very real restraint of trade. We have shipping combinations at the present time. We have a banking association which is distinctly a close corporation. We had even mentioned here on the floor of the House a newspaper combination. I cannot see why there should be any objection whatever to allow the fullest right to labour employees, of any class whatever, to combine and, in my opinion, if it is necessary to do so their interests ought to be effectively safeguarded.

There are one or two points in the bill which I should like to criticize, points which some have criticized from the opposite angle. The Prime Minister says that information, in connection with proceedings under the bill, will not be made public. I should like to ask why not? Why should there be any secrecy connected with these investigations? It seems to me that in such a provision we are, perhaps, going back to the ideals of an earlier state of industry when industry was essentially private and almost personal in its character. None of us want men to come into our homes and pry into our private affairs; but a great modern business is by no means a private enterprise. When there are a large number of people associated with it, it thereby becomes public, and the public have definite rights in regard to what is going on in connection with it. The Prime Minister said that publicity would do more than penalties to remove evils. I believe that is true. Why then should we not have the very fullest publicity in connection with this matter? In connection with this feature I was reminded of a treatment of this question which was given nearly ten years ago by ex-President Woodrow Wilson. May I be permitted to quote several paragraphs from his work "The New Freedom" which seem very pertinent to the point under discussion.

We used to say that the ideal of government was for every man to be left alone and not interfered with, except when he interfered with somebody else; and that the best government was the government that did as little governing as possible. That was the idea that obtained in Jefferson's time. But we are coming now to realize that life is so complicated that we are not dealing with the old conditions, and that the law has to step in and create new conditions under which we may live, the conditions which will make it tolerable for us to live.

Let me illustrate what I mean: It used to be true in our cities that every family occupied a separate house of its own, that every family had its own little premises, that every family was separated in its life from every other family. That is no longer the case in our great cities. Families live in tenements, they live in flats, they live on floors; they are piled layer upon