

tunity of expressing their views. Under the circumstances, having regard to the desire of the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Verville), that this Bill be not sent to the cemetery, as has been the fate of other measures, the best thing we can do is to refer it to a special committee of this House, before which all parties concerned will have an opportunity of being heard. I would suggest therefore to my hon. friend that he should consider the advisability of having this Bill referred to a select committee, and I would suggest this not that the Bill may be side-tracked in any way but, to use the words of my hon. friend, in order to save it from going to the cemetery, as I fear it would, should a vote be taken now, judging by the discussion we have had.

Let me give another reason or two why I think it desirable that this measure should be referred to a special committee. My hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) has spoken about legislation in the United States upon this subject, and he had in his hand a report of one of the select committees of the American House of Representatives. But that is only one of a half a dozen select committees which have dealt with similar measures across the line. As far back as 1862, the government of the United States enacted a measure very similar to the one now proposed, but what was the effect of that legislation? Whatever may have been the reasons which promoted Congress to pass it, this at least was the effect. Year after year the workingmen were continually representing to Congress that the measure was meaningless and useless, and session after session Congress appointed select committees to find out why it was impossible to make the measure what Congress hoped it would be. We would do well to profit by their experience. It would be well to have the reports of the different committees appointed by Congress laid before a special committee of this House so that they might be considered. I might point out further that in Nova Scotia there is at present a commission inquiring into a number of questions affecting the working classes. One is the question of the eight hour day, and it would be very much to the advantage of this House to have the finding of that commission on that subject. Further I think it would be an advantage to the House to have the opportunity of ascertaining what the fair wage officers of the department who have been preparing these schedules during the past eight or ten years, think would be the effect of a measure of this kind. For these reasons I hope my hon. friend will not press this measure but will agree to have it referred to a select committee, in order that all parties, both workingmen and employers, may have the opportunity of being heard, and in order that this House may have a further opportunity of doing some-

Mr. MACKENZIE KING

thing on behalf of the workingman in whose interests we are invited to legislate.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). By the courtesy of my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Maddin) and inasmuch as I shall not be able to be present for some time after eight o'clock, I would ask to be given the opportunity of making a reply to the question of the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. King) as to why the member for the district (Victoria and Haliburton) did not report this matter. I might point out to him that the member for the district is not one of his fair wage officers and is not in the pay of the Labour Department, thank Heaven. I might also point out to him that the member for the locality did draw the attention of the House and of the Minister of Labour to the matter last year—not that I objected to it in any sense whatever, because I do not believe in this doctrine of putting that clause in these contracts. On the contrary, I think that a contractor should be at liberty to get his labour at whatever price he can and engage that labour for periods depending on the duties to be performed. But what had these fair wage officers of the hon. gentleman done for the labouring men? A young gentleman has been put at the head of the Labour Department, promoted over the stalwarts of the party who have been doing its work for years—and I am sure the Finance Minister will agree with me in that statement—and I want to point out an insignificant circumstance in connection with this department of his. There was a labour organization in the town I represent, (Lindsay), which became defunct. There were considerable funds in the treasury when it broke up, and under its constitution the officers of that association were empowered to dispose of these funds on following out a certain well disposed procedure. Were they permitted to do so? Oh, no. A gentleman by the name of O'Donoghue—possibly known to the Minister of Labour—appeared on the scene and undertook to take charge. And into whose hands did he seek to put the disposal of these funds? Into the hands of that horny handed son of toil Senator McHugh.

Mr. KING. May I ask the hon. gentleman to which O'Donoghue he refers?

Mr. HUGHES. I think there is only one.

Mr. KING. Does the hon. member mean—

Mr. HUGHES. I mean the O'Donoghue. I mean the gentleman who, in season and out of season, has been making himself the tool of the Department of Labour for the benefit of the Liberal party; who grinds axes for that party up and down the country wherever he can. This gentleman appears on the scene. And to whom did he