

Mr. CLARKE. The militia were doing their annual drill, but even then the city of Toronto had to pay them.

Mr. LOGAN. The city of Montreal is ambitious. It proclaims itself as the national port of Canada. Surely, it should not come begging this parliament to preserve the peace in that port. If we should do so, we would be establishing a most dangerous precedent. With reference to the storm brewing, serious thinking people realize that there is one certainly threatening over the labour question. I would humbly suggest that the government should be forewarned, and that it might be in the public interest—this may not be a very well considered suggestion, but I make it in all sincerity—for this government to appoint a commission of able men to meet the leading labouring men of Canada and the capitalists and consider whether some means could not be devised for preventing the outbreak of the threatened storm. We have labour organizations, we cannot prevent their existence, we have also organizations of capitalists, and it seems to me that commission might possibly be the means of some agreement being arrived at between capital and labour in this Dominion.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I rise to make a personal explanation. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the city of Montreal is coming to parliament to beg the government to pay part of the expenses that are incurred by keeping the militia on the docks to maintain peace and order in the city. What I said is that, if the militia are to be used to maintain peace and order, it seems to me that the regular troops who are at St. Johns, Toronto, and Quebec, and who are being paid their salaries now by the government, might properly be brought to Montreal to relieve those members of the volunteer force who are now engaged in the work of maintaining order. These regular troops get their pay from the government now, and they would get the same in Montreal as they do where they now are. That is all.

The PRIME MINISTER. In answer to the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain), let me say that the troops at St. Johns have been brought to the city of Montreal and all the troops available in the district of Montreal are at the command of the municipal authorities. But, to bring troops from other cities, from Toronto and other places, it is a question that involves very serious considerations.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). I do not propose to go into the merits of this question, nor to discuss the general principle involved. I wish to refer to one point in connection with the bringing out of the militia. I feel very strongly that when an occasion arises that makes it necessary for the government to employ troops to keep

order, the volunteers of the locality if called out might be forced to war against their fellow-citizens and countrymen and that this would be wrong. On an occasion of a strike in a city, such as we have in Montreal, no local militia should be called out. The men serving in the local regiments are, in many cases, the brothers and friends of the men on strike, and both sides believe that they are doing what is right. When occasions of this kind arise—and, unfortunately, I suppose we must believe that they will arise, that we cannot help it—we should have permanent troops sent to each place of disturbance to maintain the peace. If it is accepted and understood that in the case of a street railway strike in Toronto or a longshoremen's in Montreal, the local volunteers will be called out, perhaps to fire on some of their brothers or friends, I think we are going to destroy absolutely in this country the spirit out of which our militia grows. No matter at what cost, in the case of a strike of this sort, the government should send the paid force of the country to keep order and not call upon the local militia. Though not an employer of labour, I have opinions as one who has perhaps, thought a good deal about this subject, although without saying very much. I believe that unionism is of great advantage to the men; I believe that it has come to stay and that it is going to accomplish in the end very great things for the labourer. At the same time, I have just as strong an opinion that unionism is absolutely wrong when it adopts the boycott. I believe I am right when I say that not more than one-third of the labourers in the cities—leaving out farm labourers, that is to say, not more than one-third of the mechanical labourers—belong to the unions. If I am right in that, I do not think that it is right that one-third of the labourers who are in the union should be able to say that the other two-thirds shall not work. I am not able to suggest a remedy for the difficulty, but I believe a remedy will be found; and I think that as time goes on there will be a better feeling between capital and labour—and that good feeling is growing, and must grow—these difficulties will be avoided. I believe that in the principle of a minimum wages and a share in the profits of all industries will eventually be found the solution which will make labour and capital work together in union. It is a slow process, perhaps, but we are tending to that end, and I know of industries in which that scheme has been attempted and has worked, and is working, to the satisfaction of both labour and capital. I believe it only requires patience, the avoidance of temper, and the recognition of the rights of both labour and capital. I must confess that I do not believe that a compulsory board of arbitration will do good. The results of compulsory arbitration will only be

Mr. LOGAN.