

impossible for any member from British Columbia who understands this question, to approve the action of the Minister of Labour. Of course the minister may say, I have done all I could through my officers, and so forth.

I claim that the minister is largely responsible for the suffering that has taken place there. I am not going to touch upon this phase of the question at the present time, but later on I hope to bring to the notice of the House a number of particular incidents which will surprise the Minister of Labour and will also surprise the right hon. the leader of the Government. I feel confident that the right hon. gentleman does not know the conditions under which the Minister of Labour has operated with reference to this question. I know that he is broad-minded enough to see justice done to all parties in this matter. Probably the Prime Minister is the greatest sufferer in that he has, as his colleague the present Minister of Labour. Organized labour has very little confidence in the Minister of Labour, but I would commend to him the resolution which was adopted at the Trades Congress held in Montreal. The Trades Congress has no jurisdiction to deal with a matter of this kind, but we in this House have jurisdiction, and therefore I propose to move the following amendment, which will, if adopted, carry into effect the sentiments that were expressed at the Trades Congress, a representative body of labour men, composed of 350 delegates:

That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply, but that it be resolved that the whole conduct of the Minister of Labour in regard to the claims and the rights of the coal miners on the island of Vancouver was marked by persistent negligence and absolute indifference and deserves the censure of this House.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words upon this question which has been raised by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Verville); and in approaching a subject which, in all its details, is worthy of the consideration of this House, I do so with a feeling of regret that conditions have reached such a pass in this now prolonged labour trouble at Nanaimo. But I cannot at all agree with the hon. member in his statement that my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) has been derelict in his duty, or has neglected in any way to do what an hon. member occupying the responsible position of minister should have done. The hon. member for Maisonneuve has

[Mr. Verville.]

made the point that the men had not received word that it was necessary to ask for a board. I have read the correspondence, and I do not propose to wade through it now, but I find upon the record that the men were duly notified of what was required and that the minister wrote them at the inception of the trouble, stating what was required. I also find that an official of the department, a couple or three days after the trouble reached the ears of the minister, wrote that he—

—is to-day mailing you copies of this law and forms of application thereunder. In the event of proper application being made everything possible will be done to expedite the procedure under the Act.

That is on the 19th September. The trouble broke out, I see by the records, on the 15th September. It will appear later on that the mine workers to whom this was sent claimed not to have received the letter, but the letter from the Assistant Deputy Minister of Labour on the same day shows that he enclosed the forms referred to by the minister in his letter. I am informed by the minister that these documents have not been returned from the mail, and I think I will show presently before I sit down that there is irrefutable evidence that these forms were received, although the parties to whom they were sent denied that they had come.

The hon. member for Maisonneuve says that there are two sides to the question. That is apparent in almost every dispute, whether it is a labour trouble or any other kind of trouble. I was surprised to hear the hon. member say to-day that the men's side had never been put before this House. I was present when the Minister of Labour explained at great length, and I thought with a great deal of fairness—

Mr. VERVILLE: I said that the men's side had been put, but not the other side.

Mr. MORPHY: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. What I intended to say would apply to all sides and all phases of the question; I do not think that I ever heard of a fuller, fairer or a more accurate presentation of the whole trouble from end to end than that given by the minister when he last spoke upon this subject in the House. I do not know whether or not the hon. gentleman who spoke intended to convey, in the pointed manner in which he referred to the Mackenzie and Mann interests, the idea that men of that calibre, who have built throughout this country nearly 6,000 miles of railway, and whose names