

Grain Growers' Association in the west, and I hope that the farmers in this country will form a union and assert their rights. With regard to the influence of these unions, let me say that the manager of a large industrial concern in the United States told me it was much more satisfactory dealing with unions than with disorganized labour, and some of the greatest corporations in that country want all their men to belong to a union. They find that there is less trouble dealing with the president of the union than with a mob of men. In my opinion it is the duty of the Minister of Labour to send his men down to deal with those shippers and endeavour to convince them that they should recognize the union or else this government will not protect them.

Mr. C. B. HEYD (South Brant). I do not desire to enter into a discussion on this question, but I would like to have a better definition of that phrase, 'The recognition of the union.' What does it mean? Each speaker gives it his own interpretation, and I would like the hon. minister to give us an authoritative definition of what the employees mean by it and what the employers understand by this term.

Mr. A. S. KENDALL (Cape Breton). I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to say very much on this question, because I am not conversant with the details of the strike in Montreal, but shall content myself with a few general remarks. During a later period I shall probably bring before this House some measures dealing with that great question of the relations between capital and labour. I have the honour to represent a strong, labour, industrial county in this Dominion—a county that produces millions of tons of coal every year. Down there we have a labour union which we consider the very strongest in Canada. It is about 7,500 strong. And let me say that in the county of Cape Breton we have not had, for some eighteen or nineteen years, any serious disturbance between capital and labour. Why? Because the representatives of capital recognized that their best policy is to deal with organized men and not with a mob. I wish to point out—and I think that in saying this I have history on my side—that the capitalists of this country and all those who look ahead would do well to glance over the history of simiar movements in Europe and Great Britain. We may make up our minds that we have to arrive at the point reached in Great Britain and Europe, and we had better take the easiest and not the hardest road to it. Let me raise my humble voice to ask the employers of labour to consider this matter, because a storm is rising in this country. No man who has an eye in his head can fail to perceive that great difficulties are about to confront us, and it will be a serious matter for us if we have to wade through the difficulties which agitated England and Scotland from 1840 to 1880. I

sincerely hope that the recognition of the union of workmen will be facilitated by capital in this country, instead of thwarted, and in this way, more than any other, will be avoided difficulties such as we are now considering.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). I think that the question of discussion this afternoon is one of great importance. My hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Kendall) has told us that a storm is no doubt brewing in this country. Every day we hear capitalists say that the labour question is the most dangerous one ahead of us in this country at present, and that it is rendering unsafe the investment of capital. At the same time we must recognize that the labouring man has the same right to unite with his brother labourers as the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) has to unite with his brother manufacturers in the Manufacturers' Association. The attempt to shut out labour unions in Canada would lead to civil war and could never succeed. Calling out the militia is, of course, the last resort, and should only be done to secure the peace of the community and not to suppress a strike. The question before the House was brought up by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier asking the government if they proposed to pay the city of Montreal a portion of the cost of calling out the militia.

Mr. MONK. I did not bring that question up at all. I asked the government what they were doing or intended doing in Montreal.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am responsible for that question.

Mr. LOGAN. Then it was my hon. friend from Montmorency who put that question. I think that to do what my hon. friend asked would be to set a dangerous precedent. I would ask the government if there is a precedent of that kind? We had a great labour struggle in the city of London only a few years ago, and the militia were called out to preserve the peace, but I do not think that the government of Canada were asked by that ambitious city to pay for the militia.

Mr. MONK. There was the case of the town of Valleyfield. The government were asked to pay for the militia there, but I do not know what was done.

Mr. LOGAN. I think that the government refused to accede to its demand.

The PRIME MINISTER. It was against the law.

Mr. LOGAN. And, as my right hon. friend the Premier has said, it was against the law. We had a very serious strike in Toronto last year, and although that city is not slow in asking favours from this government, we never heard of it asking that this government should pay the militia.