The House Committee

(Continued from Page Three.)

WEDNESDAY'S SESSION.

There was little of real interest to the outside public in the session of the Columbia & Western committee yesterday. The cross-examination of Hon. Mr. Wells dragging through the entire day, and even although conducted by Mr. A. E. McPhillips, M.P.P., proving to the general public somewhat dreary and monotonous.

The morning session was devoted wholly to the cross-examination of the Chief Commissioner by Mr. Helmcken, considerable old ground being gone over. Definite information was not securable, however, as to the reasons prompting the change of the grants from B. C. Southern to Columbia & Western account. Hon. Mr. Wells expressed himself surprised that action had been taken in the grants matter during his absence, but accepted the dictum of the executive. He did not remember having asked for the opinion of the Attorney-General as to the power of the government to grant non-contiguous lands; while not disputing the opinion of Mr. Gordon Hunter as to the power of the government in this respect, he had still held that to do so would have been an improper deviation from the directory instructions of the statute in this regard. He did not remember an opinion of this kind having been given in executive by the Attorney-General. The grants dated October 30, 1901, could, after the passage of the order-in-council, have been prepared, signed by the Deputy Commissioner and delivered, had not witness given directions that they should first be submitted to him. He had brought home to Mr. Dunsmuir that in giving these lands in blocks 4,593 and 4,594, the directory condition of the statute was being varied; Mr. Dunsmuir had said that he had not before understood the matter in this light. After witness' return from Montreal, Hon. Mr. Eberts had pressed for the delivery of the grants.

Before entering upon his cross-examination of Hon. Mr. Wells in the afternoon, Mr. McPhillips submitted, as a matter of privilege, the Colonist report of the proceedings of Tuesday, in one portion of which reference was made to the "long and dreary cross-examination" conducted by Mr. McPhillips, and in another to the response of Mr. Brown "four score times repeated—'I cannot recall it.'" As to the first matter of complaint—the designation of his cross-examination as "long and dreary"—Mr. McPhillips took it that but one of two conclusions could be arrived at: either that the report had been purposely colored or shaded to suit the peculiar policy of the Colonist, or else the intelligence of the writer of the report was not sufficiently great to grasp the purport of his examination. As for the second point of objection, he maintained that he had not repeated any of his questions four score times. The tenor of his question of privilege was that he was being singled out for misrepresentation and abuse in pursuance of a determined line of unfair policy on the Colonist's part, "depite which he would not be deterred from doing his duty as he interpreted it."

With the permission of the committee chairman, the Colonist's representative assured Mr. McPhillips that there had been no intention to convey the impression that any question of his had been "four score times repeated." The reference in this connection had been to the response of Mr. Geo. McL. Brown, "I cannot recall it." As for the other feature of Mr. McPhillips' complaint—it was sheer nonsense. His instructions had been to report the committee in fair abstract, and there had been no suggestion as to any particular treatment to be accorded Mr. McPhillips, "direct or indirect, incidental, remote or otherwise." The intention had been, was, and would be to furnish fair abstract reports.

Notwithstanding this explanation, Mr. McPhillips still maintained that classifying any cross-examination which he might conduct as "long and dreary" could not be interpreted otherwise than as a feature of the "policy of assassination adopted by the Colonist as applied to himself." In this respect he thought the Colonist reports were in marked contrast with the full and accurate reports appearing in other papers. The expressed animosity of the Colonist would nevertheless not deter him from what he interpreted as being his public duty.

The cross-examination of Hon. Mr. Wells then proceeded. An abstract of the new, or comparatively new, points elicited will be sufficient.

There were two vacancies in the cabinet at the time of his visit to Montreal, the witness said—two by-elections pending. It might have been prejudicial to the government's chances therein to have had the grants for these two blocks made. His interview with Mr. Taylor had been precedent to his conversation with Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, and to the presentation of the memorandum asked for by that gentleman. If Sir Thomas had agreed to the conditions imposed with respect to the delivery of the patents, he (Wells) would doubtless have felt justified in handing over the grants. He did not think had this been the case that his colleagues could have been justified in taking him to task, although any agreement entered into would necessarily have had to be ratified by government action.

He had gone to Montreal for a railway policy perhaps, and he had come back with one.

After his return, Mr. Dunsmuir had said to him that Brown was pressing for those grants again, and asked "why not give them to him?" Although the demanded concessions had not been obtained, the Premier and other ministers evidently wished delivery of the grants to be made at that time. No doubt the government in passing the cancellation order-in-council were largely influenced by the matter of the Taylor incident, of which witness had made no report to Sir Thomas Shaughnessy. It was a logical conclusion that witness' report of his conversation with Mr. Taylor was the groundwork of the recision. He was quite satisfied that Sir Thomas Shaughnessy had no knowledge of any agreement for the transfer of the grants for blocks 4,593 and 4,594 from the British Columbia Southern to the Columbia & Western subsidy. He (witness) had become impressed with the fact that through this substitution the Crow's Nest Pass Coal Co. would be deprived of its selection of lands under the agreement shown by Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, with the British Columbia Southern. In other words, the purpose of the substitution would be in effect to defraud the Crow's Nest Pass Coal Co. out of its 10,000 acres of land.

With respect to Mr. Gordon Hunter's opinion, it was witness who had submitted the facts upon which the opinion was based, giving them verbally. He must have told Mr. Hunterd that there was a reserve of available lands contiguous to the line and set aside for railway purposes out of which earned lands could be given, but that as a matter of fact the government had decided to give in lieu these two particular blocks, 4,593 and 4,594. There was no doubt but that he had given all the facts fully and freely to Mr. Hunter. Mr Hunter was probably advised that all that remained to make the transfer of these blocks complete was delivery of the signed and sealed patents, and it was upon these facts that the opinion was given.

As to Mr. Greenshields, if the preliminary agreement submitted to Sir Thomas Shaughnessy with respect to building the Midway-Spence's Bridge line, had been acceptible to the railway president, witness had wanted Mr. Greenshields to assist him as counsel for the province. It was Mr. Creelman who had manifested objection. He had first of all shrugged his shoulders. It was evident that he had no wish to work with Mr. Greenshields in the matter suggested. Witness had adduced from his actions that there was a pedrsonal objection to Mr. Greenshields. If other counsel had been suggested the same objection might not have been manifest.

Witness should not think the cost of the proposed Midway-Spence's Bridge road would exceed thirty or forty thousand dollars a mile. It was not a particularly difficult route. The distance was 180 miles, and at $30,000 a mile the cost of the new line would have been approximately six million dollars. The railway policy of the government at that time was cash subsidies of $4,000 per mile, so that the actual cost of the undertaking proposed, would have been about five million dollars to the company, even if it had got the grants.

On the 10th September, 1900, the British Columbia Southern was definitely settled with and not given these blocks 4,593 and 4,594. That would have been a complete and final settlement of the British Columbia Southern. Mr. Geo. McL. Brown was interested in advancing this settlement and his writing on the pain attached to the Order-in-Council showed that he was quite well aware of what was being done. The subsequent change, giving blocks 4,593 and 4,594, so far as witness was concerned at all events, had been agreed to with a view to the saving in area. He had believed it would amount to several hundred thousand acres, and had been led to believe so by Mr. Brown, although it had since been ascertained that the saving was but 167,000 acres. There might have been other inducements moving. Witness had bowed to the decision of the executive. He had had no view at that time of the particular value of the substituted lands.

The policy of the government with respect to prospecting licenses in these blocks was not yet decided. When applications had been received, they with the money, had been returned. There had been no determination of intention as to whether or not priority would be recognized.

Witness had received no advice from the Deputy Attorney General as to the legal effect of bill 87 of last session. The Attorney-General, however, had said that there would be no difficulty—that the government would have full power of control as to granting or refusing any selections that might be made. The government could reject any selection it wished. The company, in the opinion of the witness, would have to go outside the lands reserved in selecting its earned lands, unless it went to the mountain tops. He did not think it would have been fair to have held the company to the reserved lands, if valueless.

If bill 87 had passed, the company might have selected lands in the Similkameen or other recognized coal measures. If it had selected lands in the Similkameen there would have been added incentive for the building of the Midway-Spence's Bridge road.

The reserve referred to had been made at the instance of the British Columbia Southern and the company could not legally have objected had it been confined to selection therein. Witness maintained, nevertheless, that it would have been highly unfair to have insisted upon this. The company had earned a land subsidy, and it was not presumed to be a subsidy in lands of no value. Witness did not see that it was out of the way to suggest that the company should relinquish valueless lands, being reinstated in lands of worth.

"Did you know or think," asked Mr. McPhillips, "that it was the intention of the government in securing the passage of bill 87 to get the government out of a political difficulty by enabling the company to get blocks 4,593 and 4,594 in any way?"

Witness did not. He had never given Mr. Brown such an assurance as referred to in his letter to witness of the 22nd March. In saying that it would be impossible to go beyond the legislation that would be brought down, witness had was not guardedly foreshadowed which would have put blocks 4,593 and 4,594 in the possession of the company. He denied that the presentation of bill 87 was intentionally redemption of the promise referred to in Mr. Brown's letter. Quite the contrary was the reasonable deduction; his (witness') letter stated clearly that the company could not have these blocks.

When upon witness' return from Montreal, Mr. Eberts had pressed him to let the company have these blocks, witness had said that if the government did so the government would have to go. Mr. Eberts' reply had been, "Let us go then." Mr. Eberts had appeared to be quite content to stake his political fortunes on the action of the government in completing the grants in question. This was previous to the cancellation Order-in-Council, with which Mr. Eberts dissents. Mr. Eberts did not approve of the withholding of these blocks from the company. Mr. Eberts had not approved of bill 16 or its passage. He had approved of bill 16 of this session, ratifying the cancellation. He had neither spoken for the measure nor assisted its passage. He had left the House at the time of the vote, ostensibly to avoid voting. This bill was drafted in the Attorney-General's office. It was materially changed in the House at Mr. McPhillips' suggestion. With the knowledge of Mr. Eberts' feeling in the matter, witness agreed that it would have been the proper thing to see that bill 87 was dealt with so special care, to account for the intentions of the government and assure that Brown would not be able to carry out his sinister purpose with respect to blocks 4,593 and 4,594. Mr. Brown's question as to whether or not the bill would come in "as drafted," suggested to witness that he (Brown) had drafted it. He was aware that Mr. Brown was very anxious and would endeavor to secure as favorable legislation as possible. The full responsibility of this measure, in witness' opinion, rested in the Attorney-General's office.

Prior to the adjournment, Mr. Green protested against an editorial in the Vancouver Daily Province, in which it was intended that the committee had sought to deter Sir Thomas Shaughnessy from attending and giving evidence—quite the contrary being the fact. The committee had informed Sir Thomas Shaughnessy that were he within its jurisdiction he would be compelled to attend. The committee had extended its time and telegraphed again and again in an effort to secure Sir Thomas' attendance. The contention of the editorial was quite contra to the evident fact.

This view was concurred in by all the committee, and with the understanding that the press would make this clear, the matter was allowed to drop. Mr. Green withdrawing his motion that cognizance be taken of the matter by the committee chairman.

TYPHOID SCOURGING THE WHOLE COUNTRY.

HOSPITALS EVERYWHERE ARE CROWDED TO THE LIMIT.

DOCTORS AND NURSES BUSY.

WHY THIS DISEASE IS SO PREVALENT, AND THE BEST MEANS OF PREVENTION.

Typhoid fever is holding the attention of health officers in every part of Canada just now. It is epidemic. Many causes are attributed to the present outbreak, bad milk and impure water. The most common symptoms of this dread malady are headache, dizziness, specks before the eyes, weakness of the back, gone feeling in the limbs, and nauseous sensations in the stomach. A startling fact is that a person who is quite healthy to outward appearance may unconsciously have the disease working inwardly for a long time.

The surest preventive is to increase your vitality. Endeavor to get strong. Keep the body pure and untainted. Try and build up a reserve of energy that will enable you to repel the onslaught of the typhoid germ. In the opinion of many noted specialists, the best remedy in such a crisis is Ferrozone, which has a specific action in all impurities in the blood, and can be relied upon as a protection to those in health. A course of Ferrozone puts the system in perfect condition, and insures you against the many diseases one is liable to contract when vitality is low. Nothing so quickly builds up weak constitutions, making muscle and fibre where formerly there was flabbiness and weakness. Ferrozone is a blood-maker, a strengthener, a rebuilding tonic that gives unbounded satisfaction, and can be depended upon to bring happiness and health to those who need it. Very few are so perfectly healthy that they don't need a bracing tonic occasionally. There is none better, and not one half so good as Ferrozone. It is sold by all reliable druggists at 50c. per box, or six boxes for $2.50. Sent to any address by mail by the Ferrozone Co., Kingston, Ont.

Ferrozone assures health.

Commission In Session

Investigation as to Cause of Labor Troubles Continues From Day to Day.

Sitting Held at Court House and Local Witnesses Examined.

(From Tuesday's Daily.)

Victoria apparently, to conclude from the scant attendance in the Court House this morning, was not prepared for the advent of the labor commission.

Chief Justice Hunter and the Rev. Dr. Elliott S. Rowe took their seats a little before 11 o'clock. Mr. Bodwell, K. C., and Mr. Luxton were present to watch the proceedings, and Messrs. Lugrin and Belyea looked in during the course of the sitting. The morning was devoted to consideration of the names of witnesses proposed to be subpoenaed, and in the afternoon Mr. Wm. Wilson, an employer of non-union labor, and Mr. Twigg, a unionist employee of the Colonist, were examined at some length.

At the opening of the proceedings the Chief Justice stated that the commission would like to hear any person who had any material evidence to offer. He especially mentioned non-union workers, and employers of non-union labor, as he was well aware that such persons had a repugnance to come forward and give evidence. He explicitly stated that if any would-be witnesses were afraid to make any statements in public, fearing intimidation or coercion, the commission would receive them in private. It was the intention of the commission to seek evidence from every side of the question, and to get at the root of the present troubles, and he hoped that people would come forward who were willing to give evidence and had honest opinions to offer. It was the desire of the commission to deal fair and square with the labor question from all points of view.

Mr. Bodwell, K. C., stated that he had some witnesses who would appear tomorrow. Some were afraid, and would have to be subpoenaed. He only represented the E. & N. Railway Company, and as regards the coal mines, the Wellington Colliery Company, and he could not go outside his instructions without inviting censure. It would be much better for the working commission to appoint their own counsel.

The Chief Justice pointed out that this would lay the commission open to the charge of partizanship, but Mr. Bodwell still thought not. He thought that an impartial counsel watching the proceedings for the government, would draw public confidence, and be of considerable assistance in the enquiry. The responsibility of calling witnesses beyond his own instructions was not on him. He was sure that witnesses would not come forward voluntarily, they would have to be subpoenaed.

The Chief Justice said that of course people would understand that any information as to names of persons who could give evidence should be given in to the secretary, Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King, and these persons would be summoned. He wanted to see in the court people who had material and honest evidence to offer.

An adjournment was here taken to afford certain witnesses time to appear, but as they had not put in an appearance by half-past twelve, the court adjourned until 2 o'clock.

The first witness who took the stand in the afternoon was Mr. Wm. Wilson, plumber of Broad street, examined by the commissioners. He stated that his firm had eight employees. There were no unionists amongst them. One of his employees was coerced into leaving. This man came back to him in less than a month, and wished to be employed again, as he could get only three days a week work (to the best of the witness' recollection) at the union shop where he had found employment. He then worked for witness' firm for over a year, and was now in business on his own account in Victoria. Witness stated that his firm did not employ union labor. He preferred non-union men. He would not go so far as to refuse union labor, but would conduct his business as he saw fit. So long as he was master he would do his business in his own way.

To the Chief Justice, he said that he understood that his firm was advertised at the Labor Hall as a "scab shop" in large type, so that the blind could feel it. This, however, cut no figure with him. It had been going on now some two months. He did not think his business was affected by it. He could not say whether others also were posted. He had never received any notice from the union of the posting. In the labor column of the Colonist some three weeks or a month ago there had been a notice stating that his shop was an "unfair shop." An "unfair shop" was one in which the union rules were not complied with. Asked his objection to employing union men, he said that it was pretty near time for a business man to close his place of business if he had to be dictated to by his employees as to the hours of labor, wages, etc. His experience was that union men and non-union men employed together did not mix. As to the remedy for strikes, he said it was a pretty hard question. The labor market seemed to be overdone. There was a surplus of labor. Questioned about state interference, he thought that would be the death blow to politicians. Nobody would take up the cause. All wanted votes, and "votes tell." There was nothing to prevent a rich man making a corner in flour, tea, etc., but the unions made a corner in labor. There was one thing working men did not take into consideration, and that was that they got their wages long before their employers got returns from their labor. In witness's shop wages were paid very Saturday night. There was little bookkeeping done, but that was too much. It was months, years before profits accrued, and sometimes there were no profits at all. His firm paid the same wages as under the union scale, which was $2.50, $3.00 and $3.50 a day.

To Rev. Dr. Elliott S. Rowe witness replied that he had one apprentice—not a member of his family. There were two adult employees in his shop outside his own family.

To the Chief Justice witness could not tell why his shop was posted as "unfair" unless it was to make his men join the union. There was no reason why this should be done now more than any other time. About a year ago a Master Plumber's Union was formed. His firm had not joined it and was the only one that refused to do so. There were 13 members. He did not think their action affected his business. They tried to convince him that it would be to his advantage to join the union. He could not say whether it was the Journeymen Plumber's Union that posted his firm, but he thought it was done by Colbert, the secretary of that body. The Master Plumbers Union was not altogether an Employers' Union. The Journeymen's was a regular union, and every member had to be a union man. The Master Plumber's Union was formed just prior to the Journeymen Plumber's Union, about a year ago.

Thomas Henry Twigg was then called. He stated that he was a printer, had lived in Victoria five years, and was employed at the Colonist office. He was a member of the Typographical Union, which was an international concern, and had its headquarters at Indianapolis. He could not tell how many men were in the local union, but there 57,000 in the total organization. A strike would be decided upon by secret ballot. As to the central executive having power to order members out on strike the commissioners could get particulars from Mr. Ward, the local representative. He thought there was power at headquarters to order a strike, or the charter of a union could be suspended. He had never heard of any such suspension. So long as seven members remained the charter would stay with them. The qualification for membership was five years at the work, and competency. Witness thought there could be a sympathetic strike. There were no non-union printers in Victoria.

The International Typographical union witness said was affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, which had one and a half million members, the largest labor organization in the world. The American Federation of Labor had made no expression of opinion as regards Socialism. Asked if the boycott was a proper weapon, witness said he could not speak for the union, but he himself thought it legitimate. He thought "picketing" all right. He would not altogether approve of posting up an employer as "unfair." The object of course was to let a union man know so that he could leave that employer severely alone, but witness thought the better plan would be to post up those employers who did patronize union labor, and the Chief Justice agreed with him.

Asked by the Chief Justice if the effect of "posting" would render a man hateful to the union, witness said that was a strong word. He would prefer a milder one, even milder than obnoxious, he would say objectionable. The remedy for strikes was conciliation first, then perhaps arbitration without being binding. He thought public sentiment strong enough, it generally sided with the right. He did not think compulsory arbitration possible. Even a Supreme Court judge, witness thought, could hardly intelligently appreciate the difficulties of the working man.

Witness did not discriminate between strikes which affect the public generally and those affecting only individuals. The Chief Justice thought there was a difference between a strike of newspaper men and coal miners. The public could get along without newspapers, but not without coal. Witness did not look as if he quite agreed.

In further examination, witness said he had heard of blacklisting. The Trades and Labor Council of Victoria was seeking incorporation. Witness did not think there was any feeling of nationality between Canadian and American workmen. No one trade in Canada was strong enough to run a successful union. Witness' union dues were 75 cents a month. He was not liable for assessment unless under a referendum vote. If a non-union printer came to Victoria he would get a permit to work until the next meeting of the union, otherwise it would be practically impossible for him to find employment. Asked if the same conditions were imposed on binding, machinists, and pressroom employees, witness replied that it would be proper for union printers to walk out if non-union men were set to repair machines. Non-union men might get work in Los Angeles, where there was an "unfair" paper the Times, which worked men 15 hours a day, and a few other places—not at Dawson.

To Rev. Dr. Elliott S. Rowe witness said that to get into another union after that would depend on a man's previous career. He might have to pay a penalty at the discretion of the local union.

To the Chief Justice, witness said that if all the boilermakers in Canada joined, their organization would be strong enough for ordinary purposes.

The commission now adjourned until 2:30 p. m. when Mr. Bodwell called upon Mr. C. A. Gregg, late editor of the Rossland Miner, to give evidence as to the authenticity of the statements made in the articles referred to. Witness said that the articles where signed were accounts of genuine documents, where they reported interviews between the miners and the Board of Trade there were actual occurrences. He himself had to deal with the matter, and knew that the statements of actual fact were correct. None had ever been questioned. Reports were taken by a reporter of the paper, and Messrs. McDonald and Kirby, mine managers, had furnished statements. The Rossland Miner was the organ of the mine owners, the Rossland Evening World of the men.

The commissioners said they would try and obtain copies of both papers.

The examination of George Penkith was now resumed. He said that if non-union men had been put to work on the Garonne, the union men would have gone out on strike. He did not think the local union had broken faith with Mr. Seabrook, because there was no strike of boilermakers at Seattle when they had promised to work.

To Rev. Dr. Elliott S. Rowe witness said his own personal obligation would have been greater to the Albion Iron Works than to the union. If an agreement were made by a local union without conditions, the central authority would have power to order a breach of the contract. The union did not discuss Socialistic doctrines. All striking questions were settled by ballot. The principle the union fought for was to maintain a standard rate of wages. The effect of unionism was to promote better understanding between employers and employed.

To the Chief Justice witness said he believed in a man being persuaded into the union, not threatened. He approved of picketing so far as speaking to a man went, he did not like to see men posted up.

Examined by Mr. Bodwell, he said that individuals were not posted, but only shops. The fact of paying union wages to non-union men would not be "unfair," but the shop would not be recognized as a union shop.

To the Commissioners—The Garonne business was a system of boycott. The union was a secret society. The boilermakers were affiliated with the Dominion Labor Congress. His membership dues amounted to 50 cents a month, paid 25 cents to Kansas, six cents to the Dominion Labor Congress and the balance used for local purposes.

Harry F. Bullen, manager of the British Columbia Marine Railway Company, Limited, was next called. Witness, examined by Mr. Bodwell, said the company has works in Victoria, Esquimalt, and Vancouver. The business was building, docking, etc. The average number of men employed was 150 to 200. The works employed men of several unions. The proportion of workers in metal to those in wood was as 30 to 70. The company recognized nearly all the unions of its men. The union would interfere if he employed a metal worker where a wood worker would do. He could not so employ him against wishes of union. His firm had had labor troubles. Last year he employed two men who belonged to the Vancouver Shipwrights' union. They had been working on the Venature in Victoria, employed by some one else since leaving Vancouver, but directly witness employed them his union employees refused to work with them. A meeting was held, and a resolution passed that the local union men would not work with members of Vancouver union without local consent. I sent for the executive and told them that we wanted these men, and if all men were not back at their work at 1 p. m., their services would no longer be required. They did not come to work, and the secretary called the men off. The men termed this a "lock out"; we called it a "strike." The trouble lasted two weeks, at the end of which time, through the offices of Mr. Twigg and the Trades and Labor Council a settlement was reached. Our terms were conceded to use outside men if not sufficient, others available. A year ago also he had a steamer here for repairs from the American side. Having employed all the available union men, we asked permission to put on outside handy men for despatch, but the union, after a meeting could not grant the request, though it was explained to them that the longer the vessel lay there the worse for our own interests. As a consequence the boat could not be got away in time, though our agreement was to expedite the work. Witness had employed men from America, but objections were raised that the men from the other side were not of so high a class as the men here. The difficulty was to get enough good men here. The trouble with us is that we frequently require to "rush" a job. Our custom was to put on all men available, but union men would not stand this! We had to send away one vessel, the Salome, in consequence. It was a serious thing both to ourselves and to the port to have vessels go away like that. There were several such occurrences. They were bad for the port, because if work done on a boat should be unsatisfactory that boat would not return to Victoria again for repairs. However, his company had thrashed out their labor troubles after the strike, and had settled their difficulties with the union amicably.

Asked if he thought a permanent conciliation board would be useful, witness said yes, if outside any political or other influences. In case of arbitration it might be better to have the third arbitrator appointed by a judge of the Supreme Court. With Mr. Bodwell witness agreed that a permanent official for this port might be better qualified, but he would have to be beyond influence.

To the Chief Justice, witness complained that union men do not sufficiently realize that employers require consideration, and that the interests of employer and employee are identical. They are too apt to consider selfish interest.

However, they do not take sufficient interest in their meetings. The advantages of unionism were a uniform scale of wages, and all employers placed on the same footing. The amicable agreement he had entered into with his men was for a six months notice of either strike or lock out, thus providing time for a peaceful discussion of any question at issue.

To Rev. Dr. Elliott S. Rowe, witness said that understanding with the unions amongst his men were always carried out. He would sooner deal with unions that were not international. He felt more secure with them.

Simon Leiser was the next witness. Examined by Mr. Bodwell, he said that his firm carried on business at Victoria, Comox and Ladysmith. At Comox 12 years and at Ladysmith two years. He had no experience of a general strike at Comox, but that at Ladysmith was disastrous. His firm did business there from here. Since the strike their business had fallen off 50 per cent. Their direct store business had fallen off 25 per cent. Collection of outstandings had also fallen off 25 per cent., and if the strike continued there would probably be permanent losses on goods already sold. It could not be otherwise. Every kind of business was affected, but groceries more particularly. During the Kootenay strikes business fell right away and many Victoria houses had recalled their travelers. The pay roll of the Wellington Colliery Company was some $70,000 to $75,000, and witness estimated that all of 50 per cent. of this amount was directly added to Victoria's business.

To the Chief Justice, witness said he thought the entire loss to trade per month was considerably supplies and everything else, was $250,000.

At Mr. Bodwell's request, witness said he would try and get an estimate of the shrinkage per month in Victoria's trade due to the Fernie, Rossland, Vancouver, and recent strikes.

To Rev. Dr. Elliott S. Rowe, witness said there were always business failures during strikes.

The Chief Justice asked if witness had any suggestion as to the settlement of strikes. Witness thought that the government would have to settle them, probably by arbitration and the third arbitrator ought to be appointed by the Dominion government.

To Mr. Bodwell.—His idea would be to let local considerations influence the appointment of a permanent adjudicator, but he should be a common sense business man above everything.

The commission then adjourned till 11 a. m. today.

(From Wednesday's Daily.)

The secretary of the commission has been very busy the last two days subpoenaeing witnesses to appear before the commission, and the indications is that an enquiry of forthcoming evidence will necessitate the commissioners sitting in Victoria all this week instead of adjourning to Ladysmith on Thursday, as originally intended. The session was resumed at 11 a. m. yesterday morning, when R. B. Seabrook, ex-manager of the Albion Iron Works was put in the stand. He had lived 33 years in Victoria, and had been eight years manager of the Albion Iron Works. The number of men employed varied from 99 to 300. Asked as to labor troubles his firm had over the ship Garonne, he stated that that ship was under contract for certain repairs at Moran's, Seattle, but the moulders and machinists were on strike there, and the contract could not be fulfilled. He approached the owner, Mr. F. Waterhouse, and made a contract with him to undertake the work specified in the original contract, which was to completely boilers, engine work, repair bulkheads, etc. Before doing so he had a meeting with the Boilermakers' Union in Victoria, and was assured by them that he could fairly undertake the work. There was then no strike of boilermakers in Seattle. He made the contract accordingly, guaranteeing expenses of the ship both ways, and the ship was brought over to Victoria. With it, however, came a committee of Seattle boilermakers, who had declared a strike two days before. This committee asked a meeting of the Victoria boilermakers and proclaimed the job an unfair one. The consequence was that his own men, after promising to do the work, refused to do it. This was about March 1895. He had several meetings with his men, the officers of the local union being present. The Seattle strike was for better wages, and he offered his men their own terms—better than were contemplated in the contract, but could do nothing with them. He was consequently obliged to send the ship back to Seattle. About $300 worth of work had then been done on her, and the firm's loss altogether was a little more than $1,250. He pointed out that Mr. Waterhouse and himself were the sufferers, and not Mr. Moran, but his men said they could not go to work owing to their instructions from the meeting, and as it was against the rules of the International Union to work under the circumstances. The union afterwards offered to reimburse the firm for its loss. The contract involved a sum of some $30,000, of which about $23,000 would have been expended locally in wages.

To Mr. Bodwell, K. C., witness replied that the promise of his men to work would have been carried out, but for the visit of the committee from Seattle.

Replying to the Chief Justice, witness said that 90 per cent. of his firm's employees were union men. An average of 25 men were employed in the boilermaker's shop. He had had further trouble over a job on H. M. S. Amphion. The union boilermakers would not work with non-union men. He believed in unionism because all shops had to pay the same wages, and employers could know better how to figure out contracts.

To Rev. Dr. Rowe he said that his men had preferred taking the lower wages they were previously receiving to working on the Garonne.

Examined by Mr. Bodwell, he said it was his experience that rates of wages established in times of good profits were still maintained by the unions even though the profits were poor. That meant cessation of business in the country. If union men were idle in Victoria employers could not go outside for labor.

Further questioned, witness said that his firm had another strike over repairs to the City of Topeka. In the contract made he had figured on a nine hour working day, but foreign agitators came in and help up the work for an eight hour day. The strikers were excluded from the works for nine months, during which he had no union men in the boiler shop. The non-union men were handy helpers. Their pay was $3.50 a day. The union boilermakers were subject to interference from Seattle, San Francisco and Denver. His firm was cut out of a contract for work on the steamer Horda by interference from San Francisco.

To the Chief Justice—He need not consult with union before dismissing a man, but could simvly lay him off without giving reason.

To Rev. Dr. Elliott S. Rowe—He might discriminate between men in wages, but might not pay less than $3.50 a day.

Asked by the Chief Justice his opinion as to method of appointment of a third arbitrator on a board of conciliation, witness said he would have him appointed by a Supreme Court judge.

To Mr. Bodwell he said that he did not consider that a permanent official labor arbitrator would be an improvement on a specially appointed third arbitrator, for each particular case. It seemed to Mr. Bodwell that a permanent official would be better qualified.

To Rev. Dr. Elliott S. Rowe, witness said he was present at the Seattle committee meeting, but could not argue with it. Most of the labor troubles in the country came from the American side. In 1891 his firm had lost contracts on two ships in Seattle, and one in Tacoma, the sums involved aggregating over $100,000, of which about $70,000 would have been spent in wages in Victoria. During the nine months when his firm kept open shop, a few bills were distributed and notices posted proclaiming it "unfair" shop. The strike in Seattle was still on.

Before the next witness was called Mr. Bodwell desired to draw the attention of the commissioners to a series of articles which had appeared in the Rossland Miner relative to the strikes in that part. These articles were very interesting, giving details of what was going on from dey to day, with a historical review of the situation. The dates of the publications were 1901—July 14, 16, 17, and 30; August 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 23 and 27; and September 1, 17 and 29. He asked leave to call Mr. C. A. Gregg, the then editor of the paper, during the afternoon, to show how he had verified the statements that appeared in his paper. Leave was granted.

Geo. Penkith was the next witness. He said that his business was a boilermaker. He had been president of the local union. This was a branch of the Boilermakers & Iron Ship Builders of America. This union had branch unions all over the continent of America, and had a roll of 15,000 to 20,000 members. Its headquarters were in Kansas City. The local union contains about 35 members. Members were not sworn to loyalty to the rules of the unions, but were under that obligation. Witness was a trustee of the local union. He had been president of it in 1901 while working at the Albion Iron Works. What Mr. Seabrook had said with regard to the Garonne trouble was pretty fair. He should not, however, have brought the vessel from Seattle after the boilermakers there went out on strike. That had happened two days before. The men were willing to work until the Seattle committee came over and told them not to. This committee was composed of two Americans and one British Columbian. The local union had wired to the head union at Kansas City for instructions and had been told to work in conjunction with the Seattle union.

To Mr. Bodwell witness allowed that to arrive at an opinion as to whether the job would be considered "unfair" they had to consult the two lodges at Kansas and Seattle. He said that their charter might be taken away if they disobeyed the Kansas order. That would mean that each individual member would be "posted" all over the world.

To Rev. Dr. Elliott S. Rowe witness said that to get into another union after that would depend on a man's previous career. He might have to pay a penalty at the discretion of the local union.

To the Chief Justice, witness said that if all the boilermakers in Canada joined, their organization would be strong enough for ordinary purposes.

The commission now adjourned until 2:30 p. m. when Mr. Bodwell called upon Mr. C. A. Gregg, late editor of the Rossland Miner, to give evidence as to the authenticity of the statements made in the articles referred to. Witness said that the articles where signed were accounts of genuine documents, where they reported interviews between the miners and the Board of Trade there were actual occurrences. He himself had to deal with the matter, and knew that the statements of actual fact were correct. None had ever been questioned. Reports were taken by a reporter of the paper, and Messrs. McDonald and Kirby, mine managers, had furnished statements. The Rossland Miner was the organ of the mine owners, the Rossland Evening World of the men.

The commissioners said they would try and obtain copies of both papers.

The examination of George Penkith was now resumed. He said that if non-union men had been put to work on the Garonne, the union men would have gone out on strike. He did not think the local union had broken faith with Mr. Seabrook, because there was no strike of boilermakers at Seattle when they had promised to work.

To Rev. Dr. Elliott S. Rowe witness said his own personal obligation would have been greater to the Albion Iron Works than to the union. If an agreement were made by a local union without conditions, the central authority would have power to order a breach of the contract. The union did not discuss Socialistic doctrines. All striking questions were settled by ballot. The principle the union fought for was to maintain a standard rate of wages. The effect of unionism was to promote better understanding between employers and employed.

To the Chief Justice witness said he believed in a man being persuaded into the union, not threatened. He approved of picketing so far as speaking to a man went, he did not like to see men posted up.

Examined by Mr. Bodwell, he said that individuals were not posted, but only shops. The fact of paying union wages to non-union men would not be "unfair," but the shop would not be recognized as a union shop.

To the Commissioners—The Garonne business was a system of boycott. The union was a secret society. The boilermakers were affiliated with the Dominion Labor Congress. His membership dues amounted to 50 cents a month, paid 25 cents to Kansas, six cents to the Dominion Labor Congress and the balance used for local purposes.

Harry F. Bullen, manager of the British Columbia Marine Railway Company, Limited, was next called. Witness, examined by Mr. Bodwell, said the company has works in Victoria, Esquimalt, and Vancouver. The business was building, docking, etc. The average number of men employed was 150 to 200. The works employed men of several unions. The proportion of workers in metal to those in wood was as 30 to 70. The company recognized nearly all the unions of its men. The union would interfere if he employed a metal worker where a wood worker would do. He could not so employ him against wishes of union. His firm had had labor troubles. Last year he employed two men who belonged to the Vancouver Shipwrights' union. They had been working on the Venature in Victoria, employed by some one else since leaving Vancouver, but directly witness employed them his union employees refused to work with them. A meeting was held, and a resolution passed that the local union men would not work with members of Vancouver union without local consent. I sent for the executive and told them that we wanted these men, and if all men were not back at their work at 1 p. m., their services would no longer be required. They did not come to work, and the secretary called the men off. The men termed this a "lock out"; we called it a "strike." The trouble lasted two weeks, at the end of which time, through the offices of Mr. Twigg and the Trades and Labor Council a settlement was reached. Our terms were conceded to use outside men if not sufficient, others available. A year ago also he had a steamer here for repairs from the American side. Having employed all the available union men, we asked permission to put on outside handy men for despatch, but the union, after a meeting could not grant the request, though it was explained to them that the longer the vessel lay there the worse for our own interests. As a consequence the boat could not be got away in time, though our agreement was to expedite the work. Witness had employed men from America, but objections were raised that the men from the other side were not of so high a class as the men here. The difficulty was to get enough good men here. The trouble with us is that we frequently require to "rush" a job. Our custom was to put on all men available, but union men would not stand this! We had to send away one vessel, the Salome, in consequence. It was a serious thing both to ourselves and to the port to have vessels go away like that. There were several such occurrences. They were bad for the port, because if work done on a boat should be unsatisfactory that boat would not return to Victoria again for repairs. However, his company had thrashed out their labor troubles after the strike, and had settled their difficulties with the union amicably.

Asked if he thought a permanent conciliation board would be useful, witness said yes, if outside any political or other influences. In case of arbitration it might be better to have the third arbitrator appointed by a judge of the Supreme Court. With Mr. Bodwell witness agreed that a permanent official for this port might be better qualified, but he would have to be beyond influence.

To the Chief Justice, witness complained that union men do not sufficiently realize that employers require consideration, and that the interests of employer and employee are identical. They are too apt to consider selfish interest.

However, they do not take sufficient interest in their meetings. The advantages of unionism were a uniform scale of wages, and all employers placed on the same footing. The amicable agreement he had entered into with his men was for a six months notice of either strike or lock out, thus providing time for a peaceful discussion of any question at issue.

To Rev. Dr. Elliott S. Rowe, witness said that understanding with the unions amongst his men were always carried out. He would sooner deal with unions that were not international. He felt more secure with them.

Simon Leiser was the next witness. Examined by Mr. Bodwell, he said that his firm carried on business at Victoria, Comox and Ladysmith. At Comox 12 years and at Ladysmith two years. He had no experience of a general strike at Comox, but that at Ladysmith was disastrous. His firm did business there from here. Since the strike their business had fallen off 50 per cent. Their direct store business had fallen off 25 per cent. Collection of outstandings had also fallen off 25 per cent., and if the strike continued there would probably be permanent losses on goods already sold. It could not be otherwise. Every kind of business was affected, but groceries more particularly. During the Kootenay strikes business fell right away and many Victoria houses had recalled their travelers. The pay roll of the Wellington Colliery Company was some $70,000 to $75,000, and witness estimated that all of 50 per cent. of this amount was directly added to Victoria's business.

To the Chief Justice, witness said he thought the entire loss to trade per month was considerably supplies and everything else, was $250,000.

At Mr. Bodwell's request, witness said he would try and get an estimate of the shrinkage per month in Victoria's trade due to the Fernie, Rossland, Vancouver, and recent strikes.

To Rev. Dr. Elliott S. Rowe, witness said there were always business failures during strikes.

The Chief Justice asked if witness had any su