

leaders upon the rest of the community. And I take this stand in the best interest of labour itself, because if labour, or any other group of men, should succeed in establishing a tyranny, destroying organized and regulated society, the first and the last and the greatest sufferers would be the poor and the lowly.

It is often said, and I think generally admitted—often admitted in this House—that organized labour has the right to order strikes, tie-ups even in the production of those things that are necessary, or almost necessary to the life of the state. This proposition I deny, and having denied the proposition I, of course, deny still more emphatically the right of any man, or group of men, to prevent another man from working when, where, and for whomsoever he pleases. The family is the unit and corner stone of the state—

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask my hon. friend to make that rule apply to all groups, whether of employers or of labourers?

Mr. HUGHES: Before I sit down I will answer my hon. friend on that point and give my opinion without any equivocation or reservation whatever. I have said that the family is the unit and corner stone of the state, and the father or head of every family has the right and duty of supporting his wife and children by the work of his hands or brain; and no other man, or no other group of men combined, have the right to take that right away from him, or hinder him, in the discharge of that obligation because it is inherent, it is fundamental, it is God-given. Whenever and wherever that right is taken away, and that duty interfered with the foundations of society are either injured or destroyed.

I have said that I absolutely deny the right of any labour union to order a strike, because I cannot give to labour unions greater rights and privileges than are accorded to other men and groups of men. If any man, or group of men, in the state get more than justice, some other man, or group of men, necessarily get less than justice. I think it has long been the law that a strike or mutiny on board ship is punished by the most severe penalties, because of the tremendous risks involved and the terrible suffering inflicted upon the innocent. For somewhat similar reasons a strike or mutiny in the army is punishable with instant death. No community can or should allow its firemen or policemen to go on strike—they must arbitrate. What would be thought of the doctors of a city, or the nurses of a hospital, who went on strike even against hard conditions? And it

[Mr. Hughes.]

would be still worse if they went out on a sympathetic strike. If such a thing happened public opinion would be so outraged that these men and women would be driven from the country of their birth or adoption, and no other country would allow them to enter. And what if the farmers and fishermen struck, or loafed on the job, and produced only enough food for their own sustenance? Of course such a thing is unthinkable; as well might the feet and hands strike against the head and refuse to work, or the head strike against the feet and hands and refuse to direct their operations. The fact of the matter is that modern society is so complex, and so complicated, we are all so dependent upon one another, that no nation can properly exist to-day without the hearty, sympathetic, honest co-operation of all its citizens; and no group of nations can prosper without the hearty, sympathetic and honest co-operation of each and all of them.

From what I have said it may be readily inferred that my condemnation of strikes though severe is mild compared to what my condemnation of lockouts would be, or even the bringing about of such a condition of things that strikes would be inevitable or probable. No punishment would be too severe for men who would or could be guilty of such crimes, because the head that would deliberately plan mischief against the feet and hands should be cut off from the body.

In this connection labour, and the community generally, have a grievance which I am prepared to voice. Labour says, with much truth I fear, that the over-capitalization and stock-watering of industrial corporations, and on which such excess capital or watered stock, dividends are often paid, gives money or value to men who are not entitled to it, raises the price of the things produced beyond their fair market value, and thus reduces the rewards of labour below the fair wage level. If this argument be sound,—and I feel there is much truth in it,—the policy or the manipulation which gives such results presses unfairly upon all classes in the community and helps no one except those who are its special beneficiaries. Legislation that permits such things is defective, legislation that encourages such things is bad, and will end in destruction, because, I repeat, if any man or group of men in the community get more than justice, some other man or group of men must necessarily get less than justice.

Mr. IRVINE: Which group does the hon. member think has got less than justice in the past few years?