

stand here as the representative, in any shape, of organized capital, but as a Canadian anxious to see fair play and fair dealings, and I think that my hon. friends, like my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee), are also anxious that there should be some fairness in the legislation we pass. This Bill is most unfair. The very fact of its being so flimsy, the very fact of their being so little in it, makes it all the more objectionable because when a Bill of this kind becomes law, that is the end of it. We are told this evening that international organized labour is an advantage to this country. The advantage to this country, under our existing laws, is that labouring men can go to the other side and get protection. We are very anxious on this side of the House that that matter should take a different turn and that we should be able to hold out inducements to these organized labour gentlemen to come to this country and be protected. We are anxious to give them the same protection here as they get on the other side, but I do not notice that the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) and the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) are supporting the policy of the opposition in this House—a policy which would place us in a better position to deal with labour and industries as they are dealt with on the other side of the line. The government should legislate for protection, not only for labour but for capital and industry in this country, and not bring down a Bill of this kind, that has nothing in it. The only inducement to pass a measure of this kind is to be found in clause four :

It shall be the duty of the conciliation committee to endeavour by conciliation and mediation to assist in bringing about an amicable settlement of the difference to the satisfaction of both parties, and to report its proceedings to the minister.

That is the whole thing in connection with this Bill. Well, we have that already. I do not see that you are going to put any more strength into it, or that you are going to place this Dominion of Canada in any better position to deal with conditions on the other side of the line by passing this Bill. Indeed, I think we shall be in a worse position, for we shall have made a pretense or an appearance of doing something while really doing nothing. Now, Sir, these labour strikes do not take place in this country of their own accord. There must be some motive power, some spirit in them; and that motive power and that spirit I assert again, notwithstanding what has been said on both sides of the House, comes from forces antagonistic to Canada on the other side of the line. Why should the port of Montreal be crippled at the present time? Simply because an endeavour is being made on this side of the line to provide a system of transportation by which the produce of this country will reach Europe through Canadian channels. I can understand New York

Mr. BROCK.

and Boston using all the means that are in their power to block the city of Montreal and the city of Quebec as much as they possibly can. How can they block them? Simply by promoting a system of strikes such as that taking place at the present time in Montreal.

Mr. MORIN. Or by destroying the Welland canal.

Mr. BROCK. Exactly. We know, Mr. Speaker, that, a few years ago, thinking that one of our vulnerable points was the Welland canal, men came over here in the interest, not altogether of the United States, but in the interests of disorganized labour in the United States, to blow up the locks of the Welland canal and so interrupt the transportation system of this country. Those who are standing for the improvement of our transportation system are being recognized in the United States as a force. So, organized labour is joined with organized hatred of Canada and Great Britain. For, make no mistake about it, that is the case. We know what is going on in the United States; we know that there is a party there antagonistic to Canada; we know from watching the debates in Washington that one of the strongest arguments there against anything that looks like reciprocity is to tell them that this will result in benefiting Canada, and it is voted down by an overwhelming majority. We cannot shut our eyes to these facts, we must recognize them. Therefore, what we should have on this side is something strong, something well defined—not such an effeminate Bill as this now before us. We want something that will assert ourselves as a nation. We are told by one of the hon. gentlemen on the other side that he has made this country a nation. Sir, we shall never make a nation with Bills of this kind. No one will respect them. We have heard the representatives of labour in this House, and even they are not satisfied with this Bill. And I am sure the country will not be satisfied with it. That is why I ask the government to withdraw this Bill and endeavour, at another session, to give us something stronger, something more manly, something more national. In this Bill we are dealing with disputes between railway companies and railway employees. The railway companies have capital to be attacked. You can bring them into court, get judgments against them and collect damages from them. But, on the other side, you have an organization which is no organization when you come to attack them. They simply scatter into fragments. You cannot sue them, you cannot collect damages from them, you cannot bring pressure upon them to make them amenable to the laws of the country. In the city of Montreal to-day damages to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars have been done by organized labour. What relief can we get? If organized labour is in the wrong,