

was not accepted by them. My hon. friend knows very well that strikes occurred amongst the miners in the western coal fields in 1903, 1906, 1907, 1909 and 1911, the last being the most serious one, lasting for eight months. In that region of the coal mining industry there has not been anything like a prolonged strike since 1911, so that my hon. friend has not received, from the coal miners of the West, any information either for or against the Act, because it has not been used at all. It appears that he attended one meeting of the Trades and Labour Council at the city of Saskatoon, and there he heard somebody who knew nothing about the Act—because in Saskatoon there had never been an exercise of it but once, and that between the civic authorities and their employees—make certain observations, and still he comes here and denounces the administration of the Act, and speaks about our making some efforts to secure the observance of the Act by employers. Had he taken a few minutes to come to our office and inquire either from the deputy minister or myself, he would have found out something about the efforts that we do make and make successfully.

My hon. friend referred to a board that was appointed between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and their conductors when there was a serious strike, which was finally settled temporarily by an agreement signed by the late manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in June, 1910. When I was placed in charge of the Labour Department in the autumn of 1911 that agreement had not been carried out by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Among other things, the agreement provided that all men who had been on strike and had not been guilty of any violation of the law would be reinstated within 90 days, and that all the men should be paid a certain advance in salary to date from the month of May immediately preceding the July when the agreement was entered into. A county court judge of the province of Ontario was appointed to ascertain how many of these men were entitled to reinstatement under the terms of the agreement who had not already been reinstated and he found there were 138. This judge was chosen by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, if I remember right, the Government approving their choice. But the Grand Trunk refused to reinstate these men. One of the first things I did after taking charge of the department was to urge Mr. Hays to carry

out the terms of that agreement. But he refused to do it for me, as he had refused to do it for my predecessor. A few months afterwards, however, the Grand Trunk came to this House for legislation. I do not know whether my hon. friend was a member of the Railway Committee at that time or not, but if he was and was present he will probably remember that I took the position that the committee should not approve of the legislation they were seeking until the company carried out the terms of that agreement. I had an opportunity of discussing the matter with the late manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, Charles M. Hays, and I told him frankly, "You will get no legislation, if I can prevent it, until you have carried out that agreement," and I told him of the findings of Judge Barron, who had been appointed to make the inquiry. I mentioned that there were 138 conductors who had not been guilty of any violation of the law and were entitled to reinstatement. "Why," he said, "I never heard of such a report. I should like to see it." I said, "Come right along to the office and I will show it to you. I have it right in the judge's own handwriting." But he had to catch a train and could not come, so he asked me to send him a copy, and I did. The result was that in five or six months after this Government came into power, these men were reinstated. All were reinstated who wished to be, and not only that, but they received back pay representing an increase in wages from the 20th of May. I think it was, up to July. I have sent out bunches of twenty cheques at a time to these men covering their back pay. That is one instance where my hon. friend could have ascertained, if he had called at the office, that we had used what influence we had—and some of my friends thought I was very drastic—to coerce employers into accepting these awards.

There was another case not long since of a railway company refusing to carry out a unanimous award. The man who was chosen by the railway company was a railway man of long experience, and he joined with the other two in saying that the men should do so and so, and the company so and so. A high official of the company came to see me and pointed out how impossible it would be for them to carry out the award. I said "I won't discuss the matter with you. I do not know anything about it and you know all about it. All I know is that the man you appointed agreed with the other two in the award and that you refused to carry it out. Why