

especially when there is a demand for conciliation made to the Government of the country. I would ask the Minister of Labour why it is that for that long period, from May 8, 1913, up to very late in the year, that is to say for five and a half months, nothing at all appears in this report. Is it that the Minister of Labour was sleeping on that, or was the department sleeping on it? Are we to believe that the fair wage officers out in the West were advised not to send any correspondence of any kind, or was it understood that for five and a half long months they were not to do so? Not a single line of correspondence appears in this return. The strike was on, and if nothing was done probably it was owing to a letter received from the secretary of Sir William Mackenzie himself, in which he says that the men had acknowledged that they had made a great mistake in the way the strike was declared, and that, of course, they should have given thirty days' notice.

I suppose the minister, with the love he has for international unions, was hoping that international trades unionism would break up at any moment. How can he say the strike was not sanctioned by headquarters when the men are still being paid to-day? From the beginning to the end the men have done all in their power to get this strike settled; they even went to the provincial Government.

But, whether the men were right or wrong, or whether the operators were at fault, is not the question. We must not look at one side of the question only, and only one side has been put before this House. We must not try to prove that the men were absolutely wrong and the operators absolutely right. We have to consider the matter from both sides. Men were put in jail and kept there a certain length of time, but that does not prove they were guilty. I am not prepared to say that some men have not done wrong; far from it. If the operators have done wrong, why does not the minister come right out and state the exact conditions? My experience in the labour movement has taught me something about operators, not only operators of mines, but of other industries. They are very careful what they say. They do not say to the men: I am going to fire you because you are a member of the union; far from it. They do not say: We will not hold a conference with you because you are union men. In this particular case the miners asked for a joint committee to

hear the case. The company at first agreed to that, but afterwards they said: We do not like the committee that has been chosen, we want men who are now working for us. There is just as much sense in that as in the Government getting three of its employees to make an investigation. We could not expect them to be impartial. In September last a convention was held in Montreal. I am not going to tell the minister what was said about him there. My hon. friend is reported to have said at that time: 'Oh, I can state in two words why the congress was against me.' I hope that he will give the House those two words. It was suggested at that convention that the Prime Minister should ask for the resignation of the Minister of Labour. That was outside of the jurisdiction of the Trades and Labour Congress, I know. I am not going to ask that, but before I sit down, I will make a certain motion. Just now, I will ask the minister to tell us what has happened during the five and a half months since May 8, 1913, because

this correspondence does not
4 p.m. cover that period at all. Did
any correspondence pass between the minister or the officers of his department, and the mine owners? He may answer that he has already given me a return. It seems to me that when a motion is made for correspondence in connection with a strike, everything should be brought down, and I would like to ask the minister why the operators' side of this question has not been brought down in this return. We cannot discuss the question intelligently without that. I leave it to the House to decide why the correspondence has not been brought down. Perhaps the House will believe, as I do, that there is something wrong in the matter. The correspondence brought down covers very little. The latter part of it includes the report of the commissioner which has already been discussed in this House, and contains acknowledgements from different parties to whom a copy of the report was sent. I am not discussing that report now. My point is that for a year and a half nothing at all has been done, and during that time we have granted nearly \$16,000,000 to a company that was involved in that strike. Was it to fight the men or for some other reason?

I may be told that there is no strike on now, that the owners have all the men they want. It matters not what colour the men are. I do not want to go back to yesterday's discussion of the Asiatic question. My hon. friend knows more about that than I do. But one thing I know, it is