

—but I incline to believe in view of the fact the men accepted the settlement as it was made, partly to relieve the public of suffering, we can consistently look forward to all assistance possible in having that settlement adhered to by all concerned. We recognize the great help you and other members of the government rendered to the men in connection with the matter, and we appreciate your desire that the settlement should in honour be carried out.

Then, on February 10, hon. members of the House will remember that the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) asked me some questions in regard to the settlement. It appears that on February 7 that hon. member wrote to both the representatives of the conductors and trainmen's organizations and sent them a communication somewhat as follows:

I inclose a copy of questions I intend to ask in the House and would be glad to have your view of the situation. I have for a good many years endeavoured to advance the interests of railway employees where I could, and have been in close communication with the men at Allandale. The railway contention now is that although there was a settlement, the men who came back, came back as new men and were not restored to a claim on pension fund.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) HAUGHTON LENNOX.

That is addressed to S. N. Berry, Esq., 53 Beatrice St., Toronto. These communications were forwarded to me by both the officers of these organizations, without any knowledge on my part of their having received them. They sent them to me, thinking it important that I should be informed of all that had taken place. I will not attempt to read what was said in reply in full, but I will read what Mr. Berry and Mr. Murdock have said in part in reply to the communications of the hon. member for Simcoe. In a letter dated Toronto, February 27, 1911, Mr. Berry writes:

Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir:—

I hand you therewith copy of letter to me from Mr. Lennox, M.P., under date of the 7th instant. I fully intended to inclose a copy of this letter when sending you a copy of my reply to same.

I have no objections to matters of this kind being made public, as I trust all concerned, having nothing but the interests of the unemployed employees of the Grand Trunk railway who participated in the strike, in view, when making inquiries of this kind.

I wish to assure you my desire is that politics be kept entirely out of this question, and I do hope that any gentleman interesting himself in this matter, does so from the view point that it is justice what we want and hope to get for those men.

I am, yours very truly,
(Sgd) S. N. BERRY.
Vice-President, O. R. C.

Mr. Murdock, vice-president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen sent me the following communication:

Grand Union Hotel, Montreal
February 20, 1911.

Hon. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I inclose herewith copy of letter this day written to Mr. Haughton Lennox, M.P., in answer to a letter that he sent me under date of February 7, requesting certain information, in the form of the following question:

He gives these questions and then adds:

It occurs to me that you might be interested in reading these questions which, I presume, you have heard heretofore, and that you might also like to see the answer that I have made to the questions as asked.

Very truly yours,
(Sgd) JAMES MURDOCK.

The letter to Mr. Lennox is rather long but this is the way it concludes. It is a communication sent in answer to the questions put by the hon. member from the other side of the House, and I think it correctly answers the third part of my hon. friend's amendment in which he expresses regret that the government has not tried to compel Mr. Hays to effectively carry out the agreement. Mr. Murdock in his letter says:

In conclusion, it might not be amiss—

Mr. BLAIN. Why not read the whole letter?

Mr. KING. Very well. I may say that the questions put to Mr. Murdock were in this form:

Was the settlement of July 31 last between the Grand Trunk railway and its employees in train and yard service:

(a) Intended and understood to put an end to all then existing disputes and difficulties.

(b) Was it understood that the men would be put back in the positions they held previous to the strike.

(c) Was it understood that the men would be reinstated.

This is Mr. Murdock's reply:

Montreal, February 20, 1911.

Mr. Haughton Lennox, M.P., Ottawa, Ont.
Dear Sir,—Your letter of February 7, with which was inclosed three questions relative to the settlement of the Grand Trunk strike, has only just reached me, hence the delay in my replying.

I will answer your questions in order as given.

(a) Yes, most positively hoped for and understood.

(b) Yes, without reservation it was expected that the undertaking that Mr. Hays gave to ministers of the Crown on August 2 as to his intended application of paragraph 1 of the agreement made on July 31, contemplated that all men who had gone on strike