

so modified as to make it practically unworkable. On that occasion, when the hon. member for Essex stated that 160 went over from Canada and about 600 came in from the United States to work here—

Some hon. MEMBERS. The other way.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, reverse that—600 Canadians went over to work in the United States, and 160 came from the United States to work in Canada, and that statement appeared to meet with the approval of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, because he asked my hon. friend to repeat it the second time so that the House and the galleries might hear it; and he winked at the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) as if to say: I made a point in bringing that out. However, I want the Prime Minister now to redeem his pledge that he gave to this House and to this country that he would place on our Statute-book a duplicate of the American law that I hold in my hand. Such a Bill is now before the House, and I hope that before the session is closed the Prime Minister will take it up and place it on the Government Orders, and see that it becomes law.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member must not take advantage of this motion to discuss an order which he has himself on the paper.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am through now. I only ask that that pledge be redeemed and that the Bill now before the House may become law, but not such a law as we have now, which has been complained of by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke, a law that is being violated in his city, in the case of the strikes now taking place, by J. D. King & Co.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have only to say to my hon. friend, in answer to the latter part of his remarks, although they were out of order, that I expect this Bill of his will come up for discussion on Monday, and then we will have an opportunity of discussing the subject.

Mr. BRITTON. According to the statements of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), it would seem clear that a violation of the law has been committed, apparently by one of our Canadians, who is perfectly responsible and able to pay the penalty that the statute imposes for such violation. Now, this is not a question of the Government's policy at all. Therefore, there seems hardly any reason why the hon. gentleman should have brought this question up on a motion to adjourn, when the Orders of the Day were called, unless, apparently, he desired to make a point against the Government, that they were in some way remiss in enforcing the legislation that is on the Statute-book. Now, if this firm has violated the law in question, a simple remedy seems open to the hon. member, or to any one else, to secure redress. All he had to do

Mr. TAYLOR.

was to apply to the Attorney General to put the law in motion, and if he declined to take action, either the hon. member himself or any one else who is interested in having the law enforced, is entitled to start a prosecution. There is a plain law on the Statute-book that would cover what my hon. friend says has been done in Toronto, a heavy penalty is attached to the violation of that law. The Attorney General on his own motion might enforce the remedy, or he might authorize the hon. member for Toronto, or any other person interested in the enforcement of labour laws in Toronto or elsewhere, to take action and sue for a penalty. I submit, that the hon. gentleman has not any grievance, nor is there any grievance because of what has been done. If there is a violation, a plain remedy is provided, a remedy within the reach of any person. He may apply to the Attorney General to act in his own name, or if the Attorney General declines, then such person may institute proceedings on his own behalf.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Britton) thinks it is competent for any one to commence an action under this Act, but he evidently overlooks clause 8, which says:

No proceedings under this Act, or prosecutions for violation thereof, shall be instituted without the consent of the Attorney General or some person duly authorized by him.

If I am correctly informed, and I think I am, the labour unions protested against that clause of the Act, and claimed that in the event of its passing, it would make the Act inoperative. As evidence of that it need only be mentioned that the labour unions of Toronto have already consulted counsel as to how far they can proceed under the Act. If it was clear to them, they would not take the trouble to do so, but it is claimed they feel unable to take the action they think they should adopt in defence of their own interest on account of this obnoxious clause. If the Act was intended to be operative, why should not the position be the same as that under any other Act, and any citizen be able to avail himself of it and institute proceedings under it. In order to put the law in motion, why should it be necessary to obtain leave from the Attorney General? The Attorney General does not give his consent in advance to the law being applied in any part of the country, and so the hon. member for Essex (Mr. McGregor) applied to have some person appointed to carry out the Act, but it turned out that it was merely to wink at violations of the law. I thought it was a very strange position for the representative of the Attorney General to occupy, to know the law was violated and not interfere. A similar position is occupied by the hon. member for Toronto, who justifies this law, if I understand him correctly. I take it that the aim is to appoint some few officers favourable to their views and who will