

fore to settle a strike without recognition of the union is simply to lose the strike, so far as the employees are concerned; but to settle the strike, with recognition of the union, means that the officers of the union or its committee represent the other side to the bargain. That is all there is in recognition. The large majority of the men who are going to be affected by this Bill are not the brotherhoods who have endorsed it, but the other organizations, the majority of which have not yet been recognized by the companies; and I submit that that fact makes the inclusion of the clause which I have read all the more necessary. Without that clause, I believe the Bill will be weak, but with it, it will be strong. Now, instead of our having a new Bill, I believe the Conciliation Act should be amended. But because things are not done in just the way we wish, we must assume that there is some reason why they are done in another way. I regret that we have not been taken into the confidence of the hon. Minister of Labour and been told what the reason is. I think this principle should be included in the Conciliation Act, so that we may find out whether there is any value in it, or whether we should substitute anything else for it.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Yale and Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, as a representative of a district where there are a number of organizations of railway employees, I feel that I should say a few words on this Bill, more especially as I have been approached personally by members of those organizations, and have had forwarded to me resolutions relating to the Bill. Speaking personally, I believe a compulsory arbitration law would be in the interest of both employers and employees. However, I found an objection to such a measure on the part of the unions of railway employees. The chief difficulty seemed to be in the formation of the tribunal of arbitrators. They seemed also to think that the measure struck at the union to a certain extent. In this respect I am merely expressing what they said to me, not offering my own opinion. As this Bill was originally introduced by the hon. Minister of Labour last session, it provided for compulsory arbitration and copies were widely distributed for the consideration of those more particularly affected. In my district, the unions were opposed to the measure for the reasons I have stated. Then there was a second drafting of that Bill which was also objectionable, but in the present Bill these objections are removed by certain sections. I may say that I received resolutions asking me to oppose the Bill as introduced last session and as drafted the second time, but the gentlemen who represents in Ottawa the interest of the railway employees of Canada—at least he so assured me and I put faith in his assurance—went over the Bill with me very carefully, and he in-

structed me that the Bill as now drafted is satisfactory to railway employees. He also showed me letters which he had written to the unions, which had forwarded their protest against the measure, not as now submitted, but as drafted in the second place. At all events, he showed me the letters he had written, pointing out how the objections had been removed by certain clauses in the Bill now before the House, and assured me that it was satisfactory, and I have received no further instructions to oppose it. I do not agree in the opinion of the hon. leader of the opposition that this Bill is practically useless. Although there is no provision to enforce any award, there is a provision for compulsory investigation. In the case of a dispute, the employees should have no objection to the facts being made public and thoroughly investigated, so that the public may understand the points in dispute, nor should the employers have any objection to an investigation being had and being made public. Such being the case, this Bill, if it does nothing else, will have the effect of placing the matters in dispute before the public so that the public may judge who is in the right, and either party to the dispute will no doubt be very anxious to have the public opinion in their favour. There will at all events be the moral suasion of public opinion, and the ultimate success of either party will no doubt depend considerably on the verdict of the public. For those reasons I propose to vote in favour of this Bill.

Mr. W. R. BROCK (Toronto Centre). I did expect, Mr. Speaker, that we were going to have a Bill presented to us on this important question which would have some backbone in it. But instead we have a Bill which really amounts to nothing. In a question of this kind, we should not forget that there are two parties to the dispute. There is organized capital on the one side and organized labour on the other. In this Bill, we have provisions dealing with a corporate capacity, which can be attacked in the law courts, and from which damages may be exacted. I refer to the railway companies. But the other party affected by this measure and which is described in the Bill as 'labour,' is a body which occupies an entirely different position. No doubt, what is meant by the word 'labour' is organized labour, organized up to a certain point, and the most cowardly kind of organization—one that can attack capital but cannot be attacked in return. It seems to me that the first thing organized labour should do, if they want to be respected, is to organize under the laws of the country and place themselves in the same position as other organizations which we have incorporated. But they refuse to come under the law and are in the cowardly position of having neither a body to be kicked nor a soul to be damned. We are placing capital in a most unfair position. I do not