

American unionists, is because they believe it to be to their advantage and because they do not believe it is derogatory to their position, or to the interests of Canada that they should so identify themselves. These are the facts, and if, as my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) has stated the employers of labour in the port of Montreal have been arranging for the past six or nine months to have men in Montreal when navigation opened to take the place of the longshoremen; may I not without prejudicing the case say, that these employers placed themselves in a position to accentuate the hostility of the longshoremen; that they were doing what was likely to antagonize the longshoremen of Montreal, and to make a reasonable settlement more difficult? As the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) pointed out, there must be a recognition of the rights of both parties before a satisfactory settlement can be reached; there must be an observance of the golden rule. Except in a very extreme case, I have never known an instance where fair propositions for settlement were made by one or other of the parties, that these propositions did not eventuate in a satisfactory settlement. I hope that the efforts of the Minister of Labour will be crowned with success, but I repeat that a great deal of good would be done if he would take the House into his confidence and state who represents the government in Montreal, what has been done, how far he has succeeded in bringing the parties together, and what is the real reason why he has not been completely successful in his efforts. Before I take my seat, I again repudiate the statement that foreign agitators are the cause of this trouble in Montreal. I am sure the hon. gentleman made the statement in good faith, but I do not believe that statement is susceptible of being substantiated. It is an insult to the Canadian workmen to say that they cannot recognize their own interests, and that they have been led away by men whom they do not know, to commit acts which may bring disaster on themselves and their families.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) refers to me, I wish to say that I did not make that statement. What I said was that the head of that organization was an American.

Mr. CLARKE. Then I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I understood him to say that the present strike in Montreal was caused by the presence of foreign agitators in the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It was the member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) who said that.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. I rise, as a newspaper man, to enter my protest against the statement of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith). He said that the newspapers

are always anxious to record the misdeeds of the workmen. Let me tell him at once that the newspapers have worked more harmoniously with the labour unions than with any other class of the community. In the printing office with which my name is connected there are as a rule about 250 men employed, and all or nearly all of them belong to labour unions, and we never have any trouble with them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. Nearly all the newspapers in Canada are employing union men. They are skilled tradesmen and I am proud to say that there is no class of men who give less trouble than the members of the Typographical Union. Suppose, for instance, that one of them gets on a spree and he is dismissed, there is no trouble over it and no objection made. I make this statement to correct the wrong impression which possibly may have been created in the minds of some hon. gentlemen here, that when union men are employed in an office or a shop, they are masters. That is not the case. One of my hon. friends near me, before I rose, asked me to state what I understood by the recognition of the union. It means undoubtedly that when you have admitted a labour union in your establishment, you must work with them; they work with you, and you must work with them.

Mr. CLARKE. The obligation is mutual.

Hon. Mr. TARTE. The question has been asked whether we are not in a free country; in other words, whether free labour, labour which is not connected with labour organizations, could not be employed along with union labour. I read a day or two ago a report of a meeting that took place in the month of December last in New York under the auspices of the National Civic Federation, of which Senator Hanna was the president. At that gathering the whole question was discussed very thoroughly. The contention of the labour unions to-day is that the individual workingman has no right to sell his labour outside of the union. I read that argument in very able speeches delivered by Mr. Gompers and by Mr. Keefe, who is president of the Longshoremen's Union. Their contention is that in these days of progress and of vast organizations of capital, the right of the labourmen to organize is as large and as broad as the right of capital, and that the individual workingman, selling his labour outside of the labour organizations, causes damage and injury to organizations that should be recognized as being for the best advantage of the country in which they exist. As my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Smith) says, there are two sides to this important question, and the sooner we recognize that fact the better, both from the labour standpoint and the capital standpoint. There is no use of denying to the workingmen the