it again in this session, although I fear it will suffer the same fate of not being called when the Minister of Labour is in his seat. My Bill to amend the Conciliation Act includes the principle of this Bill we are now discussing as regards railway labour disputes, but I believe that the principle should be made general. Probably it would not affect a number of the smaller disputes, but we have had as many mining strikes almost as railway strikes and they were just as disastrous I believe. It seems to me that this principle should be applied to strikes in large factories, because public opinion in these matters is just as effective as in connection with railway matters. Most of our mining strikes and most of our big factory strikes hinge between those representing the unions and the manager; one manager. I believe that if there was compulsory investigation and the whole facts were ascertained and the findings made and published, that probably in most cases the directors and the shareholders of the companies would get a better grasp of the matters in dispute between their own manager and the employees. I quite think that it would be just as effective in settling disputes of this kind as in settling railway disputes. Now, in my Bill there was one section which does not appear in this Bill, and I submit that it contains a very material provision. The absence of the idea of it from the Bill of last year, brought forward very general condemnation of that Bill. I may state, Mr. Speaker, that the compulsory arbitration principle as operated in New Zealand and Australia does not attempt to arbitrate between the individual and the employer. It arbitrates between two organizations, the organization of the workers and the organization of the employers. The weakness of the compulsory arbitration Bill of last year was that it only recognized the individuals. As this would lead to the disintegration of the labour organizations, very naturally and wisely they repudiated it. I urged that the Conciliation Act should recognize the principle of the labour organizations by having added to it another section, which would read as follows:—

> In no case shall a conciliator or arbitrator stipulate, nor shall it be stipulated in any agreement promoted or recommended by a conciliator or arbitrator, that any employee shall relinquish his membership in any local, national or international trades union or labour association; nor shall an agreement subject any employee to a penalty on account of such membership.

I believe the inclusion of such a section would in no way weaken the Act, but would to a tremendous extent create confidence in it, and in the good intention of this parliament in passing that Act. It is no use of this House or any employer any longer attempting to ignore the existence of trades unions. They are a fact and a factor in labour disputes, which must be recognized. The disputes that arise without them usually have very little merit in them. Men in this country as well as in other countries have been compelled by the very force of circumstances to organize, and rightly so; and to ignore the fact in any conciliation Act or arbitration proposal seems to me only to weaken the confidence of the people who are going to be affected by it. The Minister of Labour has explained to us that this Bill is acceptable to what are known as the big brotherhoods, the railway organizations—the engineers, the trainmen, the firemen, the conductors and the telegraphers. These organizations accept this Bill, because they believe it will not affect them at all; and in that belief they are right.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the good of the Bill, then, if it applies only to them and will not affect them?

Mr. PUTTEE. They state in their letter that they have not had a strike in the Dominion of Canada for ten years. That is very nearly correct. As a matter of fact, I believe the last strike was that of the railway telegraphers in 1895, eight years ago. The reason that these organizations have not had a strike for eight or ten years is that they are strong now. In the early days they were the very people who had the greatest number of strikes. They were then always in trouble. Every one of these organizations is an international organization. The reason that they have not had a strike for ten years is that they are strong, and the question of their recognition has been settled. They are recognized by the railway companies as a matter of course, and that means peace and harmony. The hon. member for West Toronto wants to know what will be the use of this Bill if it does not affect these organizations. Well, I believe, making a very generous estimate, that the five big brotherhoods comprise less than 20 per cent of the employees of the railways of this country. There are several other organizations with far greater membership than they have, which will be affected by this Act, which will have to put it to the test. For instance, there are the switchmen, the boiler-makers, the machinists, the firemen, the trackmen, the bridge-builders, the freight handlers, and a number of others. At least four-fifths of the employees of the railways will be affected by the Act, and most of their organizations are not yet recognized by the railway companies. If I might digress for a moment, I would like to explain what recognition means. Recognition in connection with trades organizations simply means the giving to the second party to a settlement or agreement the right to see that that settlement or agreement is carried out; that is all it means. After a strike there is a settlement, or agreement. If the union is not recognized, there is no one to see on behalf of the employee that the conditions of the agreement in his favour are carried out. There-