

grant that this is an extremely difficult proposition. I believe that until such a measure is placed on the statute books it will be utterly impossible to deal properly and equitably when such questions as these arise.

Mr. CARROLL: How does the hon. gentleman propose to disband a labour organization without making it a criminal offence?

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend is better able to explain that than I am, being an astute and clever lawyer.

Mr. CARVELL: I would like the hon. member to explain it; he has put it forward.

Mr. STEVENS: I presume we have power under the British North America Act to pass such a statute. You could make it criminal if you liked, but you could pass a statute which would enable the Government to disband a union in case of the violation of the Act.

Mr. CARVELL: That is a very violent presumption, I am afraid.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend makes an off-hand statement, but I doubt very much if he has given the matter any great thought. I submit the proposal as the only way in which we can secure the settlement of labour disputes. You cannot enforce the penalty now. My hon. friend, when he was supporting the late Minister of Labour, was unable to suggest any amendment of this Act which would enable the Government to bring about a settlement of these disputes.

Mr. CARVELL: The late Minister of Labour always settled them.

Mr. STEVENS: No, he did not.

Mr. CARVELL: He had no trouble under this Act.

Mr. STEVENS: The late minister made just as many jokes, as the hon. gentleman calls them, as the present Government or the present minister has—quite as many.

Mr. OLIVER: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would give instances which occurred under the late Minister of Labour that would compare with the incident we are now discussing.

Mr. STEVENS: We all admit that the present dispute is one of the worst that has ever occurred in the country; but I referred a moment ago to the Grand Trunk strike, which was a very serious one.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The Grand Trunk strike was settled.

Mr. STEVENS: It was not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Pardon me; it was.

Mr. STEVENS: The Grand Trunk strike was settled in so far as the award was made, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company agreed to take back some 200 employees; but two years ago, when the Grand Trunk Bill was up before the Railway Committee, there were 125 or 150 of these employees who had not been taken back, in spite of the fact that a written agreement to do so had been made by that railway company with Mr. Graham, then Minister of Railways, and the late Minister of Labour, Mr. King.

Mr. MACDONALD: Does not the hon. member know very well that what he is talking about is the carrying out of the terms by the Grand Trunk; but the strike was settled, and the railway was operating, which was the important thing for the country.

Mr. STEVENS: The strike was settled, and the railway was supposed to be operated by the men who had been ordered by Judge Barron to be reinstated, but 150 or 170 of the older employees were absolutely not reinstated, and when the Grand Trunk Bill was before the Railway Committee, the company was compelled to reinstate them before that Bill was allowed to be passed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The big stick was used then, and very properly.

Mr. STEVENS: Certainly, but it proves the point I am making, that under this Act which was passed by the right hon. gentleman's Government, you cannot effect the settlement of a dispute.

Mr. MACDONALD: How do you propose to do that?

Mr. STEVENS: I have suggested that both the employees and employers be made responsible parties and that penalties be employed. I have suggested a remedy which my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell), with his great depth of wisdom, lightly flings aside as being unworkable; but I venture to say that if he studies the matter out and gives his advice on it two weeks hence, we may get something more erudite from him than anything he has suggested up to the present moment.

I do not believe that the militia of Canada