

all those who had not been guilty of acts of violence or disorderly conduct should be restored to the company's service. The company does not deny having given that meaning to the expression 'as soon as possible.' What Mr. Hays says is that he has carried out that part of the agreement and that the men who are out at the present time, according to the statement of his officers have been guilty of some acts of disorderly conduct. It is one of the terms of the agreement entered into between the parties themselves that is causing the trouble to-day, not a part of the agreement to which Sir Frederick Borden and myself are witnesses, but another part, words that were perfectly agreeable to the men themselves, and which they were prepared to sign. The dispute that has arisen to-day is as to the 'as soon as possible' or the three months, but whether the men who are still out have been actually guilty of acts of disorderly conduct.

The government, to my mind, were not obliged to do anything further, certainly the government has never accepted in virtue of the agreement entered into between the parties, any obligation on its part to see that the terms of the agreement were carried out. Were that doctrine once admitted, this government and parliament would be opening the door to a wide obligation, that the government would become responsible for all that grows out of the actions of every person who performs an act on behalf of the government. That, for example, in the case of the Boards of Conciliation appointed by the government the government would become responsible for the way in which the terms of settlement effected by them were carried out, we would be assuming an obligation which I think would be going much further than this parliament ever intended to go, and I do not think that the government would be justified for one minute in admitting any obligation of that kind. However, the government has stood and still stands to do its utmost to further industrial peace, and when after the settlement had been made and three months had gone by, and some of the men had not been reinstated, with the information that this situation was likely to give rise to fresh trouble on the Grand Trunk railway, the government naturally, in the interests of industrial peace, offered to do and has been doing all in its power to awaken a consciousness on the part of one of the parties to the agreement to the necessity of discharging the obligations arising out of the agreement respecting the present dispute, and so the government has in many ways pointed out to the Grand Trunk Railway Company that it expected, in virtue of its being one of the parties to the agreement in the interests of industrial peace, that that great cor-

poration should deal with its men in a manner worthy of a corporation carrying on business to the extent that it does. When my hon. friend says that nothing has been done but to send a letter occasionally to Montreal, I think he can hardly have read over all the correspondence, because he would see in it references to many interviews which have taken place not only between myself and Mr. Hays and other officers of the Grand Trunk railway in Montreal, but between Mr. Hays and the Prime Minister in Ottawa. I think that on two or three occasions the Prime Minister has himself spoken to Mr. Hays on this particular phase of the transaction. Mr. Hays is in a difficult position, I am prepared to admit that. His officers give him certain advice. He feels that, managing a great company, unless he pays attention to the advice of his officers he may not be able to carry on the organization as it should be carried on and so he has tried on the one hand, I think, to carry out the wishes of the government in the matter, and on the other hand to stand back of the officials whom he holds responsible for carrying on the affairs of the road in a certain way. The government gave him to understand clearly that if his officers were making misrepresentations to him, if the men were saying one thing and the officers another, the only fair way to do was to call in some third party and allow the third party to pronounce upon the cases. I made that suggestion first in a communication offering on behalf of the government to pay the expense of an arbitrator. I think the Grand Trunk railway should have accepted that offer, I think it was a small thing to ask a big company to do especially as the men expressed their willingness to do the same. One of the doctrines to which the managers of great corporations seem to hold most strongly is that they are going to manage their own business, and after all what the government was interested in doing was not to antagonize that corporation so that it would perhaps treat its men in a spiteful manner, but rather to facilitate the return of these men to the positions they formerly held. The government intimated that it did not matter what the method was so long as these men were given a fair chance of having their cases investigated. Judge Barron's name had been mentioned because he had acted as chairman of one or two boards in industrial disputes with great satisfaction to both employers and employed, and my hon. friend has paid him the praise which he merits in saying that he feels that in every way Judge Barron will be upright, faithful and trustworthy in the discharge of his duty, and that it would make little difference by whom he is appointed. Judge Barron has been appointed to investigate the