

be better able to bargain with their employers. Some of them spoke of the industrial revolution. Every student of history knows that that refers to the transition from hand to machine work. But these ignorant spies misunderstood the entire labour movement. I knew what was going on at that time from some of my friends who happened to be on boards of trades in western cities, but I also knew from my labour friends the real situation regarding labour. Commissioner Perry came back and made a report to the government which entirely misrepresented the situation, because his report was based on information from men who did not understand, and could not very well be expected to understand, the labour movement. That was the background.

After that there came the misrepresentations in the daily press during the strike. Relatives of mine living in Vancouver read a story in circumstantial detail of the setting up of a soviet republic on the banks of the Red river. The story was manufactured out of whole cloth, absolutely not a scintilla of truth in it, and yet it appeared in detail from the fertile pen of a Winnipeg writer.

I know several of the men who were convicted. We have not here the facilities for transforming ourselves into a court of law. The unfortunate labour people, although they raised tens of thousands of dollars to pay legal fees and get the best defence possible, have not been able to follow those who had unlimited funds in presenting their case to the public at large. We cannot discuss the details to-night, but the leader of the opposition has made some very general and very sweeping statements. I am going to make statements which I am quite prepared to substantiate, and if I could do anything to secure a fair trial for the labour people of my own city of Winnipeg, and if I could do anything to bring to trial those who succeeded in putting over one of the most dastardly conspiracies, I should be delighted and should think that I had accomplished in this house something that was worth while. I say the trials that were put on there were farcical, absolutely a travesty of justice. From beginning to end they were farcical.

Mr. BENNETT: Farcical?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, from beginning to end. The leader of the opposition referred to the effort we made to get the matter before the Privy Council. There were representations made from the law courts of this country, and the influence was such that, added to the constitutional aspects, the Privy Council did not hear the case. I think it is absolutely

unjustifiable that the leader of the opposition should endeavour to give the impression that the Privy Council endorsed what was done by our courts. We raised tens of thousands of dollars, and sent Mr. W. H. Trueman, K.C., now Mr. Justice Trueman, to England. He thought he had a good case, but he could not get the trial reviewed by the Privy Council.

If I had the time to go into the details I would tell the committee how the jurors were selected. Something like three hundred men were brought in from the country—

Mr. BENNETT: Mr. Chairman, it is not for me to call upon you to protect the honour of our courts against attack, but our rules of order on the subject are definite. If the committee desires that our courts should be attacked and those trials described in the language which the hon. gentleman has employed—

Mr. THORSON: I think I might speak on that question.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I wish to finish my remarks. It is not a point of order. If the courts need any protection I have no doubt that the legal fraternity will flock to the rescue. I am not suggesting that my hon. friend across the way (Mr. Thorson) is attempting to do that.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcell): Order. With reference to the remark made by the leader of the opposition, the rule is very plain.

A member while speaking must not cast reflections upon the conduct of judges of superior courts unless such conduct is based upon a substantive motion.

It is a rule of the house.

Mr. BENNETT: Exactly.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not think I have said anything to come within that rule, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARK: How could a trial be dastardly and farcical?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I say it was farcical, and if I had time I could very easily show that it was.

Mr. CLARK: Was it conducted by a court of law?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes. It was a trial for conspiracy, and anyone who has studied the laws of conspiracy knows what that means. Great reams of evidence were ruled out altogether. Certain laws of evidence were invoked which had come down in cases of