

that one of the most important contentions of the workmen is that a fair day's pay shall be given for a fair day's work, that we find that there is no difference between the two parties in regard to this question and that the longshoremen have been satisfied in that respect. But, I have learned also that the chief grievance that now exists between the two parties who are contending is in reference to the fact that 350 men were brought to Montreal and to the threat that something like 1,000 more men would be brought to Montreal in order to perform the work that the longshoremen usually perform which will only have the effect of depressing their wages. I recognize the rights of workmen the same as I recognize the rights of any other class of the community. Surely, when a man has nothing else but his labour to sell he has a right to associate with other men for their mutual advantage and mutual protection and so long as they comply with the law and so long as they guard against violating the law I do not see that there is any particular harm done to the country by an association of that character. I may say that those men who claim the right for their own particular class and calling to be associated together and to be organized are not justified in finding fault with workmen simply because they claim the same right. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) spoke strongly to-day as a manufacturer—I think entirely too strongly. He has assumed that Mr. Gompers came from the other side for the purpose of fomenting trouble and difficulty in this country. If Mr. Gompers is doing so surely he will not lay the blame on the longshoremen of Montreal for bringing that gentleman here. They are not associated with Mr. Gompers in any way. He comes to this country as a citizen of the United States and he enjoys the privilege which the law of this country gives him, of speaking to the people of this country. He has now that privilege in the city of Montreal. I do not wish to approve of his remarks or to disapprove of them because I know nothing about them, but he has that right and I would say that the longshoremen are not to blame in any sense whatever concerning him. I would say to the hon. member for North Norfolk that if a number of workmen refused to work for a manufacturer simply because he belonged to the Manufacturers' Association, if the manufacturers brought that before this House as a reason for the condemnation of the workmen, I would rise up in my place and offer a few remarks on an occasion of that kind in support of the Manufacturers' Association in condemning conduct of that character. So, I say what is good for one is certainly good for the other. Fair play to both is a proper thing. I will take some of the other close organizations in this country. Take the legal profession and the medical profession and no

one will contend that they are not close corporations. I remember that a few years ago an effort was put forth to have it declared, for instance, that a medical gentleman moving from the city of Ottawa to the city of Hull, which is situated in another province, would not be allowed to practice his profession without being guilty of violating the provincial laws which would not give him that right. So the House will see that even the medical profession are protected and that they are a close organization. I quite approve of that, because, in their particular profession, it is necessary that they should be protected. It is a matter of life and death frequently and I am not in favour of quacks practising medicine. Then, take the legal profession. A member of that profession cannot pass from Ontario or Manitoba or British Columbia and practice his profession without violating the laws of Manitoba or British Columbia. Probably there may be some quacks among the lawyers who might attempt to practice in these provinces and in order to practice themselves and guard their interests the legal gentlemen have a close organization in the different provinces. So, I say it would not be becoming on the part of the legal profession, the medical profession, or of the Manufacturers' Association, or of the capitalists, to undertake to prevent the workmen from becoming organized. I was very glad to hear from the director of one of the greatest enterprises in the Dominion of Canada speak as he has done. I refer to one of the hon. gentlemen from Toronto. Now, I know as a matter of fact that the railway companies in this country do recognize the trades unions. I know as a matter of fact that they have their grievance committees and that from time to time, year in and year out, the officials of the railway companies confer with the representatives of the unions and whatever grievances they have are adjusted and adjusted, I believe, to the satisfaction of both parties concerned. So I say that if the manufacturer is desirous of doing what is right, and if the employee is desirous of doing what is right no difficulty can occur between them. I was glad also to hear the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) say that this question should not be discussed in a party spirit. I quite approve of that but I am somewhat of a doubting Thomas at the time of a by, or general election, when I hear the hon. gentleman taking credit to himself and his department for the work he is doing on behalf of labour and appealing to the workmen to support his candidate or party by reason of this claim. If the hon. gentleman will be good enough to refrain from resorting to that kind of party warfare I have no objection I am sure to his statement and I would rather approve of not making this a party question at all. The idea has been suggested that if the hon. member for North Norfolk thinks that the presence of Mr.