

Mr. S. SHARPE: What is your position?

Mr. CARROLL: My position is that if there is an international organization and no other Canadian organization the workers of this country should be forced to recognize them as a labour organization.

Mr. STEVENS: If I remember rightly, the hon. gentleman stated clearly, and 'Hansard' will show it, that during the progress of the labour dispute in Cape Breton some years ago, there arose dissensions in the ranks of the labour organizations and there came into the country representatives of the United Mine Workers and organized a strike. He stated that in so far as he was concerned he was in sympathy with the attitude assumed by the provincial association.

Mr. CARROLL: I beg to differ from the hon. gentleman and I wish to tell him that he will find no such statement from me on the 'Hansard' of to-day, or on any other 'Hansard.' I said that the recommendation of the Board of Conciliation stated that the Dominion Coal Company was justified in not recognizing two labour organizations in the same district. They were recognizing one, and they could not, in justice to the organization, recognize the other. It would lead to innumerable difficulties.

Mr. STEVENS: I quite remember the statement that the hon. gentleman made. Possibly his memory is a little short.

Mr. CARROLL: I want to rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that the hon. gentleman should take the word of the hon. member for Cape Breton.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not disputing his word. I am simply suggesting that it is a lapse of memory.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I understand that the rule of the House is that the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), is bound to accept the statement of my hon. friend from South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll). I was sitting beside my hon. friend when he made his speech, and I gathered exactly the sense he has now stated as being the sense in which he spoke. Far from being guilty of a lapse of memory, my hon. friend's memory absolutely confirms what he actually said. If there be a lapse of memory it is on the part of the hon. member for Vancouver, but I only rose to a point of order for the

purpose of pointing out that the hon. gentleman is bound to accept the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Carroll).

Mr. STEVENS: I accept the hon. gentleman's statement without any question whatsoever. I have a very high regard for the veracity of my hon. friend. The question of the recognition of international unions or Canadian organizations is a very important one which is fraught with very grave consequences. At the present time there are in Canada many unions of the highest possible type which are of an international character. The Typographical Union is one of the strongest and best in the country and there are also different organizations of railway employees which are international in their scope. On the other hand, there is a widespread sentiment throughout the country that an American organization controlled entirely on the other side should not be recognized. In order that I may not be misunderstood, I hold this, that the labour body have a perfect right to organize themselves for the advancement of their own interest. They have a right, and one which should never be disputed on any occasion, to organize for the protection of their rights and privileges, but the difficulty about labour organizations in Canada and other countries is that you cannot fasten a penalty upon them. The property and funds of this union are always placed in the hands of trustees so that you cannot fix a penalty successfully upon any labour organization. The reason for that, as explained by the men, is that if they allowed their property to remain in the hands of the recognized treasurer or secretary of the organization, there would be great discrimination in the settlement of a dispute and the labour organization would be forced to pay the penalty whereas the employers would go free. I wish that the hon. Minister of Labour would undertake to devise an amendment to the Act which would place an equal responsibility upon the employer and the employee. I think it would be far better to attack the labour union by the disbanding of the union than by imposing a fine, while imposing a fine in the case of the employers. One of the difficulties of such an Act would be that a large number of employers, such as manufacturers' associations, are in existence but in name only. There is no legal organization, and in this way the employer is enabled to escape responsibility. I freely