

not appear yet to have arrived, for we cannot induce either of these parties at the present moment to receive any friendly overtures from the government. What more can be done at this stage is a question that I am unable to answer. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) mentioned that it was my duty to make a statement. I hope he did not think I was refusing to do my duty or shrinking from trying to do my duty. I rose several times, but in deference to the wishes of others that I saw rising I gave them the right of way, but, and it was not through any disinclination, as soon as I had the opportunity, to make these few observations. As to the suggestion that the government might bear the expense, the law is to-day what it has been since confederation. It is no new law. It was not passed by this government and not by the immediately preceding government, but it has been ratified by parliament and by public opinion for a generation and more, and that law is that the municipality must bear the expense of calling out the militia to maintain order within the municipality. I would say that at this very moment we have a gentleman of high position in this country in Montreal endeavouring to induce the parties to receive in a friendly way the overtures from this government with the view of arriving at a settlement. It took the President of the United States a good while to solve the problem in the anthracite coal regions. For some time the strikers refused to listen to his suggestions. They continued that strike for five months and national disaster was the outcome, the injury spreading beyond the confines of the United States. We suffered ourselves. He could not at first succeed but in time he did succeed. As the struggle continues these two disputants may become more receptive of friendly advice, and all I can say on behalf of the government is that we are in an attitude ready and waiting and anxious to be allowed to be the medium of peace whenever the two parties will permit us to act in that capacity.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, before this debate is concluded, I want to call the attention of the House to a statement of fact which was made a moment ago by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), and one which calls for some consideration on the part of every member of this House. The hon. member for Montmorency stated a moment ago that some of the volunteers who are now doing duty on the harbour at Montreal are threatened with dismissal by their employers if they continue to be removed from their daily occupations. I think that when the hon. member for Montmorency made that statement he was misinformed. I cannot believe that there is in the city of Montreal any man so mean, any man so unpatriotic as to threaten one of his employees who happens to be a volunteer

and is performing his duty as such with dismissal. I cannot believe that there is any employer of labour, knowing that his employee is engaged in protecting property, who would threaten him with dismissal because he has to be absent from his occupation. There was some feeling upon this question in the state of New York last winter when it was reported in the press that a labour organization in Schnecktady, New York, had expelled one of its members because he was a member of a military organization in the state. I hope we are not going to have anything of that kind in this country. I have seen the statement that during last winter some labour organizations in this country had discouraged their members from joining the militia force. I do not believe that statement, and in reference to the statement of the hon. member for Montmorency, I still refuse to believe that there is any man in Canada who would discourage any of his employees from becoming members of the volunteer force. It would be a sad day indeed for Canada if any citizen were to discourage any one at all from discharging his duty to the country, and if the hon. member for Montmorency is correctly informed, I think that the voice of parliament ought to be unanimous in declaring that if such a threat were to be carried into execution, if the volunteers now doing duty for their country were to be dismissed, the man who did that would be branded with infamy and he would be consigned to the indignation of every patriotic citizen of Canada.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike), in speaking upon this question a few moments ago, said that the difference, so far as remuneration is concerned, between the longshoremens and the employers had been practically settled, and that the only matter in dispute, the only question that kept the parties separate, was the question of the recognition of the union of the employees. If that is a fact, I am sure that we can appeal to the hon. Postmaster General to use his good offices to get this union recognized; because, I believe, it is one of the conditions imposed upon those who tender for work in his department that the work shall be done in a union office, and that the union scale of wages shall be paid. The demands of the men certainly could not have been so unreasonable as some hon. gentlemen have pointed out, because the hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence, has told us that the parties have agreed as to the remuneration and that the only question is as to whether the men have the right to unite together for the purpose of protecting themselves, and whether it is a reasonable position for the employers to take to say that the men shall not have that right, and to say that those who organize themselves into a union of employees shall not be given