

or the Empress hotel in Victoria, to do anything more than send clippings and quotations to the minister. There is no indication that he made any effort to effect a conciliation or to ease the continuation of the situation. On the contrary he definitely minimized the gravity of the situation and emphasized what he termed to be the subversive character of the leadership. He told the minister that the patience of the men would be worn down and they would disperse.

Mr. ROGERS: I have already pointed out that Mr. Mitchell, whom I have found to be a most competent officer of the Department of Labour and who was a former member of this house, was sent to Vancouver to keep me advised of any developments in that situation and to serve as a medium of communication with the provincial government, if that should appear desirable. Mr. Mitchell carried out both of those orders. He was not authorized to deal directly with the single unemployed men, for the simple reason that the provincial government was dealing with the matter.

Mr. MacNEIL: The sessional papers disclose that Mr. Mitchell entered into frequent consultation with Mr. Pearson and with the mayor of Vancouver. Such influence as he may have had on the situation was exercised in the wrong direction. I have before me a copy of his telegram to the minister under date of June 17, from which I quote:

John Stanton, president, youth council, on return from Victoria to-day said, "Premier Pattullo and Hon. G. S. Pearson made it clear the government would do nothing for the unemployed in the post office."

Then follow what are apparently Mr. Mitchell's own words:

We hope to prevent the trip to Victoria on Sunday. Now I suppose they will go anyway but I don't believe they will get anywhere.

As an answer to his emphasis on the subversive leadership, I should like to quote from an editorial that appeared in the Vancouver Daily Province of June 24, reading as follows:

The public knows, unquestionably, if Mr. Pearson does not, that the subversive element among the transient unemployed, though present, has been numerically small and that is the reason for public sympathy for the unemployed and public criticism of the governments at Victoria and Ottawa.

The public knows that the men who immured themselves for a month in two of Vancouver's public buildings were neither reds nor scalawags nor hoodlums, but of the fair average type of young Canadians—men who want work, and would be happy to get it, men who want to get on in the world but find themselves frustrated by the turn of events.

If these men have yielded to so-called subversive influences, they have, of course, made a mistake. But the mistake is entirely understandable—much more understandable than the

government's harsh and narrow and immutable policy. The subversive influences at least seemed to offer a hope. The governments to which the men had a right to turn in their distress offered nothing but insults and flouts and starvation.

There is one further point I desire to make. The photographs taken prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that inexcusable brutality was used to evict the men from the post office and that the officers and the police, acting as we understand on the orders of the federal government, as is indicated by the sessional papers, singled out the leaders of the men and used clubs and lengths of water hose upon them until they were insensible. These men are at present in the hospital in Vancouver. That is something that should not be condoned by this government. That day is rightly called "bloody Sunday" in Vancouver because of the inexcusable brutality used upon these men who are properly described by the words I have just quoted.

Mr. ROGERS: There is one other point arising from an item which was passed previously by the committee. The leader of the opposition drew the attention of the committee to some direct charges that had been made against the superintendent of the employment office in Kingston, Ontario. I said I would bring these charges to the immediate attention of the superintendent of the employment services in the Ontario government.

Mr. BENNETT: They were investigated.

Mr. ROGERS: They were investigated, yes. I wish to place on the table of the house a letter from Mr. Rigg, director of unemployment, to Mr. Hudson, general superintendent for Ontario, and a copy of a report made by Mr. Hudson to the minister of labour of the Ontario government. My right hon. friend fully acknowledged at the time that the superintendent of the employment office in Kingston was a provincial official.

Mr. BENNETT: All of them are.

Mr. ROGERS: Therefore the report was properly made to the minister of labour of Ontario. I should like to refer to it very briefly. One charge was that Mr. Mooers had given his services to those who had offered to do him special favours. The basis of that charge was a statement made by Mr. Leggatt before the magistrate's court in Kingston.

Mr. BENNETT: There were others as well.

Mr. ROGERS: Mr. Hudson interviewed Mr. Leggatt, and Mr. Hudson says in his report:

When I interviewed Mr. Leggatt he was absolutely unable to provide me with the name