

chens have never been reopened since the national policy came into force. I cannot agree with one remark made by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler), who says that only the permanent corps should be employed to put down riots. I maintain that it is the duty of every citizen of Canada, whenever disorder or disturbance exists in his municipality, to turn out and do his duty in assisting to preserve law and order within the bounds of his own municipality. As a representative of a riding that is not troubled with strikes, I object on behalf of that community to paying any share of the cost of suppressing any disagreement that may happen to arise in the city of Montreal, and I should strenuously object to one dollar of the public money of Canada being paid towards a settlement of any strike in Montreal. Let Montreal settle her own troubles.

So far as unions are concerned, I have always upheld them when they tend to the betterment of the condition of the workmen, or of any other men; when their association tends to make them more temperate, more law abiding, more intelligent, to shorten the hours of labour and develop their home life. But when it comes to a union saying to a man who has to earn his bread and butter: You shall not take employment under these men, then I maintain that it is the duty of the state to step in and tell the gentlemen of the union who are on strike that they may go a certain distance, but no further. We have seen suffering on the part of families of labouring men who are endeavouring honestly to earn their bread and butter, and who do not wish to join these labour unions under the dictation of a foreign leader or to be controlled by such. When these men and their families are hooted at on the streets and otherwise abused, I maintain the time has arrived in this country when the gentlemen of the unions must be taught that while they are at perfect liberty to work or to strike, they must not directly or indirectly interfere with any other man who does not belong to the union, and who wishes to earn his daily bread at whatever wage he can obtain. More than that, if the capitalists become tyrannical they must be controlled likewise by the government of the country. In England, when that great engineers' strike took place a few years ago, the nation lost millions of dollars. Already the Dominion of Canada, by reason of this strike in Montreal, has lost an enormous amount which it will take years for the parties who are engaged in that strike to make up by their operations.

Mr. KENDALL. The hon. gentleman says that the engineers' strike in England entailed a loss of millions of dollars on British industry. If that is so, would the hon. gentleman tell us how he would measure the loss to the country that was caused by

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

the control of the cotton industry by the factory men of Lancashire for a century?

Mr. HUGHES (North Victoria). I shall answer that question at a later period. But I want to point out that I object not only to the tyranny of the labour unions, but to the tyranny of the capitalists. The labour unions in the old land are very tyrannical, and I will give you one instance: A wholesale dealer in the city of Toronto visited Staffordshire a few years ago to purchase a certain brand of crockery, of which there was none in the market. It was a little out of the ordinary line of manufacture. The manufacturer said he could make the crockery for him, but said he must consult the head of the union before he could give him a final answer whether they would manufacture that line or not. Business was not any too good at that time in the old land. The gentleman was notified next morning that the labour union objected to manufacture this class of ware, and the gentleman took his order to Germany, and Britain lost hundreds of thousands of dollars on that transaction alone. So, we find, Sir, that these unions may be carried to an extreme just the same as the tyranny of capital may be carried to an extreme. The only point I rose to make is that while I recognize the right of any labouring man in any part of the Dominion of Canada to strike, I want the gentleman distinctly to understand also that he has to allow any other free man to go and take his place without being molested, and without being hounded from one end of the country to the other, as is being done to-day. The time is not far distant when this sort of thing must be put a stop to. If men seeking to go to their work on the docks are to be hounded to death and trampled in the dirt on the streets of Montreal, it is time the law interfered, and whether it be done by the regular troops or by the militia, it is time the strong hand of the law made it plain to these men that this country must be a law abiding country, and that we must have the law obeyed whether these men be in favour of it or not.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I have not received my union instructions with the brief which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) speaks of. I am not in a position to use the same kind of language as the hon. gentleman who seems to think that the longshoremen are alone to blame in this matter. The hon. gentleman, for the first time in this House, has alluded to violations of the law on the part of the longshoremen in Montreal. I have heard no charge made of that character this afternoon. So far as I am personally aware I do not know all the details of this difficulty between the longshoremen and the employers, but there is one thing I want to call attention to and it is