

cause they felt their interests were being attacked. They pointed out to that committee where their interests were going to be attacked in their insurance organizations. They have their insurance organizations internationally, and if we pass this Bill it will be impossible, and the delegates said so, to carry on their insurance in this country. Canadians have some two million dollars insurance in that international union, and as soon as ever they see that a foreign officer cannot come into Canada when labour troubles are on, just so soon will our unions be asked to send in their charters, and when they do so, they will lose all rights in the funds they have been paying into for twenty or twenty-five years; and in that way we will be doing an injustice to those men, and bringing misery on their wives and children. See the benefit some of those associations have done in keeping misery from the doors of working-people in this country. I have mentioned one organization, the railway trainmen, who paid last year alone out of their beneficiary fund to widows and orphans some \$592,000, and \$54,000 of that money was paid to widows and orphans and disabled members in Canada. By legislation of this kind you may destroy that organization. I have mentioned one of many. The locomotive engineers have been equally benevolent with their fellow-members and the unfortunates that belonged to them. If this House do their duty, they will vote down this measure.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—I should like to have the promoter of the Bill explain to the House why he does not accord to labour the same rights that are accorded to all other interests, whether business, financial, social or political interests. Will the promoter of this Bill explain to me why labour has not the same right to have organizations throughout the world that capital has? Will he tell me why insurance companies are not prevented from going abroad and seeking aid doing business in foreign countries. Will the promoters of this Bill tell the labouring classes of this Dominion why their rights are curtailed by this honourable House while the rights of all other classes of society go untrammelled? Until the promoter of this Bill gives these explanations to me, I shall have to cast my vote against the Bill.

Hon. Mr. McHUGH.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—I had not intended to make any observations upon the third reading of this Bill, but owing to misrepresentations having been made as to its effects, I feel I would be placing myself in a position subject to be misunderstood, did I not make a few remarks with reference to its application. In the first place, I might say that the object of introducing this Bill, was not so much that it might become law, as that the subject, which was one receiving a great deal of consideration, both in the press and by the general public, should be discussed by this House and otherwise and thus possibly result in the subject being dealt with more intelligently in the future than it has been in the past. Now, I unhesitatingly say that the Bill as it stands at present will lead to a great degree in the line of conciliation being adopted as the method of settling strikes, instead of the coercive measures which heretofore have been resorted to both by capital and labour. Had I been permitted to exercise my discretion to the full in this matter, I would, after the discussion before the committee, have withdrawn the Bill, being fully satisfied its object had been attained by reason of the public discussion which took place upon it; but owing to the reluctance of the committee, and I apprehend of this Chamber, to permit it to be withdrawn, as I assumed the responsibility of introducing it, of course I abide by that responsibility. But it is manifest that if foreign, irresponsible agitators—agitators who do not come within the pale of the law, are permitted to come into Canada and are permitted by a process of systematic agitation to stir up that acerbity and bickering and ill-feeling between employer and labourer which we find to be the result of these agitations which have been carried on heretofore, it is utterly impossible to arrive at a satisfactory settlement of labour disputes through any process of conciliation. The two processes which have been freely discussed, that of coercion and that of conciliation, are diametrically opposed to each other and it is impossible, I submit to this House, to suppress such a system of agitation as is resorted to except legislation will in some way step in, or except public opinion will pronounce itself intelligently against such methods of attaining labour objects as heretofore have been resorted to. Now, it is quite manifest