

accepted in good faith practically by the party in whose favour the award is made. I believe, that, eventually, arbitration will rule very much more than it does now. And I believe that with the keen interest taken by the Minister of Labour, who is now the man whom we look to as the head man in dealing with matters of this kind, if he puts politics aside and perhaps, nominate some outside man, as the President of the United States did—some strong man who would go upon the ground and see what could be done, some man who is not in politics, not a railway man and not an employer of labour—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Where would you find him ?

Mr. OSLER. Cannot a fair man be found in the whole country ? If the hon. minister (Hon. Sir William Mulock) has that idea of the country, I say God help the future—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) must not put words in my mouth that I did not use. He suggested that a man should be found, a strong man, one who is not in politics and not in railways and not an employer of labour. I only asked where I was to look for such a man. Of course, there may be such men.

Mr. OSLER. I can only say that I believe, there are men not in politics, and not in railways, strong men and honest men who could be found.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman send me a list of them.

Mr. OSLER. I wish I could quote correctly. I remember coming upon a sentence—very appropriate in describing the present government. It was to the effect—describing such a government as this—that where men who have taken power and assumed the duties that go with it and are not able to solve the questions that come before them, they are either incapable or otherwise wholly unworthy of the position they have assumed. It is not for the government benches to throw taunts at this side on every occasion, to cry : Give us a solution of the difficulty. We are not here to solve the questions that face the country. We are here to approve or disapprove of what the government do.

Mr. McCREARY. What did you do in the labour question during the eighteen years when you were in power ? You did not put in a line upon the statute-book.

Mr. OSLER. I do not hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary). Is he referring to eighteen years back ?

Mr. McCREARY. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. I am not here as a member of this House to approve of everything done eighteen years ago. I will agree with the hon. gentleman very often that those things were bad. This government have now a

strong majority, they are backed by a majority of the constituencies of the Dominion of Canada, and it is their duty to face manfully every proposition that comes before them. If they are not able to face that, then they are not fit to be in their positions. They have no right to taunt the opposition by asking them on every occasion what they would do under certain circumstances. Whenever occasion arises in which the public interest is concerned, the government are bound to propound a scheme ; it is the duty of the opposition to object or to approve of that scheme, and of the government to carry it with their great majority.

But I rose principally to express my views on this point, on which I feel strongly, that I think it is very wrong and very injudicious to call out the militia of this country to suppress disturbances between our own people, in strikes and troubles of that kind. I believe that the government, no matter at what expense—charge it to the cities, if you like, I don't object to that—but I believe that the government should make the permanent force do duty on all occasions where military force is required, as in the present instance in this strike in Montreal.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I would like to explain to the House that there has been some misapprehension in this discussion. We have been for nearly two hours discussing a question which can be boiled right down to one word. I have here the offer drawn up and submitted to the steamship people, and also the one submitted by the long-shoremen. It is clause 8, which reads :

The stevedores and the parties of the first part, will not discriminate against union men, and willingly agree to employ them.

That clause was put in because the steamship men had made a contract with some 350 men. Now, having made that contract, they are bound to carry it out.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, having already spoken, is out of order.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria). I was much interested in listening to the remarks made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary). I should suppose, judging from the tenor of his speech, that he is going to desert his old friends, the Doukhobors, and intends to secure, if he can, the representation of the city of Winnipeg in the next election. Therefore the present labour leader of that city (Mr. Puttee) must hand in his resignation, for he will no longer represent the magnificent city of Winnipeg in these halls. The member for Toronto was asked a little while ago what the Liberal Conservative party had done for the people during the eighteen years they were in power. If my memory serves me right, they gave bread and butter to the workmen of Canada. If my memory serves me right, they closed up the soup kitchens that had been opened during the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the soup kit-