

member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), with regard to outside agitation. I do not think the position taken on that matter by these hon. gentlemen is a fair position at all. How would the hon. member for North Norfolk like it if I were to demonstrate to him that alien capitalists in this country had provoked strikes by their tyranny and oppression? So long as the hon. member objects to the doctrine that the individual labourer is not entitled to come to this country and have a voice in the sociological questions without being considered an agitator, what is he to say when the capitalist employer, who is an alien, seeks to oppress and tyrannize over our people by his method of carrying on business? Now, there are two sides to this question. I do not believe in strikes. I want to say that I have been associated for many years as a leader of a labour movement, and I have never yet been in a single strike, I have always used my influence against strikes. But I want to remind hon. gentlemen in this House that there are national strikes, that there is the strike of war, that there is the position taken by one nation against the other—and even the modern method of settling these questions ultimately is for the parties to take up arms against each other and demand their rights. That being so, it must be easy for hon. gentlemen to concede that labour and capital—and labour especially, which lives in dependence upon the exercise of its force for a daily wage, is entitled to adopt that method, so long as, in doing so, it does not interfere with the constitution and with the laws of this country.

I do not think I would under any circumstances be inclined to permit an alien agitator to come to this country and dictate to me as to what were the proper conditions under which I should work. Sir, there is not as much in the contention supported by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as he asserts. This institution at Montreal, contrary to what has been said on the floor of the House to-day, is a voluntary institution, and does not receive dictation from over the line. I am speaking subject to correction, but if I understood the hon. gentleman aright, he said that it was not a voluntary institution but that it was subject to dictation from the other side. I wish to say that no alien agitator has anything to do with the conduct of the business of this institution. I agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that the most legitimate kind of influence is that which emanates from the authority of the government. But we must remember that the government have no power to insist that these people should settle their grievances: and I would like the hon. gentlemen who represent the interests of organized capital in this House to be able to assure the government that if provision was made empowering the gov-

ernment to compel a settlement of these troubles, they would support a proposition of that kind. If I had time and opportunity, I could demonstrate to this House that in nine cases out of ten of labour struggles, labour has volunteered to stand by the results of compulsory arbitration enforced by government, and that in only one case out of ten do we find the capitalists prepared to do so. Now, it is right that these facts should be presented to this House. Both sides have a right to be represented in this matter. There are two sides to this question. What does the ordinary member of this House know about the actual grievances of these poor men in Montreal? What proof can any member of this House give to show that there may not be the greatest possible reason for this strike at Montreal? Where is the remedy? The remedy I believe is in increased legislation along these lines. I do not believe that the people of this country would support the principle of compulsory arbitration, but I believe they would agree to accept some further amendment of governmental dictation along the line of compulsory investigation and conciliation; I believe in that principle. The Minister of Labour has a Bill before the House for that purpose.

Now, Sir, as to the request made upon this government to assist in paying the expenses of protection of the public in this strike at Montreal. I do not think that would be a proper thing to do, for the outside authority to have such power. I consider that the power to call out military protection by the municipality is a wise provision. But, I want to say this, that if any financial assistance is given by this government in consequence of a strike of that kind, I can easily conceive how much more ready the municipalities would be to call out the militia without necessary provocation when they know that the expense would have to be borne by another authority. There are two sides to this question also. I want to say, and it ought to be said to the credit of the strikers in Montreal, that the newspapers, who are as a rule anxious to record the misdeeds of the strikers, have not been able to chronicle a single unlawful act on their part. What reason can be given by the authorities in Montreal for calling out the militia in this instance? If the expenses of this protection are to be paid by this government, how much more easily it will be for these municipalities to call out this protection because somebody else has to pay the bill. The greatest safeguard for prudence in such matters, is the fact that the people who are concerned must pay for the protection they require.

Now, Sir, I will support any proposition in this House that will bring to an end these industrial struggles. I will subscribe with my vote to any measure that will increase the powers of the government to make compulsory investigation into these