

Demobilization—Air Services

WAR AND DEMOBILIZATION

PROVISION FOR APPROPRIATION OF \$1,365,000,000
FOR WAR PURPOSES, DEMOBILIZATION,
PROMOTION OF TRADE AND
INDUSTRY, ETC.

The house resumed from Monday, November 5, consideration in committee of a resolution to grant to His Majesty certain sums of money for the carrying out of measures deemed necessary or advisable in consequence of the war—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Golding in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR AIR

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): The committee will remember that in the previous discussion of these estimates we had reached item 6 and were still on that item when the committee rose.

Mr. GILLIS: Before we discuss the item specifically I should like to say a few words with reference to the debate that took place on this resolution when it was last before the house. A specific matter was raised by myself at that time, giving rise to considerable debate; and during the course of that discussion as well as subsequently, in newspaper editorials particularly, certain things have been said by reason of which I feel it incumbent upon me to take up some of the time of the committee this afternoon. Let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I will not discuss the merits or demerits of the difficulties at Windsor. That matter is now one between the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell), the Ford Motor company and the union. With regard to the minister's statement this afternoon, I think it indicated that the union has taken a fair and reasonable stand in the effort to bring about a settlement, and, second, the statement indicated to me that the Ford Motor company has taken an unfair and unreasonable stand. Without quoting the minister's statement, it meant this to me, that the Ford Motor company is prepared to do everything except to bargain collectively with its employees. It is not prepared to do that. I was quite pleased with the minister's attitude toward the stand the company is taking. The Ford company, in its proposal to the union committee at Windsor, merely suggests compulsory arbitration. The Minister of Labour this afternoon in his statement indicated to the house that he is not of that view, and anyone who has any experience with the labour movement and can either think back or read back over the last fifty years, knows that in the field of collective bargaining the trade union movement has fought compulsory arbitration because, once you are in that field, you

[Mr. Fournier.]

are scrapping all the ideals of collective bargaining. I am not going to go any farther into that matter, but I wish to say this; as I see the dispute in that particular section it boils down to the right to profits versus the right of the worker to a living wage.

This afternoon I was interested in picking up a copy of the *Ottawa Journal* of September 18, 1941. This paper contains a statement of the Prime Minister on this particular matter, and I shall read one of the pertinent sections of a lengthy speech dealing with the matter of industry versus humanity. The Prime Minister had this to say:

Some years ago, I made a special study of the problems of industry, and of the principles upon which industrial reconstruction should be based if, after years of war,—

And he was referring to this period.

—industrial strife were not to follow international strife. At that time, more than twenty-two years ago, I reached the conclusion that there could be no permanent peace in industry unless the claims of humanity, in industrial relations, were recognized as superior to that of industry. In other words, it seemed to me that industry must recognize that it existed to serve the needs of humanity; not that humanity existed to serve greed of industry.

Any discussion that I have had on this matter in the house was based on exactly the principles enunciated by the Prime Minister in this speech. Despite that, I have been accused of making inflammatory speeches, stirring people up, and all that kind of thing. Whether my talk was inflammatory or not I leave to the members of the house. I spoke to them and not to the people outside who made that criticism.

This afternoon I am going to make reference to a recent editorial in the *Globe and Mail*. The editorial refers to me, and it is, to say the least, anything but truthful. That statement can be borne out by a reference to *Hansard*. I shall read just a short extract of the editorial. The editor of the *Globe and Mail* had this to say:

He lied when he said the Ford strike "is the official demonstration on the part of industry in this province to smash unions and trade union agreements." He lied when he charged Premier Drew with promoting "civil strife in Windsor."

No matter how violently I disagreed with any of the viewpoints held by any other hon. member in the six years that I have been in the house, I think I can truthfully say that on no occasion have I thought for a moment that any hon. member was lying on any matter that he brought before the house. What the editor of the *Globe and Mail* dishonestly did in this instance was to take a few words out of its context and run them in this editorial to mislead the people of this province into thinking that the statement he