

a member of the staff had been dismissed. It shows the difference between the attitude in Great Britain and that in Canada.

According to the court's findings, the cause of the woman worker's dismissal was her union activity. Although the other women refused to return to their jobs without their dismissed companion, if some promise of inquiry or negotiations had been made they would have returned immediately. Without union recognition it "is difficult to see how the girls could show their sympathy with the dismissed girl without some form of demonstration". The fundamental cause of the dispute was held to be the stubborn refusal of the management to deal with the union. The court regretted this and stated it was bound to lead to a dispute—

That is, the management's conduct was bound to lead to a dispute.

—which might end in a work stoppage . . . as had in fact occurred. Therefore the almost uniform practice and well-tryed method of recognizing and negotiating with the union was recommended for this company. Without collective bargaining other troubles would no doubt arise.

If we met our problems in that way we would have far less difficulty than we have had up to now, although I am amazed at how little difficulty we have had.

Let me say again that what I am concerned with is not so much the regulations made but the attitude of the department, the attitude of the government, to organized labour. After all, certain things are necessary; we cannot carry on to-day as we would in peace time; the issues at stake are too vital and labour is too greatly concerned in those issues. One of the difficulties in dealing with organized labour here, as far as there are difficulties, is that dealing with labour organizations has not become a tradition here as it has in the old land. Consequently the employer is inexperienced in dealing with labour and labour is inexperienced in dealing with the employer. The only way in which that can be remedied is, not by refusing to recognize labour organizations, but by recognizing them.

I have before me the text of an address made by the deputy minister of labour to the convention of the Canadian Manufacturers' association last year and published in the *Labour Gazette* of July, 1941. I should like to read two short paragraphs from it. The deputy minister said he had not had time to prepare this address; nevertheless I think the address is a very fine one, although there are a few thoughts in it to which I take strong exception. He has put the case of labour fairly and shows, if labour is impatient, the cause of its impatience. He stated the matter most clearly, and if his hearers would keep in mind

what he said we should get over much of our difficulties and have much better labour relations. He said:

All I am pleading for is this, that on the management side of business there should be a sense of the labour problem, and that one executive should be assigned the duty of labour management, with a programme to be worked out. That is all very well, you may say to me, but it depends on the finances of the business. That is true. The prosperity of our whole economy depends on our resources. But the history of democracy is one long record of concession after concession. The freedoms that we talk about are those that the few had and have given up by one process or another, sometimes through strife and sometimes through evolution, to become the freedoms of the mass. Whatever democracy may hold for labour in the future, I hope to see it come by the process of evolution and not through class struggle and strife. The fulfilment of that hope, it seems to me, requires conscious planning and the assignment by business of the job of labour management to competent people.

I agree wholeheartedly with every word of that. It is exceedingly well said. I doubt, however, if it had much effect on those to whom he was speaking. Then a little further on, under the subheading "The New Labour Movement", he continued:

Now the dam has burst, and much that should have been done in the twenties and the early thirties has been concentrated in the late thirties. So we have had social security legislation, and a resurging new labour movement, a class movement . . . that is youthful and inexperienced, that knows nothing about the last war and what inflation means, that is making all sorts of mistakes, because it has had no connection with the old labour movement, in which it could have learned many valuable lessons.

The people who constitute this new labour group are largely those who came out of school during the depression and had great difficulty in finding jobs.

I ask hon. members to note that.

First of all, we have to understand their motives and background.

That we have failed to do.

They have a feeling that is, if anything, anti-social. Many of them have the belief that they have been denied their proper place, and now they are out to take it. We can be forceful with trade unions, and there is many a time, I can assure you, when I feel that certain subversive elements should be whipped with scorpions.

That is what I object to, because it indicates a lack of understanding of what he said before. The reason why there is trouble in the labour movement, the reason why these people act as if in a hurry, is that they have been whipped with scorpions for ten long years. The remedy is not to continue that whipping. The cure lies, as the cure for all these things lies, in patience, kindness, toleration and understanding.