

Public Printing and Stationery Act

prevailing rate agreed to last spring for the printing bureau is the same as the prevailing rate in Montreal at the present time. The ceiling rate for the printing bureau and the Montreal rate were the same on October 30 ultimo, and they will remain such until new agreements are entered in due course.

To make sure about the Toronto rate, I called the treasury board who informed me that the prevailing rate in Toronto, at the time of the last revision in the printing bureau, was \$1.67½ or 2½ cents more than the basic rate paid in Montreal. I am sure that you will agree that neither in virtue of the statute nor of P.C. 6190 is the treasury board bound to fix the maximum rate of Montreal or Toronto as the rate for the printing bureau. But, in your case, the treasury board has been very fair for the bureau. The printers may get 2½ cents less than the Toronto rate, but they get as much as Montreal and 10 or 15 cents more than those engaged in other printing firms located in your own city of Ottawa.

I have read with care the letter from Mr. R. B. Bryce, assistant deputy minister of finance and secretary of the treasury board. I have noted that this letter was dated July 11, 1950, when the rates of the printing bureau were those prevailing in Ottawa. As it was sent to you before the last revision of wage rates which came in force in the printing bureau last spring, I am quite surprised that you sent it to me, because the Ottawa rates are now less than at the printing bureau.

You cannot expect any opinion about the labour week nor the withdrawal of P.C. 6190, because it is a matter of government policy.

Yours very truly,

Jean-François Pouliot

Mr. Pouliot: On a question of privilege, may I say that I have the greatest respect for my colleagues in the house and that when I have a complaint to make about one of them, I notify him in advance in order that he may be here to reply. I had dinner in town, and afterwards I came here with a friend of mine who is in the gallery; then I went up to my office to read my correspondence. A colleague came to my office and said that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was attacking me in the chamber. I could not believe it; but I came down to the chamber and found that it was true. What was true? That he was attacking me. I do not complain about that. Opinions are free. But it would have been shorter if I had been here at the start.

What did I say when the hon. member started to complain about the wages of the printing staff at the printing bureau? I am not a member of any union and I do not boast that I am; but I know as much about printing as does the hon. member; and I have as much admiration as he has for the personnel of the printing bureau who are doing an excellent job.

There is a great difference between the personnel of the bureau and the union. I have never been terrorized by any union leaders for the very good reason that I have done their job most of the time when they were parading around with big gold chains and

smoking big cigars. That is my experience in my county where I have eight hundred railway men. During the railway strike I was called upon by the strikers to address them. The first thing I told them—and I do not know whether other members of parliament would use the same language—was this. I said: Gentlemen, I thank you for having honoured me with the invitation to address you. With regard to the strike, I will tell you that I have always fought for you and nearly always against the unions. They said: "You are right, Jean-François." That does not mean that I gave the cold shoulder to the men in overalls because, during the war, I was one of the few who defended them and wanted the country to respect them because their work was essential to the war effort. They respected me also. The hon. gentleman would not have uttered the second sentence if he had delivered that speech in my county.

What is the story? It is obvious. I said one thing that I will not retract. The union men and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre know that it is true. There was an agitator, by the name of Ford, who came out and cursed everybody. What happened to him was this. A week or two after he had been using such bad language in order to arouse the members of the union he was defeated by three to one. My hon. friend knows it. His name is Ford. He knows it. And he had to go. He was defeated, poof.

Mr. Knowles: That has nothing to do with the issue.

Mr. Pouliot: It is the truth that I have said and I must dot my i's and cross my t's to make my hon. friend understand, although he is clever at everything else.

Now, sir, what is the second point? I said that the printers were receiving the maximum salary. Perhaps there was a shade of difference in the terms that I used. What they receive cannot be any more than the ceiling, and the ceiling is the maximum rates of pay paid to printers in Montreal and Toronto. That is the ceiling. And in order to be fair with the committee at the time, and in order that there should be no more discussion about it, I quoted the text of the provision of the statute establishing the rates of salaries at the printing bureau. My hon. friend said, and this is in the correspondence—my hon. friend who is always right when he is alone to expound his views—that the rate at Montreal and Toronto is higher than that of Ottawa. That was partly true and partly false, because I inquired from the treasury board. I wanted to tell the truth; I always do. Sometimes there may be a slight difference in the expression of views, but I do not want to