

*Industrial Relations*

under an agreement should pay dues equal to that paid by members of the union, whether he is a member or not.

We do not, as taxpayers, object when those who refuse to pay their taxes are compelled to pay them, which, in effect, is practising the principle involved in the Rand formula.

The hon. member for Timiskaming is also worried about the irresponsibility of trade unionists. I would like to quote her remarks as reported at page 2496 of *Hansard*:

When I say that certain unions do not show responsibility and therefore should not be given this concession, that their employers should not be forced to give it to them, I do not just mean responsibility to the company; I mean responsibility to the community, responsibility to their own members, and above all a respect for law and order.

I do not believe that trade unionists as a class, section or category of the population are any more irresponsible than are employers as a class, section or category of the population. In another debate I put on the record the number of companies that were breaking the laws of this country and defying the laws of this country—and had been doing so for years—through the formation of combines in restraint of trade, raising prices and so forth. In my opinion, that is irresponsible action. But before we can demand responsible action from any section of the community we must put those people in a position where they can enjoy the democratic rights enjoyed by other members of the community.

Some years ago, in 1943, to be exact, this government appointed a board known as the national war labour board, to make an investigation into employer-employee relationships in this country. The board was under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice C. P. McTague, as he was at that time. The board made a report dated August, 1943. I should like to read briefly from that report, and I am doing this because of the opposition that is coming from employers now to legitimate trade union action. There was a majority and a minority report of this board. I am reading from the majority report which was signed by the chairman and by the employers' member on it, Mr. Leon Lalonde. The report stated:

The most serious question involved at the present time is that of the right of collective bargaining. It must be kept in mind that this is a right which in a practical way has been recognized in Canada for a period of half a century. The recognition of the right has been far from universal. By far the majority of employers have resisted it over the period. Generally speaking, the great mass of employers, until comparatively recent years, have employed all weapons in their power to resist and discourage the trade union movement. There have been exceptions of course.

[Mr. MacInnis.]

That was the attitude of employers. When you get that attitude from employers, you are bound to get some similar sort of reaction from the employees of those organizations. You get the highest degree of democracy in the older trade unions, in the trade unions that have had a longer existence, great experience, in the same way as you find the greatest amount of political democracy in governments that have exercised political democracy for us for some time. Then the majority report of the board continues:

When it is remembered, however, that the international trade unions represent but approximately 20 per cent of Canadian labour generally it is apparent on a comparison with other countries such as England, Sweden and Australia that Canada's trade union movement has been very, very slow indeed. Until comparatively recent years we have been in the main an agricultural country. That factor, together with resistance to the movement by reactionary industrial employers, induced by the fear motive or other even more selfish motives, has served to hold in check any widespread advance in the movement of trade unionism for quite a period of years.

Those are not my words. A trade unionist is not saying that. That is the studied opinion of a board set up by the government to investigate employer-employee relationships. As I said before, when you get that condition you cannot expect people who have been denied the democratic right of trade union organization to be wise, prudent and considerate in the exercise of newly found power. That desirable result will have to come through time. I think it was Lord Macaulay who said that the only way to build freedom was to extend freedom. I could continue reading from this report but I think I have read enough to show that if there is any irresponsibility on the part of trade unions—and I am not conceding that there is—responsibility for that situation rests in other places.

I now want to take you back a little bit further, Mr. Speaker, just to show the attitude of employers to trade unions in this country; and this is not so long ago; I think the report was made in 1937. In 1936 or 1937 the federal government set up a royal commission to inquire into the textile industry. The royal commissioner was, I believe, Mr. Justice Turgeon. The present Chief Justice of Ontario, Mr. Justice McRuer, I believe was counsel or one of the counsel for the commission. The heads of the textile industry were asked as to their attitude to trade unions, and I am going to read you their replies as they were given in a brief submitted to the royal commission on February 2, 1937, by Elie Beauregard, K.C., commission counsel. The president of the