

up by the government on which are representatives of the employers and the trade unions, the nomination of such representatives being the sole purview of the organizations concerned.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend will allow me to interrupt him for a moment, it has been suggested that the dinner recess be until seven o'clock instead of eight, and if the house is agreeable to that I will make the motion with the Speaker in the chair.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MOTION FOR INTERMISSION FROM SIX TO SEVEN O'CLOCK P.M. THIS DAY

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved:

That the intermission at six o'clock this day continue until seven o'clock instead of eight o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. McCann in the chair.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at seven o'clock.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

100. Departmental administration, \$166,231.

Mr. MacINNIS: When the committee rose at six o'clock I had been reading from a letter addressed to me by the general secretary of the Trades Union Congress of Great Britain which showed quite clearly that in the United Kingdom there is no question about government-controlled industries and government industries recognizing the trades unions and having agreements with them. I said that in my opinion certain labour organizations were hoodwinked by supposed decisions made by the Department of Justice on labour matters. I have here copies of two letters, one from R. H. Neilson, secretary of the national war labour board addressed to T. F. Stevenson, business secretary of the Canadian electrical trades union, and another signed by F. P. Varcoe, deputy minister of justice. I will read these two letters to sustain the point I am making. In his letter dated April 22, 1942, Mr. Neilson says:

Last December when we wrote you in response to your inquiry of the 12th of that month, it was the belief that semi-independent

[Mr. MacInnis.]

agencies of municipalities would be outside the scope of P.C. 8253 under clause 12 (1) (ii), and your understanding on this point is in accordance with the information which you were given at that time. Subsequently, however, the Department of Justice ruled that the word "agency" applied only to agencies of provincial governments, and this decision threw certain municipal bodies under the jurisdiction of the order.

Interpretative rule No. 1 of bulletin No. 2 was written then in conformity with this new interpretation of the legal branch of the government.

Mr. Stevenson then wrote to the Minister of Justice, and his letter was replied to by the deputy minister of justice. This is what the deputy minister said:

Your letter of April 27 to the Minister of Justice has been handed to me. The function of this department is confined to advising the government in matters of law and it is not my duty nor would it be proper for me to advise a private individual on such matters. I regret, therefore, that I cannot advise you upon the matter which you have referred to the Minister of Justice.

The letter was as to whether employees and workers in industries or utilities owned by municipalities and provinces came under the provisions of P.C. 8253. The deputy minister of justice continues:

I may say, however, that while some discussions have taken place between the members of the national war labour board and members of this department, no opinions have been given by this department on the matters mentioned in your letter.

Mr. MITCHELL: What is the date of that letter?

Mr. MacINNIS: The date of the first letter is April 22, 1942—Mr. Neilson's letter to Mr. Stevenson—and the date of Mr. Varcoe's letter is May 7, 1942. I submit that the function of the Department of Labour is not to try to hoodwink organized labour but to try to help organized labour so that it may be in a position to help the government and the country. I have said as much privately to some of the people who have to do with the administration of labour. Not only are trade unions recognized in government-controlled and government-owned industries in Great Britain, but they insist through their boards of arbitration and conciliation and review boards or courts, or whatever they are called, that the traditional and customary relations between workers in trade unions, and the employers, shall be carried out.

I hold in my hand the decision of a court—not a court of law, but a court set up under the labour laws in the United Kingdom—in a case where there was a stoppage of work because