

My next question was:

If so, with what newspapers and dating back how long?

The answer to that question took about two pages, listing newspapers in many cities in most of the provinces of Canada which have had contracts with the typographical union including such a clause. More recently some new contracts have been signed with other papers where no disputes obtain, and there is on *Hansard* a specific answer with respect to one of those, namely, the *Ottawa Journal*, which since the other disputes began has signed a contract including such a clause as this, with one qualification to which I will refer in just a moment.

My contention in all of this is that that clause is not contrary to Canadian law. Furthermore, the proof is found in the many contracts of a similar nature which have existed down through the years. Since that was a point on which an impasse was reached, namely, the wording I have just quoted, an attempt was made—I am not going to discuss now which side took the initiative, or where it came from—to try to reach conciliation on that point. The result was a meeting with officials of the Department of Labour on January 30, 1946, at which were present not only officials of the Department of Labour but representatives of both parties to the dispute. When the meeting was over it was agreed all round that certain words should be added to that clause to which objection had been taken. The clause as amended, and as accepted by the international typographical union, reads:

Provided, however, local union laws not affecting wages, hours and working conditions and the general laws of the international typographical union shall not be subject to arbitration except in so far as such arbitration and the results thereof are compulsory under Canadian law.

The addition of those last sixteen words clears away any doubt as to the desire or thought of the international typographical union to do anything contrary to Canadian law. When I was speaking a moment ago about the *Ottawa Journal* I mentioned a certain qualification. I had reference to that last phrase which has been added to the wording of the *Journal* contract.

It seems to me that a mountain has been made out of a mole hill with respect to this clause which has been in dispute. There is no doubt in my mind that that is not the issue. The issue is wages and hours, and also the question whether or not the publishers concerned are as anxious as they might be to see unions in this country strong. At any

rate, issue having been made on that point my quarrel with the Minister of Labour—I am going to be quite frank, because it is early in the morning and there is no reason for our losing tempers; on the other hand let us on both sides speak our minds about this; he is a member of this house and he can make his reply—is that throughout the piece he has helped to give credence and strength to the ideas that the publishers—

Mr. MITCHELL: Let us be fair about this; there is no quarrel between my hon. friend and me.

Mr. KNOWLES: I am not sure of that.

Mr. MITCHELL: No, there is not. You are making the quarrel yourself.

Mr. GRAYDON: It takes two to make a fight.

Mr. MITCHELL: When the boys read that back home I do not want them to think that the galleries were filled when you and I had a quarrel. I am not going to quarrel with my hon. friend.

Mr. KNOWLES: The minister and I could have a quarrel even if there was nobody else here at all. Apparently the minister does not like what I am saying.

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not mind; this is a free country.

Mr. KNOWLES: Certainly it is a free country, and I want to keep it so. It seems to me that the duty of the Minister of Labour is to be impartial in matters of this kind. I would hope that once in a while he would really see the workers' side of these things. But despite the fact that from January 30 of this year it was agreed to add that other clause, despite the fact that it was recognized by all concerned, the publishers and printers and labour department officials, that it took care of the matter, the minister kept on saying in this house as late as June 4, as reported on page 2153 of *Hansard*, in answer to a question asked by my colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg North, that the basic issue was the desire of the union for something that was contrary to Canadian law. That is the idea the publishers have been spreading. The minister by making a similar statement—let us face up to this—has made it difficult for the union to establish its case in the eyes of the Canadian public as strongly as was warranted by the facts.

In the meantime certain commissions were appointed to look into this matter. First of all there was a commission headed by Mr.