

or of the working class in general if we are to have such authoritarian methods applied as between employers and labour in industry.

The leader of the opposition referred to the labour situation in Great Britain, and said that labour had given up the right to strike. Strikes do take place in Great Britain, but they do not have the situation we have here. They do not have conciliation and arbitration on the question of union recognition. That is not a proper question for either arbitration or conciliation. So far as union recognition is concerned, all that should be necessary is that the union is a recognized union, that the majority of employees in a particular branch of industry are members of that union, and want it to act as their bargaining agent. That being the situation, the recognition of the union should be automatic, and should not be allowed to go to arbitration or conciliation.

The leader of the opposition referred to the Arvida incident. In my opinion the Minister of Munitions and Supply grievously erred in that matter. I understand the Arvida workers have asked for an apology from him for having described the trouble as subversive action with intention of sabotage. In my opinion not only are they justified in asking for an apology from the Minister of Munitions and Supply, but they are also justified in asking for an apology from the government, on whose behalf the minister was speaking. Either that, or the government should repudiate the statements made by the minister.

A royal commission was appointed to look into the charges made. A report from which I shall quote was tabled yesterday. It will be borne in mind that the Minister of Munitions and Supply described the difficulty at the plant as attempted sabotage, and on that basis the military were brought in to deal with the situation. On that basis also an order in council was passed giving the Minister of Munitions and Supply power to call the military whenever in his wisdom he thinks the situation warrants it. Although I have not the order before me, my memory is that that is the purport of it. The report of the royal commission on the Arvida matter states in part:

The evidence from every quarter indicates an entire absence of any subversive or hostile influence contributing in any way to the strike, and testimony to that effect and of the total absence of sabotage, actual or intended, was forthcoming from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the Quebec provincial police, the municipal police, the Department of Labour at Quebec, Mr. LaBelle the security officer, the senior officials of the company, as well as various foremen, superintendents, et cetera. Similar testimony is also forthcoming from Mr. Daris and Mr. Picard, representing the syndicate. Moreover, this testimony is strongly

[Mr. MacInnis.]

confirmed by the fact that the strikers were in complete possession of the premises for several days and absolutely no damage was done, though every opportunity presented itself. It seems clear beyond question that labour conditions alone were at stake.

It is also clear that had the Arvida plant been properly organized, with constant communication between representatives of the employees—business agents, shop stewards, or whatever representatives may have been chosen—and the management, the strike would never have taken place. If we are to have democracy in government and harmony in industry, labour must be organized, and must be recognized as a partner in industry.

Quoting again briefly:

There was no trace of latent or developed sabotage, in the sense of hostile or subversive influence, apparent at any time. The strike was one relating to labour conditions and pay, and which might have been avoided possibly had there been better provision against such an emergency.

Since the order in council passed at the request of the Minister of Munitions and Supply, enabling him to call in the armed forces of the country on occasions of this kind was based on false information, will it now be rescinded, or will the government continue to make use of it and to hold it as a club over the heads of other workers? Will they do that with an order in council which was obtained under false pretences? That is a question the government should answer.

I suggest again that the Prime Minister has a responsibility in the matter, because he is responsible for the acts of his ministers. During the recess an order in council was passed making sure that before a strike is called the employees in a plant or industry have by a majority voted in favour of such strike. Penalties were provided. Then, almost every month some order in council is passed for the regulation and restriction of workers in industry. I should like some time to see the government pass an order in council which would affect employers as a group. I should like to see it pass an order in council, or some sort of ordinance, to bring a sense of social responsibility to the minds of some of our employers.

I believe a conciliation board asked for by miners at Kirkland Lake has reported to the minister. What is the situation there, and what is the government going to do about it? What is the Department of Labour going to do about it? I wonder whether the Minister of Munitions and Supply will have an order in council passed permitting him to call out the military at Kirkland Lake mines to deal with the employers as he dealt with the workers at Arvida? I have before me excerpts from