

wage increase asked for by the workers? I thought it was prepared to recommend six per cent, and not seven cents an hour.

Hon. Mr. Farris: That was the finding of the conciliation board; but it makes no difference what the conciliation board recommended—and if my honourable friend wishes it I can give him Mr. Mather's statement as to the fact that his company was prepared to pay even more than seven cents an hour, provided the working hours remained as they were.

Hon. Mr. Bouffard: I quite agree with that.

Hon. Mr. Farris: The reason I dealt with that phase of the matter in my opening remarks was that we have heard so much all over the country, and even in this chamber, about the problem of the high cost of living. Had the men been prepared to continue working the hours they were working, at this time when production is so necessary and everyone must do his utmost their demands for wages would have been met in full, and the question of the high cost of living would not have come into the consideration of this matter at all.

Hon. Mr. Bouffard: That is true.

Hon. Mr. Farris: Honourable senators, I have as the next item in my notes what Mr. Hall said about hours of labour, but I wish to defer that for the moment, because either the figures in his statement are wrong, his statement is inadequate, or Mr. Justice Wilson and Mr. Pitblado are wrong in their findings. In my opinion the board was not wrong in its findings. I will come to Mr. Hall's statement under the heading of remedies which I shall suggest.

My honourable friends will pardon me if I take a little time on this matter, because I am speaking from a brief which I prepared over the week-end. I hope that will not detract from my argument. Let me point out that I am not trying to be oratorical, nor am I attempting to persuade anybody. But I believe that the time has come for thoughtful consideration of all the facts, in order that out of this tragedy we may arrive at some sensible solution of the disputes between industry and labour without involving innocent third parties and damaging them to the utmost degree.

I am sticking to my text, honourable senators, in which I have set out eight reasons why I think the strike was not justified at the time and for the issues in the final analysis.

My next reason for saying the strike was unwarranted is that there never was a secret ballot on this question. The men had to sign their names, write their addresses, local union

and everything else on the ballot. The arguments of the unions were set forth right on the ballot, and if the worker voted contrary to that appeal he knew what the results might be. My submission is that the ballot contained inadequate information. I had in my notes the word "misinformation", but I struck it out because I did not want to make any improper allegation. I shall read what Mr. Hall said on the strike ballot, and I think it will explain why his view was different from that of Mr. Justice Wilson. The ballot contains this paragraph:

The evidence we presented as to the prevalence of a reduced work week in Canada was too voluminous to present here. However, we did show, based on the Department of Labour surveys, that the five-day week is the predominant practice in industry generally, with the trend continuing.

You will observe, honourable senators, that in other places Mr. Hall talks about the "five day forty-hour week", but when he makes a comparison in the foregoing paragraph he says nothing about forty hours. As I say, I have not had an opportunity to work out the details, but if that statement by Mr. Hall means a five-day forty-hour week, then Mr. Justice Wilson and Mr. Isaac Pitblado did not know what they were talking about. In any event, Mr. Hall chooses to confine his statement to the five-day week, not 40 hours. I say that is inadequate information to place on the ballot.

In the next place, I say that the calling of a strike at the eleventh hour was not justified, because the men had never voted on the issue on which the strike was called.

Hon. Mr. Howard: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Farris: I have before me two ballots, one dated May 16, 1950, and the other dated June 12, 1950. The ballot under the latter date reads as follows:

This is a statement by Mr. Hall. It is not a statement by the Labour Department of what are the fair issues, it is an ex parte statement by the labour leaders. The ballot requires the members of the union to sign their names, give their addresses and occupations and so on. It reads:

The undersigned, having carefully read the foregoing statement, votes for . . . (or) against . . . a peaceful withdrawal from service unless the matter is satisfactorily disposed of and I hereby appoint the Organizations' officers constituting the Negotiating Committee as my attorneys in fact and authorize them to act accordingly. I understand that in the event of such withdrawal from service, it will be conducted in accordance with the laws of the respective organizations.

That was the authorization for a strike based on conditions as they existed last May and June, when the Board made a report in favour of a 6 per cent increase and a 44-hour week. At page 20 of the *Hansard* of the