

interest to me, in addition to questions I have raised during the course of the session, is the typographical dispute. First I should like to make it clear that this dispute is between certain publishers and a union which is clearly a well-established trade union organization. The minister knows as well as I do that the international typographical union is one of the oldest on the North American continent. I was interested to learn a short time ago that at a banquet held by this union in Toronto in October, 1944, a message was received from the Prime Minister in which he expressed his regret at being unable to accept an invitation to attend. In part he said:

I regret not being able to be present as at one time I wrote a short history of the international typographical union as a study in trade union methods. It was published in the *Journal of Political Economy* of the University of Chicago that year. The international typographical union is a model for others to follow.

I was interested in getting from the library a copy of volume 5 for 1896-97 of the *Journal of Political Economy*, and reading the article on the international typographical union which appears at page 458 and following, written by the present Prime Minister. I mention this only to make it clear that this is not some passing organization which is out to stir up trouble. It is one of the oldest unions on the North American continent, and has been recognized for some time by no less a person than the Prime Minister, as a model for others to follow.

As I understand it, the dispute arose in Winnipeg nearly a year ago when contracts then in existence between the union and the two daily newspapers there were about to expire and it was time to seek negotiation of a new contract. The union in seeking this new contract was desirous of improving its position in the matter of hours of work, take-home pay and certain other conditions—but mainly the first two items I have mentioned. The negotiations had not proceeded very far until something of an impasse was reached. But the publishers made an issue, not out of the things really at stake, namely hours and wages, but rather out of certain words in the contract as proposed by the union. The words were these:

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.

The publishers picked out this clause and declared it to indicate in the main two things: (1) that the union was asking for something contrary to the law of Canada; and (2) that the local union in Winnipeg, of which I am a

[Mr. Knowles.]

member, was being dictated to by the head office of the international union in Indianapolis. My understanding of the situation is that that was a wholly false position for the publishers to take. In the matter of the second claim, that there was dictation from the head office in Indianapolis, I am in a position to know that decisions all through this dispute have been taken in a democratic way by one of the most democratic trade unions in North America.

When local unions are part of an international union, the minister will know what I mean when I say that that is part of their strength. It is best for them not to be just a local group, but to be part of a nation-wide, and in this instance, a continent-wide organization. They draw from that fact all the strength they can in their struggle with their employers. But the basic decision whether certain conditions should be sought, and, if such conditions are not met, whether the workers should go out on strike, is made by the members of the local union themselves.

With respect to the other charge, that the union was seeking something contrary to the law of Canada, let me say that I take strong exception to it on several grounds. To begin with, there can be no objection to the expression "provided however local union laws"—and please note this part of it—"not affecting wages, hours and working conditions"—and I go on—"and the general laws of the international typographical union shall not be subject to arbitration". In that clause asking for the exception from arbitration of certain laws of the union, specific exception from the exception is made with reference to matters affecting wages, hours and working conditions. Those are, by definition in P.C. 1003, the essential items in a collective agreement so far as Canadian law is concerned. I contend that on the face of it the wording of the clause objected to cannot be called contrary to Canadian law. In addition, similar clauses have been in contracts between the international typographical union and a great many Canadian newspapers for a great number of years. That information is already on *Hansard* for June 26, where the minister gave answers to certain questions which I asked, to be found on pages 2848 and 2849. These were:

1. Have any contracts between the international typographical union and Canadian newspaper publishers prior to November, 1945, contained a clause providing in any way for the accepting of the union's laws, not relating to hours, wages and working conditions, from arbitration.

To that the minister replied "Yes."