

If my Conservative friends would read the Conservative press they would know that.

Mr. LENNARD: I just asked what papers the hon. member was referring to. I asked only for information.

Mr. MacINNIS: I took it in the way it was asked, and I do not think my hon. friend was asking for it in just the way he says. He thought I could not come through with the goods.

Mr. LENNARD: Not at all; I expected you would come through. I asked only for information.

Mr. MacINNIS: Along the lines of this editorial, I would urge the minister to take action. The *Ottawa Journal* of August 29 contained a dispatch from Vancouver relative to the approval of certain wage scales by the regional war labour board of British Columbia. This dispatch reads:

Now the board has sanctioned increases for shipyard workers, steel workers, construction men, mechanics, printers, plumbers and dredge operators, who receive the top boost of 20 cents an hour. The board also approved a 40 hour week, instead of 48, for practically all workers.

The largest group—2,000 men—comprises shipyard workers, in the wooden boat yards, who get a 15 cent an hour raise, and next come building trade workers—1,400—including plumbers, steamfitters, painters, bricklayers and shinglers, with a boost of 18 cents an hour.

Note that in all cases the increases are from thirteen to twenty cents an hour, and the reduction in hours is from forty-eight or forty-four to forty, perhaps not in all cases to become effective immediately, but as a part of the agreement. One of the Ottawa papers of a day or two ago contained an item from Cornwall, Ontario, reading:

Increases in hourly rates for shift workers range from 13.7 to 27.5 cents an hour and for day workers from 13 to 21.5 cents. Rates for boys and girls are increased 10 cents. Time and a half is to be paid for work on Saturdays and double time on Sundays. Weekly hours of shift workers are reduced from 48 to 42 and for day workers from 48 to 44.

I mentioned that the proposals made to the industrial relations committee by the steel workers for the settlement of the steel strike should be accepted. I notice that press items dealing with the steel strike state continually that the steel workers demand a 40-hour week. That is not correct; in the proposals made to the industrial relations committee by their representatives they agreed to continue on a 48-hour week in order to get a settlement and in order to give the companies time to find the necessary personnel. I should like to read

[Mr. MacInnis.]

briefly from the submission made to the committee, as follows:

The union is anxious to assist in increasing actual production during the coming months, as urged by Mr. Donald Gordon.

The union firmly believes that shorter hours are needed now, that shorter hours would increase efficiency and that there would be no shortage of men for the steel industry if wages and working conditions were more attractive.

We are as determined as we ever were to avoid the paradox of some men working long hours while others go unemployed.

However, as previously stated, the union is willing to give the employers more time in which to find personnel and arrange new schedules.

On the basis that we are still in a period of reconversion and readjustment, the union, with reluctance and with some misgivings, will yield to the companies' claims that the 40-hour week cannot be established immediately or in one step.

It is important, however, that the principle of shorter hours be recognized.

We therefore propose that a work-week of 44 hours be made effective as of April 1, 1947, with the usual penalty for overtime.

I am convinced that there are a great many people who talk about the steel strike who do not know about that concession.

In settling this dispute I would urge the government and the Department of Labour to be imaginative and generous. In the natural order of things this strike will leave an aftermath of bitterness particularly in Hamilton, perhaps altogether in Hamilton—more than usually the case of strikes. A number of the workers remained at work in the plant. While in the plant they received triple pay. After the dispute is settled, any gains in wages and improvements in working conditions won by the union men, who have made sacrifices in the loss of wages and suffered other inconveniences, will also go to the employees who cooperated with the steel company in opposing those high wages and better conditions. Under those circumstances, is it not understandable that there will be bitterness?

I received a copy of a brief that was sent to the chairman of the industrial relations committee from the Montreal chamber of commerce. First, they stated that during the past few years organized labour has made great gains in wages and improved conditions. Then they make most emphatically the point that they are opposed to forcing workers to become members of a labour union; in other words, opposed to any form of union security. In replying to their letter and the brief, I said that I would agree with them provided that they would agree with me that the conditions won by the union men went only to members of the union. That seems to me a reasonable proposition, because I do not believe that people who not only refuse to strive for better