

Interim Supply

the Canadian brotherhood of railway and transport workers or the C.B.R.T.

At the time of the merger between the two unions the N.A.M.E.—the marine engineers union—had been in negotiation with the Northland Navigation Company and two other shipping companies on the west coast and had reached agreement in principle upon the terms of a collective agreement that was to exist between the union and Northland. However, the agreement itself was not signed because of the pending merger. Subsequent to that time, in meetings which were held actually to consummate the collective agreement and to sign what had already been agreed upon in principle, Northland Navigation Company, the company which is recipient of this \$294,500 which we have authorized and payment of which for the coming year we shall be considering today, decided that it had changed its mind and did not want to enter into the agreement which it had agreed to enter into previously. This event, of course, was rather disconcerting to the national association of marine engineers, naturally, and they wondered why this was so.

Events two or three days following the particular meeting to which I have just referred showed why Northland Navigation Company, to whom we pay a subsidy of almost \$300,000 a year, did this or what that company had in its mind. From subsequent events it was quite obvious that it had reached some understanding with another union, namely, the seafarers international union, that the S.I.U. would apply, as they did some two or three days later, for certification of the same group of employees for which the national association of marine engineers had been previously certified.

We know that in the days just following the second war, the seafarers international union entered labour-management affairs in Canada in a sort of back-door way and participated quite extensively in smashing the then Canadian seamen union. Some charges were levelled that this was done with the connivance of the Liberal government or with its acquiescence. The history of the S.I.U., in so far as its dealings with companies are concerned, is not the best in the world. That fact is generally recognized. In any event, there was some evidence here that the Northland Navigation Company, to whom we have authorized payment of a subvention of \$294,500, was entering into or wanting to participate in the signing of, let us call it, a back-door agreement with the S.I.U. to replace the national association of marine engineers as the certified bargaining agent for certain employees working for Northland.

[Mr. Howard.]

As a result of Northland Navigation changing its mind and as a result of the S.I.U. having applied for certification, the marine engineers, thinking that it was the only way in which they could exert some influence upon Northland to continue its negotiations with them, undertook to call a strike and they did. When the strike was called on the waterfront of Vancouver, the following events were troublesome and there was a good bit of difficulty in the attempt of the national association of marine engineers to establish a picket line. The seafarers international union, obviously as a result of its desire to replace the N.A.M.E. and obviously because of its close relationship to Northland Navigation Company, in this instance attempted to break through the picket line and to herd scabs through it in order to load the ships. I give this information only as some sort of a background to indicate the close relationship which existed between the Northland Navigation Company and a particular union, to connect it with our payment of a \$294,500 subsidy to that particular company and to wonder whether some of that money is not being channelled into an area that promotes and foments industrial disharmony and jurisdictional disputes and is and was being used to attempt to bring in a union with a record like that of the S.I.U. to replace a decent, honest union like the N.A.M.E. That is what I am asking the department or the Minister of Transport to look into.

In this waterfront dispute, or the jurisdictional question which arose, in attempting to break the picket line through the use of strong-arm tactics and goons and thugs and people of that nature, a number of them were arrested by the police and charged. As to some of those who were arrested and charged, in the car in which they were riding during this waterfront dispute I understand that baseball bats, bicycle chains and a shotgun were discovered. I have in my hand a transcript of the evidence arising out of this trial or at least part of it before Oscar Orr, Esq., Q.C., police magistrate, in the city of Vancouver, B.C., on July 20, 1959. With your permission I should like to relate some of the evidence given in order to show conclusively that this is another instance of collusion between a company to whom we are paying a subsidy and a particular union in order to promote the interests of that particular union to the detriment of others. I do not think that public funds should be used in this way. They are for the purpose of providing a service to the coastal points or upcoast points of Vancouver island and for the people who live there and they should not be used for the purpose of promoting gang warfare on the waterfront or to bring in goon