

*The Address—Mr. Archibald*

3. In the meantime the company closed the mine on July 16, three days prior to the threatened strike.

4. The claimant, a waitress, was employed at the mine and filed her claim on July 30.

5. The claimant was notified that she had been disqualified by the insurance officer on August 13 on the ground that she was directly interested in the outcome of the labour dispute which had caused the stoppage of work.

6. On August 23 the appeal of the claimant against the insurance officer's decision was heard by the Vancouver board of referees and the claimant was represented by three officials of the united mine, mill and smelter workers. The court set aside the insurance officer's decision and allowed the claim.

7. As the company had not been represented at the session and requested an opportunity of giving its version of the stoppage of work, the claim was referred back to the court of referees. On September 10 the court reaffirmed its decision to allow the claim, the claimant being represented by officials of the united mine, mill and smelter workers. The commission, exercising its right, appealed the decision of the court of referees to the umpire. The umpire heard the appeal on October 28 and rendered his decision on December 7, the following being the pertinent portion of the decision:

My decision, therefore, is that the claimant lost her employment by reason of a stoppage of work due to a labour dispute at the Silbak Premier Mines Limited. As her conditions of work stood to be affected by the proposed collective bargaining agreement, she was directly interested in that dispute and was, therefore, rightly disqualified by the insurance officer in the first instance, under section 39(1) of the act.

It has been suggested by the chief claims officer that I give some guidance as "to the way in which we are to decide whether or not the stoppage of work is deemed to be still existing" or if it can be assumed that at some date "there was a definite abandonment of the project for economic or other reason." As indicated by Mr. Dowd, at the hearing, other gold mines have closed or are in the process of closing in the province of British Columbia, due to economic conditions. It may, therefore, be found that the stoppage of work, within the meaning of the act, has ceased at the Silbak Premier Mines Limited and that the mine is closed permanently. This, however, is entirely a question of fact which should be determined by the insurance officer after having communicated with the interested parties and investigated the prevailing circumstances.

The appeal is allowed.

The commission, not being in a position to obtain any information in regard to the possibilities of a general resumption of work or the permanent closing down of the mine, decided that the stoppage of work had ceased on December 7, date of the umpire's decision. Therefore they would get their unemployment insurance nine days later. I should like to point out that this matter came up before the

board of referees twice and on both occasions the appeal was allowed. Then by arbitrary action it was thrown into the hands of an umpire. In the first place we had an example of arrogance on the part of the mine operators when they did not appear before the court of referees when it first sat. It showed that they were interested only in intimidating the workers.

The labour record of this boss is well known from 1919 on. He is anti-labour all the way through. He had an experience in Australia that taught him a sharp lesson. They would not stand for that kind of nonsense down there and he had to come back here where he would have the protection of rules such as this. This action has created bitterness in the mining camps of British Columbia and has worked against democracy and this government. It was an example of outright bowing to the will of the mining bosses of British Columbia. These are two samples of injustices that are bound to have an effect on the working of democracy.

Over and above that, there is the general policy of the government in granting refuge to former nazi sympathizers which action does not go down at all well with those who contributed in world war II. I should like to point out the difference between the treatment given to these nazis and to ordinary people, and I refer to a paragraph which appeared in the *Montreal Gazette* of February 26 in the column headed On and Off the Record. It reads:

Justice for all, privileges for none: While Ottawa allows de Bernonvilles and Seigneurs to remain in Canada, with records questionable to say the least, little time is being lost in moves to deport two merchant marine veterans, brothers from Belfast, Ireland, without a single black mark on their records. Gordon and William West have been in immigration detention quarters for the past three weeks awaiting a ship for Manchester, where they stowed away last fall. They worked for a while in a hotel, and earned a good record. Then they sought to have their entry legalized, to bring in their families. Instead, their deportation was ordered. They have little money, and cannot fight deportation, as can others. A Liberal lawyer is working on their case, but it looks as though they would be deported without benefit of order in council.

I remember listening last session to the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Gillis) when he stated that it was necessary to have a good bank roll before you dared show yourself in a court room if you wanted to get justice. To a large extent this clipping outlining this little human tragedy backs up that position quite clearly.

If modern government hopes to carry on and gain the support of the people it must be government of the people, for the people and by the people. It is certain that north Atlantic pacts, military pacts and so on, with-