

then I will ask hon. members if the workers are to blame for asking for a little higher wages. At page 760 of No. 124, *Votes and Proceedings*, containing the recommendations of the war expenditures committee, I find this:

In its investigations the subcommittee found in one instance that an aircraft producing firm agreed to pay a salesman for release of an existing sales contract an amount equal to 50 per cent of its firm capital and which agreement the subcommittee believes to be an improvident agreement and should not have been entered into had the facts been brought to the attention of the department promptly.

There is one instance, if you want to get a lot of money—and I emphasize “a lot”—where you could get money to pay more wages to those in the lower income brackets. I commend that to those who are so fearful of inflation. Let me read the next recommendation of the committee, on the same page:

That active steps should be taken now to plan for post-war salvage of physical assets owned by the Department of Munitions and Supply. Hundreds of millions of dollars of public money have been spent on buildings, plant and equipment for war production, some of which has been expended on private property and which the department is under agreement to remove within a very short period of time after the cessation of hostilities. This whole problem demands special study.

There is another place where money can be found. Let me read another recommendation because I want to help the Minister of Labour and the government. In its report the war expenditures committee says:

As a result of its investigations to date the subcommittee makes the following recommendations:

(1) That the policy of placing fire insurance on material to be used for the manufacture of aircraft and also on the finished aircraft down to date of actual acceptance by the Department of National Defence for Air should be discontinued and all existing contracts amended accordingly to provide that this risk should be carried by the Department of Munitions and Supply and further that the amount of fire insurance carried by privately owned companies on their own property and chargeable by the companies as a cost item with respect to aircraft built under the aforementioned contracts should be restricted to an amount not to exceed actual cost less depreciation. . . .

And so on. These are instances of glaring—I was going to say—misappropriation of funds. Without question of doubt, the men who are working day after day in those plants know that men in the higher executive offices are getting salaries which must be regarded as huge in contrast with workers' wages of fifty-five cents an hour, a little better than \$100 a month. They know that these executives are receiving anywhere from three to twenty-one and twenty-two thousand dollars a year;

[Mr. C. E. Johnston.]

yet you go to the workers and tell them they should not strike, that they should be satisfied with \$100 a month. Well, if you are used courteously you should not be. Yet the Prime Minister has told us on more than one occasion in this house that there would be no blood money in this war. I fear that he does not know the facts, because if he did he would see to it that certain changes were made.

As a result of this serious situation, and in view of the references which I have made, although briefly, in passing, to the war expenditures committee, I ask the government to hold a secret session of parliament wherein the operations of the committee can be thoroughly discussed, and that the evidence be brought down so that every hon. member shall have access to it. I am sure that the membership of this house will be tremendously surprised when they have all the evidence before them, and they are the ones who should have it. In my opinion an immediate secret session should be called. I am going to leave it at that. If a secret session is granted, we shall discuss the matters in secret session; and if not, we shall discuss them outside the secret session.

One other phase of this question to which I wish to refer related to women in industry. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) referred to it the other day; and I agree heartily with what he said. Anywhere I have travelled I have been tremendously impressed with the ability and the interest women have applied to this class of work. They are working at the side of the men and doing just as well as the men. I do not think there have been any complaints about them. As far as both quantity and quality of production are concerned they have achieved equal results. Yet we find a man and a woman working side by side, doing exactly the same type and quality of work, and the one receiving higher wages than the other. This is not right, and the Minister of Labour will have more trouble on his hands if he does not rectify it. I suggest to him that he get busy before the matter comes on his doorstep. There should be equal pay for equal work. There is no question that that is the right principle, and the United States has shown that it can be applied. I quote from the October, 1942, issue of the *Labour Gazette*:

A recent decision of the American war labour board establishes the board's policy in regard to the question of whether women industrial workers should receive as much pay as men for the same kind of work. The board declared its opinion that women who “in comparable jobs produce work of the same quantity and quality as that performed by men” should receive the same wages.

This statement of policy arose out of a decision by the war labour board ordering the