

and at least as arduous and hazardous. There is no justification ~~for~~ for such a gap in wage rates as exists.

The majority report of the Barlow Commission rejected the comparison with Oshawa, for several reasons. Three of them are of particular interest: (1) Oshawa is near a large metropolitan centre; (2) Oshawa rates are "largely affected" by Windsor rates, which in turn are affected by Detroit rates; (3) the rates at both Oshawa and Windsor are affected by the rates paid in the parent companies in the United States. The steel workers are pretty certain to draw the conclusion that under the Government's wage policy workers near a large centre are entitled to higher wages than those at a distance; workers near Detroit are to be similarly favoured; and workers in American branch plants are entitled to more than workers in purely Canadian firms. This from the high priest of "national autonomy", "National unity", and "equality"!

I may add that, again, the majority report, in this as in other contexts, does not even discuss the merits or demerits of the union's case. It just keeps harping on P.C. 5963.

The cost of what the steel workers are asking is of course a mere flea-bite in ~~comparison~~ comparison with total payrolls of Canadian industry, national income, and ~~total war expenditure~~ total war expenditure. Total payrolls for eight leading industries are now running around \$53,000,000 a week, or over \$2,750,000,000 a year; and this covers only about 1,816,000 of the country's 3,060,000 non-agricultural workers. National income, according to the D.B.S. estimates for the first nine months of 1942, is running around \$7,400,000,000 or more; the average for May to September, inclusive, was over \$640,000,000 a month. Our war expenditure is now, I think, about \$4,000,000,000. Of course the Government professes to be afraid that an increase in steel will start a sort of avalanche of increases; it even hints that Labour is "plotting" to "break the price ceiling". This last is of course utter and malicious nonsense. As for the danger of an avalanche, our position before the Commission was that we were simply asking for the removal of discrimination (we contended that existing restrictions in effect imposed on steel workers a ~~concealed~~ concealed discriminatory income tax); that we wanted our case considered on its merits; and that any other applications for increases should also be considered on their merits. I should think it is certainly true that there are other industries whose workers have as good a case for increases as steel, and I'd give them exactly the same treatment; but there are other industries which have no case for an increase, and I'd treat their cases on their merits too.

We submitted a good deal of evidence, as I've said, on the inadequacy of the basic rates in steel (and a very large proportion of the workers, especially at Sydney, are on or near the basic rate; I can get you the ~~exact~~ exact figures; indeed, I shall get them at noon and add them to this). Some indication of what is involved appears from the facts that (1) the average weekly wage (inclusive of cost of living bonus and overtime) in crude, rolled and forged