

of violation on the part of the employer, either the union—and there are far too few of them in the country—or the individual himself, would have to take the initiative in prosecuting the employer if he was the offending party. It abrogates any trade union agreement that may be in operation. Further than that, it definitely goes into the provinces where certain arrangements or certain basic laws are laid down with respect to rates. In the last clause, No. 64, it is stated:

This order shall supersede any inconsistent provisions of any dominion or provincial law, order or regulation, but nothing in this order shall deny to employees cost-of-living bonuses or other benefits to which they were entitled on November 15, 1941.

National defence contracts, for example, contain a provision that the wages applicable in the different sections of the province shall be based on prevailing rates paid in the province. You will find in one section, where there is a strongly organized union, carpenters, for example, paid ninety cents an hour on national defence contracts, while in another section a hundred miles away, where there is no established union, rates as low as fifty-two cents are paid.

As I see this order in council it can mean that the only arrangement recognized is the cost-of-living bonus as set out in it. I have not had time to read it completely, but I have picked the clauses that are objectionable to me as a trade union member who always had the right to bargain with the employer on the basis of the employee's ability to earn.

Before there can be maximum production in Canada, before there can be full cooperation of the workers of this country, you will have to recognize that you must make obligatory on the employers of this country the recognition of trade unions. Thousands of men in industry, hundreds of men in the unions, are tied up and not doing the job they should be doing because they are wholly occupied 365 days a year in trying to brush away or break through the maze of red tape. They are quarrelling with governments and government regulations. Whereas if you had a legitimate trade union movement across this country, affiliated with the national organizations having offices in Ottawa, it would make for efficient action. It would further national leadership from coast to coast. It would eliminate the necessity of workers coming from Vancouver and western Canada in delegations away from their regular employment for the purpose of holding conferences with the national war labour board. In the final analysis the war labour board is not in a

position to legislate for the industries across the country because it is not in contact with them. The majority of the workers across the country are not organized. Plant councils are being set up, but the men have no proper arrangements for collective bargaining; they are not able to make presentation of their case. Seventy-five per cent of the trouble is due to confusion, lack of leadership and trying to cut the red tape that now exists in the matter of wages.

The arguments that I have heard advanced in the house against increased wages, so far as I have been able to follow them—I make no pretence of being a financial expert or understanding the mysteries of high finance—are to the effect that increased wages mean inflation. I do not think increased wages mean any such thing. Anyone who uses that argument practically admits an inability to control prices, because there is no relation between an increase in the purchasing power of the people and prices getting away from you. If you can control prices you can control them regardless of the amount of money in circulation.

I am very critical of the government's policy with respect to the formation of legitimate trade unions. I am not blaming the minister for this; I know he is a member of the legitimate movement and has been for some years. But I think at times he must find himself in a very unhappy position in having to administer a policy under which the government themselves, in their own established industries, are not giving a lead to the other employers. In Research Enterprises, for example, the right of collective bargaining is denied. This is a government owned and controlled organization. I have here a decision rendered on December 13 last, to this effect:

As the company is a wholly owned and operated government undertaking, I am of the opinion that your minister would not have authority, under the said orders in council, to direct an industrial disputes inquiry commission to deal with the complaint outlined in your letter.

That is a decision rendered by the Department of Justice to the Department of Labour, though not since the appointment of the present Minister of Justice. If that is the attitude taken by the government, the minister must find himself in a very unhappy position, with the government of the country operating an industry and refusing the employees of that industry the very thing the government have advocated in order in council 2685, in which they laid down the principle of collective bargaining. I do not understand how that can be done.