

I did not specifically mention. That is a shameful thing to do and utterly contemptible. What I have said is sufficient.

Mr. PROBE: Why not be courageous?

Mr. KNOWLES: The Church of England? The United Church? The Presbyterian Church in Canada?

An hon. MEMBER: Why not be a man and name them.

Mr. BLACKMORE: I prefer to use a little diplomacy and decency in dealing with this matter. I do not hesitate to name them from fear. I am not afraid of any man in Canada, or of any group of men, but I do not think it is fitting to name them. I do believe that a number of people have made themselves busy in connection with this problem when they should have been wise enough to remain in the background and leave the matter to those who had the responsibility to decide what was the wise thing to do. It was to them I was referring, not to the member for Vancouver East nor any member of the C.C.F. group. When I want to refer to them I will name them on the floor of the house and give them a chance to answer.

Mr. JAKUES: My previous question I suppose should not have been directed to the Minister of Labour, but it just cropped up. I am not criticizing the Minister of Labour at all over the fact that prisoners of war still remain here as prisoners of war after the war is over. I am also aware that their treatment in this country is humane. But it is the principle of the thing I do not like. I do not believe the end justifies the means. That is not a philosophy to which I subscribe. If we follow the practice of keeping prisoners of war here in Canada a year after the war is over, maybe two years for all I know, that sanctions the practice in other countries where prisoners of war are not humanely treated, where, in fact, they are being barbarously treated, and I intend to refer to that on another item in the Department of External Affairs. I do not want the minister to think that I attributed any criticism to him, because this matter is not really his responsibility.

Mr. KNOWLES: A week ago to-day I asked the Minister of Justice a question with regard to triple pay at Hamilton. The minister replied that the government had not been asked for an opinion on the matter, nor was any opinion given. A few days later I received a telegram from E. B. Jolliffe, counsel for the United Steelworkers of America, giving me the text of a telegram he had sent to the

Minister of Justice, bringing his attention to the fact that on August 22, both by air mail and by telegram, the union had requested the Minister of Labour, under P.C. 9384, to give his permission to the union to prosecute the company for violations of the wage control order. The letter which Mr. Jolliffe sent to the Minister of Labour stated the name or names of an employee or employees who had received triple pay, and made the specific request required by the order in council for permission to prosecute. Mr. Jolliffe also expressed his view as to the "absurdity of the government countenancing the open and continuing violation of the wage control order by an employer while asking the employees to respect that order." The president of Stelco, he pointed out, "frankly informed the industrial relations committee, of which two ministers were members, that non-striking employees would be paid triple wages, which is clearly contrary to P.C. 9384." The Minister of Labour replied to Mr. Jolliffe's letter under date of August 23, acknowledging the letter but not even indicating in his communication what the matter was about. The letter simply stated that he was asking the advice of the minister of labour for Ontario as well as the advice of the regional board of Ontario before replying to this request. I should like to ask the minister—

Mr. MITCHELL: Will my hon. friend read the rest of the letter?

Mr. KNOWLES: Yes. I had better put the whole letter on record:

August 23, 1946

Dear Mr. Jolliffe:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 22, and before replying at length I am asking the advice of the Minister of Labour for Ontario, as well as the advice of the regional board of Ontario.

The steelworkers' request for an increase, as you are well aware, has not been before the regional board of Ontario in the form of an application. Nevertheless, the board's interest in the point you raise is obvious and I wish to have the benefit of the advice of the chairman as well as the advice of the Minister of Labour for Ontario because the dispute is basically one coming under the provincial jurisdiction, before replying to your letter.

Yours sincerely,  
Humphrey Mitchell.

I am not commenting on the letter—it seems to me that it should be framed—but what I should like the minister to tell us, now that it is out in the open that this request has been made, is what the government's attitude is towards the company's violation of the wage control order.