

are through." He cited labor relations in Britain as an example of freedom of trade union activity.

Commends Profit-Sharing.

J. P. Mackay (Lib., Hamilton East) offered as a "salvation of democracy" the experiment of the Dominion Steel Foundry in Hamilton, a profit-sharing plan found generally satisfactory, and warned that the expectation of labor legislation had so stirred up many people it would be hard to satisfy them.

John Newlands (Lib., Hamilton Centre) supported collective bargaining and chided the Opposition for demanding a committee on the Ottawa River power bill and opposing committee consideration of the labor bill.

W. Duckworth (Prog. Con., Dovercourt) charged at the opening of last night's session that the management of the Dominion Glass Company at Wallaceburg would not recognize the men who represented the union in the recent strike there.

This was denied by Liquor Board Chairman St. Clair Gordon, in whose riding Wallaceburg is situated. A board of conciliation had been asked for, said Mr. Gordon, but when it was found that a union had been in existence at the plant for many years the board was withdrawn and the C.I.O. union was told it had no business in the plant.

The management of Dominion Glass had communicated with many of the workers who had been forced out of work through the strike, and asked every one of them to come back to work, Mr. Gordon declared.

"All workers were asked to come back, and most of them went back today," said Mr. Gordon.

Says Unions Are Illegal.

In the absence of legislation making unions lawful, the common law applies, and unions are illegal combinations in Ontario, Provincial Treasurer Mitchell Hepburn told the Legislature in opening the debate on the motion.

This is the view of law officers of the Crown, Mr. Hepburn said, in the course of an address in which he explained reasons why the Government had temporarily dropped the bill in favor of placing the entire labor problem before a committee of the Legislature.

Mr. Hepburn's statement that unions are illegal combinations because of the absence of legislation legalizing their activities, drew rebuke from L. M. Frost, (Prog. Cons., Victoria, Lindsay), who termed it "an absolute disgrace" that in a supposedly enlightened day the Province of Ontario had no legislation on its statute books recognizing the rights of labor. Ontario stood alone in this respect, he declared.

Mr. Heenan and Col. Drew crossed swords following Mr. Hepburn's address. In the course of the skirmish Mr. Heenan denied that J. L. Cohen, labor lawyer, had been retained by the Government to draft a labor bill, but admitted that Mr. Cohen had been retained in an advisory capacity. The Labor Minister also denied that the bill had been printed, and asserted that he made this statement on his authority as a Minister.

Should Be Non-Partisan.

Mr. Heenan, who followed Col. Drew, appealed to the Opposition for support in dealing with the problems of labor. No one should be interested in obtaining political advantage in a matter such as this, he declared. He reviewed the differences of opinion which developed over the provisions of a labor bill, and the representations made to him by various organizations.

At the outset of the debate Col. Drew interrupted Mr. Hepburn's opening remarks with a request that discussion on the resolution be deferred until Premier Conant was able to attend.

"It is not merely that the resolution to form a committee stands in his name, but there is a special reason," said Col. Drew. "On Jan 29 at Kingston the Prime Minister indicated clearly that labor problems should be dealt with by joint action of the Dominion and the Province, and he urged the Dominion to call a conference of all the Provinces. Now, if that was the opinion of the Prime Minister a week before this House met, it seems anomalous for him to introduce a resolution which calls for entirely different action. We are ready to go on with other business and we strongly object to not doing so."

Mr. Hepburn unleashed a blistering offensive against the tactics of C.I.O. unions, and singled out John L. Lewis, head of the United Mine Workers of America, for condemnation. At the outbreak of the present war there was no doubt that Lewis held economic control of the United States, said Mr. Hepburn. He spoke of acts of violence, "Yes, even murder," committed by C.I.O. unions. Mr. Hepburn expressed concern over the possibility of foreign interests dominating the economy of Canada in the postwar period through a labor monopoly. He referred to the wish of some labor heads for a law

placing certain responsibilities on unions in the matter of funds collected through dues. In the Kirkland Lake strike, he said, it was found that no funds were forthcoming to aid the strikers, and other unions throughout Canada were asked to donate a day's pay a month to help the strikers.

"I shall endeavor to establish that there is need for a collective bargaining bill in this Province," said Mr. Hepburn. "But we must not overlook the fact that we are not dealing with factory workers alone. There are other interested parties. Labor's demands should be reasonable to the point where they command respect. There are sharp differences among workmen themselves. I have received enough letters of protest, commendation and condemnation, to cover the front row desks.

Something fundamental was wrong, Mr. Hepburn said. Labor had a grievance. Labor had not been satisfied because it was seeking to establish its rightful status. He cited a joint legal opinion prepared by legal officers of the Ontario Government — C. L. Snyder, K.C.; W. B. Common, K.C., and C. R. Magone, K.C.—that in the absence of legislation in Ontario, which all other Provinces had, labor unions at present are not legal in the Province of Ontario. And though under Federal legislation it was a criminal offense for an employer to refuse employment to a member of a lawful trade union, it was doubtful, in the circumstances, if this applied in Ontario in the absence of legislation making unions legal. In which case the workman or union organizer was "left at the mercy of his employer."

Invites Co-operation.

"There is another bone of contention," continued Mr. Hepburn. "If the unions are given legal standing, and if they make an agreement with an employer, should that agreement be binding on both parties? There is a wide difference of opinion on that. The unions don't want to be put in that position. Others want custodians of funds held accountable. No jurisdiction in Canada has worked out the solution. There has been no unanimity of thought on any of these problems.

"This is a challenge to the Legislature," said Mr. Hepburn. "I believe the Legislature is the proper tribunal. Let's hear the C.C.F., the Communists, the farmers, the workers and management. We could have referred the whole problem to a commission, but I believe this is the proper way.

Mr. Hepburn's survey of the labor

situation brought from Col. Drew a demand for an explanation from the Minister of Labor himself, Hon. Peter Heenan, as "the man responsible" for the promised labor bill. He quoted Mr. Heenan as having said some time ago: "The bill will go through or I will raise a hell of a row," and demanded: "Why haven't we got the bill?"

Mr. Heenan characterized the quoted statement as incorrect, explaining he had not said "I will raise a hell of a row," but "there will be a hell of a row. I didn't say I'd raise it."

"That may be quite correct," returned Col. Drew.

"We know you had a bill printed," declared Col. Drew. "This Legislature is entitled to know what has happened to this unborn child."

Mr. Heenan denied the labor bill had been printed.

"Everybody knows the bill was drafted with the advice of J. L. Cohen and there was a disagreement as to whether to go ahead. This is an attempt to avoid the Government's responsibility. There has never been a more shameful disregard of the responsibility of a cabinet minister," Col. Drew charged.

Denies Following Mitchell.

Mr. Heenan denied Col. Drew's suggestion that he had followed Federal Labor Minister Humphrey Mitchell's lead in promising labor legislation, saying Mr. Mitchell followed him, but Col. Drew insisted the Federal Government didn't act — "and perhaps with malice" — and the Ontario Minister "was confronted with the necessity of doing what he thought he'd never have to do at all."

"The time has come when the Minister of Labor," said Col. Drew, "should tell this Legislature what he proposes to do or make a declaration of complete bankruptcy as far as that department is concerned by the Minister responsible."

J. J. Glass (Lib., Toronto-St. Andrew) offered to support the motion for appointment of a committee of the House on labor problems "on the understanding that this Government has pledged itself to the principle of collective bargaining," and that the committee would merely collect data to help arrive at the type of bill to be adopted, which, in his opinion, should protect labor's rights "without doing violence to the interests of the community generally." Should the committee "attempt to dewater the proposed measure" he would oppose it regardless of who or how many supported it.