

the appeals tribunal has considered an appeal, and certainly not before. Only some such procedure would permit, in our view, Canadian workers, 90 per cent of the people of our land, to have the democratic right of appeal, and also, I might add, put corporations in our country in a fairer position. The injustices that are embedded in the law concerning this farce of an appeal procedure must be corrected.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I want to say something very briefly about the history of the working people of this country. It has been largely since the first world war, resulting from a series of strikes, difficulties, confrontations, in cities as far apart and diverse as Winnipeg and St. John's, Newfoundland, as Windsor and Oshawa, that working people got the collective right to have some minimal say in our industrial system. It has been a very real struggle for a great number of highly dedicated men and women.

In raising this particular issue the New Democratic Party sees it as being fundamentally connected with the history of democratic rights of working people. We see this law that is now on the books, objectionable as it is in its general prescriptions for dealing with inflation, as profoundly unacceptable in its measures for dealing with the right of appeal precisely because they deny that right of appeal.

Having spoken to a number of workers on the scene in New Brunswick and in the city of Ottawa in the last few days, I can now understand more clearly why they have become so profoundly opposed to the whole anti-inflation program. They perceive in this program, clearly illustrated in the complete denial of their rights to appeal, a serious and deep anti-labour attitude.

I submit that the only way that the government has the slightest hope of getting any kind of compliance with its program from the working people in the weeks and months ahead is to make the appropriate change. If it does not make this change but leaves the law in its highly arbitrary and undemocratic state, then I predict—I am not encouraging this and I do not want anyone to suggest I am—that the kind of opposition that we have seen in the last few days will be a mere pittance. It will grow, and grow with considerable depth right across the country. In concluding, I urge that the government come to its senses and make the appropriate changes.

**Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Labour):** Madam Speaker, I listened with some attentiveness to what the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) said about the Anti-Inflation Board and the question of appeal. I think the matter is clearly on record. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said today that, as he perceived the application of the act, the Anti-Inflation Board would have a jawboning function. It would advise the parties on what it felt was reasonable in the circumstances with respect to a settlement, and then if the parties did not want to adhere to that advice, went off on their own and made an agreement contrary to that advice, the board could refer the matter to the administrator and he would make the ultimate decision in terms of enforcement.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** And impose penalties for contravention.

#### *Labour Conditions*

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** And impose penalties for contravention. The board would refer if its advice were not taken. That provision is in the act, and it was in the legislation when it was brought into parliament, so presumably we can study it in that context. The Prime Minister stated that if, as a result of these representations, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) considers these provisions should be in the act, he will bring them to cabinet and we will make a decision as to whether improvements in the procedure can be made. So we are open to persuasion, and this was quite clearly stated in the House today by the Prime Minister.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** What else could he say?

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** If hon. members would check *Hansard* they would see that is pretty well precisely what the Prime Minister said. I do not think there can be any argument about that.

I think the legislation is fair in the circumstances, but if it can be improved in terms of equity we are open to persuasion. The point I should like to emphasize is this, and it was raised by the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The position of the CLC at the very outset when this policy was first announced was, in a sense, negative. They condemned the policy in all its aspects. Having condemned it completely and said that they would fight it, they then went out on a limb, so to speak. I suppose they felt that it would be inconsistent if they adopted the approach of suggesting amendments or improvements to the act.

I have a very high regard for the Canadian Labour Congress and what it has contributed to this country. I think most of the leaders will attest to that fact, and I do not have to protest my feelings about it to any hon. member. What I am saying is that the CLC having said that it is not pleased with the legislation, having indicated to its membership that it will use all lawful means to combat it and prevent its passage, and having tried to persuade members of the House, and so on, not to give consent to this legislation, might have made a constructive posture by examining the legislation and accepting the invitation of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and this government to come up with needed improvements before the legislation was passed by the House. The CLC did not do this. I feel it missed a very real opportunity to be of service not only to the country but to its membership. I repeat that these were invitations not only by myself but by the Prime Minister, and we could not get any concrete suggestions from any students of this legislation in the CLC regarding its improvement.

● (2030)

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** You had scores of amendments in the committee and you did not accept any of them.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Munro (Hamilton East):** Perhaps hon. members would listen, keep their minds open and their mouths shut for a moment and hear what I am saying. I am not talking about individual members of parliament or amendments they have suggested. I am talking about an invitation to