

*Industrial Relations*

in your pocket that counts, or what you get in your pay envelope; it is what that money will purchase.

**Mr. Noseworthy:** You cannot get anything if you have not got some.

**Mr. Mitchell:** My hon. friend does not look as if he did not have any.

**Mr. Smith (Calgary West):** According to the song, the best things in life are free.

**Mr. Mitchell:** We have to learn from the trade union movement in Great Britain. I have no criticism to offer of Great Britain. I was born there, but I do not live there now. I think the message of discipline and industrial statesmanship should be learned from the British trade union movement and the employers. It could well be emulated by the people of Canada. We have to learn that these concessions bring responsibility.

Turning now to the economy in general, I say that by the very nature of things every increase in profit, every increase in wages, must go into the price structure. That is one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why at this moment one sees so many British cars on the Canadian market. Price is the determining factor. When my wife or your wife goes out to buy a hat, she does not care who made the hat or what it looks like.

**Mr. Graydon:** You are in trouble tonight.

**Mr. Mitchell:** I just want to say this to the member for Peel; I notice he is laughing and I thank him for being in good company. It is the consumer who calls the tune. I have stated this problem in simple language that I think every man and woman in this nation can understand. This moment in our lifetime calls for a degree of industrial statesmanship in order to check the present inflationary tendency. We hear a good deal about old age pensions, and pensions supplied by industry. What is the use of promising to pay a man \$100 per month at the age of 65, if by the time he reaches 65 the \$100 is only worth \$1 or 50 cents? I think we have learned our lesson from the inflationary movement in other countries. I have said these things in sincere language, and I hope I will be given credit for being just as sincere as the others who have spoken, and who would advocate old age pensions at 21 years of age.

Briefly, this labour relations board, if it were turned into a court, must necessarily change its complexion. I would be the last one to deny any person in this country the right to be tried by a jury of his peers, presided over by a man who understood the rule of law.

**Mr. Angus MacInnis (Vancouver East):** I should like to say a few words in support of this bill. I was not in the house when the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mitchell) began his remarks on it, but from what I have heard of his speech, if he does not mind my saying so, I would say a great deal of it does not refer to this bill at all. He has taken us all over the world, behind the iron curtain and back. This bill is all on this side of the curtain, if you understand what I mean. Let us consider what this bill proposes to do. It asks that a new section be added to the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, providing that the board have the power to make an employer reinstate an employee discharged contrary to the provisions of this act, and pay to such employee the monetary loss suffered by reason of such discharge.

There is nothing in that amendment that interferes in any way with the rule of law. It is law. It is not contrary to the provisions of the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act. As a matter of fact, it is no more arbitrary that the board should make a decision such as is provided in this amendment, than that it should make any of the other decisions that the board may make. The decisions of the board are not subject to any appeal or any review by any court. The board's rulings are final, except in so far as they may be reviewed by the board itself. Let me read to you subsection 2 of section 61 which outlines the powers of the board. It reads as follows:

A decision or order of the board is final and conclusive and not open to question or review, but the board may, if it considers it advisable so to do, reconsider any decisions or order made by it under this act, and may vary or revoke any decision or order made by it under this act.

Surely a board with such wide powers as those is not going beyond the realm of what is necessary, if it undertakes to make a decision in such circumstances as are mentioned in the proposed amendment. If a trade union—and when I say “trade union” I also mean an industrial union; I am using the word in an all-inclusive sense—is strong enough, it does not require a provision such as this. The trade union of which I am a member has had such a provision in its agreement with the company, as a result of collective bargaining, for over forty years. As I say, if any trade union is strong enough it does not require to have legislation of this kind to protect its members in their relation with their employers. It is able to insist that the provision be inserted in any collective agreement that may be