

Industrial Relations

was asked for leave to prosecute, but there was no prosecution, though in my opinion court proceedings should have been undertaken.

Mr. Mitchell: My hon. friend said the junior member for Halifax was mixed up. I am afraid my hon. friend from Vancouver East (Mr. MacInnis) is mixed up. He starts to talk about the labour relations board, and then he speaks about a conciliation board. I am no waif and stray in these things. I believe I know which way I am going. I believe I know the philosophy of the American Federation of Labor, the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada and the general labour movement of North America. I believe my hon. friend should stay with the labour relations board. I know the board about which he is talking. It was a political strike, the Canadian seamen's strike.

Mr. MacInnis: I am afraid the minister is putting himself in a spot right there. If I referred to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Garson) instead of the Minister of Labour it was a slip of the tongue, and a slip of the tongue is no fault of the mind. The Minister of Labour says, "Oh, it was the seamen's strike." Just because the Minister of Labour did not like the seamen or their organization, they could not get their case taken to court.

Mr. Mitchell: I must rise on a point of order.

Mr. MacInnis: If you would sit down, you would not get into all this trouble.

Mr. Mitchell: I must rise on a point of order. I have never refused prosecution by any organization since this legislation has been on the statute books. I believe in conciliation and not the settlement of disputes before the courts.

Mr. MacInnis: That is not a point of order, that is an argument. After I am finished, the minister will have the remainder of the evening to make all the arguments he wishes. Then, he will have some evenings later on in the session, so he should not take my time in making arguments—arguments which, after they are made, have nothing in them anyway.

I merely rose tonight to make the two points, that the member for Bow River (Mr. Johnston) was not considering the proper board and that we should not have a law on the statute books of Canada the enforcement of which is dependent upon the will of the minister.

Hon. Humphrey Mitchell (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, there is five minutes remaining, but I cannot finish in five minutes.

I disagree completely with the approach of my socialist friends, and let me say that very frankly.

Mr. MacInnis: I disagree with the approach of my capitalist friend.

Mr. Mitchell: This is a free country.

Mr. MacInnis: Of course it is.

Mr. Gillis: Will the minister permit a question before he gets into deep water?

Mr. Mitchell: I have not said anything yet.

Mr. Gillis: With the minister's permission, I should like to ask him this question: This bill is not socialist philosophy, you know that. Are you aware of the fact that the bill was scrutinized and approved by the representatives of 300,000 industrial workers in Canada? That is their philosophy.

Mr. Mitchell: That is all right; my friend cannot speak for 300,000 people. I have heard a lot of things in election campaigns.

Mr. MacInnis: You said a lot of things in the election campaign.

Mr. Mitchell: That is all right; you do not like to hear these things.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Mitchell: I disagree fundamentally with my hon. friends in the thought that you can negotiate labour agreements on the floor of the House of Commons. That was tried in Germany, and at the very moment it is being tried in France. My mind goes back to my old friend, Sam Gompers, who said, "The truth is still the truth, it does not matter what year it is." He said:

I want to tell you, socialists, that I have studied your philosophy; read your works upon economics, and not the meaneast of them; studied your standard works, both in English and German—have not only read, but studied them. I have heard your orators and watched the work of your movement the world over. I have kept close watch upon your doctrines for thirty years; have been closely associated with many of you and know how you think and what you propose. I know, too, what you have up your sleeve. And I want to say that I am entirely at variance with your philosophy. I declare it to you, I am not only at variance with your doctrines, but with your philosophy. Economically, you are unsound; socially, you are wrong; industrially, you are an impossibility.

Now, that is a quotation from the proceedings of a convention of the American Federation of Labor held at Boston in 1903.

In introducing this bill the other evening, my hon. friend used these words:

If the dispute between the two parties cannot be resolved, the board is powerless to do anything except let the parties go back to fighting it out on the streets.

Mr. Gillis: That is as it is now.