

*Labour Conditions*

● (2100)

**An hon. Member:** Shame!

**Mr. Stanfield:** I heard a member say "Shame," Mr. Speaker. If there is any group in this House that should be ashamed of this issue, it is my hon. friends opposite.

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

**Mr. Stanfield:** If I had not been convinced before—well, I will not go on with this; there is no point in talking about the cynicism in the Liberal ranks because it is certainly beyond measurement. As I said, I did not support the bill on third reading for the reasons I have indicated. I also said that I would urge Canadians, and my party would urge Canadians, to comply with the law passed by parliament and to co-operate with the Anti-Inflation Board. I believe that compliance with a law adopted by parliament is essential to the maintenance of democratic government and is essential to the maintenance of an orderly society.

I accept the right of labour or any other group to try to bring about a change in the law through persuasion and through pressure, at least such degrees of pressure as are compatible with the maintenance of democratic institutions. I accept that; but I want to make it very clear that I could not condone or support any massive defiance of the law, and I am not suggesting this has taken place. I simply want to make it very clear that I could not support or accept any declared intention by businessmen or working people, organized or unorganized, to defy a law passed by this parliament. No group can set itself above the law and no group can set itself above parliament.

I do suggest, Mr. Speaker, to hon. members opposite that there has been an unnecessary polarization in the way this program has been developed. It is all very well for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) to stand in this House and lecture members of the opposition, expressing the hope that we will not do anything at this time to increase polarization. The very way in which this government has chosen to introduce its program of controls has tended, itself, to work in the direction of polarization and to add strains.

I sometimes ask myself whether this polarization that we are now seeing in the country is not really something that the government, if it does not seek it is at least prepared to welcome. I sometimes wonder whether you can explain some of the polarization that the government has developed simply through the normal amount of stupidity that they demonstrate from day to day, or whether in fact this is a deliberate kind of exploitation, a deliberate kind of polarization.

**An hon. Member:** It is called divide and rule.

**Mr. Stanfield:** You can call it divide and rule, or you can call it developing an election issue and running the next election against organized labour on the basis that it has defied a government program and defied a law of parliament. I have already referred to the duration of the program as asking an unnecessary amount of forbearance from the labour movement, asking the labour movement to give up far more than is necessary and asking them to

[Mr. Stanfield.]

accept very substantial restrictions on the collective bargaining process for such a length of time.

There is also the matter of the appeals procedure. As I understand it, the Anti-Inflation Board makes a ruling and there is no way to get from the Anti-Inflation Board to the administrator, in effect, except by defying the Anti-Inflation Board, by refusing to comply or by threatening to refuse to comply. This, surely, is an intolerable situation.

As I understand, the Irving case—and I should like to be corrected if I am wrong—the Anti-Inflation Board made a ruling, then it was referred to the administrator and the administrator soaked the company with a fine. It was not a case of the administrator saying to the company in question, "I support the finding of the Anti-Inflation Board and order you to comply within a certain number of days." It was simply a reference to the administrator and the administrator treating the company as if it had already broken the law.

Today, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Labour talked about the jaw-boning role of the Anti-Inflation Board. That gives the impression that all the board does is jaw-bone and try to persuade, and nobody does any enforcing except the administrator. It is some jaw-boning if you do not do what is suggested to you, so you get socked with a heavy fine.

Surely the truth is that the government intends the Anti-Inflation Board to have the final say as to what the guidelines are and how the guidelines apply to the particular case. When you remove all the verbiage, the government intends to maintain a very, very strict control over any appeal from the Anti-Inflation Board.

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

**Mr. Stanfield:** It is set up that way. That is the only conclusion I can draw. Not only is it set up in such a way that an appeal is virtually impossible unless the law is defied, or unless the government or the Anti-Inflation Board wants to see the thing carried a step further, but when the administrator makes a decision supporting the Anti-Inflation Board and imposes a fine, he gives no reasons. The statute provides for an appeal from the administrator based on natural justice, based on an erroneous finding of fact or a mistake in the law. How can a Canadian corporation or a Canadian individual exercise any kind of appeal that means anything if they do not really know what the decision of the administrator was? How can any member opposite defend the failure of the administrator, the lack of requirement for the administrator to give reasons for his decision?

I would be very difficult to find a more arbitrary procedure anywhere. The government says it is open to persuasion but not open to persuasion about how you get from the Anti-Inflation Board to the administrator. Neither the Prime Minister nor the Minister of Labour indicated there would be any easing of the lid that is really placed upon getting from the Anti-Inflation Board to the administrator.

● (2110)

The Prime Minister and the Minister of Labour said they were open to persuasion with regard to appeals from the administrator and as to whether the union would be given