

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly.

Mr. CONMEE. I doubt if he can.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Why not?

Mr. CONMEE. He is to have no direct interest.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He is not specially paid by the company or the union to work on the board, he has a salary all the year around. He is the best man to represent the employees, he is selected by them and sits on the board and he receives from the government the amount which is fixed by section 52, but that would not prevent him from receiving his usual salary.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. By section 53, would a corporation be able to appoint as their member of the board a retained lawyer? They might give him a \$5,000 additional fee if he did the right thing by them as a member of the board. There is nothing to prevent it, he is the paid lawyer of the corporation. The word 'salary' in the section means as a member of the board?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes as a member of the board.

Mr. GALLIHER. I take it the object of the section is to prevent a man sitting on the board receiving a bribe?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX. After the word 'salary' I would insert an amendment in accordance with the suggestion of my hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. Duncan Ross) 'as a member of the board.'

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 54,

54. Each member of the board will be entitled to his actual necessary travelling expenses for each day that he is engaged in travelling from or to his place of residence, in Canada, for the purpose of attending or after having attended a meeting of the board.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would move to strike out the words 'in Canada.'

Mr. GALLIHER. What is the intention in striking out the words 'in Canada.' If they bring a man here from Peru to represent them will we pay his expenses from there? I think when we go so far as to pay his expenses from the borders of Canada to the place where the commission meets and back that is all we are called on to do.

Mr. LOGAN. We have provided that the limitation is only to a British subject and by striking out these words you could not pay a man his expenses from London, England, for instance.

Mr. GALLIHER. I think we could settle it without going that far.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If expedition is the point we could not wait until he came from there.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 57,

It shall be unlawful for any employer to declare or cause a lockout, or for any employee to go on strike, on account of any dispute prior to a reference of such dispute to a board of conciliation and investigation, or during the pendency of any proceedings in relation to such dispute before a board under the provisions of this Act: Provided that nothing in this section shall prohibit the suspension or discontinuance of any industry or of the working of any persons therein for any cause not constituting a lockout or strike.

Mr. PARDEE. Reading that clause in conjunction with clause 65 of the Act, it appears to me some ambiguity might possibly arise as to the right of the employee to strike and of the employer to exercise his right to lockout. I move that section 57 be amended by adding at the end thereof the following words:

And provided that, except where the parties have entered into an agreement under section 65, nothing in this Act shall be held to restrain any employer from declaring a lockout, of any employee from going to strike, in respect of any dispute which shall have been duly referred to a board, and which has been dealt with under sections 24 and 25 of this Act.

That simply puts it beyond peradventure that unless there is an agreement between the employer and the employees, the employees shall practically have a right to strike at any time.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Do the brotherhoods endorse that?

Mr. PARDEE. I do not know. I did not ask them. I take it that the Act is rather ambiguous as to whether or not, after a binding agreement has been entered into between the parties, or even after there is a recommendation of the board, if they are not satisfied with the finding or recommendation, they would still be entitled to declare a lockout or go on strike. I take it that they would be; but to remove any doubt, I desire to provide that, if they have not come to any agreement within a certain time under section 65, the employees may at any time go on strike. The Act is simply to aid in conciliation, but not to prevent the employees, if dissatisfied, from exercising their right to strike if they want to.

Mr. CONMEE. I think there is a further object to be served by the amendment of my hon. friend. Suppose, after an agreement is made between the parties, one of them breaks faith. Then there might be doubt as to whether the employees could strike without recourse to another reference. I take for granted that that is not