

the whole question of industrial relations in the work place which involves questions of the work environment, job satisfaction, worker participation, and all these matters.

Mr. Rodriguez: Alice in Wonderland.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): The cynic over there who talks about Alice in Wonderland should tell that to all the labour people who have been participating in all the studies to make it work.

Mr. Rodriguez: Oh, oh!

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Why don't you make your smart aleck remarks to the labour people who are working so hard in some of these areas? I do not think they would appreciate them.

The fourth area which is very much in the interests of labour leadership and its membership is the development of far more appropriate and adequate arbitration services so that union members can have their grievances dealt with more readily and quickly. All these areas are very much in the interests of the labour movement.

So I think it is very much in the interests of the labour movement, its membership, its leadership, and the Canadian people not to let their emotions and their strong feelings with respect to these controls divert them from the course they have always followed, and that course has always been to act in every way in their best interests.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Madam Speaker, if I may I should like to ask the minister a question before he sits down.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Will the minister allow a question?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Yes, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): After listening to the minister for 30 minutes I still have not heard the answer to the main point. Can he name any provision in the Anti-Inflation Act, apart from section 24 which gives the right of appeal to the cabinet, which would give a trade union the right to appeal the decision of the Anti-Inflation Board or to appeal the decision of the administrator?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): I think the act is quite clear that the direct way to get the administrator's decision on a ruling is from the Anti-Inflation Board.

An hon. Member: What are you talking about?

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): I think that is quite clear in the act.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, I have a feeling that tonight is not a very appropriate one for the Leader of the Opposition, so it is

Labour Conditions

perhaps just as well that I am shedding this mantle in a few days.

I feel a little sorry for the minister, and I do not think it is very fair of my hon. friends to press him to defend the indefensible.

I did not support the anti-inflation legislation on third reading—

An hon. Member: You did on second.

Mr. Benjamin: You can't have it both ways.

Mr. Stanfield: I can't have it both ways, but I am one of the few people in the country who has not tried to have it both ways.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I was concerned about the administrative procedures established in the bill, and especially about the appeal procedures. I was very concerned about the proposed duration of the program of some three years or more, with very easy provision for extension, so that anybody, whether on the management side or on the labour side, could very well anticipate that we were in for a fairly long haul.

I said in the course of the debates on the bill, and I say again tonight, that it is one thing to ask leaders of organized labour and members of trade unions to accept substantial restrictions on collective bargaining in the public interest for a period of a year and a half or so, but it is a very different thing to ask the labour movement to accept such restrictions for a period of three years or three and a quarter years, and perhaps substantially longer because a government with a majority in this House can extend the duration of this program by a simple resolution which can be debated for only three days in parliament.

So it seems to me that proposing controls for a period of three years or more was a most inappropriate way to get acceptance of the program in the country, and particularly from the organized labour movement, especially in view of the complete about face of the government on the whole issue and the complete lack of credibility the government had in making such a proposal to the country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Despite what the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) said here tonight, the government compounded this offence by repeated hypocrisy in the House and by pretending that the government was maintaining free collective bargaining. The Minister of Labour can protest as much as he likes, but I have had answers from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) and from the Acting Prime Minister who is the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp), time after time in this House, taking the position and adopting the pretence that this legislation did not restrict collective bargaining and that the government was by no means prepared to interfere with collective bargaining. This kind of pretence, this kind of hypocrisy, has added to the general lack of acceptance in some quarters of this country. I did not support the bill on third reading for the reasons I have indicated.