

all these various publications and it was an advantage to them to have the great body of labour information in this one publication. I say quite frankly that I am sorry it has been discontinued.

I have admitted already that at this stage of the game there is no point in blocking the bill, and even my 40 minutes, if I used it all, would not do that; but I am going to give the Minister of Labour another warning. I give it to him as a result of a very interesting experience I had this week. I spent two hours or more Wednesday evening, while most members of the House were up at the farm at the Speaker's party, in the company of Sir John A. Macdonald.

**Mr. Regan:** I was with Mackenzie King at Kingsmere!

**Mr. Knowles:** Well, there is a difference. Sir John A. Macdonald came into this chamber, walked around and looked at things. He came over and talked to me, sat here and asked me what this thing was, the microphone into which we speak. He looked the place over and asked me what changes had been made. He told me things seemed quite different than they were when he was Prime Minister in the last century.

**An hon. Member:** Did he point out the black spots, Stanley?

**Mr. Knowles:** I pointed out the black spots to him and told him about the mistake I had made and how I asked to be forgiven because it was not the first time a member of Parliament had seen something that was not there.

**An hon. Member:** Is this another example you are telling us about?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Knowles:** He made some retort about shadow cabinets and that kind of thing. Maybe others have seen him because he was around most of the week. At one point we were coming down on the elevator from the sixth floor to the second floor. He had been up in my office for a while. As we came down, the elevator stopped at the third floor and the hon. member for Saint-Michel (Mrs. Killens), got on. I never saw a woman's face look so flabbergasted as hers. I said: "Don't be worried. I want to introduce you to my friend, Sir John A. Macdonald." I turned to him and I said: "Sir John, you don't hate Liberals today the way you used to?" "Oh, no, I love them now", he said. She got over it. It was a very interesting experience. In fact, he stood here in front of my desk, and when we were talking about committees and whether they were a good thing he said: "In my day I used to say that if the government had a big enough majority to put the right members on a committee you could debauch a whole committee of archangels". I looked at him and I said, "Well, Sir John, you have been dead since 1891 so you know a lot more about archangels than I do!"

Why do I tell about this experience I had visiting with Sir John A. Macdonald this week? I see members looking at me wondering if there should be a knock on the door and the men in the white suits should come and get me, so I will explain this in a moment. Before I give the explanation and spoil it all, I

### *Department of Labour Act*

want to say to the Minister of Labour that he better watch out. If Sir John A. Macdonald, who died in 1891, can come back to these halls, Mackenzie King, who did not die until 1950, may well come back, and I do not think he would be so friendly. If he comes back and finds that this young fellow who is now the Minister of Labour has done away with his pride and joy, the *Labour Gazette*, he will have something to explain.

I may say that my reference to the visit of Sir John A. Macdonald was not of one who had had hallucinations. Rather, it is a fact that TV Ontario, through its educational television section, is doing a piece for students on Parliament and it devised this way of doing it, having an actor play the part of Sir John A. Macdonald and come here to have an interview with the Speaker, with the government House leader, some backbenchers and so on, and I was one of those who had the privilege of meeting with him. He certainly looked the part and it was enjoyable, but I say to my friend the Minister of Labour that when Mackenzie King comes back and sees what he has done to the *Labour Gazette*, he will not be able to report that experience with quite the same relish or delight.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, it is Friday afternoon and these are the things that go on. I say again this Friday afternoon that I regret very much that this valuable publication has been discontinued. I regret that the Department of Labour broke the law by discontinuing it in 1979 and is now getting authority for that two and a half years later. I hope the minister will take seriously the responsibilities he has accepted under the new wording and do his best to collect, produce and distribute information about the labour scene that will be helpful to those who are involved in the various employment areas of this country. If I had my will I would defeat this bill and bring back the *Labour Gazette*, just as Sir John A. Macdonald came back here this week; but sometimes there are facts one just has to accept.

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

**Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand in the House on a Friday afternoon and be able to follow two of our more eminent members of this House who have been with the Parliament of Canada for many years. The minister across the way and myself are relatively new to the House, but when he questions the propriety of the comments of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton), I think I am compelled to follow on some of the themes outlined by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain, from his years of wisdom and experience, indicated clearly to the House that when one sees any piece of legislation which has a retroactive feature, then as a member of Parliament fulfilling his or her responsibility to constituents one must be suspicious that the law, indeed, has been broken.

I want to go back to the minutes of the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration of June 26, 1980, just a couple of weeks short of one year ago. On that date the bill was reported to the House. It was ready for debate and