

are against the anti-inflation program. It means that they are against the guidelines because, even if there were appeals, the appeal tribunal would be bound by those guidelines. It would be impossible to allow more than 8 per cent, plus 2 per cent, plus 2 per cent for catching up, and 2 per cent for productivity. In fact, there is no right to appeal and if appeals were allowed—

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

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** —of course they are not, that is to say, Mr. Speaker, it is possible to appeal from the interpretation of the guidelines, but not from the guidelines themselves. They are included in the legislation and must be complied with.

Now, if we are talking about an appeal which would allow, for example, the paper workers to get an increase higher than that provided by the guidelines, those workers will argue that the wage relationship between the pulp and paper workers and the woodworkers is no longer the same. Then, let us cancel the program and allow inflation to get out of control, or else, let the New Democratic Party table a resolution asking for a wage and price freeze and a return to the wartime system. If this is what they want, let's play fair. As far as I am concerned, I do not like the program, I would prefer the free bargaining system across the board. We tried, but it did not work. Nobody in the Canadian public would forgive us for doing nothing under the circumstances.

What does the New Democratic Party do, Mr. Speaker? It simply stirs up certain groups of workers who are not the most in need in our society, without offering a worthwhile solution. When you talk about the right of appeal as a right enabling workers or trade unions to go beyond the guidelines, this means that these guidelines are destroyed. And what is proposed if they are destroyed? Yes, they are destroyed without any doubt. I say that all trade unions have a valuable argument about catching up and if pulp and paper workers can catch up, the woodworkers will then say: Well, before that we had such a relationship with pulp and paper workers and we want to maintain it.

And if that is it let us say so frankly, let us stop beating around the bush; this is unpleasant, this is clearly unpleasant. I simply say that it is not true that we have killed the free bargaining process. Now, we are threatened here, we have heard those threats. The Canadian Labour Congress will pull its representatives out of the federal agencies. Well, the CNTU did that several years ago. Let us not forget that, for all practical purposes, the CNTU pulled out of the federal agencies five or six years ago, to my knowledge. It does not even submit any brief. This is what makes me smile, as I know something about the history of the unions.

I remember very well that in 1926, five years after its creation in Hull, the CNTU asked to be accredited by the Minister of Labour. It wanted to be recognized. What is the history of Canadian unions before 1944 or 1945? It was a struggle for recognition by the employers and the government. In Ottawa, the federal government—

● (2150)

[English]

**An hon. Member:** It was the Liberal government.

### *Labour Conditions*

**Mr. Marchand (Langelier):** It was the Liberal government that enacted C-103 in 1945 which compelled the employer to recognize the union. Don't forget that.

[Translation]

I do not know whether those hon. members can do anything else but shout, whether they can have some valid ideas. I simply suggest that before that time, there was a fight for employer recognition of the union, and then a fight for collective bargaining in order to try and get better conditions.

Unions succeeded in obtaining that the law itself force employers to recognize unions. The second fight by unions was to get government recognition, labour relations boards' recognition, recognition wherever they had interests. The government finally yielded, all governments finally yielded in Canada. Now they are threatening to remove themselves the rights they fought very hard to obtain. Such is the meaning of this.

Who are they threatening in so doing? Nobody but themselves. How come, Mr. Speaker, and this will be my final point although I could go on for a whole hour, how come that labour unions which are—

Oh, stop those shouts through your nose, you wake up people! How come, Mr. Speaker, that labour unions are fighting with employers—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I would ask hon. members to let other members speak. Tonight's debate was requested in order that the views of the various parties be heard. I believe the minister has a right to be heard.

[English]

I think the minister has the right to be heard, and should be heard in this House.

[Translation]

Labour unions have diverging interests from employers and have always been fighting them. They would not accept for a moment that employers cease to recognize them. That is basic, it is now included in our law. It is an essential aspect for the labour movement's and the workers' future. They not only ask employers for recognition, they also made strike after strike to get it. They even fought for government recognition. And now comes that great threat, they now tell us they will cease to recognize the government. The Federation of Labour in British Columbia stated they were following instructions from the Canadian Labour Congress. It is the first time I hear a labour federation or Canadian unions say that they obey the Canada Labour Congress. It is the first time in my life. It is only because they hide behind the congress in an attempt to force acceptance of things which they find it difficult to live.

Then, Mr. Speaker, this threat could as well be carried out. I do not like to say that the right of appeal will give additional rights to workers as I do not believe it. If a more perfect system were proposed I would agree to support it, but if the only things we can expect from this House are demagogic appeals or suggestions which do not improve the situation I consider that we do not serve the interests of workers, of unions, nor those of the people of Canada.

**Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, I shall first thank the Chair for allowing us today to discuss a