

*Labour Conditions*

in every province, this decision arising from the now clearly demonstrated and acknowledged absence of the right of appeal under due process of law for all those affected by decisions of the Anti-inflation Board and/or the administrator, and leading inevitably to further breakdown of civil order in Canada.

Note that phrase "breakdown in civil order". As if the Canadian Labour Congress would suggest violence, or taking to the streets after the fashion of unruly demonstrations in some other countries!

There is no evidence that any member of that party can produce to indicate that the Canadian Labour Congress today has decided to withdraw from all areas of co-operation with the federal government in every province. To suggest such a thing is entirely wrong. And we are here because those words in the motion were taken at face value. In actual fact the CLC said it would consider such a move when the executive got around to doing so. "Considering it" is a long way from making a firm decision.

I know the Canadian Labour Congress as well as the New Democratic Party does, and I know how difficult it is for the president. I do not think the President, Mr. Morris, gets a fair shake in the press. He has a difficult job, as politicians should understand. In many ways he is a politician.

**Mr. Nystrom:** The friend of labour!

**Mr. Mackasey:** You are no friends of labour with your radical views. It is your type of view that gives labour a bad name in this country, one it does not deserve.

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

**Mr. Mackasey:** That is the tragedy of your type of intervention in the House of Commons.

**Mr. Nystrom:** Address the Chair.

**Mr. Mackasey:** *Hansard*, of course, can't capture the wistfulness of that party hoping—

**An hon. Member:** Tell us about the appeal procedure.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order, please. The Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) has the floor. Give him his chance to express his opinions.

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

**Mr. Mackasey:**—hoping that labour will be as irresponsible as they have been tonight. They say, "We hope it doesn't happen; we are not suggesting that labour withdraw from all the different bodies, the Economic Council and all the other boards to which they make such a valuable contribution." But I am saying that their intervention was an invitation to the labour movement to do precisely that, and that is not in the best interests of the labour movement. The best interest of the labour movement in this country, and of the people in this country, is for the labour movement to participate in the decision-making process whenever it has an opportunity.

**An hon. Member:** When?

**Mr. Mackasey:** They had an opportunity to participate in this fight against inflation from the very beginning and

[Mr. Mackasey.]

they chose, as is their democratic right, to ignore the existence of the board and not to bring forward the name of a person suitable to the Congress to sit on that board. It was their own decision.

I can understand the problem of the Canadian Labour Congress and I can see the progress that is being made. I can understand their fear, and it is a legitimate one, that somehow this system might be applied unjustly to labour because it is easier to control wages than it is to control prices. I can understand their concern.

But remember, Mr. Speaker, inflation hits the poor, the hungry, the senior citizens, the people who live on fixed incomes. And these traditionally have been areas with which labour is concerned. If we have old age pensions in this country, if we have minimum wages to help the poor, if we have any kind of medicare program, we have to thank the labour movement for it. As Hubert Humphrey said the other day, there are no votes in being a spokesman for the poor any more, or for the underprivileged or for the sick or for the senior citizen. That is a liability in a country which is tending to be very reactionary and losing track of the fact that we have to help each other in society.

Labour, too, is not without sin, and there are times when the labour movement can be wrong. That is something the hon. member for Nickel Belt cannot seem to understand. I do not happen to believe you can eliminate the adversary concept entirely. Collective bargaining is nothing more than a reflection of individual rights. When you talk about industrial relations you are really talking about human relations, and we all have the adversary system built into us as part of our culture.

We shall never solve all the problems which arise between labour and management by everyone becoming idealistic about an objective. That is why we have government. Sometimes it has to do things it would not wish to do under normal circumstances. But take the large labour unions. Last year their wage settlements happened to be higher than inflation. They did not suffer. The people who suffer are the unorganized, those who have to live on fixed incomes, the people on minimum wages. If you want government and members of parliament and the business community to stop taking more out of the system than we can afford, in order to help those very people, is it so wrong or anti-labour to say to organized labour; "You, too, have a responsibility to co-operate, if only for 18 months or two years, in order to help break the spiral"?

I think that in 1976 it is a little much to be talking about "they" and "we", or about the employer as the enemy, or about labour as the enemy. I am glad my colleague mentioned that there are people making \$20,000 or \$22,000 in the paper industry. More power to them! Let's face it, though, they are middle income or upper middle income people; they are people who have something left over and they want to invest; they want to invest in a country that is prosperous, a country that is going somewhere. They do not want to see their savings eaten up by inflation. They are as concerned about the profit motive as myself, or any member of the House of Commons.

It is ridiculous to think that a family today cannot earn sufficient—those who are working—to have something left over for investment. The working class wear two hats in effect. Are we here talking about the anti-inflation pro-