

Labour Gazette a year or so ago. It is a case of Parliament being asked, after the event, to approve what the government has done.

Mr. Fraser: You are absolutely right.

Mr. Knowles: However, the reasons I am opposed to the bill have in large part been stated by the hon. member for Vancouver South. In the first place the *Labour Gazette* has been a very important instrument in labour relations for decades. I suggest that to bring it to this unceremonious end is a mistake. In the second place I do not like the government taking these actions first and then asking Parliament to approve of them afterwards. In the third place I do not like the unfairness to the employees involved in the publication of the *Labour Gazette* which is represented by the action of the government in bringing this publication to an end.

I should like to take a minute or two to warn every Liberal member of this House that tonight the ghost of Mackenzie King may stalk their bedrooms. I hope that he scares the daylights out of them. I remind the Liberal government that in effect it is bringing to an end an important piece of Canadian history and a highly important piece of Liberal history. I invite members of that party to read books such as "William Lyon Mackenzie King", a political biography, by R. McGregor Dawson, and in particular to note the experiences which Mackenzie King went through in the summer of 1900.

Mackenzie King spent part of that summer in Rome and part of it in London. At that time the institution of the *Labour Gazette* was being considered, and its publication was to be under the direction of the then postmaster general, the late William Mulock. In the middle of the summer Mr. Mulock sent a telegram to Mackenzie King in Rome offering him the editorship and management of the new *Labour Gazette* which would begin in July, at a salary of \$1,500 a year. Mr. King at that point was trying to get into academic life. He thought he had an opening at Harvard University. He knew that if he got such an opening at Harvard, it would pay \$400 or \$500 a year.

According to this diary, he went through great travail of soul as to which of those offers he should take. It seemed to bother him that he was leaning in the direction of taking the choice that made the most money. But, of course, he was prepared to do that only if it was for the common good. However, when he leaned the other way and considered accepting the offer at Harvard, he found that Professor Tausig at Harvard, whose books on economics some of us had to study some years later, and his father, the late John King, both urged him very strongly that the place for him to come was to Ottawa to take on the important function of editing the *Labour Gazette*.

That is the beginning, in a practical sense, of the Liberal party having some interest in labour relations. Mr. King went from that position to other positions in the Department of Labour, to become its deputy minister and so on. Then in 1908 he took the further step of becoming a member of the House of Commons and, of course, we all know what happened from that point onward, how he became the Prime Minister of this

Department of Labour Act

country and held that position longer than any other person, at least thus far.

But now we have the Liberal party saying that this patron saint of theirs, who is capable—according to his beliefs—of coming back and bothering them, is to be brushed aside with all his interest, as I say, in having a publication which would play a part in labour management relations. It has done that through the years. I think that it is a serious mistake to discontinue the publication, and that is all that this bill does. It substitutes a clause in the Department of Labour Act for one that is already there, and it brings to an end a requirement to publish the *Labour Gazette*. It is a mistake, and a move to which I am strongly opposed.

However, we have agreed not to spend too long debating it this afternoon, but in return for that the government has agreed that the bill will go to committee so that it may be considered further and, if necessary, considered again back in the House. Along with the member for Vancouver South and on behalf of my colleagues, I register very strong opposition to this bill, to what it does to the *Labour Gazette* and to what it does to the memory of the Liberal party's patron saint, Mackenzie King.

Mr. Kilgour: Mr. Speaker, I understand that there has been a House order and some sort of agreement on this bill that there will be no further speeches. Is that the understanding of the Chair?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): That is the understanding I sought, a moment ago.

● (1610)

Mr. Kilgour: I discussed the matter with the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser). If I understand my friend correctly, I should like to add something in support of his position on the bill, but if it is the ruling of the Chair and the understanding of hon. members that there be no further speakers today, obviously I shall abide by that. I just wonder if Your Honour could clear this up.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. If we are to reverse the prior decision it would have to be with unanimous consent. Unanimous consent was granted by hon. members a few minutes ago that we not see the clock at four o'clock and go beyond five o'clock for private members' hour. It was understood that there would be one more speaker.

Mr. Collenette: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the agreement was that the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) would speak, then the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) would reply to what I said and that now we would call the question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): That is what the Chair understood. It has been brought to my attention that I referred to hon. members a few moments ago as "honourable gentlemen". To the lady members present, I wish to apologize.

Is the House ready for the question?