

*Government Orders*

labour and other labour leaders calling for anti-scab legislation in the federal arena.

I would certainly like to add my voice as NDP labour critic to the call for that kind of legislation. I say that in an uncritical way. It may be that the government will bring forward a form of anti-scab legislation that will be unacceptable and will only, as the member said earlier, legalize a form of scab labour by sanctifying the movement of employees in a way that amounts to the same thing. We will wait to see exactly what the minister has in mind.

We know that in those provinces where genuine anti-scab legislation has been brought forward there is a lot less labour-management strife. Management has to bargain. It is not that all management bargains in bad faith, but there are rotten apples. Sometimes they bargain in the knowledge that they can put people out on strike and hire scab labour. When that kind of legislation is in place they cannot do that and they have to bargain in good faith. I hope we will see very soon from the government legislation in that regard.

In my riding a strike has been ongoing for two and a half years. I see the same guys walking back and forth in front of the Northern Blower plant in my riding. I believe this is their third winter. They are dealing with a company that has absentee ownership that does not care. It will not bargain. It has scab labour in there. These guys have been in this situation for a long time. If we had that kind of legislation in the provincial domain in Manitoba they would not be in that kind of situation. It is wrong for that to happen to people. I hope that we will see anti-scab legislation in those provinces which do not now have it and at the federal level.

● (1945)

Just the other day I went to the shopping centre in my riding. A fellow stopped me as I came out. The projectionists at Famous Players theatres are on strike. They are being asked by a company that I understand is making good profits to take a 60 per cent cut in wages.

What is going on when companies can ask people to take this kind of beating in their standard of living, particularly when those companies are making money? The company has brought in other people to run the projectors. If it was not able to do that it would have to bargain more seriously with its workers and would not be able to demand these kinds of concessions from them.

I have mentioned the situation of the lockout when it comes to the west coast. We have a similar thing happening at CP Rail right now. The brotherhood of maintenance workers decided to have a series of rotating or geographically isolated strikes, not to shut down the whole system, but to demonstrate anger at the situation without endangering the economy as a whole. What did

the company do? The company locked the workers out. The company tries to create a crisis.

Obviously we do not have the crisis yet that the company wants. I am sure it would like to see back to work legislation but I would try to counsel in the same vein as others counselled the minister yesterday. Why not try to do something now about the situation facing us with respect to the railways rather than waiting until the situation develops further?

I am not talking about back to work legislation. I am talking about bringing the parties together and knocking some sense into the railways. They cannot expect railway workers to give up the kind of employment security benefits they negotiated. The workers gave up things for that security at the bargaining table years ago.

The railways cannot have it both ways. They cannot have asked employees in the past to give up certain benefits in order to get employment security and then at some point down the road say: "Do you know that employment security we gave you in return for all those things, well, we want it back. However we are not interested in giving back to you any of the things that you gave us in order to receive employment security".

I have a final comment. These debates always illustrate the kind of philosophical gap that exists between how we interpret the actions of working people and how we interpret the actions of people with money.

I heard the member for Wild Rose talk about the young business couple in his riding being held hostage by, in this case I presume, the longshoremen. I heard somebody else talk about the fact that a small number of people can hold up the whole country in this way. I understand that argument.

Why do we not have the same sense of offence when a small number of money speculators can hold the whole country hostage? Why do we not take the same offence at the small number of currency traders, the global casino operators? Why do we not take the same offence when they say: "I am not getting a high enough interest rate out of you, Canada, so I am going to undermine your economy".

Why is their economic freedom and their self-interested economic judgment to be respected and appeased? Why do we listen for instance to members of the Reform Party get up in the House even today and say: "We have to do what these money markets want us to do". Why is their economic self-interest sacred and yet the economic self-interest of longshoremen is held in a different category, if not in contempt?

● (1950)

I say not just to the Reformers because I have seen this happen long before they arrived here but we make this distinction. When working people say: "I will withdraw my labour because I