Labour Conditions

Brunswick. We might think we are dealing with very poor companies. However, they are not poor. They are very rich multi-national corporations. Somehow or other they get some pretty good deals in New Brunswick. For example, there is no stumpage fee for five years. This is to be reviewed at the end of five years. There is no stumpage fee at all. In terms of tax the people of New Brunswick do not get any benefit from that resource. I found out something else that appalled me—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired. He may continue only with unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, unlike the pride of the New Democratic Party, I am going to speak to the resolution or the particular reason why we are here tonight.

An hon. Member: You will be the first on your side.

Mr. Mackasey: I can talk about the New Democratic Party. It is not hard. If labour has many more friends like the NDP, it certainly will not need many more enemies.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: We have not heard any outbursts by the NDP about the responsible attitude of Premier Schreyer in Manitoba. Let them give their views on that. They do not like to hear the truth. I did not start out in this vein and I would prefer not to, but I can carry it on.

An hon. Member: Patriotism.

Mr. Mackasey: Patriotism is something the hon. member should appreciate. When he says that unions in this country are not radical, he is correct. They are very moderate. It is only the self appointed spokesmen for the labour movement such as the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) who create the mistaken impression across this country that labour is as radical as he is. In this country, however, they do not happen to be.

I wish to take advantage of this occasion to say something about the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), in fact the only effective opposition in the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: By coincidence I was in the House when the hon. gentleman made his first speech in his new role. It was difficult, even for one of his experience. As I recall history, I think one of my interjections upset him. But as often happens when relationships begin on the wrong foot, we became very, very close friends. Frankly, I think he is probably one of the most under-rated, under-estimated people who has ever sat in the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: People in the gallery, and there were many tonight from labour and other segments of society,

had a wonderful opportunity of comparing the style of the Leader of the Opposition with the diatribe we have been listening to from those poor people in the corner for the last hour or two. When we read *Hansard* tomorrow we will see that the hon. gentleman's contribution to the debate was not only much more eloquent, but much more persuasive to the ministers on this side who will now want to look at this legislation extremely carefully in the event that unintentionally there was some denial of the rights of individuals or trade unions.

I noticed something significant when I dug out Votes and Proceedings tonight. With regard to the passage of Bill C-73 there was not one single amendment put forward by the New Democratic Party to strengthen the appeal procedure or, if labour had been unintentionally overlooked, to rectify that at that time when the bill was being examined, debated at second reading, in committee, and on third reading. There was not a word from the NDP about the terrible loss of liberty to the labour movement. It is obvious that they were either asleep in committee or did not attend.

Now they have suddenly awakened in their opportunistic manner when something seems to be bothering the labour union to reinforce once again the adversary concept, making Canadian society so structured that you have the haves and have-nots, which everybody deplores but which that party seems to think is the key to political success. They never seem to learn, because there are no more of them in the House now than there were 20 years ago.

Why are we here tonight on an evening that is so important to members opposite? They have to sit here when, on this Wednesday night, they want to be looking to their own personal affairs. If it was to improve the bill I could understand it. If there were a national emergency I could understand it. That is what Standing Order 26 is all about.

(2250)

In determining whether or not we would spend a Wednesday night in the House—and remember it is really inconvenient to the staff and everyone else associated with us; never mind the members, we abide by the Speaker's decision—why did the Speaker suggest that an emergency debate was justified under Standing Order 26, a fairly rare procedure as you know? It was not because, in the opinion of the Speaker, there was a flaw in the bill; it was not because the Speaker felt that the bill was unfair or that there was a national emergency. It was because the New Democratic Party unintentionally—I use the word "unintentionally"—misled everybody.

An hon. Member: Oh, come on!

Mr. Mackasey: Members over in that corner say "come on". We are supposed to sit here and enjoy their diatribes, but when something is said that they don't like they yell, "Oh, come on, don't be too hard on us". I am going to put of the words of their leader on record—as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes), the adjournment of the House, under the provisions of Standing Order 26, for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the revelation today of the announced intention by the executive of the Canadian Labour Congress representing almost two million Canadian workers to withdraw from all areas of co-operation with the federal government