

*Supply—Labour*

ease. This fact encourages management to agree more or less readily to labour demands for higher wages. Thus the whole inflationary spiral continues. Coupled with this is the almost relentless rise in government spending at all levels, which I believe is a major force behind recent price increases and is an open admission that today politics take priority over economic common sense.

At the present time management and labour in many industries are living in a state of fear or, conversely, in anticipation, depending on their knowledge of the outcome of the Kennedy round talks. We were informed this morning by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the agreements reached in the Kennedy round discussions will be helpful to the fishing industry as there will be some reduction in the tariff on the fish we process and ship to the United States. But while this will be helpful to the fishing industry—and I can assure the minister that industry is desperately in need of help—I cannot help but wonder what concession was given to secure this reduction in the fish tariff.

It seems to me that individual leaders in unions and management will have to get their operations into fighting trim to withstand the competition that will be unleashed by the tearing down of tariffs resulting from the Kennedy round negotiations. Canadians in the labour and management fields will have to compete with the growing output of other industrial nations. I would like to hear from the minister whether his department has made any special plans to help Canadian labour and management cope with the new problems we will have to face as a result of the Kennedy round agreements.

[Translation]

**Mr. Mongrain:** Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be brief, first, because I would not like to repeat everything which has been said up to now, and also because I will have to leave the house in the next few minutes.

I have noticed, like many others, ever since I have been in this house, that the Department of Labour is not always a bed of roses. In fact, it is perhaps one of the departments which might be the greatest source of problems for its incumbent. I heard the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Crouse) say earlier that the Minister of Labour was his favourite minister, and I understand that several hon. members feel extremely sympathetic toward the Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson) precisely because of the multiplicity and the seriousness of the problems he has

to settle and which are, most of the time, human problems which affect closely the members of our Canadian labour force. Obviously, those problems are not always easy.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to support the remarks made earlier by my colleague for Lapointe (Mr. Grégoire) with regard to the dispute still prevailing between the C.N.T.U. and the international unions with regard to natural bargaining units. I shall not repeat all his arguments. For once, I have nothing to say against the remarks of the hon. member for Lapointe, since his comments were intelligent, objective and quite to the point, uttered on a tone which will have impressed everyone—since it was the tone of moderation—and the facts he stated speak for themselves.

The minister should take under special consideration this problem which will have even more serious repercussions than we can anticipate at the present time, in the labour world. Because it has—how would I put it—some separatist connotations, efforts should be made to remove the causes of discord.

Besides, after I heard that next year will be celebrated as the human rights year—if I understood correctly what the minister said—it does not seem natural to me that we should, on that occasion, deny some members of the labour force their freedom of representation within the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to repeat everything that was said, but I think the hon. member for Lapointe summarized what many of us think, and I should like to join him in urging the Minister of Labour to consider this matter as one of somewhat special urgency.

When the minister says that if agencies are set up by the government to handle certain responsibilities, it is not conceivable that the government should intervene, I think that his argumentation is unsound, because just the same the government and parliament are the supreme authorities here and they would not delegate their powers to organizations which would become superior to the government.

● (3:30 p.m.)

When such an important policy is involved, I think that the government should intervene; moreover, I understand that a cabinet committee has been set up to consider that question, but we have not yet heard about the results.

Mr. Chairman, I said earlier that I wanted to be brief. I simply wish to point out to the minister a matter which I find unthinkable in