

get another \$25 increase, and the Anti-Inflation Board will not look at that at all.

Where are all the Abitibi plants in my area? I come from northern Ontario, and I speak for northern Ontario. There is a plant at Sturgeon Falls. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Blais) represents that area. The Iroquois Falls plant is in the federal riding of Timmins. The Smooth Rock Falls plant and the Spruce Falls plant are in the Cochrane riding.

I am not too familiar with northwestern Ontario, but I am sure the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. McRae) will be able to tell us about those areas. However, it seems to me that those plants will receive an increase in their revenue on top of unjustifiable revenues which they have been making for the last two or three years. They will receive an increase because of the international price, and I suggest there is nothing this House can do to stop that.

All these plants I am talking about in Ontario come under Ontario labour legislation. When I asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) to use his offices and intervene, I was aware that this came under provincial jurisdiction, and he hastened to point out that he had no responsibility. Mr. Pepin is the labour boss in this country. He will make the decision for every agreement made in this country, and he will set prices. He is now the czar of labour in Canada. The federal Minister of Labour does not matter. He can talk about the little game he has been playing for two years of trying to get management and labour to go along and help him run his business if he wants.

The hon. member from New Brunswick said that other people should not get involved in New Brunswick politics, but the negotiation which took place between Irving and its employees was under the labour legislation of the province of New Brunswick, not federal legislation and not under the Anti-Inflation Act. That settlement was negotiated under the jurisdiction of the New Brunswick labour board, and I think the workers there have the right to take Irving to court to make sure he lives up to the contract which was signed because that was a provincial contract.

We have forgotten that we allowed the total elimination of all jurisdictions in the field of labour by this legislation.

I will close by saying that I sympathize with workers in the pulp and paper industry and those in particular who have been made the bellwether of the anti-labour legislation of the Liberal government. They have led the fight and they are stymied. What can they do? They cannot appeal. There is talk of a one day strike and of withdrawing services. If we lived in a warmer climate I am sure that rebellion would have been talked of, but it is cold here, so the labour movement may walk around 1,000 strong and protest on Parliament Hill. They may do this at provincial legislatures as well, but there is a terrific amount of resentment on the part of every worker in this country who is facing collective bargaining under provincial legislation because workers know that no matter what agreement is signed, and no matter what employers are willing to agree to, an agreement is subject to federal legislation which overrides, eliminates, and negates any benefit which might be had through common, ordinary collective bargaining.

### *Labour Conditions*

I have known both cabinet ministers who spoke tonight a long time. Both came from honourable backgrounds in the labour movement, and both of them have made contributions to that movement. Never has there been a time when their voices should be raised publicly and in cabinet with greater strength than today, because they have a role to play in telling their colleagues that the whole process of collective bargaining is being destroyed by this legislation without workers in any way seeing any benefit by way of reduction in the cost of natural gas, gasoline, fuel, hydro, or any of the other commodities which make up their cost of living.

Members of trade unions have always been fair and reasonable. I sincerely hope that my two colleagues from better days will make their voices heard on the side of the workers whom they supported, and who supported them for so many years.

**Mr. A. C. Abbott (Mississauga):** Madam Speaker—

**Mr. Broadbent:** Paperworkers of Toronto, here we go.

**Mr. Abbott:** I am glad I have 20 minutes because I may have to endure the catcalls of my hon. friends opposite.

At the risk of offending the sensibilities of my hon. friends opposite I should like to confine my comments to the motion which is before us tonight.

**Mr. Broadbent:** You would be the first Liberal who has tonight.

**Mr. Abbott:** I may be the first Liberal who has, but certainly from the last few speakers I have heard on the NDP benches there have not been any appropriate comments in connection with the Irving decision which gave rise to this problem.

Perhaps I could say at the outset that I have considerable sympathy for the indignation expressed by the labour movement in connection with this decision because I think that, upon analysis, it has tended to distort the viewpoint that we might have of the anti-inflation program and the possibilities of appeal.

● (2340)

I should like to start by quoting part of the question asked by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas):

—which would give trade unions the same right of appeal as that enjoyed by the corporations and to remove the necessity of breaking the law in order to get a case before the administrator. I would therefore ask the minister if the government is prepared to introduce two amendments. First, an amendment to provide for the appeal by any party affected by a decision of the Anti-Inflation Board to the administrator and second, an amendment which would allow any person affected by the decision of the administrator to appeal directly to the appeal tribunal?

The minister stated that he was going to give consideration to this suggestion. I should like to deal with the first point, which is the appeal from the order of the Anti-Inflation Board which I think is actually a misconstruction of the whole matter. The Anti-Inflation Board was not given the power to issue an order; it was given the power to state that if in its judgment the guidelines had been exceeded by the parties to which it was addressing itself and it then