

the right of appeal. What must one do to persuade the government that this procedure is utterly arbitrary, without justification and at odds with our traditions of procedure? What must we do to convince the government that if it persists in its course, the Canadian people will not be persuaded that the legislation is fair and applied evenhandedly. If the program fails, it will be a disaster.

I will not countenance defiance of this law, but I will not tolerate a government which polarizes the country and encourages people to protest against the program. This evening, that is the point we must consider. We must consider the government's approach to the question. It pretends that a reasonable appeal system is in being, when no such appeal system exists. The Acting Prime Minister (Mr. Sharp), the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Marchand), the Minister of Labour, and Postmaster General (Mr. Mackasey) understand these matters. Do they think Canadian people, particularly those in the labour movement, regard this procedure as fair?

One can find many faults with the program. I say to the Acting Prime Minister, through you, sir, "For God's sake give the program a chance. Pay some heed to the principles of natural justice and our traditions of judicial procedure and give the people a chance to support the legislation and the program."

Mr. Cyril Symes (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, in this evening's emergency debate we shall discuss two issues: the denial of natural justice to working people, particularly members of the Canadian Paper Workers Union who were dealt a cruel blow by the anti-inflation administrator, and the government's attempt, with its anti-inflation program, to destroy free collective bargaining as we know it. I have tried several times to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 in order to discuss these issues and I am glad that Mr. Speaker allowed this motion.

My colleagues, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Rodriguez) and myself made a fact-finding tour of some one-industry—paper industry—towns in northern Ontario affected by the paper workers' strike. We met workers and their families, civic officials and businessmen. We learned first-hand how the government's anti-inflation legislation has prolonged the strike of about 25,000 paper workers in this country, sometimes by more than seven months. We heard of families which had used life savings to meet expenses because the \$20 a month strike pay was not enough. We heard of families who were thousands of dollars in debt, paying as much as 24 per cent interest on loans. We heard of families who had lost their homes through inability to meet mortgage payments, and of families separated from the breadwinner who had found a temporary job elsewhere in Canada. My colleagues will elaborate on these heart-breaking stories and will tell the House how the government, by its legislation, unnecessarily prolonged the strike to the detriment of many Canadian families.

Mr. Blais: That's baloney.

Mr. Symes: What astonished me most was the lack of Liberal members of parliament in those areas.

Mr. Rodriguez: They run and hide.

Mr. Blais: Baloney. We live there. That's totally false.

Labour Conditions

Mr. Rodriguez: You people run and hide.

Mr. Symes: The hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Roy) and the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) were not there, even though the workers had asked them to be there. I invite Liberal members from Port Arthur, Cochrane, Timmins or Saint John to return to their communities and explain the rationale of this program to the workers. Let them explain how only a short while ago in the 1974 election campaign those very Liberals argued against the kind of wage controls which this government has now imposed. They argued that the Conservative party would impose wage controls.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Roy (Timmins): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) referred to me in his remarks in a disparaging way. I think the next election will be held in 1978. I invite him to run in my riding, if he thinks I was not there. Then he will see.

Mr. Symes: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's constituents will make the proper decision in 1978. We will not see the hon. member back in the House. The Liberal party won the federal election by opposing wage controls. Now, with its program which discriminates against the labour movement, it has completely reversed itself. I shall show how the program this government instituted has victimized the Canadian Paper Workers Union and has actually destroyed the well-being of thousands of workers. Many of those workers have been on strike since July, 1975. They bargained in good faith in the spring of the year, long before the Prime Minister addressed the people on Thanksgiving Day. Previously, the paper workers had entered into a two-year contract. During those two years the paper industry made tremendous profits. The paper industry in Canada quadrupled its net profits, after taxes, from \$79 million in 1972 to \$320 million in 1973.

Mr. Benjamin: Where were the controls then?

Mr. Symes: It more than doubled its profits in 1974, to \$685 million. What did one hear about controls in those days? We suffered from price inflation the extent of which this country had never seen. Yet the government made no move to control that inflation. Meanwhile, the workers were locked into a two-year wage contract. Incidentally, we have yet to see the Anti-Inflation Board make one ruling with regard to rolling back prices.

Between 1973 and 1975 the paper industry increased the price of a ton of newsprint by 52 per cent, and the price of a ton of bleached kraft pulp went up by 118 per cent. In December, 1974, before collective bargaining had begun, Abitibi offered a one-year extension of the wage contract. The union locals turned it down, rightly, since in view of the company's astronomical profits it could afford to pay more. They also argued that they could not accept that kind of a wage offer because just previously the woodland workers, with whom they had always a historical wage relationship, had settled for a higher offer. Meanwhile these great corporations, these good corporate citizens, had been running the mills seven days a week and had been stockpiling paper for over three years in anticipation of a strike. That indicates they were not serious about getting