

[Translation]

It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock this evening, when the House will proceed with a motion moved under the provisions of Standing Order 26 by the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent).

At 6:02 the House took recess.

#### AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

### MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

[English]

#### LABOUR CONDITIONS

##### IRVING PULP AND PAPER—CANADIAN LABOUR CONGRESS REACTION TO DECISION OF ANTI-INFLATION BOARD ADMINISTRATOR

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Leave having been granted to the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) to move the adjournment of the House pursuant to 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 2 million Canadian Workers to withdraw from all areas of co-operation with the federal government", accordingly the motion is as follows: Mr. Broadbent, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moves:

That this House do now adjourn.

**Mr. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby):** Madam Speaker, for sometime now the New Democratic Party has made its opposition clearly known to the kind of anti-inflation program that the government has brought before the people of Canada. We made that known last Thanksgiving when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) went on television and announced his intentions. We followed that up by clear opposition to the bill which was introduced subsequent to that time in the House of Commons. There has been no question about our general opposition to the kind of program that the government has presented to deal with inflation.

Notwithstanding our opposition to the general program, that is not the issue before the House tonight. The principal concern of tonight's debate is the absence, in the law that has been passed by this House, of the fundamental right of all Canadians to appeal judicial or quasi-judicial decisions which affect them. That is the issue before us and that is the one to which I hope spokesmen for all parties, particularly spokesmen for the government, will address themselves.

On January 28 in the House for the first time in a question I indicated, on behalf of my party, concrete reasons to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald) for believing the appeal procedure set down under this law

#### Labour Conditions

was, to put it bluntly, a farce. The minister at that time dismissed the question. He suggested that I and one of my colleagues should reread the law. I read the law with considerable care before I raised the issue then. I would like to suggest to the minister, and I wish he were here, that he read his own law and, in addition that he try to comprehend more fully the basic anti-democratic component that is deeply imbedded within it, and take steps to change it forthwith.

The reason for this issue coming glaringly to the surface in the last few days has, of course, been the Irving Pulp and Paper case, the outcome of which has been the fining of the company in the amount of \$125,000. Let me briefly outline the chronology of events in this particular case because they illuminate the general situation in a clear fashion.

Last November 30, following serious negotiations between the company and its employees, an agreement was reached through the normal collective bargaining process on what the terms of employment should be. The company then proceeded to implement this agreement. It considered that it did so precisely within the framework of the law of Canada. In particular it paid what it regarded as scrupulous attention to the historical relationship clause in the white paper which preceded the law. It paid, as I said, its workers according to its honest interpretation of the law.

On December 18 the Anti-Inflation Board decided that the company had exceeded the guidelines. However, still acting from within its own perceived framework of the law, the company decided to continue to pay its workers on the basis of the agreed upon settlement with the workers.

On January 23, urged I might add by both the union and Mr. Irving, the Anti-Inflation Board referred the case to the administrator. As soon as the board referred the case, Mr. Irving, acting I submit entirely appropriately, began paying his workers within the framework of what was deemed to be appropriate by the Anti-Inflation Board, putting the amount of money in excess of that in escrow to be left there depending on the outcome of the appeal procedure.

● (2010)

On Friday the minister announced agreement with the board's interpretation of the law and Mr. Irving was fined \$125,000. As matters now stand, the agreement originally reached by collective bargaining is in a shambles. Mr. Irving, a law-abiding man, finds he has become unintentionally a lawbreaker, and the pulp and paper workers who are directly affected have no right to appeal.

I believe that in this case Mr. Irving was correct in his judgment—that he was right in thinking the original contract did come within the framework of the anti-inflation guidelines. That is a matter of opinion. My colleagues and I think the case for the settlement agreed upon was reasonably made, especially in view of the historical relationship between wages paid to pulp and paper workers and to the outside workers. A point of greater significance at the moment is this: this case is a graphic illustration of the injustices which are built into the act and which will remain a permanent part of the law of Canada if the act is not changed. The law makes a criminal of an employer and leaves his employees without recourse to appeal in the face