

Procedure and Organization

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That is a great improvement in the hon. member's reading habits.

Mr. McCleave: It will have been an improvement if hon. members opposite heed the words of Sir Wilfrid. I quote:

Sir, these rules are to be swept away, they are to be ridden over rough shod; they are to be put aside, and we are to have the gag substituted for them. And what is the pretence? The pretence is that there has been obstruction in the House. Sir, if obstruction be a fault, if obstruction be an offence, I call upon the man on that side of the House who is without guilt to cast the first stone. I read in some Conservative newspapers that obstruction was the murderer of parliamentary government. I do not here now challenge the statement; but if obstruction be the murderer of parliamentary government, the murderers are on that side of the House, and not on this. My right hon. friend has experience, and he will experience still more, that as you sow, so shall you reap; and Sir, it does not lie in his mouth or in the mouth of his followers to say that there has been obstruction in this House by the parliamentary minority.

May I also read from a book with the notation on the cover, "Political Pamphlets, Liberal, 1919-35". This book no doubt has been maintained in the library at the taxpayers' expense. I do not know how it was compiled but it is heady reading, as I am sure the Minister of Justice will agree.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Absolutely.

Mr. McCleave: It may not be amiss to re-echo the starry cries of the 1919 Liberal convention. I quote from this book as follows:

Liberalism is essentially progressive and open minded. It has a history and traditions of which it has reason to be proud. But that does not mean that it is to rest upon tradition and to become stationary. It is not a dead thing, but a living, growing organism. It thrives in an atmosphere of freedom, and especially of liberty of thought and of speech.

An hon. Member: They don't want free speech now.

Mr. McCleave: May I now quote the words of another great spokesman for Liberalism. These were spoken on the night of October 14, 1935, a night the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) will long remember. That was the night he was first elected to this chamber. Mr. Mackenzie King had this to say:

The individuals and the nations which discard Liberalism, pay by losing their liberty. When liberty goes, little else remains. Today the task of Liberalism is two-fold: it is to maintain what we have already gained of freedom in many spheres, and to gain for our fellowmen more in the way of economic freedom. That battle will not be won

[Mr. McCleave.]

by individuals putting their own present and material interests before all else, or by Canada putting her present material interests before all else. In the realm of individual freedom, it will be won by each seeking to gain a larger liberty for others as well as for himself. In the international sphere it will be won by international co-operation and international good-will.

Although I have a few words more, Mr. Speaker, I must end on that note.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the house under standing order 40 deemed to have been moved.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—VANCOUVER— DISSATISFACTION OF LETTER CARRIERS WITH FIVE DAY DELIVERY

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, my question was prompted by sit-downs in the Vancouver and Burnaby areas on the part of letter carriers obviously dissatisfied with the single mail processing which was consequent upon the imposition of the five day mail delivery. The reaction of the letter carriers of the western metropolis was typical of that which has been revealed throughout the country. Of all the failures which the minister has chalked up in his year of office that in the field of labour relations is certainly the most gregarious. His threats of prosecutions, his failure to consult adequately before making sweeping changes in employees' work routine, the story of the locked washrooms—all of these are now well known. They have been dramatized by the type of actions which were taken in Vancouver and Burnaby and by other indications of dissatisfaction in other offices. Happily these, while significant, were not sustained and in general the postal workers are to be congratulated for their restraint in the face of what chief adjudicator Martin has described as arrogance and highhandedness on the part of the employer.

It is regrettable that for reasons which still appear mysterious, the report of Mr. Martin was not revealed to the public until July 4, nine and a half weeks after the date of his decision. The suggestion that while the chief adjudicator signed the decision on April 30 he worked on it after that date is an intriguing one, especially since the two other reports dated May 15 and 16 bear his signature as adjudicator. The unusual delay in the production of such an important document is all the more disconcerting in the light of the Postmaster General's (Mr. Kierans) revelation that