

Supply—Labour

I want to hear from the minister in this regard. Remember, once a firm starts working in an interprovincial area and is caught by the labour standards act it cannot allocate its crews so far as scales of pay and working hours are concerned in that particular work and then have different standards for the rest of its employees who may be doing work strictly within one province. In this context I am thinking of some of the more extensive operations of heavy trucking firms in Alberta who haul drill rigs, pipe, bunkhouses and other kinds of equipment. Are they going to have certain of their personnel covered by Alberta legislation and the remainder who cross provincial boundaries covered by other regulations under the federal act? How could a firm maintain equitable management-employee relations in such circumstances?

Many operators in the oil industry have approached me with respect to the difficult conditions under which they are being asked to operate. These are impossible conditions. As I said, it seems to me that the labour standards act was designed for nice cozy factory operations in central Canada but so far as our development industries farther afield are concerned, which may be caught by this act, somebody was out to lunch, so to speak, and it should not apply.

We must also remember that the products of these industries go into a very competitive market. The cost of production of commodities has become a very serious problem to Canada. Not only have we got higher transportation costs. Higher costs have been imposed on the trucking industry as a result of this act, but there are higher costs elsewhere. For what benefit? The men involved want to work longer but they are not permitted to do so. Thus we are driving up costs to the point where some people are saying it is not worth the candle. Judgment must be exercised in regard to some of the standards that we may set. If the product will not be sold at the end of the line then it is useless to say that our people will be employed. Canadian business is not in existence merely for the purpose of stockpiling.

I want to ask some questions with regard to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation but since the minister indicated, and I agree with what he said, that we should defer questions on it until a later point today, I will content myself by indicating one area to which I hope he will address his remarks. I refer to the provision under the National Housing Act whereby the corporation may make loans to companies or individuals who

[Mr. Lambert.]

hold blocks of C.M.H.C. mortgages. I ask, on what terms? It would appear as though the costs of these loans may be as high as those of loan factors. Certain difficulties have arisen as a result of this type of financing. I would like to have some elaboration on that point.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Labour gave the committee an interesting sermon a few minutes ago. He spelled out his belief that both labour and management have the fullest freedom to pursue their legitimate interests in a free society. It is a belief with which we all agree. I only wish that the speeches the minister made across the country throughout the last year had contained the same argument. I am going to deal with that point in a few moments, but I think I would be remiss if I did not comment on the interesting remarks of the first speaker for the official opposition, the hon. member for Edmonton West.

The hon. member for Edmonton West made a speech in which on every issue with which he dealt and which divides labour and management he wound up on the side of management. He came out for compulsory arbitration.

Mr. Lambert: I did not.

Mr. Orlikow: He is shaking his head that he did not but if one reads his speech in *Hansard* one will see that the context in which it was given would so indicate.

• (12:50 p.m.)

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, it is fair that I should rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member is absolutely misquoting me. I did not say I was in favour of compulsory arbitration. I said there was a danger that we were heading toward it and that there were some very grave inequities in respect of compulsory arbitration. I certainly did not advocate it.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I could hardly misquote the hon. member because I did not quote him at all. The hon. member who talks, as he has just done again, about the fact that we are moving toward compulsory arbitration did not say that he disapproves of it. I think the record will speak for itself, and I drew the inference that he was not opposed to compulsory arbitration.

Similarly, the hon. member spoke about the need for respect for our laws. I got the impression that only labour people on occasion ignore the laws. We did not hear about the cases of large companies and others in this