

Labour Conditions

newspaper, *Montréal-Matin*, wrote that I would have trouble reconciling my present attitude with my statements of March 6 and June 12, 1964.

It is an article entitled:

A Liberal member talks too much.

In that article we read the following:

He opposed measures which are advocated at the present time by his party.

Mr. Speaker, if a member speaks too much in this house, I wonder if a parliamentary correspondent does not write too much.

I also wonder why this parliamentary correspondent, who can obtain all copies of *Hansard* and of speeches delivered in this house, waited until the month of October to write his article and say that on March 6 and June 12, 1964, the member for Lafontaine stated this and that.

The first time, that is on March 6, 1964, the house was considering a bill providing for two weeks vacation after one year of employment. On June 12, 1964, the bill provided for a minimum wage rate of \$1.25 per hour.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how the press gallery correspondent could come to such conclusions, especially if he took the trouble to read what I had said. I suppose he did not have enough time, because he could easily have realized that I supported the labour standards mentioned in the legislation now before us. It may be that he is preparing his campaign for the next election. I suppose it is his privilege, but I do not think the people of Lafontaine riding or the rest of the country could fall for such publicity.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I would not have raised the matter if it were not for the fact that, in the past, I had the opportunity to deal with the labour class, with the leaders of labour movements. I must admit that I had not read the article referred to because I very seldom read that newspaper. However, several people got in touch with me to ask how the hon. member for Lafontaine could be against the labour standards proposed in this legislation.

I immediately made a point of checking with the heads of that paper and I have in my mind the article entitled: "A Liberal member talks too much".

I have absolutely no hesitation in saying that I see no difficulty in reconciling the remarks I made on March 6 and June 12 with those I wish to make now concerning the legislation introduced by the Minister of Labour.

[Mr. Lachance.]

However, here is what that article said:

Wages—same support, on June 12, 1964, to a minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour but with the following reservations: "If the minimum of \$1.25 is extended to all regions, there would be reasons to believe that there will be more benefits for industries located away from larger cities.

Mr. Speaker, the press gallery correspondent certainly did not check page 4278 of *Hansard* for June 12, 1964, because he did not say so in his report. But if one refers to my remarks, one can read this:

Far be it from me to be against a minimum rate of \$1.25 but we must face the facts, and those are problems which must be discussed and examined thoroughly before setting up legislation for that purpose.

One can certainly not say that I am against the setting up of a minimum wage.

And a little farther I said:

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre introduced a bill suggesting a minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour. In a year or two, it might have to be increased to \$1.50.

If the press gallery correspondent for the newspaper *Montréal-Matin* did not refer in his report dated October 7 to the paragraphs I just quoted, I insist on reminding him of the speech I made on June 12, 1964 and on asking him to add the two paragraphs I read to the report he published on Wednesday, October 7.

The press gallery correspondent was once active in politics, and perhaps he is preparing his next election campaign. That is why I wanted to clear up those points.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the people in Lafontaine county and those of labour circles did not believe that report, because according to another important and popular newspaper in Montreal, the report may have seemed biased, for it does not speak the whole truth.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see this bill before us today. I hope that it will have an early implementation and that it is the forerunner of other labour standards. In my opinion, it is a shy attempt, but often a shy beginning leads to a better ending.

I think that other labour standards will be considered by parliament, and I shall have, no doubt, the opportunity to discuss the matter further in committee of the whole.

[Text]

Mr. Mather: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am wondering whether there is a quorum in the house at the present time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, I believe there is a quorum in the house.