

made in the editorial is correct. When I say that the person who wrote that editorial dishonestly manipulated and misconstrued what I had to say I refer to what I said at page 1819 of *Hansard* of November 5. My statement there is clear. I had this to say, that the trade union movement across Canada viewed the Ford strike as the initial official demonstration on the part of industry in this province to smash trade union agreements and the trade union movement. It was recognized as such by the union movement across the country. It was made known at that time. I was not lying about that, as the editor of the *Globe and Mail* suggests. In support of the soundness of that opinion I should like to call the attention of hon. members to the fact that since the police were sent into Windsor some thirty other organizations in that area took that stand also. Why did they do so? For fun? Not at all. Simply because the organized union movement in this province recognized the fact that what I said in this house was a correct assumption of how they, the movement, assessed the present dispute at the Ford plant. Only to-day I see by the *Ottawa Journal* that sixty Montreal locals vote for Ford sympathy strike. Are they taking that action in Quebec because they themselves are directly affected? Not at all. But they see that business in the city—

Mr. MITCHELL: May I say this to my hon. friend to be fair and to keep the record straight? I do not believe that companies generally are out to smash the unions.

Mr. GILLIS: I am not asking whether the minister does or not. If the minister wishes to ask a question I am prepared to answer.

Mr. MITCHELL: May I say this to my hon. friend—

Mr. GILLIS: I am not going to take a lecture from the minister.

Mr. MITCHELL: Mr. Ford did say this to me, that unions are here to stay and that he wants to deal with them. All I can say to my hon. friend is that I hope the Canadian company will take the same view.

Mr. GILLIS: The fact of the matter is that they have not. I am not arguing with the minister at all. Before he came into the house this afternoon I complimented him on his stand this afternoon.

Mr. MARTIN: The minister is trying to be helpful.

Mr. GILLIS: He is not being helpful.

Mr. MITCHELL: Why would I not?

47696—139½

Mr. GILLIS: I do not know. I am making my argument now against what I consider to be an uncalled-for editorial against myself in the *Globe and Mail*.

Mr. MITCHELL: If I took the same stand as my hon. friend I should be talking every day in the week.

Mr. GILLIS: No, you would not. To my knowledge this is the first time that I have seen anything said in this house by a member deliberately characterized as a lie, and be called a liar by a newspaper of the country.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I would not worry about that.

Mr. GILLIS: I am not worrying too much. I think the editor of a newspaper who would write an article like this about a member of the House of Commons, no matter who he is, has very little respect for the House of Commons or what it stands for. I am going to say this to the editor of the *Globe and Mail*: he is either an old man in his dotage and completely blinded or prejudiced, or he is a very young man who is completely inexperienced and has no idea of the principles for which this House of Commons stands, or the attitude of the members of the house on any matter that comes before it.

I am now going to say a few words with regard to a statement made by the hon. member for Eglinton, who, I am sorry is not in his seat at the moment. In discussing this matter he told the house plainly that when I said that in this province there was not such a thing as collective bargaining legislation I did not know what I was talking about, that my statements were founded on misinformation or lack of knowledge.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I would not worry about that.

Mr. GILLIS: I wish to keep the record straight. I am convinced of one thing, that if you had any kind of decent collective bargaining legislation in this province you would not have had the Windsor dispute. In the final analysis, no matter what the minister thinks about it or what may be the outcome of the Ford strike, you will need that legislation in order to avoid a recurrence of this trouble from time to time. That must definitely be recognized provincially. At page 1833 of *Hansard* the hon. member for Eglinton said that he was glad the hon. members in this section of the house were listening to him, and that in this province there was the