

view toward profits and prices as we take toward wages.

• (3:20 p.m.)

This co-operation cannot be obtained by suggesting you have a government policy, then spending almost \$13 million on the refit of the *Bonaventure*, \$1.2 million on an annual overhaul and then saying you are going to scrap that ship. You do not obtain co-operation by passing an order in council, as the government did last January, whereby you forgive the Ford Motor Company of Canada \$75 million owing to the federal treasury because that company could not meet all the requirements of an order in council made some five years before. This is a company which last year had a net profit seven times greater than it had in 1964. In the first nine months of this year it has a net profit of \$51 million compared to \$36 million in nine months last year. This is also a company which has \$150 million in depreciation reserves, and retained earnings of \$302 million. You do not obtain this co-operation when you ignore the basic, urgent issues of today such as urban renewal or urban redevelopment.

I say that if by government policy and government action you mean the curbing of prices and the control of profits then undoubtedly, not perhaps, you will receive the co-operation of labour. I see my time is almost up. There was another matter about which I desired to speak, but in conformity with the rules I will come to a conclusion based on a worry, a fear, of mine concerning the actions and the thinking of some Canadians. We must be outspoken, responsible members of parliament so that we can bring about understanding and co-operation between all sectors of the Canadian economy. This is a "must".

I made a statement a few years ago for which I was damned, condemned and criticized. I shall repeat it, however, here in the House of Commons today. The world does not owe Canada a living. We must earn it. To do that all of us, not only in this House but all 22 million Canadian citizens, must recognize the realities of today. If we do not then I—and I am not a prophet of gloom nor doom—would say we face disastrous consequences in the immediate future.

Mr. C. Terrence Murphy (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, before adding my comments to those already made in this debate, I wish to

The Address—Mr. Murphy

compliment the hon. members for Sarnia (Mr. Cullen) and Lapointe (Mr. Marceau) for their excellent contribution to this debate on Thursday last. I think it only natural that their constituents should be justifiably proud of their outstanding performance as we in this House are proud.

While it is true that the Speech from the Throne contained references to many subjects of great importance to the people of Canada, one observation was of particular significance to me as the representative in this House of the constituency of Sault Ste. Marie. It reads as follows:

Satisfactory relations between labour and management are of critical importance to our social and economic progress. The government is devoting greater attention to the problems and possibilities of industrial relations and will be putting forward for your consideration amendments to the legislation governing collective bargaining in the industries within federal jurisdiction.

The city of Sault Ste. Marie has been paralyzed by a steel strike since August 1. In a city of some 75,000 people, which relies practically exclusively on one industry for its economic existence, the shut-down of that industry, whether by strike or lock-out, can be disastrous. We who live in the city are of course aware that, from time to time, the very nature of industrial disputes makes such shut-downs necessary. However, I cannot help but feel that the present shut-down could have been avoided if the laws pertaining to labour relations were more realistic. I, of course, realize that the dispute in Sault Ste. Marie falls within the jurisdiction of the provincial government, and that the parties to the dispute are governed by the provisions of the Ontario Labour Relations Act. Nevertheless, it is my hope that we in this House will enact federal legislation in this field which will be a model for the provinces, which will be so advanced that the provincial legislatures will have no alternative but to follow our lead. In other words, we should endeavour to be leaders, not followers, and if our efforts are successful perhaps—just perhaps—we might end up with labour laws which are more or less uniform from coast to coast, a result which is so desirable that the mere thought of its attainment should give us the courage to forge ahead and legislate in a field where up until now even the angels have dared to tread but lightly.

Needless to say there is not sufficient time available to discuss all of the provisions one would like to find in such labour legislation.