

*Legislation Respecting Railway Matters*

member of the cabinet over that which is now before parliament?

**Mr. Pearson:** You will find out.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Parliament is dealing with this matter and it is being changed outside.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I am quite anxious to pursue this point to clarify the situation because—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Answer the question.

**Mr. MacEachen:**—this is an interim settlement for 1966 and because it is a provisional settlement—to use the words of the Minister of Justice on another occasion, referring to the 1958 bill. It is a provisional interim settlement for 1966. The parties are free to change this figure through the process of mediation provided under this bill.

The second inaccuracy made in the statement of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition is that the wage rates for 1967 are not covered in this legislation. I want to tell the house, Mr. Speaker, that the government carefully considered whether it would include a provision in the bill providing for the Munroe award for the year 1967. That was a choice open to the government. It rejected that course—

**Mr. Churchill:** No confidence in the judge.

**Mr. MacEachen:**—because it took the view that the maximum opportunity ought to be left to the parties to work out an agreed settlement for 1967, and failing that there is the solution of the dispute between them by arbitration.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Douglas:** The lamest excuse we have heard tonight.

**Mr. MacEachen:** The hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Douglas) this afternoon accused us of destroying collective bargaining by imposing compulsory arbitration. His deputy leader told us that it does not exist. Maybe they ought to get together to reconcile their own differences.

The reference to 1967 is a clear illustration that the Leader of the Opposition has distorted beyond recognition the provisions of this bill with respect to the wage settlement. It is absolutely clear that Mr. Justice Munroe

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

recommended a settlement of 18 per cent for a two year period.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Why did you not put that in the legislation?

**Mr. MacEachen:** Anyone who has any understanding of collective bargaining, as the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) has, will readily agree that it is unrealistic that any settlement reached through agreement or arbitration will be less than the total wage package.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, past experience teaches that—

**Mr. Fulton:** Does the bill say that?

**Mr. MacEachen:**—and I am satisfied that if the Leader of the Opposition had used the percentage of 18 per cent, as he would have been entitled to do on the basis of past experience, the effect among the workers in Canada would have been entirely different.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I accept the right of any hon. member to disagree with this bill; but I do believe it is totally irresponsible to misrepresent what we are doing.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Ricard:** If it is so good, let us vote right now.

**Mr. MacEachen:** I am satisfied that anyone who reads the proposals of Mr. Justice Munroe and looks at the proposal provided for 1966, and who examines what has happened in previous mediations and arbitrations will reach exactly the same conclusion I have reached and which the hon. member for York South obviously has reached. I wish the hon. member for York South would get up and say it, and tell the workers that this is a total settlement ultimately as prescribed by Mr. Justice Munroe.