was the same amount of work from less men. The union was concerned because the men who were likely to be laid off were men up in years who, if they were fired, would not only lose their jobs but in many cases would lose their pension rights. This was the real cause of the dispute. It was for this reason that we, in this party, felt if both parties could settle the wage question, about which there was no quarrel, the matter of the reduction of the work gangs could be left first to an investigation by the commissioner under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act and subsequently to collective bargaining on the basis of the facts produced by that inquiry.

I want to draw attention to the attitude which the government took with regard to our proposal. On Thursday, June 9, as recorded at page 6173 of *Hansard*, I asked the Prime Minister, first, if he had any substantial hope of an early settlement and, second, if he had not would he give consideration either to advancing the bill of which the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) had given notice or introducing a bill which would contain provision for a settlement without imposing compulsory arbitration. The Prime Minister replied as follows:

> Contrary to what the hon. member has suggested, and to what was suggested in the press release I have received from the New Democratic Party to the effect that there is no hope of an early breakthrough, there is hope of success in the negotiations.
>
> • (9:40 p.m.)
>
> We have not given up that hope. Judge Lippé is negotiating at this moment; we have been in touch with him during the last hour and we have not by any means given up hope that this serious issue will be settled very shortly by the processes of free collective bargaining and not by parliamentary direction.

Those are brave words, Mr. Speaker. What is the bill before us now but parliamentary direction? This is parliamentary imposition of a requirement which was demanded by the shipping federation and opposed by the union. This is typical of the Liberal party, which is always unctuous in the proclamation of its principles but is always prepared to sabotage its principles when it comes to their specific application. A government that was not going to have any parliamentary direction is now asking us to take parliamentary action, not to require the parties to bargain collectively, but to require the union to accept the findings of a commission which has not yet brought down its report.

If the government wanted to do that they should have told parliament and the country what they were doing. Unless the house insists I will not take the trouble to quote all the *Hansards* which I have here. But the fact is that when the minister announced the settlement on June 14, he made no mention whatever of the fact that the findings of the commissioner appointed under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act were to be binding. When he made his report to the house regarding the appointment of the commission there was no suggestion that the findings were to be binding. The government is now trying to tell us that the reason it did not make this announcement was that the union agreed to do this, but that they did not want it made public too soon.

The Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Marchand) surprised me this afternoon with the speech he made. He has a very logical mind and whenever he indulges in sophistry I know that he is on weak ground and that he is all too conscious of it. He is also a very experienced and renowned labour leader. But when I listened to his sophistry this afternoon I began to realize the corrosive and seductive influence of sitting in the seats of the mighty. Because here is what the minister, in essence, said. He began his speech by saying that compulsory arbitration is not uncommon. Then he proceeded to tell us that this bill is not compulsory arbitration. He ended up by saying: Well, one swallow does not make a summer; we must not assume that compulsory arbitration will be the general policy of the government.

The minister sought to show that the union were really very happy about this imposed compulsory arbitration. I want to point out that if the union were agreeable to compulsory arbitration, there is no need for this legislation. Both sides could have put into the collective bargaining agreement the provision that they would submit this matter either to an arbitration tribunal or to a commissioner set up by the government, and that both would accept the findings of that commission. If they were both agreed there was no need for this legislation.

Mr. Marchand: Would the hon. member allow me. I never said that it was not binding arbitration. It is definitely binding arbitration. The problem is to know whether it is binding arbitration based on the will of the parties or on the legislative action of this parliament alone.

Mr. Douglas: I agree wholeheartedly with the minister. The issue is whether this legis-