

*Legislation Respecting Railway Matters*  
basis of clause 6(b), which provides as follows:

—each basic daily rate in effect on December 31, 1965, established by or pursuant to the agreement in the case of an agreement binding or entered into on behalf of operating employees by 4 per cent effective January 1, 1966, and an additional 4 per cent effective July 1, 1966.

The actual increase will be 6 per cent. That is an interesting figure when one begins to realize the degree to which the 6 per cent bank interest rate has caused difficulty in recent months. Will the men go back to work? Those in the Liberal party used to be the six bucks boys. We remember them. Now they are the 6 per cent boys. They are offering to the workers far less than was actually offered or suggested by the conciliation board. I ask again: Will these men go back to work? We want them to go back to work. Their families want them to go back to work. The families of many are having difficulty living in a reasonable and decent way because of the inflationary trends in this country.

**Mr. Hamilton:** Caused by Pearson.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Caused by the degree to which the dollar falls and falls in purchasing power and the government fails to do anything. When we ask for action, the answer from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp) is always accompanied by that beatific smile. Here it is.

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

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** And he says, "We are looking into this matter." I can see the smile now on the face of the former minister of finance. How he must laugh at what is happening today. He had his difficulties, but they were almost heavenly compared to the difficulties of his successor—and both were equally successful.

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

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** With those few generous words, I want to ask this government: Do you ask parliament to say to men, "You shall work" and at the same time say, "You shall work for an increase of 6 per cent"? No amount of evasive circumlocution on the part of the Prime Minister can get away from the fact that he and his government made 30 per cent and 34 per cent the basic increase in keeping with present day conditions. That is what they did. They boasted about the tremendous achievement that had been brought about. Ordinary mortals could not do it.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

• (9:10 p.m.)

There were difficulties. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson) laboured and brought forth a mouse; but when the Prime Minister got hold of that problem, it grew to 31 to 34 per cent. I say to the Prime Minister that he and his government are responsible in large measure for the tremendous undercurrent within this nation today, for anxiety about the government's uncertainty and, above all, their capacity for achieving settlements. Will the men who are affected go back to work? Parliament has the right to know and to receive an assurance on that. Parliament must not be asked to pass legislation and then find itself challenged. If that ever takes place, this nation will face a situation dangerous to the people as a whole, and completely destructive of parliament. When laws are passed, whether we agree with them or not, those laws are the law of the land.

Are we in parliament to be asked to pass legislation decreeing a 6 per cent increase without knowing what the reaction will be, not of a few people but of many? I said this afternoon, and I have no reason to withdraw it this evening: People who work are generally law abiding. The government speaks of 6 per cent and compulsory arbitration. It is easy to pass laws, but unless they have the support of the people, they will have the effect of adding to the psychology of lawlessness that is more and more becoming an attribute of some democracies.

I implore the Prime Minister to ask the Minister of Labour to tell the house whether this will be accepted. Does he say it is fair? Does he say it is reasonable? If we are going to pass legislation of this kind, we have to have behind it the whole power of the thinking of parliament.

I am not familiar with the operation of unions. The minister of manpower is present; he is familiar with these matters. A week ago Sunday he announced at a political meeting in the province of Quebec that there could be no compulsory arbitration. Both he and the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Sauvé) are authorities on labour for others. They belong or did belong to a great union which today is challenging national unions through raids for membership, holding out the expectation and hope that with two outstanding members in the cabinet it is better to belong to such a union if you want to get things done. I am glad there is no competition there because everybody said the hon. gentleman is one of those who leads or who has led the competition. If the hon. gentleman is experienced in