

with a money settlement but with other important matters.

For example, the bill contains a clause which says that the wage settlement shall apply retroactively. It could have been presented to us without such a clause. This was an act of judgment on the part of the government. It was also an act of judgment to specify a minimum rate as a basis for further negotiation and arbitration.

The Progressive Conservative Party presented its own act of judgment. It said the government proposal did not go far enough. I do not care whether they call it an adjustment or what they call it, they are simply saying: you are not paying these men enough. We in this party reserve the right to do the same. Our view is that the settlement is niggardly. Our view is that we have the power, the right and the duty to discuss this settlement fully, including the question of wage rates.

I listened carefully to the Minister of Transport this morning. It was hard to avoid listening to him carefully, he was so eloquent. He spoke to us with candour, with intensity and with fervour, as well as with considerable logic in relation to the unimportant bits and pieces of his speech.

I respected him for addressing himself squarely and clearly not only to the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves but to the real nature of the conflict between management and railway workers. I notice that the members of the Official Opposition applauded the minister's speech enthusiastically. I do not think they applauded because they liked him more but because they liked us less. It was fairly obvious that the minister was tearing a strip off us this morning. I suspect he realizes that the only effective criticism of his position can come from this quarter of the House and not from hon. members to my right.

We are all bargaining, and let us admit it. The government party put in the first bid; the Conservative party put in the second bid, and we are putting in our bid now. The Social Credit party will put in their bid in other kinds of money. But we are all bargaining. We are all judges and we, in turn, whether the Minister of Transport likes it or not, will be judged by the people of this country.

● (2310)

Unfortunately we are here not only as employers but as arbiters; we are the judge and the jury. This is why members of my party have advanced the very correct thesis that it is totally invidious for parliament to be in this position.

I should like to say to the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Transport that if they do not think parliament should be involved in bargaining, the choices open to them are simple; not to call parliament back, or to do the kind of thing the right hon. member for Prince Albert did back in 1961, that is, not to bargain but to tell the people to go back to work. This is a very cruel but logical kind of procedure.

What I am stating is very simple. The logic of the government's position has to be followed through to its conclusion. Once having begun the process by bringing us back and by placing the bill before us, it must accept the

Railway Operations Act

validity and the necessity of continuing the bargaining right here and now.

I do not know how I could possibly add to the remarks of my colleague, the hon. member for Fraser Valley West. I cannot find the words from my own repertoire so I will do a little bit of quoting.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Harney: A number of years ago one of North America's foremost social critics, Paul Goodman, wrote in a book called "Growing Up Absurd" that we have a cockeyed way of distributing remuneration for work done in our society. He set forth three very simple principles which describe the way we pay people in our society, not the way we ought to pay them, and he said that the more the work is hard, the more the work is necessary, and the more the work is in the public realm, the less people get paid.

This is certainly the case when we are dealing with railroad workers. Perhaps there are some people who work harder than they do, but I doubt if you will find work that is more necessary than theirs. Their work is certainly public, and they are the very people in every case that we put up against the wall.

I discovered a little bit of cant in the speech of the Minister of Labour in his use of the term "labour dispute," but we are all guilty of using cant in these matters. Many of us have said: "Well, management may have its point of view, labour may stand for its point of view, but the only people who get hurt are the innocent public". There is no such thing as an innocent public. We are all participants in the marketplace, we all have our responsibilities, and we here in parliament cannot hide behind the so-called innocence of the public. We have a responsibility to see that the very mechanism of the marketplace, so lauded by my colleagues to the right, works.

This is Labour Day weekend and many of us, if parliament rises tonight or tomorrow, or by Sunday, will be heading off for a Labour Day holiday, probably participating in Labour Day events and making labour speeches. Let us remember one principle, not only on Labour Day but tonight when we are discussing a matter which has to do with labour, and that is the principle of using the services that people provide rather than using the people who provide the services.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matte: Mr. Chairman, since there is before the House an amendment and an amendment to the amendment which have aroused the Minister of Labour (Mr. Munro) himself, I had intended to wait till the end of the discussion on this sub-amendment before moving a further amendment. But since my proposed amendment solves the problem of the amendment and the sub-amendment before us, I believe it my duty to explain at this point how, by way of an amendment slightly different from the one proposed, unanimity in this House could be achieved.

It is always extremely ticklish to arbitrarily fix any figure. Why 30 cents, 38 cents or 34 cents? What does that