

Some hon. Members: Answer.

Mr. Lewis: I would remind him and other gentlemen who are making a great deal of noise—I do not mind; I will wait, if you have patience, sir—

An hon. Member: Answer the question.

Mr. Lewis: I would remind them that a compulsory deduction of dues was established in this country in the first place, on the first important occasion, by no less a man than the then Mr. Justice Ivan Rand back in 1945 at the time of the united automobile strike in Windsor, as I am sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) will remember. I say to the hon. gentleman who asked this question that if he has any reason to doubt my own attitude toward some of these things, it is his privilege. But I, and many members of this house who know Mr. Justice Rand, are certain he would not have approved compulsory deduction of union dues if this was an erosion of freedom. In my own opinion it is not, and I therefore support deduction of union dues.

Mr. Webb: May I ask the hon. member another question?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would remind the house that the time allotted to the hon. member for York South has expired and that a question can be put to him only by unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Webb: I should like to ask the hon. member whether he was a representative counsel for the union in years past at a fee of some \$200, I believe, or \$50 a day, though since the unions have been on strike his fee is now raised to \$2,000 a day.

An hon. Member: Explain.

Mr. Lewis: I answer this question with a smile even though I think this kind of ungentlemanly attack on other members of this house is to be deplored. I merely say that I have not acted for these unions since I was elected to parliament. As a matter of fact, they asked me to act on the conciliation board and I told them I could not because I was a member of parliament. As to any charge for my fees, that is my own affair and the affair of my clients, as other people's fees and earnings are their affair.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Legislation Respecting Railway Matters

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Some hon. Members: Filibuster.

Hon. A. J. MacEachen (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I can understand the anxiety of hon. gentleman opposite in seeking a vote. My purpose in speaking is to secure a unanimous vote in defeating the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker).

I realize there is unanimity in the house as to the necessity of railway operations in Canada being resumed. I realize there is unanimity in the desire that the strike shall cease and that the men should return to their jobs. I hope that when this parliament has passed a law, not only will every member of the House of Commons expect his fellow citizens to obey the law, but that every member of the House of Commons will encourage his fellow citizens to obey the law that is passed by parliament.

In 1960 when the Leader of the Opposition introduced his railway legislation, or at least announced his intention of introducing legislation to avoid a strike, the present Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) made the following comment:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side share the Prime Minister's regret, a regret which I am sure is felt by every hon. member of the house, that in spite of the strenuous efforts that have been made in accordance with the best democratic practice it has not been possible to reach an agreement on this important matter. The Prime Minister (Mr. Diefenbaker) has announced that legislation will now be introduced to deal with this question. It goes without saying, as he has mentioned, that whatever legislation is passed by the house will be respected and obeyed by trade union members and anyone else who is covered by it. I think we can all count upon that.

That is the end of the quotation. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that if we cannot count on that in Canada, the result is anarchy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEachen: I listened with great interest to the earlier part of the remarks made by the hon. member for York South and I must say that since the former member for Eglinton was in the house I have not heard the words "nonsense" and "rubbish" repeated so often in a single speech.

I intend in dealing with the issues before the house to consider three aspects of the