

What is that but compulsory arbitration of the worst kind?

**Mr. Pickersgill:** It was exactly the same in your bill of 1958.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I wish you would get over that Smallwood approach. Clause 10 continues:

(b) providing for the powers of the board of arbitrators appointed under paragraph (a), the procedure to be followed for the purposes of arbitration, the form in which decisions of the board shall be set forth and for giving effect to any decision of that board, or by the chairman of the board where no majority decision is reached.

(2) In the event that a board of arbitrators is appointed under paragraph (a) of subsection (1) and decides any matter not agreed upon between a railway company and a union at the time of its decision, the collective agreement to which this Act applies between the railway company and the union shall be deemed to be amended by the incorporation therein of such decision, but nothing in this section shall be deemed to limit or restrict the rights of parties—

Sir, in 1950, the government of which some hon. members opposite formed a part, imposed compulsory arbitration. Again tonight, as so often in the past, the Prime Minister gave vocal support to the maintenance of collective bargaining while at the same time bringing in compulsory legislation that would not have been necessary if the government had acted in time.

Sir, it is ten o'clock.

**Mr. McIlraith:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Before the hon. gentleman speaks, Mr. Speaker, may I recall that I said to the Minister of Transport I would be glad to answer his questions. I am ready.

**Mr. McIlraith:** Mr. Speaker, since the opposition have indicated their desire to get on with this debate I would ask if the house would consent to permitting the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) to conclude his remarks.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Oh, don't give me any particular grace.

**Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I am sure there will be unanimous consent for that, because this is a very urgent situation.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I am glad to note at last that the Prime Minister regards this as an urgent situation. He delayed, and dillied and dallied for months, but I am very glad that at last tonight he realizes the seriousness of the situation.

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

**Mr. Pearson:** Carry on.

**Mr. Speaker:** I understand that the right hon. gentleman who has the floor has called it ten o'clock.

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION**

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

[Translation]

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION—PROTESTS RESPECTING LACK OF BILINGUAL R.C.M.P. OFFICERS

**Mr. Maurice Allard (Sherbrooke):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to remind the proper authorities of the presence in Canada of a French Canadian population. At the time I asked it, my question had to do with the National Capital Commission and unilingual members of the R.C.M.P.

It happens quite often that French Canadians from Quebec or other provinces come here, in the Ottawa-Hull area, and cannot speak to the authorities in their own language even though our constitution recognizes bilingualism, especially within the central government.

Now, we have been behindhand for many years. If we stress that fact, it is neither through ill will nor through discrimination but to find a positive way of making Canada a pleasant country to live in, where the two cultures and the two nations feel equal, especially in this Canadian Mecca, the federal capital, the Ottawa-Hull area. Mr. Speaker, if we raise this question periodically, it is because we would like the government to settle it permanently instead of always putting off its solution indefinitely. It would be easy for two great cultures closer to one another. Well, I am quite willing to give the hon. member for Lotbinière credit for his aspirations and enthusiasm, but I would much prefer to see constructive action, especially as far as this area where we live is concerned. You will find here citizens from all parts of the present government to act along those lines. In various circumstances, it has been said both here and outside the house that the government is in favour of that idea. I recall that during the debate on a bill dealing with culture, the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Choquette) identified the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) as the man who would galvanize the future of Canada and bring the