

hope that people who are involved may have seen it. It said this:

The issue now before the country has become one even bigger than the rail strike, big and urgent enough as that is in itself. The issue has developed into the place of Parliament as the ultimate authority in the country, the court of last resort, the final word.

Canada has had troubles over the years, in the breaking of laws and the defiance of orders from the courts. But few indeed have been the times when the possibility—even the likelihood—of defying Parliament has been openly raised. For to speak of defying Parliament is to speak of defying the very basis of authority in Canada: beyond Parliament there is nothing.

Labor leaders among the railway workers may believe that the measures brought down in the House for ending the rail strike are far from satisfactory. They have every right to protest, and every right to keep on protesting. They may clamor outside the House for amendments to the proposed legislation, and lobby for changes, and bring every sort of pressure to bear upon the House.

But there is no defensible right, on anyone's part, to defy Parliament. Parliament is the groundwork, and the only groundwork, for everyone's rights. It is not possible for citizens to pick and choose which laws they will obey and which they will reject.

Citizens may certainly do just that as voters at the polls. But to have groups declaring that Parliament's decisions will not apply to them is more than protest; it is civil disobedience. And what one may do, all may do.

Then it would mean that the will of Parliament, as expressed by its laws, has meaning only if the laws are found acceptable to the particular groups to which they happen to apply. The veto power would be widely distributed. Parliament instead of being the final authority of the people, would become only a body that expresses hopes or wishes, such as may or may not have any effect.

The editorial closes with these words:

No matter how seriously any group may feel about what Parliament may decide, to undermine Parliament itself, by dragging its authority down, is to

destroy whatever protection anyone may hope for in the future. If the traditions of parliamentary democracy in Canada are to be replaced by a system of group vetoes of legislation, then the rule of law has gone with the wind. What would take its place would be nothing new, but something terribly old. It would be either tyranny or anarchy.

It seems to me that that was as well said as any expression I have heard.

We have the conciliation report in the bill and the negotiations will of course continue. It is hopeful that some good will come as a result of them, and I feel therefore that they will reach an understanding. I think that the Freedman formula should be endorsed. I gather, unlike some others in the house here, that the Prime Minister today actually said that they had endorsed it in principle and would take some action about it very quickly and in due course.

Honourable senators, I close with this observation, that compulsory arbitration has had an undistinguished history of non-acceptance. It did not do the job before and that is why we are here today.

There was a long stride taken in 1950 down the road which was neither trade unionism nor democracy. It was not a cure and is a source of conflict; it has multiplied strife rather than preventing it. For that reason, of course, I will vote for the bill, because I want the railroads to get started as quickly as possible—perhaps even tonight, to look after the holiday people who need some form of transportation and will be anxiously looking for it.

I hope that, in the light of what has been said in many responsible places, that the railroad men who must feel the responsibility very heavily will return to work once again.

Hon. M. Graftan O'Leary: Honourable senators, it was said of Mr. Gladstone that he could make a budget speech sound like a sonnet. I thought of that as I listened to the soothing words this evening of the Government Leader in the Senate (Hon. Mr. Connolly, Ottawa West) about this bill. I thought also that if he had not distinguished himself in politics and in law he might have gone into medicine and made a vast reputation for himself on his bedside manner alone. Speaking of bedside manners, I must say I was a bit astonished to find that veteran warrior, Senator Roebuck, objecting to the