

eration arguments which have been advanced, and we only worked them out in the latter part of the day.

Mr. Morgan: Mr. Chairman, as a rookie member I have been sitting here all day wondering what the House is attempting to do. We have a serious responsibility and I sometimes wonder, with all the rhetoric and so-called logic which has gone on amongst us, whether we are really taking our responsibilities seriously or whether we are here only in a pro forma position. I have listened to what the leader of the NDP has to say, and hearing all the rhetoric and double-talk which has come out of him I am reminded of a little rhyme. Perhaps it is the hour of the day which brings it to my mind. It is:

There was an old man from York South,
Who knew not what the truth was about.
So to save himself trouble,
He spoke at the double,

At once from both sides of his mouth.

That is an example of what he and his party have done here. The so-called government has failed to set a good example. It has done nothing. It has caused chaos in this country, with inflation running rampant. The government sat on its hands, and the Minister of Labour has not contributed a thing toward that which we want done in this country.

● (0020)

An hon. Member: Hallelujah!

Mr. Morgan: Perhaps because of the hour my mind is cast to the thought that "When Munro went from "health" into "labour", the government said, "Here is your saviour". But to say the least, there was no star in the East, and the pain was just greater and greater."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Morgan: I am satisfied that the members of this House have the ability and the intelligence to solve the problems that come before us, but sometimes I am weary about what goes on. I admit I am a rookie and perhaps I must get used to this kind of nonsense that goes on and on. But things must be done—inflation must be corrected, and the people of this country must be looked after. I submit that this is not being done. We sit here hour after hour discussing things that could be done with any degree of intelligence and if we had a government that knew what it was doing and where it was going. If that were the case, we would not have these problems today. I think that as soon as we can bring to a conclusion what we are attempting this evening, putting the railway workers back to work, the better the country will be served.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Chairman, I shall take to heart the words uttered by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat and make my remarks very brief. We on this side of the House have voted against two amendments to clause 5. We have done so in order to emphasize a principle that was enunciated earlier today by the Minister of Transport, and later by the Minister of Labour—a principle that sought to establish a future settlement, first of all

Railway Operations Act

on the basis purely of the award by the chairman of the conciliation board, and later by the arbitrator, in conformity with the practice that has been established in the past.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Bell: You can't reflect on a vote.

Mr. MacEachen: I am not reflecting on the vote. I am saying that we have sought to emphasize this principle in committee of the whole. The committee has not accepted the principle we put forward, and in accepting the sub-amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition it has accepted a different principle. I make no comment about that at this stage. However, facing us now is a decision in respect of the clause as amended. When the Chairman calls the clause as amended, the clause as a whole will be before the committee.

I want to indicate to members of the committee that we on this side of the House will be supporting the clause as amended because we take the view that it is essential that this bill be passed in order to end the national crisis in the transportation system; and in addition to that, an effort to defeat this clause would deny the workers a wage settlement or would be an effort to deny the workers a wage settlement—and that is the very heart of this clause.

Certainly it is not our intention to frustrate that objective, and for that reason it is entirely consistent for us to indicate to members of the committee and the country that we support this clause as amended in order to reach the objective I have stated.

An hon. Member: You have no choice.

Mr. Hees: What else could you do? You have been licked, and you have to accept that verdict. In other words, you have been knocked out and you have now announced that you have been knocked out. That is real Liberal honesty.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Chairman, we have tried in various ways to amend clause 5 with which we could not agree in any way in principle. This clause provided for an hourly rate which was inadequate and established standards which were not indexed on the rise in the cost of living, which went against the objectives of the workers.

Mr. Chairman, while accepting of course the principle of an increase of 30 cents, we believe it is not sufficient and this is why we were putting up a fight: we wanted the increase provided for in clause 5 to be geared to the ever increasing cost of living. This is why our party supported the motion moved by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) who wanted to see this clause to provide a constant rate for the increases in the cost of living. We wanted to see this amendment to clause 5 based on a amount calculated on a percentage equal to the rise in the cost of living index computed on the average wages of all railway employees.

Mr. Chairman, such was the principle that we upheld as forcefully as we could and it is exactly the same as the one put forward by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters); that is why we voted with him. Now we cannot go