

Where is the consistency, when the amendment before the house proposed by the Leader of the Opposition castigates us because we have failed to include fringe benefits, have failed to legislate every item of the Munroe awards and have failed to legislate the Freedman report? How can the Leader of the Opposition square this amendment with his own conduct as prime minister, when he brought in the bill and refused to legislate in respect of a single item, a single term of a single collective agreement? All I am trying to prove, Mr. Speaker, is a very simple thesis.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** That black is white.

**Mr. MacEachen:** I am trying to prove a simple thesis, namely that nobody on the other side of the house ought to find any fault with this bill on any of the grounds that have been put forward against it, if they want to be consistent with their past conduct; because it is a fact that any government that intervenes in the process of free collective bargaining is bound to take steps that can be criticized, and easily criticized, by any opposition party.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** What about the 30 per cent formula?

**Mr. MacEachen:** I want to say a word or two about the Freedman report because I realize it is a very important issue in this dispute.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, before the minister continues, would he accept a question? I have paid his remarks the attention they deserve. The minister has stated how wonderful this bill is. Will he now tell the house whether the Prime Minister or any other minister of the government, while parliament sits, is offering to raise the ante to the unions far and above anything that is included in this bill?

**Mr. Pearson:** Mr. Speaker, I can answer that question at once. The right hon. gentleman, as usual, has been deceived by his headlines. No offer has been made.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** "No offers have been made." Does the Prime Minister say—he dare not deny it—that he did not make offers this very evening?

**Mr. Winkler:** Whom have you been negotiating with?

### *Legislation Respecting Railway Matters*

**Mr. Nicholson:** On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) says that he knows an offer has been made today. I challenge him. I deny it, and I say he has no right to interject statements of that kind when the Prime Minister of this country has said that no offers have been made.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Winkler:** I would like to ask a question, then: Whom have they been negotiating with?

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. We should have order in the house. The hon. minister has the floor.

**Mr. McIlraith:** The continuous breach of the rules by the official opposition.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Mr. Speaker, I said when I began that I wanted to say something about this bill in connection with the problem raised by the Freedman report. I believe it is wrong to state that the bill makes no provision for a determination of the Freedman-type issue. The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) made explicit something that is implicit in the bill, namely that there is provision for the arbitrator to deal with this particular aspect of the dispute which we face at the present time. The concern of, especially the trainmen, and others involved in this dispute is understandable with respect to the problem posed in the Freedman report. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I have expressed fully my views on the Freedman report and the kind of guidepost it will establish in the field of industrial relations and labour relations in Canada. This problem cannot be ignored. It is a fact that there is concern among the workers that the institution of technological change during the life of a contract may have consequences in respect of their job security. They have urged that they have an opportunity to negotiate on these changes during the life of an agreement.

Mr. Justice Freedman in his report made the proposal that the ideal solution of this problem is to permit the parties, the unions and the men, to work with proper procedures to cope with the problem. This is Mr. Justice Freedman's principal recommendation. He says that if this fails, legislation can be considered along the following lines: An arbitrator will be appointed to determine whether