

up and castigate labour, who point out wild-cat strikes and legitimate strikes, but who forget that for every strike that takes place there are hundreds of agreements signed quietly and fairly.

● (8:00 p.m.)

The government must do more than look at company profits if it expects labour in all fields, not only the railway labour field, to be responsible in its demands. We are duty bound to look at consumer prices, increased dividends and record profits. We can no longer treat the problems of Canada piecemeal. I would suggest, of course, that by the same criterion the unions themselves are morally bound to settle their differences with the railways by November 15.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the right hon. Leader of the Opposition who I am sure will be along in a few moments. On three or four occasions he pointed out that the railwaymen were responsible people and that he expected they would go back to work, but that he could not blame them if they did not. This reminds me a little of the funeral oration in Julius Caesar when they kept repeating "Brutus was an honourable man". If I was a cynical type and a real partisan, which I am not, I would say that at times I was left with the impression that the right hon. Leader of the Opposition might have been toying with an invitation to the men not to return. I was pleased at the change in his attitude over night.

I would imagine that some of the responsible members from the west who are concerned with the problems of wheat shipments and members from the maritimes who are concerned with the problems of the maritimes may have suggested to their leader that parliament is here to represent the rights of all Canadians, including the farmers and the workers.

The term compulsory arbitration has been bandied about by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition and by the leader of the New Democratic Party. I imagine that this is supposed to be synonymous with sin; to a railwayman and a labourman it is. In looking back into labour matters which have appeared in *Hansard*, as far back as 1950, I was intrigued by the legislation introduced in the House of Commons in 1958 to settle the Canadian Pacific Steamships strike in British Columbia. I know that many members of the house who are here tonight were present in 1958. Those who were here will recall that

#### *Legislation Respecting Railway Matters*

this strike had existed for many many months and had been very disruptive in the field of communications in British Columbia. The minister of labour at the time, the present member for Ontario (Mr. Starr), was plagued by the problem of settling this particular strike; so he introduced a bill, a copy of which I have here, which was nothing more or less than compulsory arbitration. I do not say this to castigate the hon. member, the then minister of labour, because there are circumstances where compulsory arbitration is the only and the last method of settling a problem.

The main feature of that bill, which was introduced by hon. members who now sit in opposition, was that it gave the union members on strike so many hours to get back to work, at the risk of forfeiting their jobs. Since the summer recess was coming up, that same bill included the right to punish the union men by order in council if they disregarded the government's instructions to go back to work. All the way through the debate at the time hon. members, particularly the hon. member for, I think, Skeena (Mr. Howard) or, if not, his deskmate, kept referring to the fact that this was compulsory arbitration. I mention this because for the benefit of labour and the people in the gallery, the hon. member and other members of the Conservative party have tried to create the illusion that they never stooped to compulsory arbitration legislation. Yet that is what they did in 1958.

Mr. Speaker, I then looked through other papers to see what else I could find—what other examples of compulsory arbitration. I came across a rather appealing and interesting document put out by a member of the New Democratic Party, the hon. member for Skeena, in July of this year. Because the hon. member had accepted the invitation of the Minister of Labour to settle the dispute of the longshoremen, he proposed, for the better part of a week, to lay on the order paper a resolution to introduce a bill to settle the longshoremen's strike. It never reached the printing stage, but the hon. member was honest and decent enough to send a copy to this party. He did launch the bill in a very grandiose manner with a full fledged press conference graced by no less than the leader of the N.D.P. He proposed to settle the longshoremen's strike. How?—by ordering the longshoremen back to work; that is how.