

Hon. Mr. Haig: No, that is not what it says. It says:

—the arbitrator shall decide the matter within the limits of the proposals that he determines were made . . .

No matter what the parties may say the proposals were, the arbitrator will determine what they were. He is the man who will do that.

Hon. Mr. Turgeon: How would the arbitrator reach his decision?

Hon. Mr. Haig: I do not know. If the unions came forward and said, "What we proposed was this", and the railways came forward and said, "No, what you proposed was that", the arbitrator could say which he thought was right.

Hon. Mr. Bouffard: He can hear witnesses and investigate in any way he wants to.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Somebody will have to determine, will he not, what the proposals were? If the arbitrator does not determine it, who would the honourable leader opposite suggest should do so?

Hon. Mr. Haig: Well, those words should not be here at all. They were not in the original bill proposed by the government, and it was only after criticism that this proposal was inserted. The original bill did not contain this proposal at all.

Hon. Mr. Fogo: May I ask the honourable leader opposite what would happen if that amendment were not there? Would it not then be open for the arbitrator to decide that the men should receive something less than the railways offered on Saturday last. Is that not the reason why the amendment was inserted? Was it not to ensure that the arbitrator should not in any event grant less than the railroads had offered in their best offer?

Hon. Mr. Bouffard: Exactly.

Hon. Mr. Haig: The same applies to the men.

Hon. Mr. Fogo: Is it not insurance?

Hon. Mr. Haig: That is not what the Act originally intended to do.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: What does that matter?

Hon. Mr. Haig: It makes quite a bit of difference.

Hon. Mr. Hardy: No, it does not. Let us get on with the bill.

Hon. Mr. Haig: It makes quite a bit of difference, and as for getting on with the bill, I will just take my own sweet time. I am a good timekeeper. I can stand all the needling my honourable friend wishes to give me. I will just stand up here.

Hon. Mr. Horner: You will be all right as long as that fellow from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) doesn't get after you.

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. Haig: The honourable senator from Blaine Lake (Hon. Mr. Horner) says something when he says that.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: I will spar with him any time he likes.

Hon. Mr. Haig: With whom, the honourable senator from Blaine Lake?

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Oh, boy, you have nerve.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Haig: As I have said before, this marks the first time in the history of the Parliament of Canada that compulsory arbitration between employer and employee has been introduced into the legislation of this country.

Hon. Mr. Farris: Was it ever needed before?

Hon. Mr. Haig: I do not know. We shall come to that.

Hon. Mr. Euler: What is the alternative?

Hon. Mr. Haig: I do not know. We shall come to that too in just a minute. If the United States saw fit to have legislation authorizing the President to seize the railroads, why cannot we try that system? Apparently it works in the United States.

Hon. Mr. Grant: Is not that compulsory?

Hon. Mr. Haig: It is compulsory to seize the railroads, but it does not say what the hours or wages will be.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: They have to work that out.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Yes, and the President appoints a fact-finding committee which reports to him. The unions in the United States have always been in favour of that system. In fact, when the present railway dispute broke out in the United States the unions there requested the President to seize the railroads.

Hon. Mr. MacKinnon: Labour requested it.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Yes, labour requested it. There are seventeen international unions affected by the strike in Canada, and the same unions function in the United States. I want to state that as emphatically as I can, and I wish it to be recorded that I for one, am not at present in favour of compulsory arbitration.

It does not matter how much the leader of the government may attempt to soften down