

we had quite a fiasco in Peterborough, as a result of which labour men were prosecuted. In Oshawa I think there was a tearing up of an injunction that was presented there.

**Hon. Mr. McCutcheon:** Does my honourable friend call it a fiasco to enforce the law in the courts?

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** I am saying that the law was not enforced.

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West):** He was saying that the law was not enforced.

**Hon. Mr. McCutcheon:** He called it a fiasco. The law was enforced in Peterborough and the men were sentenced.

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West):** He is commenting on the fiasco.

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** I am saying that the fiasco was as a result of the law being enforced and that the men involved were sentenced.

**Hon. Mr. McCutcheon:** Now you are explaining it.

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** They had a strike at International Nickel where the policemen had to obtain permission from the pickets to drive their cars in. You have the same thing happening at Stelco in Hamilton.

Now, in that atmosphere, do you think any Government could have been justified in taking away from the people their rights to strike? What would have been the result? We would have had wildcats all over the place. That is the mood labour is in at the moment. We have to live with it until such time as the mood passes, and in the meantime try to reason with these people.

You cannot beat them on the head. Reasoning with them is one way of indicating to them that the law applies to them and to the Government. The Government has lived by the law, and so they have a right to say to these people, "Now we want you to live by the law also." That, I think, is a very strong argument.

Let me just say this also. My friend keeps talking about the longshoremen and the seamen, and their raise in pay. It was a substantial raise in pay, but no one knows better than he does that these people are seasonal workers and part-time workers; they are not railway workers.

As I recall railway workers—and I have known them all my life—they had tenure, they had pensions, they had comparatively

good wages and they were the aristocrats of labour. That is as I remember them and as I have always known them, and they cannot be compared with these part-time, seasonal workers who catch on now and then and earn themselves some money and then go on unemployment insurance for the balance of the time.

Now, as to my friend's remarks about the 6 per cent that appeared to be offered originally, actually the Government was trying not to write a contract. They attempted to leave something to conciliation and arbitration, and not write a contract. Once a government gets into the business of writing labour contracts, then there is no end to it. They try to avoid it as much as they possibly can.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** Was not the 6 per cent in the contract?

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** No. It was put in the 1966 portion, and the arbitration that was provided for November 15 was to deal with the other portion—the 4 per cent and the 6 per cent, which may very well have turned out to be 6 per cent and 8 per cent or 4 per cent and 8 per cent. Who knows? It may yet turn out to be that, if the climate is satisfactory. The Government wanted to leave it that way, but the desire was to put it in the bill, and it was put in by Mr. MacEachen who spoke in the House of Commons. He made it clear, as he was heard by many of us, and there could be no doubt about it. Mr. Marchand and the Prime Minister made statements such as I am making at the present time—I am only repeating them—yet, they appear not to have been heard. Certainly they were entitled to be heard, believed, and to have their statements relied upon.

**Hon. Mr. McCutcheon:** But they never answered the basic question: Where are the railways going to get the money?

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** That was not really basic, except from your point of view. The Canadian people have provided money for the Canadian National for a great many years, and if I recall correctly I did not see the President of the C.P.R. making any collection with a cup in his hand. The C.P.R. is quite well to do.

Let me deal with something that concerned me a little. I think the most infuriating words in the English language are, "I told you so." I remind this house that 16 years ago almost to the day a bill providing for compulsory arbitration was introduced, under identical cir-