

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why, then, is there no incorporation of the conciliation board report for January 1, 1967 and July 1, 1967?

Third, we would not provide for any subsidy at this time, because—

Mr. Pickersgill: The right hon. gentleman has left a lot out.

Mr. Diefenbaker:

—we believe the railways to be in a position to pay the increased wages for the period until the royal commission on transportation makes its report—the Prime Minister has said that that will be by the end of March—and until the government is then in a position to review the whole problem of railway finances in the light of the actions which have been taken. That is how the Liberal opposition would have prevented this strike and in doing so have given justice to the employees without, in our view, prejudicing the position of the railways.

Mr. Pickersgill: If the right hon. gentlemen would permit me to ask him a question—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Monteith: Sit down, Jack, and make your speech later.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Pickersgill: I rise on a question of privilege, sir.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I will allow the hon. gentleman to ask his question when I have concluded.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, a question of privilege.

Mr. Pickersgill: My question of privilege is a very simple one. When the house is given what purports to be a quotation from *Hansard*, it should be given in full.

Mr. Diefenbaker: All right.

Mr. Pickersgill: The right hon. gentleman carefully omitted certain of the words from this paragraph, as has happened on many occasions in the past.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is the usual interruption from the hon. gentleman. When he realizes that he has not any argument, then he brings along one of these phony smoke-screens. He will have every opportunity to review and deal in detail with what I have to say, and I expect he will, but I hope more successfully than his leader.

Legislation Respecting Railway Matters

Now, a moment ago I mentioned the Secretary of State for External Affairs. As reported at page 371, of *Hansard*, he said:

Mr. Speaker, I have followed carefully the remarks made by the Prime Minister yesterday, his observations over television last night, and the third instalment of his speech in this house this afternoon. I wish to say at the outset that the position stated by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday was clear and precise.

So he gives approval to what the Prime Minister of today said on that occasion.

We say this strike should have been prevented.

Those are the strong words of a man who knows his labour problems at first hand.

We would have made sure that a strike would have been unnecessary instead of implementing a minority report, as the government is doing. We would have provided a settlement based on the majority report of the conciliation board which was accepted by the railway workers.

Was the present report accepted by the railway workers?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): How much did you give them in 1960?

Mr. Diefenbaker: We are dealing with today.

Mr. Starr: We negotiated it and achieved it through collective bargaining.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The hon. gentleman settled this almost as completely as he settled some international problems recently. He went on:

For these reasons, if we had been in office, there would have been no strike but there would have been a fair settlement.

These are the people who today occupy the treasury benches.

Mr. Starr: And we have a strike.

Mr. Diefenbaker: These are the people who knew how to settle these matters. They now come before parliament. Instead of having parliament meet, as parliament could have met last Wednesday and Thursday, they waited.

Now, sir, the Prime Minister went into some detail regarding the manner in which the government had dealt with this question. Therefore I think I ought to put on the record the balance sheet of pussyfooting by this government.