

of those paid in other industries. I speak with some knowledge when I say that. I have represented no less than 17 of the unions that are engaged in this dispute today. I have represented the running trades that are now involved for the past 30 years. Nobody has been appointed by the running trades but myself, until this last occasion, over the last 30 years. So, I think I can speak with some knowledge of the circumstances, the conditions, and the men involved in this dispute.

They are good men. They are law-abiding men. They are wise men too, as a rule. They form one of the finest classes of citizens we have in Canada. I want to make it clear that I am not in favour of only 18 per cent. I would have given them more.

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: How much?

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Never mind how much. It would have been very nearly all they asked—very nearly.

Hon. Mr. Walker: What was that?

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: They were asking roughly 30 per cent, and we are offering them 18 per cent. However, that is my own personal view of this matter. I would not have made any reference to arbitration, but let me assure my honourable friend, Senator Croll, this bill does not establish arbitration at the end of the negotiations which will take place immediately following the enactment of the bill into law, and the return of the men to work.

At the present moment the Parliament of Canada has the power to pass a bill establishing arbitration. All this bill does is to transfer that power not from Parliament, but to the Executive. That is all it does. The probabilities are that it will never be acted upon. I have every hope it will never be acted upon, and had I been drawing the bill I would not have mentioned it. I would have simply told the men to go on with the negotiations, and left the future to take care of itself.

But, honourable senators, somebody had to draw this bill, and our constitutional arrangements are such that that duty fell upon the Executive. They have drawn the bill, and I think only the veriest of partisan would assert that they have not done so with every possible care, devotion and bona fide in an attempt to bring this strike to an end, and doing so in a manner that would not cripple too greatly the economy of our country.

We all might say it is a bad bill in some respects, but it is the only bill we have before us. It is the only measure we have for ending this disastrous strike. As such, I intend to support it, and I intend further to ask my friends in the railway unions—and I have many of them—to accept this bill, to return to their posts, and to look to the future for further concessions if that is their desire.

I am confident, honourable senators, that that is what is going to take place. I call your attention to the statement made by Mr. Kelly, the Vice-President of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, on the air last night to the effect that his union will obey the law. I have other information that leads me to be perfectly confident that immediately after this bill is assented to by the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, telegrams will go across the country asking these railway men to return to their work. I am also confident that similar telegrams will go from all other leaders instructing their members to obey the law as we lay it down in this bill, and that by the morning many of the trains will be running, particularly the passenger trains. So, setting aside all comparatively small criticisms, I am prepared to support this bill.

But let me say to my friends outside, who may perhaps hear my voice, that the Parliament of Canada is the citadel of freedom in Canada, and there is no other. We in Canada for the last hundred years have lived happily and peacefully together in probably the freest community in the whole world, and I do not exclude even England from that statement. We have been kind to one another. We have developed rapidly. We are free. Our women and children can walk the streets in peace and security and we have the rights and freedoms of free men. We look the whole world in the face, we bow to nobody, we take our hat off to nobody. That has been accomplished under parliamentary rule.

What is the alternative? If the laws of Canada are not to be observed by those who disagree with them in part or in whole, then what? What follows that? Is it chaos? Is it military rule? Is it a dictatorship? Or what is it?

Hon. Mr. Choquette: Anarchy.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Is it just the kind of chaos that would result when the employer goons on the one side and the plug-uglies, the gangsters, work in the ranks of the workers, fighting it out in the streets? I have seen