

no desire whatsoever to ram through legislation. We appreciate its importance and significance. We are seeking a way to get the legislation dealt with in the shortest possible time consistent with the rights of hon. members to study it and discuss it. My suggestion was an attempt to put forward a formula that might do that.

I am wondering, since the hon. member is not the one who speaks next after the member of the government presenting the legislation, if it would be agreeable to adjourn for a number of hours after that member has spoken to permit the legislation to be studied. I wonder if that course is agreeable to other members of the house. As an alternative we could sit until six o'clock and then adjourn until tomorrow, if hon. members consider that a better course.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Olson:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could make a suggestion that may find some agreement in the house. The government house leader has suggested that we sit until six o'clock and then adjourn until eight o'clock. I wonder whether the house leader and members of the other parties would agree to adjourn now so that hon. members could have until eight o'clock to look at the bill. This would be useful in following the Prime Minister's remarks respecting the bill. Because of the urgency of getting on with this legislation we could perhaps debate it between eight o'clock and ten o'clock tonight, and certainly the debate will continue tomorrow. I wonder whether this would satisfy hon. members.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, I do not find this bill very difficult to understand.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I am amazed at the attitude of the leader of the New Democratic Party. They have been asking for action. Now there is an opportunity. All this bill provides for is two payments of 4 per cent, or 8 per cent in all, and compulsory arbitration. Nothing else is involved. This is not difficult to understand or debate. Why should there be any necessity to adjourn in order to permit an examination of the bill. It is simplicity itself. All the workers are going to get now is 8 per cent and then there is to be the setting up of a committee of arbitration whose decision is to be final. As I say, the legislation is simplicity itself. In saying that, however, I would point out again that our attitude in the past has always been one of opposition to this

*Legislation Respecting Railway Matters* type of thing. But there is nothing difficult about the legislation.

**Mr. Pearson:** What about 1958?

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** I do not want to answer, but the only reason hon. members opposite did not follow what we did in 1960 was that members on their front benches voted against it at that time and they therefore had to sacrifice the needs of Canada to political expediency.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Caouette:** Mr. Speaker, I agree with the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) when he says that the bill before us is relatively simple, very easy to understand, and in fact comprises only two items: an 8 per cent increase and the establishment of a conciliation committee.

Now, the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) has been saying for three weeks that the government is slow to take action and is not assuming its responsibilities, and now that we are all gathered here, it is the leader of the New Democratic Party, again, who asks us to adjourn the debate to allow us to study a situation which his group has been well aware of for at least six years. Why should we put off until tomorrow what we can do today? Mr. Speaker, I believe we are gathered here to study these bills, even if the leader of the New Democratic Party were to go to bed at six and sleep until eleven tomorrow morning. He already has an opinion and he could very well express it now; what he is asking for now would only hold up the business of the house.

I support the government which wants the debate to take place immediately, so that we may deal conclusively with these matters concerning the strike and the Railway Act.

● (4:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Douglas:** The necessity for speedy action, Mr. Speaker, does not mean we are prepared to see legislation passed without giving it due consideration and careful examination. We have had this legislation for only a matter of minutes, and to ask hon. members to deal with a matter of such fundamental importance without giving them adequate opportunity to study the bill seems to me quite improper. I think the suggestion made by the government house leader that