

April 18 of this fact. On May 13 Mr. Justice Cameron was selected. His board reported on August 10. Again through the normal processes strike action was decided on August 22, to begin on August 26, four days later.

In the case of Board No. 4, Judge Little of the County Court Bench in the Province of Ontario sat on one board which dealt with the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen in the Canadian National System, numbering some 8,500 members. Again, the union and the railway company nominees were unable to agree on a chairman, and the minister was so advised on May 26. The chairman was appointed by the minister on June 9. He made his report on August 12. Strike action was decided on August 22, and the strike began on August 26.

Roughly, the same schedule applied in connection with the appointment of Judge Little for Board No. 5 which dealt with the problems of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen in the Canadian Pacific Railway system, numbering some 6,200 members.

When the Government was informed officially that strike action was decided upon on August 22, the Prime Minister immediately sent a wire to all of the parties concerned. That wire was tabled by me in the house here a few evenings ago. That wire offered whatever services the Government had at its disposal to try to bring about a settlement before the deadline for the strike on August 26 was reached.

Honourable senators, I think it quite proper for me here to speak of my colleague the Minister of Labour, and indeed of the other ministers, and certainly also of the officials of the Department of Labour. All of my colleagues were indefatigable in their efforts to try to avert this strike. If some of them are showing up a little the worse for wear just at this time, honourable senators will understand why. Neither sleeping time nor eating time seemed to matter. They were on call and were at work almost continuously for the purpose of trying to prevent this national emergency from arising.

I think it appropriate for the purpose of the record to give some of the reasons and some of the reasoning of Mr. Justice Munroe. I quote from page 8 of his report with reference to the 55,000 non-operating employees.

It may be said that the recent wage settlements in the Quebec Longshoring and St. Lawrence Seaway disputes

should govern my recommendations as to wage increases. I think not. It should be noted that the employees affected by such settlements are not working in Durable Goods Manufacturing Industries; such settlements are not typical or representative of negotiated wage settlements for 1966 and 1967 in such industries or in industry in general; such settlements involved a relatively small number of employees and arose out of special circumstances and facts which are clearly distinguishable. It would, I think, be no more justifiable to consider such settlements as governing factors in my determination than it would be to say that other wage settlements of amounts less than my recommendation which involve larger numbers of employees, of which many examples could be cited, should govern. In my view, a national standard—not individual settlements or regional standards—is the proper standard to apply to the national railway industry whose employees live in remote hamlets and in metropolitan areas across Canada. The national standard of the earnings of Durable Goods Employees, adjusted for the factors referred to in my 1964 report, remains, I think, as the sensible standard—because those two groups of employees are the most nearly comparable. Such standard has the support of many years of jurisprudence. It would, I think, be unwise to abandon it at this time in the interests of expediency.

He made the same findings on this point with reference to the shop craft employees report in which 2,800 people were involved.

I quote further from the recommendation in the report of Mr. Justice Munroe with reference to the rates of pay on page 9:

My recommendation is as follows:

To the hourly basic rates of pay in force at December 31, 1965, there shall be added:

- (a) effective January 1, 1966, add 4 per cent.
- (b) effective July 1, 1966, add a further 4 per cent.
- (c) effective January 1, 1967, add a further 4 per cent;
- (d) effective July 1, 1967, add a further 6 per cent.

Daily, weekly and monthly rates shall be increased in an equivalent manner.