

run this part of the plant. Yet, the computer operators are, in fact, providing the human element of the service that was previously provided by labour union members. So there is some justification for the union's stance, even though the operation at the terminal has moved to a higher stage of technology.

I shall not repeat the figures with regard to the decrease in the number of labour union members required to operate that terminal and the tonnage per worker, which, of course, has gone up tremendously, even though I have them here. This terminal is far larger than the old PRG No.1 Terminal, and that is clear. The output at the Prince Rupert Terminal is far more than two or three times the amount dealt with at this old terminal. Of course, labour union members are concerned about what the new rules will be in the application of advanced technology. I refer not only to the members at this terminal but to the members at other terminals as they face the situation of what happens after modern machinery and technology is installed.

I have heard no discussion on the guidelines for the arbitrator. Is the government simply going to turn the matter over to an arbitrator with, or perhaps without, some recommendations?

The bill calls for binding third-party arbitration. It seems to me that there ought to be in the bill some guidelines within which the arbitrator's recommendations will be binding. Perhaps Senator Kelly, or whoever will be here from the Labour Department, would like to deal with that question as well.

Senator Kelly: Honourable senators—

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, I must inform the Senate that if Senator Kelly speaks now his speech will have the effect of closing the debate on the motion for second reading of this bill.

Senator Kelly: Honourable senators, I would like to comment on a couple of matters, but before I do I wish to confirm that the minister and some of his officials are here, and I shall be moving that we consider the bill in Committee of the Whole.

I would like to comment on one item raised by an honourable senator from across the way, and that is the question of the naming of a proposed arbitrator. The union has suggested that Mr. Justice Emmett Hall act as arbitrator. I did not mean to imply in my earlier remarks that Mr. Justice Hall would not be an impartial arbitrator; rather, I was referring to the need for arbitration processes to be seen to be impartial. While I am certain that Mr. Justice Emmett Hall would have been impartial, it would be hard to expect the other party to the dispute to feel the same way. For the success of arbitration of this sort I think it must be seen and felt to be totally impartial. I was not trying to be critical in any way.

On the question of the Vancouver agreement affecting the agreement at Prince Rupert, I am sure that a full answer will be provided by the officials. My understanding is that certain common issues are involved. Since the same union was negotiating, and since certain issues were common to Vancouver and Prince Rupert, there was an informal understanding and,

[Senator Olson.]

in fact, an agreement that where some of those matters that were common had been settled at Vancouver, that settlement would apply equally to Prince Rupert. In other words, it simply formalized what has been an informal understanding and what has, in fact, been taking place. At least, that is my understanding.

● (1540)

Honourable senators, I do not have any comment to make on the general question of who should be managing a computer centre. That is clearly something on which there will probably be as many views as there are people thinking about it. However, again I think the minister and his officials can answer that question more effectively and fully than I can.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

Hon. William Kelly: Honourable senators, I move, seconded by the Honourable Senator Tremblay, that the bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole and that the Senate do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for that purpose.

The Hon. the Speaker pro tempore: It is moved by the Honourable Senator Kelly, seconded by the Honourable Senator Tremblay, that this bill be now referred to Committee of the Whole.

Is it your pleasure, honourable senators, to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Senate was accordingly adjourned during pleasure and put into a Committee of the Whole on the bill, the Honourable Rhéal Bélisle in the Chair.

Senator Doody: Mr. Chairman, with leave, I would like to ask that the Honourable Pierre Cadieux, Minister of Labour, be invited to participate in the deliberations of the Committee of the Whole, and that he be accompanied by his Associate Deputy Minister, Mr. Bill Kelly.

The Chairman: Is leave granted, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Pursuant to rule 18 of the rules of the Senate, the Honourable Pierre H. Cadieux, Minister of Labour, was escorted to a seat in the Senate chamber.

Senator Doody: Honourable senators, once again I welcome to this chamber the Minister of Labour, the Honourable Pierre Cadieux. As I have already said, he is accompanied by his Associate Deputy Minister, Mr. Bill Kelly. I am sure the minister would be pleased to answer any questions that senators might have on this piece of legislation.