

the general public a lack of sympathy for either side, especially when the disputes result in strikes.

• (2200)

An editorial in the *Montreal Gazette* of April 12 of this year illustrates very well the feeling of many people regarding strikes. Part of it states:

A strike is similar in some respects to war. It may be just, although a just strike is as hard to define as a just war. It is a question of causes, objectives and alternatives.

In no case does a strike settle the question as to who was right and who was wrong, however these terms may be understood. Reasonable arguments do not decide the issue. In a strike, as in war, superior force and staying power win out.

I would remind honourable senators that it is always the poorer people who suffer the most on these occasions. Surely it is possible that in this enlightened country some better way can be found to settle differences between labour and management than confrontations that so often lead to such strikes.

Suggestions have been made that to meet the situation in which we find ourselves today Canada should change the system of free collective bargaining under which we have been living for more severe controls, such as the labour courts of Australia. The methods used in Australia, and the methods used in Sweden—which is supposed to have very advanced and mature relationships between labour and management—have been thoroughly studied by Canada, and it has been decided that free collective bargaining is the best and most acceptable method for labour and management to carry on in a North American country like Canada. However, there must be some provision to see that opposing parties recognize and observe their social responsibilities.

As Senator Goldenberg told us, the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act was originally passed in 1948. Although I believe it has been amended since that time by following Parliaments, it is practically the same as when passed in 1948, and has in the past done much to modify what might, without it, have been more serious conflict between labour and management.

The present bill will be even more effective in avoiding such conflict. It provides, as we were told, for the reconstitution of the Canadian Labour Relations Board as a full time body, and makes provision for industrial inquiry commissions and a wide range of actions that can be taken by the minister in regard to the appointing of conciliation officers or a conciliation board. Making use of skilled and specially trained negotiators in this field seems to be the ideal way to solve the differences that arise.

As reference has been made to it, I cannot conclude without making some reference to the much needed provisions regarding technological change. We know that technological changes must come if Canada is to hold her present position in world affairs as a producer. We know, too, that in the past technological changes taking place unexpectedly, and without prior warning, have caused great hardship, and have given workers a frightening sense of insecurity. I have seen this in my own province in

[Hon. Mrs. Fergusson.]

some of the industries in which technological changes have taken place, and I realize the suffering endured by workers who did not know what was going to happen to them in future, or what was going to happen to their children. I think the provisions of this bill will do a lot to help deal with this situation. The provisions of the bill, which was explained to us so well by Senator Goldenberg, will do much to help many people in the future who are affected by such changes.

I was interested to read in *Hansard* of the other place that in the debate on this bill members from all parties seemed to support it. As Senator Goldenberg said, only two voted against it on second reading, and it passed third reading on division. I trust that this house will give it as warm a welcome, and do as well by it.

I sincerely hope that through its provisions "the fruits of progress," to which I have referred as being in the preamble, which we have reason to hope will continue to come to Canada in the future, will be more widely shared by all Canadians than has been the case in the past.

Hon. Allister Grosart: Honourable senators, I am aware of the fact that the chairman of the Standing Senate Committee on Health, Welfare and Science is very desirous of having this bill given second reading tonight so that it can go to committee tomorrow. It had been my intention to speak on the bill tonight. However, it is obviously impossible for a statement to be made on behalf of the official Opposition in four minutes. I am sure honourable senators would agree that we would be derelict in our duty if we on this side did not express opinions on the bill. Therefore, having yielded to other honourable senators, who have now brought our proceedings to three minutes to ten, since the Senate must adjourn in three minutes—

Hon. Mr. Martin: I am sure we would all agree there is no requirement that we adjourn then, and that we would all be very happy to let Senator Grosart speak now if he wishes.

The Hon. the Speaker: In view of the last remark by the honourable Senator Grosart, I must remind the Senate that there is, of course, no time limit in this chamber. I thought the honourable Senator Grosart meant that because we had sat for two hours we should now adjourn. It is in the hands of honourable senators.

Hon. Mr. Lamontagne: I would plead with Senator Grosart to change his mind. I am quite sure that honourable senators are very interested in hearing what he has to say about this bill, and I would hope that he would make his speech tonight. As he knows, it is proposed to refer this bill to the Standing Senate Committee on Health, Welfare and Science. I understand the committee might have to sit for several hours before we are in a position to report the bill back to this chamber.

Senator Grosart, as chairman of the steering committee of the Special Committee on Science Policy, knows that we have an important meeting with foreign guests starting at five o'clock tomorrow afternoon, which will go on tomorrow evening. It is too late to delay that discussion, which I believe is quite important. For that reason, I would like Senator Grosart to tell us what he has to say about this bill now. Then we can give it second reading