

*Debates of the Senate* on July 5 the report made by Judge Lippé, dated June 23. I did this for the convenience of honourable senators, and so that they would know well in advance of this moment the history of this situation.

I should say at this point that prior to the strike, which began on May 18, there had been a stoppage of work on April 19 over a parking problem in the Port of Montreal. This lasted but two days, and through the good offices of a conciliating officer from the Department of Labour the walkout was ended on April 21.

Judge Lippé, as I said earlier, began his work on May 18. On May 25, or about a week later, he invited the international president of the union to come from New York to see himself and senior officers of the department, and he did what he could with the president in an endeavour to work out an arrangement.

I should also tell the house that on May 28 the Minister of Industry and the Minister of Labour were at Montreal working with both parties. This discussion continued on May 29. I am not sure whether they were all in Montreal or in Ottawa on that day, but I do know that they sat together until 2 o'clock in the morning of Sunday, May 29, hoping to achieve a settlement.

Finally, on June 11 the parties met with four ministers, including the Acting Prime Minister, but still they were not able to work out a settlement. However, a settlement was reached late at night on June 14, and the negotiation of it involved the Prime Minister of this country. The terms of that settlement are to be found at page 875 of our *Hansard*.

May I summarize the terms. First, it was provided that the contract will be in force as between these parties for two years from the date of the expiry of the old contract. The terms also involve certain wage increases. In the year 1966 there is an increase of 20 cents an hour, and this is an outright increase dating from January 1, 1966. In addition there is another award of 20 cents an hour in compensation for improvement in productivity. In other words, the second 20 cents is not an unconditional wage increase, but is in compensation for better productivity activities on the waterfront.

Dating from January 1, 1967, there is another outright increase in the wage rates of these longshoremen of 15 cents an hour, plus another 25 cents an hour, dating from May 15, 1967, to the end of the contract, in compensation for increased productivity.

In addition to that there are special small rate increases of three cents, four cents or five cents an hour for the various ports. Whether the increase is three cents, four cents or five cents depends upon conditions in those ports. This is all spelled out in clauses 8, 9 and 10 of the minutes of settlement of June 14.

There is another provision in the settlement relating to the call-up of gangs, particularly in Montreal, and the amount of notice that is to be given. In clauses 5 and 6 arrangements are made for the handling of cargoes, as to whether or not hooks should be used in certain cases. There is a provision as to what should be done with reference to the opening and closing of hatches. These are all details. There is a provision in clause 11 for vacation pay, to which the parties have agreed. There is a minimum hourly guarantee in clause 12. There is a special clause that has no number and which, for the purposes of my statement, I think I should read to the house. It will be found at page 876 of *Hansard* of July 5, and reads as follows:

The agreements terminating on December 31, 1965, shall be amended by incorporating therein the terms of settlement—

That is, the terms of settlement that I have just described and which are in this document dated June 14.

—set out above and these amended agreements shall remain in effect until December 31, 1967—

That is the provision for the two year agreement.

—unless amended by negotiations or otherwise.

That word "otherwise" is put there as a result of the discussions which took place between the parties and the people who were attempting the conciliation.

I want to say why the Shipping Federation said at that time they would accept legislation in the form in which it had been passed and is now before us. The unions, I must say, did not ask for this, and they made no comment about it other than to say that if the legislation were produced they would obey the law. I think that is a very important point. To continue:

The parties agree to attend a meeting convened and presided by Judge Lippe for the purpose of signing the new agreements in accordance with the above. It is