

May the flame kindled by his noble soul forever enlighten the Canadian nation and guide it toward its final destiny!

(Text):

Hon. George H. Barbour: Honourable senators, in rising to second this motion I should like first to pay tribute to a former member of the House of Commons for Prince County. I refer to the late Right Honourable Mackenzie King, who on October 20, 1919, was elected by acclamation. Several eloquent tributes have already been paid to his memory in this chamber, and I am sure that the people of Prince County will read them with approval.

I wish to thank the leader of the government (Hon. Mr. Robertson) for allowing me the privilege of speaking at this time, though I must confess that I would be much happier if I were listening to somebody else, and I certainly would be much more comfortable.

Some Hon. Senators: Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. Barbour: However, having been asked to attempt the seconding of this motion, I shall do my best, for I feel that in giving this privilege to me my province has been honoured.

I am sorry that because of not knowing the French language I was unable to follow the honourable gentleman from Rigaud (Hon. Mr. Dupuis), but I am sure that he made an eloquent speech.

Parliament met for this session under conditions hitherto unknown in Canada. Honourable senators will not soon forget their journey to Ottawa at this time. We have come here by bus, by plane and by motorcar. The tie-up of our train service, with not a railway wheel rolling in Canada, was something that we did not expect to happen in this dominion. I came up here by motorcar, and it was not until the third day of the trip, after having driven through Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Maine, and New Hampshire, that in Vermont I saw a train moving. There was not much danger of being struck at any of the railway crossings on that trip.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: Did you stop at all the crossings?

Hon. Mr. Barbour: This Canada of ours is a great country, and it has always been blessed with a stable government. I am sure it was an inspiration to anyone to sit in the gallery of the other house and listen to the Prime Minister, the opposition leaders

and other members discuss the vexed question with which they were dealing. The discussion was, I think, in strong contrast to what would be heard in a dictator's country. The members spoke in their usual tone of voice and, in the end, accomplished what they had set out to do.

The strike is now settled, but in the last week or so there was a good deal of discussion about collective bargaining. Now, I do not know what is meant by conciliation boards or boards of arbitration unless there is to be some conciliation at the meetings of these bodies. If no one is willing to give and take there is not much sense in holding meetings; and if an arbitrary clause had to be inserted in the bill in order to get desired results, I am sure it is not the government that should be blamed. I read in the *Financial Post* an article setting out the steps that led up to the strike, and I will quote a few extracts:

April 15: Conciliation boards recommend the 44-hour week with an hourly raise of 6.63 per cent.

May 1: Railways reluctantly accept boards' findings.

May 12: Unions reject recommendations, order strike vote.

I should say that was fairly fast action for the unions to take. If they wish to bring about better conditions they should be willing to sit down and reason matters out.

Now I should like to read a paragraph from quite a long editorial in the *Globe and Mail* of August 31:

The government mediator, Dr. W. A. Mackintosh, has put his finger on some of the salient causes. He found a complete lack of confidence between the parties to the dispute, and a very low level of effectiveness in collective bargaining in the industry. Matters like these are of very great importance in explaining why there was a strike, and they show why the government was wise in allowing the issue to come to its final stage.

The *Globe and Mail* evidently thinks that the course taken by the government was the best in the circumstances.

I should like to suggest to both the railway management and the union representatives that before they have any further meetings they read the 13th chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians and try to understand what is meant there by the word "charity." If they do that and carry on their dealings in a spirit of charity, they will find that it "never faileth."

As I see it, the difference between what the unions demanded and the railways offered was very small in comparison with what the people of Canada were bound to lose through a strike. Had the unions accepted the final offer they would have been giving up only a small fraction of what they had asked for,