

was received and made public? I realize that there is a great deal of dispute, a great deal of controversy, as to the attitude of the parties, as to whether or not there was an agreement, whether or not there was acquiescence in the passing of this legislation.

I have here some quotations—which I am not going to read, because I presume others have seen them also—where the labour leaders deny there is such knowledge and such information.

Honourable senators, I would like to see this bill given a hoist, so that we could send it to a committee, where all parties interested could come and be heard. Every time we pass legislation containing compulsory arbitration in an industrial dispute, we are weakening the whole fabric of our collective bargaining as we know it.

Honourable senators, from my words you may take it that I am opposed to this measure and that I shall vote against it.

Hon. John J. Connolly: Honourable senators, I shall not detain the house for any length of time—

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators realize that if honourable Senator Connolly (Ottawa West) speaks now, it has the effect of closing the debate.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): There are some things that I should say in reply to my honourable friend the senator from Cape Breton.

It is important to try to project our minds back to the night of the June 14. These parties had then been negotiating, disputing, probably with some heat, for some eight months. The ports had been closed from May 18—almost a month. It was realized that this situation was creating a condition which was dangerous to the Canadian economy in many ways.

The parties came very close to a final conclusion. There was very little separating the federation from the union in their respective positions. We must give both of them credit for desiring to get those ports open again. This was a commendable attitude for them to have and they took it. There were many, even minor points of difference between them. For example, 20 cents of the 40 cents increase for the first year was to be in return for certain improvements in productivity; in the second year, 25 cents out of 40 cents was to be granted for increased productivity.

Now, they might have been able to go on bargaining. How many more days, how many more weeks, how many more months might have had to elapse before they came to a final conclusion about these relatively minor points, when they were so close to a final agreement is not known. What they did in effect was this. They said, "Let us get the ports open, let us get the men back to work, let us get these cargoes moving, let us appoint an arbitrator who will examine these outstanding points of difference."

This arbitrator is not going to go into these hearings with a preconceived idea of what should be done; neither is he going to take dictation from anybody at these hearings. The union representatives and the representatives of the federation will present their cases, not only in respect of productivity but in respect of certain protection and advantages that are to accrue to the workers themselves. I do not think we should prejudge what this commission will find.

There is another aspect to be considered, honourable senators. The negotiating team from the union in this atmosphere was anxious for its union to agree that they should return to work, and I could understand they would hesitate to see put down in writing the precise terms of the legislation. That, I think, more than anything else, was the reason why the wording was as indefinite as it was. I think that at that moment of time they felt they could rely upon the fairness of the arbitrator and of the commission that would be appointed to deal with these outstanding points of difference. These productivity factors had to be measured. There was going to be payment for them, but they felt that this could be done in a way that would be fair to both parties and that would recognize the seniority and the position in the union of the various workers.

The words "compulsory arbitration" may have a bad connotation, and perhaps it is unfair to apply it to this particular legislation. I do not mind applying it because I think there is certainly an element of compulsion in it. But I think there is an element of fairness about it that will result from the incorporation into these agreements of the findings of a fair investigator, and that is the kind of man the Government has appointed to do this.

I commend the bill to the Senate.

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, it is moved by the honourable Senator Connolly (Ottawa West), seconded by the