

tions should be determined by an impartial tribunal. It was therefore the board's conclusion that no useful purpose would be served by a specific recommendation from it.

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: May I ask the honourable Leader of the Government a question? Is it Government policy to put into legislative form—although I am confused as to how you would ever do it—the Freedman Report?

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): I think the answer to that is no.

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: No.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): I quote from page 12 of Judge Little's report:

We accordingly recommend that the parties in conjunction with the Minister of Labour agree upon the appointment of an impartial party qualified in the matter of wage determination to examine into and make recommendations upon a more rational wage pay system.

Honourable senators, throughout this protracted period of negotiation there has been a most strict and faithful observance of the law by the companies, by the unions and, if I may modestly say so, by the Government.

Hon. Mr. McCutcheon: I would withdraw that last statement.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): I certainly will not withdraw it.

Hon. Mr. Thorvaldson: It certainly did not follow precedent.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): I thought it did follow the precedents. It certainly followed the precedents that are established under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act. I challenge my honourable friend to show how in any particular the Government has strayed from those principles.

Hon. Mr. Thorvaldson: It did not follow the very good precedent of the legislation of 1960.

Hon. Mr. Croll: That was not a precedent.

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): We are talking about something now that the honourable gentleman has strayed from.

In the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act there is enshrined proce-

dures for collective bargaining. These procedures have been strictly observed. I would be the first to admit, if I were called upon to do so, that the period of these negotiations stretching from November 1965 to August 1966 is too long a period when it affects an industry as vital to this country as the railroad industry. I feel too that the procedures which have grown up through the years have become cumbersome. They may even be described in many respects as outmoded. They need streamlining, and I hope that some action in this direction will soon be undertaken, not only with the co-operation of management but with the co-operation of the trade union movement as well.

For the workers in this dispute I have real sympathy, and I think all honourable senators have sympathy with them. They are faced with rising costs—as, indeed, all of us are. They see better working conditions being established in various industries throughout this country, and they want to have better working conditions in their own industry.

The problem of job security in the face of technological change certainly is a problem for these workers, and we would not be talking about retraining and the more effective use of manpower if we did not intend and hope that technological change and greater productivity could be and would be developed in this country so that our goods which are sold so widely on the markets of the world can be competitive.

I think I can say as well that the pay received for special skills in some branches of the railway industry is out of line. Much attention will still have to be given to this very complicated and difficult area of conciliation, mediation and negotiation.

So much for the workers. I want to say something about the companies. The railway industry in this country has been and still is a controlled industry.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: Before the honourable Leader of the Government leaves the subject of automation, may I ask him if labour is being given the assurance that it will have the opportunity of sitting in on the discussions when such matters are under consideration?

Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West): I think it flows clearly from the extract I read from the report of Judge Little that this has been agreed to by the railways.

Hon. Mr. Brooks: Well, we know Judge Little made a report, but there did not seem