

cumstances, for the same reason and for the same purpose in the other place. I was a member of the other place at that time, and I voted against that section of the bill. Well, here we are again, 16 years later, with the same actors, the same play, the same stage, the same script, the same audience, asking for the very same action.

**Hon. Mr. McCutcheon:** And you were quoted yesterday.

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** The point I am making is that it is hard to believe that we have made so little progress in labour-management relations in all these years. I heard the question asked yesterday, and repeated here today: Is there real collective bargaining in the railways? The picturesque phrase used was that in so far as the railways were concerned it was a ritualistic dance.

**Hon. Mr. McCutcheon:** Are you going to finish Mr. Douglas' statement?

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** I thought it was a very apt description. I am glad to associate myself with it. From my own point of view I think it is a shambles. It just ain't there! If you want to know my view about it I will say that if that is the way they are going to carry on, and come back to this Parliament every time they are in a bit of trouble, then that is one hell of a way to run a railway. I objected to compulsory arbitration, and I have had no reason to change my mind.

**Hon. Mr. Walker:** Are you in favour of it?

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** Of course I am not.

**Hon. Mr. Choquette:** Are you going to vote against the bill?

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** That is why I got up. I would have been on my way a long time ago.

**Hon. Mr. Choquette:** Are you going to vote against the bill?

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** I voted against it in 1952, and found myself in the position of being the only Liberal who stood up to vote with George Drew. I find myself in the same position so far as compulsory arbitration is concerned. I am opposed to it. I did not think it was necessary then, and I do not think it is necessary now. We can do without it; in fact we won't use it.

The argument by the proponents then was that it was not to be considered a precedent.

It was introduced in a limited field for a limited time with a limited objective. Yet, it did harm then, and it does harm now to the concept of collective bargaining, and by its potentialities it has proved through the passage of time to be destructive of the concept.

I believe that the terms "collective bargaining" and "a free society" are synonymous. I believe it is one of our show pieces and one of our great possessions. Once we take pride in our free society we cannot deny collective bargaining.

It was made clear in 1950—those of you who were there will remember it, and those who were not can read the record—that it was not to be a precedent. But, it was employed in 1958 and again in 1960. And now, once again, we are faced with it. It is not a precedent; it has become a habit. If the principle of collective bargaining is on the verge of burial in the railway industry, then I ask: Can trucking and air services be far behind? I said then that it was dangerous—less because of what it attempted to do than of what, in other hands, it might be made to do later. This is later—much later—and we are faced with it once again. At this stage the Government has no alternative, but it does say: In certain circumstances you are no longer free to exercise your rights. I consider it wrong to say to labour: When you jeopardize a large number of your fellow men we will strip you of these rights and privileges. I reiterate, that is destructive of democracy.

I have indicated that it is habit forming. It does harm to the concept of collective bargaining because collective bargaining is an important process and must be preserved to the full. It is the only way yet available to us for the adjustment of the interests of the two great elements of economic strength—capital and labour. We have been operating under procedures and concepts that were adequate 25 years ago. I certainly join with Senator Walker in saying that it is about time we did something towards improving these labour-management procedures. We must realize that what was good 25 years ago does not fit today. Times have changed. We have now automation, technological advances, electronic achievements, and yet our procedures and laws are cumbersome and backward. It is as though they belonged to yesteryear; they are not sufficient for grappling with labour-management problems that are as modern as tomorrow.