

said Act, and it is in the national interest that the conclusions of the said Commission with respect thereto be carried into effect without delay following receipt of the report of the said Commission, by the incorporation of those conclusions in the terms of settlement that were entered into following the settlement of the other issues involved in the dispute and in any collective agreements entered into pursuant to those terms of settlement;—

This is compulsory legislation. It so states in the preamble. It is so admitted by the honourable Leader of the Government in this house. Yet, there was no word up to the time the bill was introduced to the effect that the Government contemplated compulsory arbitration of this dispute. Again I ask: Why the secrecy?

It is of passing interest that the first paragraph of the preamble which was mentioned by my honourable friend the leader reads:

...in the report of the mediator appointed to mediate the issues then in dispute, it was recommended that an Industrial Inquiry Commission be appointed...

On June 23 the mediator made his report, in which he recommended this compulsory arbitration. If it was agreed upon by the parties on June 14, if it was known to the longshoremen on that date that there was to be compulsory arbitration, why was not the mediator informed of this? Because it is obvious that if he recommended it he had no knowledge that it had already been agreed upon.

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West):** I understand that the mediator was present at the discussions.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald (Cape Breton):** I can well believe that if he was present he did not understand there was to be compulsory arbitration, because apparently there were present 18 representatives of the longshoremen's union, I do not know how many from the Shipping Federation, and I suppose a dozen or more Government representatives, and everyone of them seemed to have a different recollection of what took place at those meetings. So I daresay the mediator also had a different recollection.

**Hon. Mr. Connolly (Ottawa West):** In all fairness, if you do not mind, may I say that in a matter of this kind Judge Lippé, who has had a great deal of experience, would certainly know what the consensus was.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald (Cape Breton):** If he knew, then why was he cluttering up his report with the recommendation that there be this type of legislation?

Honourable senators, at this time I shall not go into the question of whether or not there should be compulsory arbitration in cases of this kind. I will say this, that traditionally, and with very good reason, organized labour has been opposed, and bitterly opposed, to having settlement of labour disputes imposed upon them rather than being allowed to negotiate.

I know there are people who will contend that there should be compulsory settlements of industrial disputes where the public interest is heavily involved. Indeed, whenever we are in a period of labour unrest—and we are in such a period now—there are renewed demands for imposing a settlement on the parties to these disputes, rather than have the public interest suffer.

Honourable senators, I can appreciate that there may be times when some type of compulsory settlement may be necessary, but generally speaking it should be remembered that the collective bargaining procedure is the best method yet devised to allow labour and management to get along together and to settle any disputes that may arise between them. It may be that the time has come to take a new look at all our labour legislation, to see if it is as effective and as beneficial as it might be, to see if improvements could be made.

I think it would also be as well to investigate and to learn the causes of so much labour unrest at the present time. Some people believe, as I do, that the main reason is the ever-increasing cost of living. Others believe it is the threat to job security caused by automation, new procedures, and the like. In any event, whatever the cause, if we knew it we might be able to take preventive action.

I do not know how many honourable senators read an editorial which appeared this morning in the *Montreal Gazette*. If they have not, I commend it to them. I shall not quote it, but it deals with the situation of the Province of Quebec at the present time. With equal effect, it could have applied to the whole of Canada.

Honourable senators, with regard to the bill itself, I do not think it should be passed at this time. It is an amazing thing that an industrial inquiry commission has been appointed but, before a report can be brought down, that report is to be incorporated into a collective bargaining agreement. At least, could we not have waited until the report