

My third suggestion is that the strike ballot should not have contained an *ex parte* argument by the labour leaders, based on inadequate information. I do not wish to charge that the present ballot contains any misinformation, but it does not give the full information that ought to have been placed before the men. My suggestion is that before a strike ballot is sent out it should be submitted to the Department of Labour, and if in future we have a labour court, it should be placed before that body. Upon receipt of the ballot, the department should at once call in the other parties to the dispute to inquire whether the ballot sets forth all the facts of the case. In the end, the ballot should be passed upon by the Department of Labour, instead of by one party to the issue.

I would not venture to say, honourable senators, what would have happened if at the end of August labour had had a further opportunity of voting on this question, with all the facts before them.

I have before me a telegram from the Saskatchewan Employers' Association, directed to the Prime Minister. I presume all honourable senators received a copy of it.

Hon. Mr. Gouin: Quite right.

Hon. Mr. Farris: The telegram reads in part as follows:

The text of the ballot should be made public and the results published by districts. Such legislation would take no privilege away from anyone, but would give to workers the democratic right to express their true opinions without fear of intimidation from union officers and organizers.

This association further says:

We believe that the strike would not have taken place had there been a secret ballot.

I do not know that that is so, but in looking to the future it is a fair supposition that the secret ballot would lessen the danger of strikes based on inadequate information or apprehension of what might take place.

I think, honourable senators, that these steps should be taken immediately to strengthen the temporary structure—the detour, if you will; but let us look to the future for a more permanent structure to take its place.

First, I do not think we should adopt any such procedure as that used in the United States. Canada has no public officer comparable to the President. We have the Prime Minister, but he is not commander of the Canadian forces, and even if he were, I am sure that no one would want to bring the administration of our railways, under strike conditions, into the hands of an officer corresponding to the President of the United States, who is also Commander in Chief of the armed forces.

Hon. Mr. Gouin: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Farris: Furthermore, we would not want to drag wage disputes into the political arena, if it could be avoided.

Secondly, I cannot see how the appointment of an administrator would solve the problem. One newspaper referred to such a person as a "czar". Whether or not that is a proper definition for him would depend on the powers given to him. Let us try to visualize the results of railway operations under an administrator. What would he administer? Would he run the railways? Such a person would be under political pressure at all times, and if he were acting with authority it would be resented by the men. It seems to me to be an utterly impracticable solution for any permanent results in this country.

Just by way of illustration, let us look at the attacks made on Donald Gordon. Is it not significant that there was very little attack on Mr. Mather? The answer is that Mr. Mather is not a political appointee. A political appointment is the place to strike because politicians are more vulnerable than private citizens who run private corporations. My opinion, which is given with hesitation and is subject to review and revision by myself, is that this question, like all other disputes in our country, should be settled by the law, administered on the principles of justice as we pride ourselves in having them in this country. I believe that a new court should be established. I do not like arbitrations which are set up for each occasion. Sometimes they are all right and sometimes they are not. I believe there ought to be a permanent labour court. Everybody knows the effect of making men judges and giving them appointments until they have reached a certain fixed age. An *esprit de corps* is built up among them. We have all known partisan politicians who, when appointed to the Bench, have risen above their antecedent experiences and have become fine judges with a full consciousness of their responsibility to the state. I would make an outstanding lawyer the chairman of such a court. I am not trying to establish a position for any lawyer, because any man possessing the outstanding abilities necessary to handle the job would probably be making a sacrifice in accepting the appointment. Experienced lawyers are trained in procedure, in the powers of analysis, and in getting the viewpoints of others. That is the whole basis of the legal profession. I have never yet seen a lawyer who was capable of giving good counsel who was unable to obtain the viewpoint and to understand both sides of a question. That is a lawyer's training, and that is the kind of man I would like to see as chairman of such