

From that point on a controversy has arisen as to what actually took place. This is unfortunate, since I think it would be helpful if we knew whether this bill just seeks to implement an understanding or agreement which was arrived at between the parties, or if the Government took the initiative to impose compulsory arbitration. I do not understand why precautions were not taken to prevent such misunderstandings, as it is obvious from the correspondence which has been tabled that the union representatives were somewhat suspicious of the Government representatives.

If you look at page 7442 of the House of Commons *Hansard* of July 8 you will see in the telegram to the Prime Minister that the union representatives said, in part:

When I.L.A. St. Lawrence river ports locals delegation left Montreal for Ottawa it was determined that no member of delegation would meet alone or without witnesses in seeing any minister or any representative of federal Government.

While such an attitude may appear hostile it was the unanimous decision of the 18 delegates who having met with Government representatives on two previous occasions in same dispute refused to go to Ottawa unless that rule be observed.

So it is obvious certainly there was not that trust in the Government representatives which one would like to see.

The Minister of Labour, in his correspondence, leaves no doubt that he feels the union representatives were fully informed as to the intentions of the Government to introduce this legislation. In his letter of June 27, he quotes from the terms of settlement to prove this. You will find it on page 7438 of the Commons *Hansard* of July 8. As was mentioned by the Leader of the Government—and this does not simply confirm it, because this is in the letter of June 27 from the minister—he says this:

The terms of settlement signed on June 14 include the following statement: "The agreements terminating on December 31, 1965, shall be amended by incorporating therein the terms of settlement set out above and these amended agreements shall remain in effect until December 31, 1967, unless amended by negotiations or otherwise."

Honourable senators, this may seem crystal clear to the Minister of Labour. According to him the words "or otherwise" were put there to signify compulsory arbitration, although care was taken never to use that expression. What I do not understand is this: Why the secrecy? Why the attempt to disguise the matter, if the minister is correct on the hidden understanding? If it was known to both sides that legislation such as this was to become part and parcel of the terms of settlement, then why was not that clearly stated and set out in the terms of settlement?

The longshoremen, the members of those six locals, had a vote on those terms of settlement. I do not imagine that they read the fine print or, if they did, that it was crystal clear to them that the words "or otherwise" meant compulsory arbitration in their dispute with the Shipping Federation of Canada.

As far as I can learn, the minister has given no reasonable explanation for his strange action in keeping secret what he had in mind. Certainly, if honourable senators look at the statement he made announcing the settlement on June 14 they will find not one syllable to signify there was to be compulsory arbitration. Again I ask: Why the secrecy?

As I mentioned, if there was an agreement between the two parties that the conclusion of the commission would be part of their agreement, then this legislation is simply a matter which concerns those two parties to that industrial dispute. It would be a strange method of adding some clauses to their contract, but if they wanted it that way I suppose no strong objection could be made.

However, honourable senators, I do not think it could be seriously contended that there was such agreement. But it has been stated that the representatives of the longshoremen were informed and they fully understood that this legislation would be introduced, and that their consent was implied, if not expressed. If this be so, or if they had no such knowledge, then the matter of compulsory arbitration is no longer a matter concerning only the two parties to the dispute. It has become a matter which concerns the whole labour movement in Canada.

The bill itself, I suppose, is the best evidence we have as to why it was introduced. The second paragraph of the preamble is very clear and definite. It is:

And Whereas an Industrial Inquiry Commission to inquire into those certain matters has been appointed under the