

\$75,000,000. Whether that be an extravagant figure I cannot say, but I presume the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with his usual thoroughness, would have investigated the matter with extreme care and used those figures only after mature consideration. I figured out rather roughly this afternoon that in at least the next few years there is a possible saving to the two railways of \$25,000,000 in the form of wages, and I feel no injustice would be done to the railways if a fairly large percentage of that amount which they are to save were used to compensate the men who will lose their positions as a result of this measure.

This afternoon we had it as the opinion of the minister that because he is in favour of granting compensation to all employees who lose their positions, we should not deal simply with railwaymen. Now is the appropriate time to initiate measures to take care of men who lose their jobs, because so far as I know, this is one of the very few cases where men are likely to lose their positions on account of the operation of a measure to be put into effect by parliamentary action. The time has come when practical application should be put to those phrases which we use in regard to the human element in industry. I should like to take the opportunity of moving an amendment to clause 2 along these lines:

Any employee of the railway companies affected by this act or any employee who loses his employment as a result of cooperation of services between the railways shall be entitled to such compensation to be determined by a board of three to be appointed: one by the employees, one by the railways, and a third to be selected jointly by the preceding two parties.

In case of failure to select a third party, who shall be chairman of such board, then such selection shall be made by the Minister of Labour.

The funds for such compensating board shall be derived from a levy on the gross receipts of the two railways and the award of such board shall in all cases be final.

I move that as an addition to clause 2.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacNicol): May I ask the hon. member to what part of clause 2 this amendment refers?

Mr. HEAPS: I would put it at the end.

Mr. MANION: Before we deal with the merits of the amendment, I should like, just for the information of the committee, to suggest that it is possible the amendment may be out of order, the reason being this: there is a rule that no one but a member of the government may introduce legislation to increase public expenditures. My hon.

friend has introduced an amendment, it is true, that the railways out of gross earnings shall pay to men who are dropped because of cooperating measures such compensation as may be decided upon by some board. It is true that technically the railways would pay that, but as a matter of fact if we take the earnings of the railways for the last year or, at any rate, for the last few years, it would be the people of Canada, through the government, who would be paying it, because the deficit last year on the national railways, including eastern lines, was over \$60,000,000, the operating net revenue of the national railways being \$5,000,000, and the interest on both eastern lines and the general system amounting to so much that the total deficit, as I say, was over \$60,000,000. I merely draw that to the attention of the committee as a point that should be considered before we discuss the merits of the amendment.

Mr. HEAPS: The point raised by the minister is a peculiar one. It appears that a motion will be quite in order if the Canadian National has a surplus and be out of order if it has not. You cannot have a point of order based on such conditions. If the government is providing funds for the railway, it is doing so of its own volition. Parliament has the power to vote it down, if it so desires. So far as the Canadian Pacific is concerned, it does not come in the same way under the provisions of the act; consequently in my opinion the amendment is not out of order.

Take the case of the workmen's compensation boards in our provincial legislatures; in certain of our legislatures private members have introduced bills to increase the compensation paid to men who are injured and who come within the scope of the board. If it is in order for a private member in a legislature to make a motion to increase compensation by a levy on industry, whether the industry pays or not, the same thing applies to this case.

Mr. MANION: In the case of the compensation board, the money is paid by the industry from which the compensation is collected, so that it would not be a payment by the government at all. Therefore a private member could introduce such legislation.

Mr. HEAPS: We are told that the Canadian National Railways is a private institution and that the government had to take over the assets of the company. I cannot see how putting a levy on the receipts of the two corporations can be regarded as spending government funds. I would like to have the com-