

*Transportation*

Act is not deleted, so to the extent that section 182 of the Railway Act remains and provides compensation for employees it is still in the law. If you took the Railway Act and Bill C-231 together, you would still have a provision in the total transportation legislation for the limited kind of compensation which section 182 of the Railway Act now provides. All this amendment does is extend the principle and the application of the contents of section 182 of the Railway Act. In that way I respectfully submit it is again entirely in order because it relates to policy and other statute which this bill seeks to amend.

I think it would be nothing less, and I use these words deliberately, than heartless and thoughtless on the part of this parliament and the minister if we spent weeks adopting a bill that deals in large measure with rationalization, were careful in every instance where rationalization may affect the railways adversely to provide for compensation to them from the public treasury, and did nothing to compensate those workers affected by rationalization. We even provide in this bill, as was argued yesterday, that within the first three years of the coming into force of this law there is to be a study of the Crowsnest pass rates to ascertain whether they are compensatory, and if the commission feels they are not compensatory the governor in council may compensate the railways for the losses involved.

**Mr. Pickersgill:** No.

**Mr. Lewis:** That is the way I read it—"may" compensate them; I do not say "shall".

**Mr. Pickersgill:** The governor in council may make a recommendation to parliament but the Governor in Council cannot compensate the railways.

**Mr. Lewis:** The governor in council may make a recommendation to parliament to compensate the railways; that is fine. But we have provided here for compensation to the railways for any losses generally. I am not going into detail in this respect, Mr. Chairman, so forgive me for using a general phrase which necessarily is not entirely accurate but is accurate enough for the purpose of our discussion. We are providing that if there are losses in the application of the Crowsnest pass rates we shall after three years compensate the railways. But there is not a single, solitary word in this bill about compensating the workers of the railway who might have to

move from one place to another as a result of the rationalization which this bill requires, or who might, without even being afforded the opportunity of moving, lose their jobs and suffer other losses as well.

If the minister insists on asking the Chair to rule this amendment out of order and if, as I hope is the case, the Chair holds that it is in order and the minister insists on opposing it, he will justify the worst fears of the workers of the railways and other modes of transportation in this country. These are fears that I may frankly say I have, namely, that this is a bill not really to deal with a transportation policy as a whole, because you cannot have an effective or adequate transportation policy without employees, but a bill primarily concerned with guaranteeing the railways that they will be compensated, without any consideration for the workers of the railways who may be affected by the policies laid out in the bill.

I urge the minister to accept this amendment despite his statement that it was not the intention to introduce industrial relations matters into the bill. This is not a question of industrial or labour relations. The actual implementation of the recommendations of the Freedman report will require other legislation. That will involve negotiation between the railway companies, the unions, and so on. This amendment is precisely in the spirit of the rest of the bill. When the railways are hurt they should be compensated, and we say that when the workers are hurt they should be compensated. I should like to understand how the minister morally and in social terms is able to make a distinction between the two forms of compensation.

**Mr. Horner (Acadia):** Mr. Chairman, I should just like to say a word on the amendment. The railway committee studied precisely this matter a number of years ago in respect of Bill C-15 introduced by the former member for Port Arthur. The committee studied that bill at length and reported favourably on it to the House of Commons. It said that steps should be taken along the lines of the bill. The minister of the day, the same Minister of Transport, agreed with this and informed the committee that legislation would be introduced somewhat along the lines of the bill.

I urge the minister to take a close look at this amendment. He may wish to ask that the clause be stood while his officials consider the amendment. I urge that even though he may