

*Maintenance of Railway Operation Act*

they have an issue in this particular bill and that the moves they have made are going to make them more popular in the country. I do not say that with regard to those who have introduced the legislation but I think that is the view in mind. I know that we can be expected to take one side in this particular issue, the side of the workers, and by doing so perhaps it can be said that we are taking risks because of the fact that the majority of the people in the country, according to the way some people interpret the situation, do not feel that this would have been a justified strike or was even a justified strike vote.

Well, in so far as these views may be concerned, the argument put forward by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Pearson) that this, in effect, is the government coming down on the side of railway management in this particular matter holds true here. It seems to me that for the government to declare that it cannot consider a subsidy, that it has no alternative but to do this to intercept a national emergency, is being quite unrealistic in a fair sense. What it is doing is putting this government in behind Mr. Crump and Mr. Gordon.

I have been lectured, as most members of the railway committee of this house have been, by Mr. Gordon during his appearances before that committee. During the debate in 1950 the leader of the C.C.F. party at that time, Mr. Coldwell, suggested that Mr. Gordon had outlived his usefulness in the Canadian National. Mr. Gordon has survived for another decade. I do not know how much longer he will last, but I do know that the railway workers, not only on the Canadian National but on the Canadian Pacific as well, are convinced that Mr. Gordon is really leading the fight against them in a definite attempt to shake down their agreements and put them in a much less favourable position than they are now. I hope the Prime Minister and the government as a whole are considering the position of Mr. Gordon in relation to this railway. It certainly seems to be a point that he had lost the confidence of the people, according to Mr. Coldwell in 1950 and I think there must have been some substance to that argument. It would seem to me the case is much more so today.

The point brought up by the Leader of the Opposition with regard to the encouragement this gives to any irresponsible leadership might be personalized a bit by giving an example. I would cite the international teamsters union which has been carrying on what might be called raids upon certain railway employees in unions that are involved in this particular dispute. Now, you must face the facts of life within union organizations.

I know union leaders have to do so all the time. I refer to the fact that the membership wants you to produce something for them, to do something for them to indicate that you have been successful in presenting their claims according to what they feel is right. Here you have a situation where for six or seven months the irresponsible elements among these people were trying to move in on some of these unions—I will not go into whether or not they have the right—but they are certainly going to have a happy hunting ground because of the fact that the union leaders who are involved in this dispute have been compromised to this extent. Their whole case, their whole position, has been wiped out.

We hear a lot of nasty things about union leaders these days, but I do not feel that any group of responsible men, such as these men have proved themselves to be in their attitude toward this whole business, should be put in that invidious position where other union leaders in competition with them can come in and say, look at the way the government has pushed your men around.

The government has decided there shall be no subsidy. This means that if you accept the idea of a standard, the durable goods standard or even the old manufacturing industry standard weighted as to sex or even the Woods-Gordon standard that the railways brought in, these workers merit an increase now and have since the start of the agreement period. I have noticed during the two years we have questioned Mr. Gordon on this point during his appearances before the committee that he indicated he felt there had to be some kind of standard. We have countless examples that the durable goods standard seems to be the most sensible one.

Even according to the statistics that have been given to us, even by the Woods-Gordon standard of the railways, the workers at this time would have been entitled to an increase of 16 cents an hour. It seems to me the government is suggesting that standards are out for railway workers, that the standard of the future will be something that must be developed after the royal commission has reported. It seems to me that the problem of a standard is always with us, and this is why I think the main government move should have been to come out for a standard. I think the railway workers would have been prepared to accept a reasonable one.

Everyone who has looked into the question, whether it has been Judge Kellock or Eric Taylor or the other people who have examined the question over the years, has tended to come down to a standard that relates to the durable goods industry. If you accept what seems to be more and more the argument