the corporation's business because he must cover his overheads by bidding one-quarter, one-eighth or one-sixteenth of a cent per pound higher than his bigger competitors who have lower overheads because of their volume of business?

The small salt codfish processor simply cannot convert to processing fresh or frozen fish, for this would mean an almost complete replacement of his equipment. He cannot afford to scrap all his drying equipment, to write it off as a total loss and at the same time finance the purchase of new machinery and refrigeration plant required by the fresh fish industry. In some cases both he and his employees have worked side by side over the years to build up the business and now, through no fault of their own, they will be out of business and unemployed.

Another question is whether the processing operations are to be concentrated in a few centres. If this is done, plants that are not in those centres will be put out of business no matter how efficient they are. In such cases local efficiency will be sacrificed to an over-all average efficiency throughout the participating provinces. There is a concern expressed by industry representatives that the burden of dislocation and redundancy will weigh unequally, not only upon the fishermen and not only upon the processing plant but upon the participating provinces. In other words, provincial governments are asked to opt in or opt out on a guesswork basis. These are some of the questions that are not answered in Bill C-175, and they were not answered by the minister in committee.

I suggest that in the absence of answers there is, and will be, a continuing obligation upon the federal government and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) to keep a compassionate eye on the operations and the results of the act establishing a Canadian Saltfish Corporation. I say this because the government has turned loose a monopolistic corporation upon the saltfish industry. It has ordered that corporation to operate on a self-sustaining financial basis and has hammered that order home with a warning that there will be no money from the federal government to pick up a deficit.

The government, in effect, has given the corporation a balance sheet for a heart—a heart that can only beat in the black at whatever sacrifice of redundant humans. I should like the government to have written into this bill some of the findings and conclusions of Mr. Justice Samuel Freedman when he acted as industrial inquiry commissioner on Canadian National Railways' run throughs in 1965. That report was made to the minister's colleague, the hon. member for Cape Breton Highlands-Canso (Mr. MacEachen) when he was Minister of Labour, and was tabled by him in the House. The commissioner, speaking of another federal corporation, said at page 103 of that report:

> The Commission is of the view that an obligation rests upon the company to take reasonable steps towards minimizing the adverse effects which a run through may have upon its employees. That obligation has its root in the principle that when a technological change is introduced the cost of reasonable proposals to protect employees from its adverse consequences is a proper charge against its benefits and savings. Apart from the advantage of expeding traffic, the company's "run through" program would yield monetary savings of nearly a million dollars a year. These savings would be an annual item to be reaped by the company from year to year. Fairness demands that the advantages of the program should not fall all on one side—the company's—and its burdens all on the other—the men's. According, it is proper that the cost of protected measures for employees hurt by the run through should be charged against the savings resulting from it! Admittedly this would reduce those savings, but only at the beginning, for the savings would be recurring while the protective costs would not.

Mr. Justice Freedman had other words of wisdom which I recommend for study by the minister. At page 106 he stated:

> Does a man acquire an equity in his job? To say that he does is not to imply that he is entitled to permanent tenure in it. His services may be terminated, but when they are he should be entitled, by view of his prior service, to some form of severance pay. Admittedly this approach is not in line with traditional attitudes towards the relationship between a man and his job. But it is dictated by considerations of wise social policy, and it is rooted in principles of morality and justice. It is especially relevant in an age of technological change. Nor can it now be regarded as revolutionary. The ground for it has already been broken by industries which have accepted the principle of severance pay as part of an employer's responsibility. The matter is well expressed by the London *Times* in an editorial comment on the Redundancy Payments Bill, a bill recently introduced in the British Parliament, and providing for a legal right to compensation on the part of workers losing their jobs through no fault of their own. The comment is as follows: "At the back of this too is the developing new conception—that a man holds some rights in his job just as an employer holds rights in his property, and that his rights gain in value with the years. In so far as the work done in it is part of an enterprise, he is a part owner, who must be compensated if his share is taken from him."

Finally, I am certain the Minister of Fisheries, as an engineer economist, will find the comments of Mr. Justice Freedman very