

to sign the appearance sheet. I then went to Owen Sound, and when I came back two days later I found someone had signed my name to the sheet. That is how the work was performed during and after the war.

For 15 years I worked on the CNR. I never had a day off and we did not have holidays in those days. We had to go on strike in order to get seven days' holiday. The first year that we were given a week's holiday another chap and I went around to see how the oldtimers were taking it. They did not know what to do with themselves. That first year they worked the week and collected their holiday pay as well. The second year we put the heat on and said to them: "There is no point in having a week's holiday if you don't go away on holiday." The next year when we went around they were sitting on the veranda. They did not know what to do with themselves. Those oldtimers had worked 40 or 45 years without a holiday. This was a new thing to their system and they did not understand what it was all about.

Honourable senators, clauses 93 and 95 of the proposed bill appear to suggest that the company or commission may make bylaws subject to the provisions of the legislation that would thereafter become law under the force of the legislation. In our respectful submission, this seems to suggest that the railway companies would become self-regulators of the railway system, similar to the system utilized in the United States. This, again in our respectful submission, is quite apart from the history, public policy and best interests of Canadians, in terms of the safety of railway operations across our country. After all, from even a cursory review of the reports of the Grange or Foisy commissions it is quite evident that the railway companies have failed time and time again to put into effect, on their own initiative, adequate safeguards to guarantee the most optimum safety conditions in their operations of our railway systems. We respectfully submit that the railway companies have demonstrated in the past that they cannot be relied upon to self-regulate their operations adequately in respect of the very important area of railway safety.

History has shown that even the Canadian Transport Commission has had difficulty in either persuading or ordering the railway companies to promote or adequately introduce safe practices and technology in the most timely fashion. In our respectful submission, it will become much more difficult in this current era of deregulation to persuade the railway companies to regulate their operations in the most optimal manner in the very important area of railway safety. After all, the ultimate objective of Bill C-105 is to ensure the safe operation of the railways across our nation.

At the time of the wreck in Mississauga, I sat in opposition in the House of Commons. At that time I asked the now Deputy Prime Minister whether the train had been inspected on both sides when it went over the road crossing at Quebec Street, and he was not sure. I received good, reliable information that, of the two carmen who were supposed to be there to protect and inspect the train, one had had to go to Windsor because they were short a carman in Windsor. He had left the train before it arrived at and crossed over the crossing at

Quebec. That particular carman had gone to the CNR and had gone "dead-end" to Windsor. Therefore, the Mississauga wreck could have been prevented if we had had that extra crew member inspector look at the train.

Honourable senators, I have tried to bring to your attention the concerns of the 60,000 workers employed by the three major railway companies and a number of smaller, short-line railways which operate freight or passenger trains from coast to coast in Canada.

At the report stage on third reading I hope to speak on railway employee stress as a safety factor, on employee assistance programs and on the subject of mandatory testing of employees and prospective employees for the use of drugs.

Hon. Mira Spivak: Honourable senators—

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: Honourable senators, I wish to inform the Senate that, if the Honourable Senator Spivak speaks now, her speech will have the effect of closing the debate on the motion for second reading of this bill.

Senator Spivak: Honourable senators, I commend this bill to you for second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read second time.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

The Hon. The Acting Speaker: Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the third time?

On motion of Senator Spivak, bill referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications.

[Translation]

EXCISE TAX ACT EXCISE ACT

BILL TO AMEND—SECOND READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

Hon. Jacques Flynn moved second reading of Bill C-117, to amend the Excise Tax Act and the Excise Act.

He said: Honourable senators, this bill provides for parliamentary approval of the proposed changes in federal sales tax and excise tax announced by the Minister of Finance in the budgets of February 18, 1987 and February 10, 1988, in the White Paper on Tax Reform of June 18, 1987 and in the tax reform document of December 16, 1987. Thus, the bill contains a number of important tax measures. However, I may point out that the increases in sales and excise tax provided under this legislation are part of the general tax reform program which will lead to very substantial reductions in personal income tax, totalling \$12 billion over the next five years.

Obviously, no government likes to raise taxes. This bill clearly reflects the present government's commitment to better and equitable management of government operations and public resources. Overhead costs and operating and maintenance expenditures have been cut back over the past few years. Management of public finances has been improved. In this respect, the bill provides for accelerated remittance by taxpay-