

Transportation

Chairman, that that amendment was concerned with the situation where one of the modes of transport involved in the bill wished to acquire, either directly or indirectly, an interest, by purchase, lease, merger, consolidation, or otherwise, in the business or undertaking of any person whose principal business is transportation, whether or not such business or undertaking was subject to the jurisdiction of parliament, and notice had to be given to the commission. Provision was also made in that amendment for how the commission should deal with the matter. According to the final words of that amendment the commission may, by the provisions of the amendment, disallow any acquisition sought by any company in the field of transportation. I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is absolutely nothing in this resolution other than the last words—

Mr. Pickersgill: What about the very first words?

Mr. Lewis: The very first words referred to defining a national transportation policy for Canada. If it is wide enough to include legislation to deal with consolidation, merger and acquisition, then it is surely wide enough also to include protection for workers who are affected by any action taken by the commission.

For the life of me, Mr. Chairman, I do not see how it is possible to suggest that the amendment moved by the hon. member for Port Arthur covers what this amendment seeks to do. There is not another clause or subclause in this bill dealing with the subject matter of the amendment which is now clause 20 of the bill. There is not a word in the resolution suggesting that this bill is intended to deal with what essentially is the monopolistic acquisition of other transportation property. The minister introduced the amendment and the committee was ready to deal with it because obviously it was something consequential upon or related to the national transportation policy referred to in this bill.

I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment before the committee falls much more clearly within those words than did the amendment accepted by the Chair and voted on by the committee. Can anyone who is not trying to be frivolous or fractious suggest that the consequences to employees of the rationalization of rail services are not a result of that rationalization? Can anyone logically

[Mr. Lewis.]

argue that the result of rationalization in regard to the employees is not a direct consequence of the rationalization which is provided in this bill, the entire machinery of which deals with and encourages rationalization of the railways?

● (4:10 p.m.)

The amendment to which I have referred and which was, as I said, passed by this committee was in my respectful opinion a proper amendment precisely because it too dealt with the rationalization of the transportation services in Canada. There is also the fact that the basis of the bill is competition and this competition would be ended if one mode of transport got a monopoly over other modes of transport or if one company in one mode of transport got a monopolistic hold over other modes. In precisely the same way is this amendment proper and within the scope of the resolution.

I also respectfully urge that it is entirely within the actual spirit and letter of the bill before us, if I may put it that way, and of the particular section before us, because what we are dealing with in clause 42 and more particularly in new section 314D is precisely the subject matter of (a) encouraging rationalization, (b) the consequences of rationalization on the railways and (c), how the consequences of that rationalization are to be dealt with. I urge upon you, Mr. Chairman, that what this amendment deals with is on all fours in principle with precisely what the section deals with, namely, the encouragement of rationalization, the consequences of that rationalization upon employees affected thereby, and the way in which those consequences are to be dealt with. The only difference is that the bill before you now provides that the consequences to the railways, if they are adverse, are to be met out of the public treasury, whereas this amendment says that the consequences to the employees, if they are adverse, are to be met by compensation determined by the commission, again tying it directly to the bill which deals with the commission. The amendment provides that in this event the company concerned shall compensate such employees.

May I make two more points, Mr. Chairman. They are intended to support the procedural argument even though they necessarily deal in part with the merits of this question. I would remind the minister and you, sir, if I may, of some of the things the minister said. Unless I have misread this clause of the bill, section 182 of the Railway