

was to see whether he could not lower their standard of living. That is the evidence before us. Not one working man in Canada was appointed to serve on the commission, to say God bless them, although the present government when in opposition went through the country in 1930, telling the railway men and other labouring classes that they would be given representation on all important commissions. You should have heard how that sounded in the constituency of Kenora-Rainy River—representation on all important commissions. Well, what commission is more important to the railway men of Canada than this one? I am only reiterating the protests of twenty-one general chairmen of all classes of railway men who met in Montreal and wired their protest to this government when they saw in the newspapers that certain gentlemen were likely to be appointed. No notice was taken of them by the government then, nor is any notice being taken of them now, because the minister refuses to allow the bill to go to a committee so that the railway men might be able to present their views. They have no possible way of letting this House of Commons hear their views as to how they will be affected; they are not afforded an opportunity to ask for some protection. That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate the fact that you did not rule me out of order.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member said that this act would prevail over all other acts. It does not say so; it says:

The provisions of this act . . . shall prevail over all inconsistent provisions of all other acts . . .

That is vastly different. The hon. member made another point in regard to compensating men. It is well to remember that in part II provision is made for compensation of men, so far as the Railway Act in the past has compensated them, at terminal points which are being eliminated. I mention that to show that there is some compensation for that class of labour, just as there has been in the past.

Mr. HEENAN: There is no guarantee of compensation in the bill.

Mr. MANION: There never was any guarantee of compensation.

Mr. HEENAN: The point I make is that we are now passing a measure which is going to throw men out of work, and I submit that we should incorporate in it some guarantee of compensation.

[Mr. Heenan.]

Mr. MANION: I have already given my reasons for opposing that suggestion; I do not think we should compensate one class of labour when it is thrown out of work and ignore all other classes, much as we desire to compensate the men in this case. The leader of the opposition has directed attention to the fact that this clause reads:

This act may be cited as The Canadian National-Canadian Pacific Act, 1932,—

whereas this is 1933. The reason for the apparent error is that this bill was introduced in the Senate in 1932. I am going to ask my colleague to move an amendment substituting 1933 so as to avoid any possibility of misapprehension in that regard.

Mr. VENIOT: I am opposing clause 1 for reasons which I consider very important. If clause 1 goes through it means the adoption of this bill practically as a whole; if it does not go through, then my views may prevail with regard to leaving certain railway conditions in the maritime provinces as they exist to-day. Before going into details, showing the reasons for my objection to this first section, I wish to correct the minister on the question of compensation. The minister tells us that under part II of the bill there is compensation for the men at the terminals. That compensation is provided for in the old act and it has reference only to cases where a terminal is closed or changed and men are moved from one terminal or station to another. But the only compensation they get is expense caused by removal from one point to the other. Surely that cannot be called compensation under this act, when men are being retired from the service.

One of the reasons I gave on the second reading of the bill for my opposition was that there was no guarantee in it with regard to seniority. If laid off for a certain number of months or years the men lost their seniority. I wish now to correct the impression I may have left at that time. I have since gone fully into the question of seniority and I find that it is not governed by any act of parliament; it is covered by an agreement entered into between the different railway unions or lodges and the railway affected. I will therefore leave that argument entirely out of consideration.

Let me however call the attention of the minister to the provident fund or, as we now call it, the pension fund. Up to 1929 there was a provident fund, but the statute has been changed and the new Pension Act appertaining especially to railway employees on the Canadian government railways, was