

*Maintenance of Railway Operation Act*

and water transport employees, and sleeping and dining car employees be reduced to 44 hours and that they be paid at the rate of 106.63 per cent of their existing hourly rates of pay, the change to be effective August 1, 1950. The effect of this recommendation would have been the same as in the dispute affecting the international unions.

The minority report recommended that the unions' demands for the 40-hour week for hourly paid employees, except hotel employees, and for the 208-hour month for monthly-paid employees be granted, with no reductions in take-home pay.

In respect of hotel employees, the majority report recommended that the unions' request for a 5-day, 40-hour week be rejected. The minority report recommended that the work week of these employees be reduced to 44 hours with the same take-home pay as for 48 hours. As in the dispute affecting the international unions, the majority report stated that the members had no evidence before them to justify their making recommendations in regard to wages and hours of work of water transport employees. The minority report recommended, in respect of these employees, that the companies and the unions negotiate further with a view to equalizing working conditions for all classifications among the crews.

The majority report recommended that the hours of work of sleeping and dining car employees be reduced from 240 per month to 224 per month, the employees to be paid for the new working hours at the rate of 106.63 per cent of their existing hourly earnings. As stated above, the minority report recommended that these hours be set at 208 per month, with no reduction in take-home pay.

The majority report recommended that the unions' demand for the check-off be rejected, but the institution of this procedure was recommended in the minority report.

On April 14, 1950, the department supplied certified copies of the reports of the boards to each of the parties concerned and inquired whether the recommendations contained in the reports were acceptable and whether the disputes would be adjusted accordingly. On April 24, 1950, the national unions informed the Minister of Labour that the recommendations contained in the board's report were not acceptable to the employees concerned. On May 1, 1950, the companies advised the minister that they were willing to accept the findings contained in the majority report and negotiate a settlement on this basis. On May 11, 1950, the international unions informed the Minister of Labour that the recommendations of the conciliation board were not acceptable to the employees concerned and on May 12 advice was received from both groups of unions that decisions had been made to make submissions to the employees involved for an expression of their willingness to withdraw their services in the event of failure of their negotiating committees to reach a settlement with the companies.

**Mr. Smith (Calgary West):** You are sure that is accurate, are you? That is not the way I read the ballot.

**Mr. Gregg:** This is a summary; it is not quoted from the document itself. Between the latter date and August 8, 1950, several conferences were held between railway officials and the negotiating committee of each of the two groups of unions concerned in the disputes to explore the possibilities of a settlement, without result.

On August 8, 1950, the negotiating committees of the employees were asked to meet the presidents of the Canadian National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on August 10, 1950. Pursuant to this invitation the two union committees met with the presidents of the two companies at a later hour on August 10, 1950, but no agreement was reached.

On August 17 and 18, 1950, railway officials again met with the committees representing the two union groups, but no further progress resulted from the discussions.

On August 16, 1950, the Prime Minister wrote the parties to the disputes requesting the postponement of strike action for thirty days and stating that the Minister of Labour would appoint a mediator if the parties themselves were unable to reach a settlement by August 22, the date set for the strike. I have the letter of the Prime Minister and the replies thereto. If the house prefers I am prepared to read them, or I can table them.

**Some hon. Members:** Table them.

**Mr. Gregg:** They will appear as part of this record.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the house wish them tabled, or should they be read?

**Some hon. Members:** Tabled.

**Mr. Speaker:** Then it is agreed that the documents will appear in *Hansard*.

**Mr. Gregg:** The letter of the Prime Minister to the parties to the disputes was as follows:

Office of the Prime Minister

Ottawa, August 16, 1950.

F. H. Hall, Esq., Chairman, Joint Negotiating Committee, 509 University Tower, Montreal 2, Que.

A. R. Mosher, Esq., Representing Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees and Other Transport Workers, and the Brotherhood of Express Employees, 230 Laurier Avenue W., Ottawa, Ont.

Donald Gordon, Esq., Chairman and President, Canadian National Railways, Montreal, Que.

W. A. Mather, Esq., President, Canadian Pacific Railway Company, Montreal, Que.

Gentlemen:

This letter is written on behalf of the government of Canada and it is a joint letter because those addressed represent the parties concerned in the current dispute between the railways and the unions representing the non-operating employees of the railways.