

*Legislation Respecting Railway Matters*

In addition to the salary problems there are, as I mentioned yesterday, many other legitimate problems which concern the workers. I am referring to working conditions. Just the other day it was mentioned to me that the cabooses which still are part of freight trains have not yet been equipped with electric lights or toilet equipment. There are many other things which are grievances so far as the workers are concerned and must be considered.

Likewise there is the whole area of allowing for the effects of automation. This should not be part of this bill because it is not the responsibility of parliament to arbitrate in these things. It is part of the negotiations that are continuing and will continue until November 15 and beyond if the results at that time warrant continued negotiation on that basis. But in the event that the results do not a board of arbitration will be set up then whose findings are to be binding.

Free collective bargaining has been the basis of labour-management operations for a long time. It should continue; it must continue. Government's role in the past has been to set rules so that the system would operate fairly and the well-being of the general public would be adequately safeguarded. But the unions and management cannot have it both ways. If they intend to appeal to the government for solutions to their problems—and it is evident that both union leaders and management felt this was necessary—then they must quit paying lip service to free collective bargaining and accept the consequences of compulsory arbitration.

The field of industrial relations is the area in which the government has a new role to play in setting up conditions under which the fruits of automation will be more equitably spread across the nation. Automation has increased productivity tremendously in the production industries. The result is that for the first time we have the money and the manpower to undertake great new developments in the social and cultural fields.

Government does have a responsibility to make sure that this takes place. That is why the suggestion made the other day by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Nicholson), one which I believe should have come from the government a long time ago, that a labour study commission should be set up is a step in the right direction. There also needs to be a study made of each particular industry to

[Mr. Thompson.]

allow labour and management to plan in advance for the changes that are coming.

This is why government does have a definite responsibility in industrial labour relations to bring about consultation in a way which we have not yet seen. Government has this responsibility and it applies not only to the situation on the railways but in the whole transportation industry. Government also has the responsibility in connection with its own legislation to bring together the various aspects of management and technical development in order that we can plan to meet the problems that are inevitable in the future and thus anticipate them rather than being forced into a situation like that in which we are at the present time of having to deal with a crisis that involves the economic well-being of the entire nation.

In this regard I would state that perhaps Bill No. C-230 could have been better worded. There has been some lack of explanation and it requires rewording in some places. The 4 per cent plus 4 per cent formula should have been amplified and explained. There should have been some reference or assurance regarding provision for the results of automation and the government's responsibility in bringing industry and labour together.

I also think there should have been some reference in the legislation to amending the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, particularly with regard to broader use of the job security fund which was established in 1962. Further, some reference could well have been made to Judge Little's report, a very important report which demonstrates with clarity many of the things that the C.N.R. is already doing in anticipation of future developments.

Yesterday the Prime Minister gave an explanation of why a 30 per cent settlement was justified in the case of the seaway workers and the Quebec longshoremens. Why did he not give it when the settlements were made? Why was there not some reference to it in the television appearance which he made a few nights ago? If this explanation had been given it would have been easy for the labour unions to understand and realize what they felt they were seeking as their just desserts as the result of previous settlements.

Why was there not some mention made of the need for a work stabilization agreement? If the details of fringe benefits are not the job of parliament then neither are the details of working out these things to which I have