

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

were tabled in response to a Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers by the hon. gentleman.

While the study was prepared in a very scholarly fashion, it did not seem to certain members of the government and certain members of the opposition to provide a good response to a very awkward legislative problem, not only for this Parliament but for all democratic assemblies including the United States and the United Kingdom.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** We are agreed on that.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** To a degree we already have a conflict of interest statute, more particularly, the provisions of the Senate and House of Commons Act. It is recognized in certain respects that it is far more restrictive than is necessary. We had an instance last year with regard to certain members of this House who were covered by the sections of the Senate and House of Commons Act far beyond its original intention, and special legislative measures had to be taken in that regard.

The government is not seeking a restrictive measure but one that will give Members of Parliament and others related to government a clear set of rules so that in advance they may order their private affairs in such a way as to avoid conflict with their public duties. The question is still under study within the aegis of my office. I regret I am unable to state at the moment a specific timetable. I agree it would be desirable to try and resolve this particular question at the present time when there is no problem with regard to conflict of interest, and when the question is not one of active partisan dispute in the event that in future there may be an instance in which specific rules will be required.

*[Translation]*

## CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—SHUT-DOWN OF SOME STATIONS

**Mr. Roland Godin (Porineuf):** Mr. Speaker, I have already directed a question to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), as to the shut-down of some railway stations. That question, which was considered as being of general interest, has to do nevertheless with an abnormal situation.

Favouritism has existed for a long time in the Canadian National and in the Canadian Pacific Railways and the patronage handlers as we call the railway officers who, through

*[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]*

their inefficiency, dilapidate the companies' profits, are now going after the employees with 35 to 40 years of service and want to dismiss some of them.

The proper authorities should put a stop to such a situation that leads to the debasement of the human being and of the worker. As the Canadian Pacific have already enjoyed grants and various other benefits from the government, their moral duty towards the Canadian people is as great as that of the Canadian National.

Most of the employees affected by the changes contemplated by the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific are doubly qualified people, although they are 50 or older. It is obvious they have rightly deserved their present employment. I ask that all the positions filled by those gentlemen be maintained until their official retirement.

Can we allow people who have played an essential part in society, to be shunted in favour of a few technocrats who vote themselves salary increases? Can we, through a government organization, do everything possible to create jobs in so-called special areas, and at the same time order crown corporations to dismiss people in that same area?

Let us remember that for 20 years after the end of the last war, the government managed to finance the presence in Germany of thousands of soldiers. In my opinion, we should be able to find the financial means necessary to keep in their jobs some of those people whose health was ruined in the service of this Crown Corporation.

I have already emphasized, Mr. Speaker, the necessity of a royal inquiry into this matter. I am ever more convinced of the pressing need for such an inquiry. There may be a financial mess but there is also a mess of accidents which are endangering the safety of the public and cost the taxpayers millions of dollars.

Here is a striking example of how these changes are brought about in the administration. Eight years ago, in Quebec, there was a director, a certain Mr. Gauthier; today the director is still a Mr. Gauthier. Apparently, it is Mr. Gauthier's son, a tough man who makes it tough for the others. When a man who has done nothing to deserve it, is entrusted with such a position, we have some reason to believe that this high ranking official does not understand his mission too well. We may therefore ask Mr. MacMillan, president of the Canadian National, to reconsider the way promotion is granted in order to