the Freedman inquiry. What a story it reveals about obdurate management, a complacent government with its ears blocked and its eyes blinded, and a discontented labour force seething and desperate with a common cause for grievance even though it was scattered in dozens of separate locales from Vancouver to Moncton.

Let me emphasize this. Repeatedly the government was warned by parliamentarians and by union leaders who were frankly somewhat frightened at the surging militancy of their membership. The recommendations of a committee of this house were ignored by the Minister of Labour and by a succession of Ministers of Transport, including the incumbent. The House Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines in 1963, with great unanimity, had recommended, after considering a private member's public bill, that the government so legislate that material changes must be either negotiated or take place within a regulatory framework which set out some formulae for compensation, retraining and adjustment.

Why was the committee so convinced that it gave what is so rare in parliamentary history, approval to a private member's bill? The arguments that convinced them were the arguments that convinced Justice Freedman. As early as 1960 delegations had come to Ottawa from unions and from community representatives of railway towns to protest the casual and unplanned consequences of railway management's innovations springing from the residual rights theory.

Let there be no mistake about it, gentlemen. There were warnings. The wildcat national walkout of October, 1964 in its nature was spontaneous. It had no official leadership; it streaked like wildfire across this nation; it tied up one major railway and it would have tied up another if the government had not guaranteed an inquiry. A lot of pumpkin-wise guys, especially those who write editorials for newspapers, were astounded and shocked at this illegal event. Why did railway labour have to be dragged screaming into the mid-20th century? Could they not see that their archaic practices, their featherbedding, their resistance to change were impeding the orderly development of an improved system? Well, my friend, railway workers, like their brothers in most of the world, are neither stupid nor conservative but they wanted and want a fair shake.

Canadian National management's most publicized invokement of residual rights was in their institution of run-throughs. A run-through is a trip or assignment which requires crews to run through a recognized terminal or turn around point where crews normally change off and the incoming crew books off duty for rest. Run-throughs double the mileage and time on duty of the crews for a single trip.

Obviously the C.N.R. had a policy to introduce run-throughs from coast to coast. Put cleverly, their plans were introduced piecemeal and without much notice. From the first the union officials objected at all levels. Despite their protests run-throughs were instituted in certain places beginning in 1958. By the time the C.N.R. was ready with its second round in 1960, more coherent objections had been formed. I remember coming to Ottawa to protest one run-through planned in my home area. The minister of labour did not listen. He did not intervene to establish a board of conciliation. It took the threat of a wildcat strike to head off these run-throughs. The railway went on with its plans. Demoralizing rumours about changes, about the coming death of railway towns like Nakina and Wainwright, rippled across the railway system.

At negotiation time the railways refused to bargain on the issue or to let any protection be placed within the contract. Management had the initiative, government was deaf and blind, and the men seethed. There were more and more delegations from across the country. Sometimes it would be union leaders, sometimes regional and local union officers, sometimes mayors and community delegations. They came to Ottawa, they told their story, they pleaded for protection, they asked for changes in the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act and in the Railway Act but to no avail. Thus, when the C.N.R. management announced plans in the late summer of 1964 to introduce run-throughs in late October, 1964 which would decimate both work and community life in Biggar, Saskatchewan, and Nakina, Ontario, the balloon went up. Again there were delegations and representations to Ottawa. The Ministers of Labour and Transport listened and did nothing. And so the strike came and then the inquiry and then the Freedman recommendations. I am going to quote parts of the recommendations at pages 91 and 92 of the report of Mr. Justice Freedman:

> The commission must accordingly conclude that on the basis of the law as it exists today the company does have the right, as it contends, to institute run-throughs. That conclusion at once