

their money to the United States, to their detriment, when the unions could have been saving these funds in Canada for the use of Canadians.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Alkenbrack:** I see that my point is understood by the committee. I protest the fact that these 56,000 non-ops are receiving no strike pay. They should be. I want to point out the injustice being perpetrated on these men by their international unions. They should at least be receiving a small pittance to sustain them during this time when they are not receiving any wages.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 11 agreed to.

On Clause 12—*Railway services to be resumed.*

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Chairman, this is another clause on which we have given notice to amend. However, we believe the subject matter of our amendment will be covered by the proposed amendment to clause 14. Therefore, it will not be necessary to delay the committee with regard to clause 12.

Clause agreed to.

On Clause 13—*Terms of collective agreements amended.*

**Mr. Rowland:** Mr. Chairman, this is not going to be a long speech.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Rowland:** It is not going to be a very happy speech either. I am sick at heart over what is happening here tonight.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Rowland:** Since the admission by the first speaker on the government side this morning, this House has been abandoning any consideration of justice in the wage settlement to be given to these workers when sending them back to work. I am sick at hearing that.

The Minister of Transport said we are incapable of determining the justice of this question. I am not going to argue that because it has been done over and over again. There is no sense to that argument. The facts and figures are there for anyone who cares to look at them.

Let us look at the argument put forward by the government. Let us take it in their terms. First, they told us it was not our business to decide whether the settlement is fair or just, but we must concern ourselves with what we can best do to see that the procedures of collective bargaining function in the railway industry once again. That is what they told us it was our business to do. The job we are here to do is to see that the process of collective bargaining once again begins to operate in the railway negotiations.

The process has broken down because, as was said, on the two previous occasions in the past 23 years when the railway workers went on strike and parliament sent them back to work, the railway companies counted on parliament to send them back to work. It is accepted by members on all sides of this House that the railway companies

### *Railway Operations Act*

did not bargain in good faith. If we want to make the collective bargaining procedures work once again, we must do it in a way that will give the workers a settlement that will make the railway companies afraid to have parliament again bargain in this way. And that is our job, to make collective bargaining work, and that is the way to do it, not to impose on the workers a half-baked settlement.

● (0120)

The second argument is that we cannot make a judgment respecting the justice of the case put forward either by the railroads or by the unions. That is a questionable assertion, but let us accept it for the moment. The Minister of Transport told us we are here to end a rail strike, to get people back to work.

**Some hon. Members:** Yes!

**Mr. Rowland:** How does he expect us to get people back to work with wage provisions which are totally unacceptable to the workers? Unless the bill sets out terms which are sufficiently acceptable to the workers we shall settle no crisis. All we are doing is perpetuating one.

The productivity of the railroads has increased and I think it is only fair that the workers should get a share of the benefits of this increase. After all, they have contributed to it. If it had not been for them there would have been no increase in productivity.

The settlement imposed upon the operating trades by clause 13 gives them about .2 per cent of that increase in productivity. That is the amount which will go to yardmen who are on two-hour call 24 hours a day, men who work under difficult conditions and who are subject to accidents of the bloodiest kind, men whose family lives are ruined as a result of the terms upon which they are employed.

This settlement is imposed on conductors and brakemen who work on trains which have greatly increased in size and which travel at ever greater speeds. They work on trains which now carry exotic chemicals, new products of every kind. This traffic requires increased knowledge on the part of conductors and brakemen. They have managed to grasp this knowledge and keep the railroads running, thus contributing to increased productivity.

Moreover, they have run these faster trains over railbeds which are inadequate by any standards, and they have done so with good safety records. What are we giving them in return? About .2 per cent of a share in the rewards of increased productivity.

I said I intended to be brief, and I will finish on this note. But I am sick at heart that the House could do this to a group of men. I cannot comprehend how we could do it. I intend to move an amendment. I know what the result will be, but I shall put it anyway because I think it should at least be heard.

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman:** Does the hon. member for Ottawa West rise on a point of order?

**Mr. Reilly:** Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. After the hon. member for Verdun, the Minister of Transport and other members on the government side have spoken so eloquently and, I believe, with deep understanding and conviction