> Your consideration to these matters will be greatly appreciated.

So interested was Mr. Crosbie in safety in the railways, honourable senators, that he never even answered this letter.

Under this bill automatic, minimal medical standards are to be met. Again, I sent a copy of the drug and alcohol testing guidelines to the boys in southwestern Ontario. Their reply is as follows:

> After reviewing the material you sent me, over drug and alcohol testing and discussing it with several members of the Local, I have drawn the following conclusions.
>
> 1. The survey leaves a lot of doubt, as to its credibility.
>
> 2. One who likes an occasional drink, is now having his privacy invaded, let alone policed.
>
> 3. No mention of interview with Company officials in the survey, let alone the Minister of Transport's office and officers or the C.T.C. or R.T.C. or the Transport accident investigation board.
>
> If we must live with it then let it also apply to Government members, all the way from Prime Minister down.

Honourable senators, I might mention that they all drink, too!

The letter goes on to state:

> Reasoning, that these people have a greater control in decision making, which affects a larger number of citizens than an individual Railway employee. One must also remember, a person can be devastated in more than one way.
>
> So in view of these items and what appears an easy way out for both Company and Government bodies, I decline the proposals placed forward by the whomevers.
>
> I do believe we now have a system that seems to work satisfactory now.

The bill provides for the establishment of support programs for those persons and standards applicable to such programs. That means that, if you are caught drinking, you are enrolled in a course. Honourable senators, we believe in that sort of approach, but why should we single out a separate group of workers? If this sort of support program is to be provided to railway employees, then why should we not include airline and bus employees?

Honourable senators, I am also concerned as to the powers given to certain individuals under the proposed bill. For example, under the provisions of subclause 28(3), paragraph (*c*), railway safety inspectors are given the power to seize property. In my view that provision is open-ended in that it does not afford the affected person any reasonable protection in accordance with similar general protections in Canadian law.

Subclause 31(6) of the proposed act requires a railway safety inspector to provide a railway company and its supervisors with notice as to equipment not to be used or operated—for example, defective equipment—except under specified terms and conditions. There is no corresponding requirement for the railway safety inspector to provide the employees affected by such defective equipment, or their organization, with any notice of the order issued by the railway safety inspector.

I would submit that it is appropriate that this provision be amended to require that employees, who may have to operate such defective equipment or equipment under very strict terms and conditions, and their organizations, such as trade unions, receive copies of all such notices. In my view such a requirement would be in accordance with the safety provisions set out in the Canada Labour Code.

Honourable senators, the following questions come to mind: Who will the railway safety inspectors be? Where will they come from? What training and how many years of railway experience will they have had? How many inspectors will be hired? Will they be off the street—say, firemen or policemen? What city or railway terminals will they operate out of? Will the inspectors be on call 24 hours a day like railwaymen, or subject to call if they are working a spare board? These are questions that we need to have answered, and no doubt we will receive these answers when this bill is referred to committee.

Under clause 32 the minister is required to provide notice of orders concerning unauthorized or improperly maintained works to the railway company responsible for such work and to make any necessary orders that he deems appropriate. Once again, it is the minister who must give notice when he is of the opinion that such a railway company has contravened any regulations under this proposed act.

It is my submission that it is only fair and appropriate that employees and their respective organizations receive notice of such orders and that they be kept fully apprised of the developments throughout the process, since the employees actually operate such equipment.

Under clause 33 of the bill the minister has the power to make emergency directives and forward such to the railway company in question in respect of certain practices of the company.

Again, I would submit that the employees and their organizations have an equal right to be made aware of dangerous conditions existing on the railway, of questionable practices by their employer and of any orders issued by the minister in that respect. Furthermore, I submit that there should be an obligation on behalf of the railway company to notify its employees and trade unions of any dangerous conditions, commodities or practices as determined by the minister and the effect of such on the employment of persons who might be affected.

In the olden days, if a railway employee discovered a rough section of track, he would report the situation at the first available station or at the terminal. The dispatcher would then send sectionmen out to do the necessary repair work. In those days there was safety.

Honourable senators, clause 35 mandates physicians or optometrists to disclose potentially hazardous conditions of certain employees critical to railways operations. I harbour no illusions that our members, being from the running trades and