

of the employees affected." In this provision I see nothing but delay and disagreement, because presumably the direct representatives of the employees of the Canadian Pacific Railway—and I know whereof I speak—would be diametrically opposed to the contentions of the employees of the Canadian National Railways, and the operating officials of the two roads would say, "Well, we will divide up the employment and allocate it after you agree among yourselves." That might take a long time. Therefore, speaking as a representative of labour for many years, I may say that I regard those words as unnecessary. The relations between the railway men and the officials of the two roads have been of too cordial a nature to necessitate anything which will only delay the allocation of the employees of the two lines under a co-operative plan.

As I have said, it had not been my intention to say anything in regard to this subject, but when my honourable leader participated in the discussion I thought it only proper that I should state my position. I think the words I have referred to are totally unnecessary and will be disadvantageous rather than advantageous in the settlement of differences between the employees.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Honourable members, I am in complete agreement with the honourable gentleman from Parkdale (Hon. Mr. Murdock). The words inserted by the House of Commons are not only unnecessary, but nonsensical. The clause into which they are injected was given to me in our Committee by the honourable senator from Parkdale, the intention being to make such provision as Parliament reasonably could make to see to it that under working agreements or operating arrangements, or the like, between the two systems, there should be a fair division of the work among those who had had it before, and that it should not go elsewhere. The main object was to see that men were not displaced any further than was absolutely necessary. Why in the world should such a matter be arranged by negotiation with the representatives of the men? To show how utterly nonsensical the amendment is, I ask, why do the railway companies need to go to the men to negotiate in order that those men may get the work? If it were a matter in which the men were pulling one way and the companies the other, negotiation would be proper, but the railways are directed to do just what the men would want them to do. That being so, why negotiate? If there were to be negotiations between the employees of the Canadian Na-

tional and the employees of the C. P. R. as to the division of the work, then the negotiations should be between the representatives of those two groups of employees, and not between the employees on the one hand and the railways on the other.

I do not know how much danger there is in this provision. I know it is of no earthly value. The honourable gentleman from Parkdale will know whether or not it is worth while moving to strike it out. If he thinks it is, I will support him. I think the words which have been added are superfluous, if not nonsensical, and would be better out of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: My own judgment is that this amendment should go out, but I am not going to make a motion of that kind, because this looks good to gentlemen who were in the business of negotiating for the employees ten or fifteen or twenty years ago, when we used to have to sit on the bottom step of the railway offices for ten or fifteen days awaiting an interview. But those days have gone by. To-day we can go to the officials in a proper way and discuss anything on an even footing.

This language is superfluous, and I think it will result in unnecessary discussion between the employees of the two lines; but probably we should leave it there to see how it will work out. My personal judgment is that later we shall want to place the responsibility where it properly belongs—and where it was placed before the Bill left this House—namely, with the operators of the two railroads. But let us try this out and see what comes of it.

The amendments were concurred in.

## INDIAN BILL

### SECOND READING

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN moved the second reading of Bill 21, an Act to amend the Indian Act.

He said: Honourable members, the main purpose of this Bill is to provide, once again, for the enfranchisement of Indians, even though they do not apply for it. In 1920, while Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, I introduced into the House of Commons and had accepted by it a measure designed for this very purpose. Strange as it may seem, the Indian population, especially the active and oratorical members of the bands, are almost always opposed to anything of this kind. They want to keep their populations intact; they do not want those who mature intellectually and otherwise to enter into full citizenship, and they do not look with favour