

APPENDIX No. 2

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: I have told you. I understand there is a law in 28 states or so which requires payment to be made semi-monthly.

Mr. PELTIER: May I ask Mr. Chrysler another question? He said a moment ago that the Canadian Pacific is divided into four divisions for payment.

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: I did not say that.

Mr. PELTIER: How many did you say?

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: I said there were four offices.

Mr. PELTIER: Exactly, and they are divided into four offices for the payment of their employees. That is four railways, so far as the question of payment is concerned, is it not?

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: That may be so.

Mr. PELTIER: It is not a transcontinental railway so far as payment of men is concerned.

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: What I have said is that there are four offices in which these payments are made. I pointed that out for the purpose of showing that the company has done all it could to subdivide payments, but still the whole time is required, that is now actually taken.

The CHAIRMAN: Before you take your seat, would you briefly state your objection?

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: In the first place it is an interference with the domestic concerns of the company, which it is not part the duty of this Parliament to do. It is a matter of contract between the company and its men. Secondly, it is not practicable to make payment twice a month on these railways. Thirdly, the men are free agents. They act through very powerful confederations of labour, and the conditions, as I understand, have for a number of years past been entirely satisfactory. If they are not satisfactory the question of semi-monthly payment is one of the terms which can be dealt with by agreement between the companies and the men, and should be dealt with in such manner.

Mr. LAWRENCE: I submit Mr. Chrysler has made out no case at all in his reference to the companies and the men. Take for instance the correspondence you have just read signed by Mr. Chester and Mr. McGovern. The former is the Chairman of the General Committee of Adjustment of the Order of Railway Conductors on the C.P.R. The latter is the Chairman of the General Committee of the Trainmen's Organization. They wrote and requested this legislation, because so far it has been impossible to get the consent of the company wherever it has been taken up. Now, I received a letter from the Chairman of the General Committee of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. It is true, as Mr. Chrysler has said, that they have a close agreement with the company, but I received a letter—I am sorry I have not got it with me to-day—stating that their committee assembled in Montreal, had endorsed my action in trying to get a semi-monthly Bill enacted by the Dominion Parliament. Mr. Chrysler laid stress upon the fact, as he said, our organization is strong enough to demand these things from the railway company. That may be so if they go about it in that way, but would not help the other fellow who has not got any organization at all, or help the other organization that is not strong enough to get these advantages?

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: I did not say anything about their being strong enough.

Mr. LAWRENCE: That is what you insinuated and what you suggested should be done. We are not in favour of class legislation in any shape or form. We think what is good enough for us is good enough for the other fellow whether he can go and demand it from the company or not. I do not know whether I stated the fact the other day, but the state of Michigan two or three years ago enacted a law which requires railway companies to pay their employees semi-monthly. The Canada Southern Railway, where I have done my railroading, is operated by the Michigan Central.