

period; neither is it the lowest. During this two weeks I have had to be within reach of the 'phone at all hours: if I miss a call, I go to the bottom of the list, and if delay thereby ensues I am held responsible.

When a wreck is narrowly averted, we often hear a lot about the "coolness and skill" of some engineer, and "the lives which hang on his vigilance and judgment," and so on; the same man is apparently a mere thief at pay day. The passenger man is often entrusted with half a million dollars' worth of equipment; so, likewise, the freight man, who is often required to make fully as high speed with valuable freight and with vastly inferior facilities for stopping in a hurry, if need arise.

The true answer to incompetent criticism is that railway officials, the best judges of the facts, have recently agreed on several American roads, to an increase in enginemen's wages. I suppose we shall be told that we have "used the club to them." Those who could say so only exhibit their utter ignorance of our methods of negotiation, the type of man by and with whom these are conducted, our general excellent relations with our officials, and, in short, can only demonstrate their entire incapacity to sit in judgment.

F. G. ROE.

Those are the conditions that exist, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad to have been able to make a reply to the statements that have been made.

Dealing for a moment with the remarks made by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) this afternoon, if I remember correctly, he spoke in almost the same language both last year and the year previous. A reference to Hansard leads one to believe that he was quoting from a previous speech that he made to the House. I do not wish to be unfair to him, but I am simply taking the record as it stands. I feel that it is my duty to reply to some of his statements, but first may I be allowed to quote what he said in this House in the budget debate of two years ago? This is what he said—Hansard, 1922, page 2316:

Now, I am not interested in the railways; I have not a dollar in railway stock. But I ship as much freight as any man in this House. I ask hon. members who criticise the railways and find fault with them: how are the railways to cope with this condition? The railways should be in a position to say to these men: "You must do thus and so, as you did before; conditions have changed; you also must change and come back to normal conditions." When a strike is called, who calls it? Mr. Carey of Indianapolis, or some other leader of an organization. In the election of 1911 we heard a great deal from our friends on the other side of the House to the effect that there should be no truck or trade with the Yankees. Well, so far as the Yankees running our railway system is concerned; so far as their dictating when and how and how many hours our men shall work and what pay they shall receive, I say it is time that we had no truck and no trade in that direction. We ought to say: "Hands off; we will run our own business."

I believe it is my duty to reply to the hon. member's remarks as quoted, as they are almost identical with his language to-day. I

should like to state for the benefit of hon. members that the different labour organizations throughout Canada are no doubt international in their character but nevertheless their affairs are entirely in the hands of Canadian representatives. The moneys of these different organizations run up into many millions of dollars. The money collected from the Canadian members of these organizations remains in Canada and is invested here, it does not go to the United States. More than that this money is deposited in Canadian banking institutions. As to the officers of these organizations, let me say in reply to the hon. member for Sherbrooke that although our unions are affiliated with international organizations the officers, and those having jurisdiction over legislative and protective work, are entirely Canadian. Furthermore, we have no connection with the American bodies in respect to negotiations for higher wages or improved conditions—these, if we take the railways as an example are undertaken and carried out by Canadian representatives, with the entire approval of the men themselves. I feel that the amicable relations that exist to-day between railroad men in Canada and the officers of the different railways are as strong as they are in any other country in the world. The officers of the great railway corporations welcome the plan of collective bargaining, of co-operation on the part of the employees, and they also cordially receive any suggestions tending to bring about more efficient operation. My hon. friend should not be afraid—nor indeed any member of the House—of any labour organization that is conducted on sane and businesslike lines. That remark applies to the action of the rank and file of the members, and is equally true of the officers. It has reference more particularly to the organizations responsible for the negotiations between the railway corporations in Canada and their employees. The railroad men, to whom reference has been made by different hon. members, only want a square deal so far as their wages and conditions of work are concerned and, according to representations that have been made to me are only too willing to lay their cards on the table, and to have the questions at issue thoroughly discussed with the representatives of the companies in order to arrive at what may be considered the best solution of the existing difficulties. I believe that by having recourse to this plan of co-operation and joint consultation greater progress towards efficiency in railway affairs will be made than by any other method.

That brings me to a consideration of what attitude should be adopted in reference to the