

7 GEORGE V, A. 1917

gentlemen to come here and say: "We make our agreement, we provide for our payment and our hours of labour and all the other conditions of our employment by agreement, and then we come to Parliament and ask for an additional term which is to our advantage and the disadvantage of the railway company." I say this is unfair.

Mr. CARVELL: Do you contend that this should be part of the agreement?

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: It is a term which should be arranged in the negotiations and which should not be added to the agreement by an Act of Parliament. It seems to me that if this was a matter of so much importance the men would have had it inserted in their agreement. Why have they not?

The CHAIRMAN: Did they not ask for it?

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: I do not know.

Mr. MACDONELL: They ask for it now, and they have asked for it a hundred times to my knowledge.

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: They made their agreement.

Mr. CARVELL: I suppose they will say they could not help themselves.

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: I am sure it will not be said by members of this committee that the men made an agreement because they cannot help themselves. It is a free agreement. That is my objection, and the other is that it cannot be done.

Mr. MACDONELL: How about American railways?

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: They do not compare with ours.

Mr. MACDONELL: How about the practice?

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: I am told that out of the 50 odd states 28 have a state law for semi-monthly payment.

Mr. BEST: How are you getting along at Brownsville, where you pay once a week?

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: I do not know where it is.

Mr. BEST: It is in the state of Maine.

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: Well, they might pay daily.

Mr. BEST: They did it for over two years.

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: This, I submit, is not a proper thing for legislation here, at any rate. It is a domestic matter to be settled between the companies and these men, and they do settle it, and settle it in the best spirit. There is no complaint at present, these gentlemen themselves who speak for the employees have said so here in this room.

The CHAIRMAN: Have they not presented their case?

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: They have presented their case, but that is the general case, that they are in agreement with the railways and that there is no dispute between them.

Mr. PELTIER: The Canadian Pacific controls the Sault line, does it not?

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: I do not think that has anything to do with the matter.

Mr. PELTIER: What are their pay-days on the Sault line?

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: I do not think that has anything to do with the matter, it simply means they are operating in the United States and have to conform to the laws there. That is a fact which may be interesting, but is of no great relevance here. I did not fully answer Mr. Macdonell's question about the railways in the United States. Circumstances there are different. There is no railway which operates from the Atlantic to the Pacific; the railways break at Chicago, they break again at St. Paul, or Minneapolis, or some other point out of which the railways are split into three systems.

Mr. MACDONELL: I was not asking the reason, but merely what the practice is in the United States with regard to railways. If you cannot give the information, do not bother.