

and not with the individual. In the case of an employee whose services are not required, the management do not consider it necessary to give the reasons for his dismissal. Of course it would be very easy to do it.

Mr. PUTTEE. The only ground on which the government would discharge an employee would be for good and sufficient reasons. If so, why should not those reasons be stated? If they are damaging to the man discharged, he will keep the information to himself. If it be a question of unjust discrimination, the organization will see that justice is done him. If he belongs to no organization, he can only appeal to men's sense of fairness and justice. The minister has said that in the case of telegraphers who are discharged, the reasons are given, but in the case of men who do not belong to any organization, they are discharged without any reason being given. Well, a man who gets \$1.50 a day is just as much interested in keeping his place as a man who gets \$3.50 a day. And after a man has been a number of years on the Intercolonial, his usefulness is gone for other labour. No man who has been in continual service should be discharged except for good and sufficient reasons, and there can be no honest objection to telling him what those good and sufficient reasons are. The hon. member has brought up the case of two men. I am referring to two other men whose cases have been brought up before the House. They were employed at Moncton and were discharged at the beginning of this year—Fabien Leger and F. B. Wood. Now it is said by these men and by others on their behalf that they were discharged really for activity in connection with unions.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Puttee) knows that that was denied. The hon. gentleman himself had an interview with me with respect to that matter, and it is fair for him to state that fact, I think.

Mr. PUTTEE. I was going on to say, Mr. Chairman, in the very next sentence, that this was denied by the minister. But with this denial should be given information as to what was the reason for their dismissal. One of these men had been for twenty-three years on the Intercolonial. As a matter of fact, he has been active recently in trades union matters. It must be remembered that, as we have seen this morning, the fact that the trades union is strong and some of its members are employed under the department leads to this—that if one of those men is discharged it becomes necessary, under the agreement under which he was employed, that the reason for his discharge shall be given. One of these two men I have referred to, I believe, was the correspondent of the government's 'Labour

Mr. EMMERSON.

Gazette' and was soliciting subscriptions among the employees of the Intercolonial Railway for that publication. Not only on his representation, but on the representation of his fellow-workers and fellow-townsmen, the impression has been given and certainly exists that activity in trades union matters was disagreeable to some prominent men in the city of Moncton and dismissal followed. At page 3437 of 'Hansard' there is a long series of questions put by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Ralph Smith) and answered by the Minister of Railways. It seems from what the minister says that the men are absolutely denied the advantage of having put before them reasons for their dismissal other than simply that it is 'for the benefit of the service.' On behalf of every labour organization I want to say that that is no satisfactory answer to any man who has been discharged after being employed in any service for a number of years. The reason given should be a specific reason. It is stated—and on this I would refer to the hon. member for Vancouver—that the dismissal was ordered from Ottawa, that it did not come from these men's superior officers nor from any one actively engaged in the operation of the railway. I believe that men thus employed should be given, not only in this case but in every case reason, for their dismissal. That is a point that is always put forward by trades unions and it is always conceded in each case. And surely the weak man, the man who has not the support of his coworkers is entitled to the same treatment.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is almost a pity that this incident was brought up, for it has, in a sense, the effect of drawing a red herring across the trail, and preventing us from getting information which we desire with respect to political partisanship on the part of officials. I agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) that it is a great injustice that men should be dismissed without reason given. It might be that if a man knew the reason, he might set the matter right and so avoid dismissal. It may be a case of double injustice. A man may be dismissed upon allegations which, if examined into would be found to be incorrect; and, as the hon. member for Winnipeg says, when he applies for employment elsewhere and is asked the reason for leaving his former employment, he is unable to give any reason, and so must rest under suspicion that he is not worthy. But it appears from what the minister says that if he belongs to the telegraphers' union reason must be given if he is dismissed. And why? Because there is a force behind him—

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a subject of agreement.

Mr. SPROULE. The man who is unable to bring any force to fight his battles can-