

and Labour Congress of Canada did a study of this subject and they found likewise that there were large areas of discrimination in those two particular fields.

Q. Well, that is hearsay.—A. It is not hearsay. It is from experience.

Q. Experience of others, not yours?—A. It comes from my knowledge of the industry. You may disagree with my knowledge of the industry.

Q. I do not know what it is. It may be something; it may be nothing. I do not know what it is. But I ask you about your personal knowledge, not what has been said by any Labour Congress; that is hearsay for you. I mean your personal knowledge. You say you are interested in labour problems and I would like you to tell us from your own knowledge. I asked you the same question I asked the Deputy Minister of Labour, if to your knowledge there has been race, colour, religious or national origin discrimination in any enterprise since you have been interested in labour problems.—A. Perhaps I did not make myself clear. In those particular fields, I, of my personal knowledge, have found or concluded that there is discrimination. I do not only give you my opinions, sir.

Q. I do not want your opinion. I want your quotation of facts. Your opinion is nothing. I want you to state the facts upon which you base your opinion.—A. At the present time I should not like very much to go into the subject of what is knowledge from the philosophic point of view, but I think we are just quibbling over words with all due respect. I say, in so far as I can judge, in so far as I can, from my opinion—

Q. It is not as far as you can judge. It is as far as you know. It is very different.

The CHAIRMAN: I believe the witness, Mr. Pouliot, has answered your questions to the best of his ability.

*By Mr. Pouliot:*

Q. No. He has not answered them at all and I want him to answer them. You spoke about the railways. Do you mean the porters of the sleeping car? —A. Yes, that is one.

Q. Did any porter make any complaint to you of discrimination?—A. We have, sir, the sleeping car porters, Toronto local, supporting this brief. That, I think, is evidence of a sort.

Q. No, no. I ask you if one single porter made any direct complaint to you of any discrimination?—A. Yes, sir. I can tell you of one I recall.

Q. What was the discrimination?—A. Well, he happened to be a lawyer and this was in difficult times and he had to take a job as a porter on the railways. Now, I am glad to say he is a solicitor for one of the large cities of Canada.

Q. There is no discrimination in that.—A. No. But he was obliged to work as a porter. I think he had the ability to be more than a porter; apparently his ability was not recognized beyond the porter level. Now, it seems to me rather strange that people of one particular race should find that their avenue of employment in a large industry is limited to a certain range. I would say, sir, that there must be socially something wrong when groups that have that ability to rise above a certain group in that particular industry do not have the opportunity. The fact of the matter is that so far as I know that group has been limited to a certain level in that industry.

Q. I asked you to give me an example. You gave that of a porter. I asked you if he had suffered discriminations and you told me that he had to undertake a job that was not worthy of him, that of porter, to earn enough money to pay for his course at Osgoode Hall.—A. No, no. He was a graduate, sir.