

Mr. HEENAN: At any rate, he quoted quite approvingly the ten per cent cut in wages.

Mr. MANION: I did not discuss it.

Mr. HEENAN: He commended the men for taking the cut in a loyal way.

Mr. MANION: Hear, hear.

Mr. HEENAN: I know how those men took that reduction; they took it the same as the opposition took the bill passed by closure this afternoon. They took the reduction because they had to do so or strike. In that instance I agree with the minister that they were loyal, for rather than tie up the commerce of the country they took the wage reduction. But it is a peculiar situation, and I know the railway men see it as I do, that every time there is a Conservative government in power they have to accept a reduction in wages. I am not suggesting at this time that the government has anything to do with it, but in 1921, just before the Conservative government left office, the railway men had to take a twelve per cent reduction in wages, while between 1926 and 1930 they got between six per cent and nine per cent of that back, but now, with the advent of another Conservative government, they have to take a further ten per cent cut in wages. That speaks for itself.

I could not let the minister's remarks approving of the commission he appointed pass without comment. I do not know any of the gentlemen, but these twenty-one general chairmen know all the executive heads of the railroads of the American continent, and they know who are antagonistic to the ideals of labour. No one in this house, I am sure will stand up and say that railway labour and their representatives are not as fair and reasonable a body of men as can be found anywhere on this continent. Therefore when they make a protest of this character it should be heard. I wish to put myself on record as protesting against this government appointing a commission without the men having a representative on such commission any recommendation of which, however slightly it may affect our railway operations, must in turn affect the lives of the men working on those railways and their families more than anyone else, yet they are the only class of people who have not representation on the commission.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the special committee on railways and shipping.

## SUPPLY

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Maloney in the chair.

Yukon territory—miscellaneous expenditure, including salaries and allowances of court officers, etc.—further amount required, \$1,000.

Mr. COOTE: We have not been able to hear what particular business is being carried on.

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance): These are the supplementary estimates for the past year, brought down the other day.

Mr. VENIOT: As I understand, these supplementaries are to make up the difference between the estimated expenditures voted last session and the actual expenditures during the year.

Mr. RHODES: Yes.

Mr. VENIOT: Which shows that in order to meet the administration of justice you now require \$1,000 more than was estimated and voted in 1931.

Mr. RHODES: Yes.

Mr. VENIOT: That being the case, I should like to have an explanation from the Prime Minister. On March 30, 1931, when introducing the supplementary estimates, he made the following statement:

No department has the right to allow its officials to exceed the estimates voted by parliament. This principle has been clearly established, but in spite of this fact such estimates were exceeded without the knowledge of the ministers. The time has come when rigorous steps must be taken to prevent a recurrence.

When the Prime Minister had these estimates before the house I drew attention to the fact that I did not think what he had stated could be carried out. I see now that in making that remark I was quite right, because these supplementaries amount to \$2,242,474.83.

Mr. RHODES: My hon. friend is including the railways.

Mr. VENIOT: It should be \$1,059,474.33?

Mr. RHODES: Yes.

Mr. VENIOT: The Prime Minister assured the committee at that time that a new system was to be adopted, and that great care would be exercised in seeing that there was no over-expenditure.

Mr. BENNETT: And there was not.