

On that I want to point out that as such it is designed to throw thousands of railway men out of employment, consequently the title as presented to the house is not a proper title. Now I am not going into it, because the Minister of Railways evidently does not like to hear me making the same speech as I made on second reading, but if I have opportunity I am going to make that same speech, with a little latitude, on the third reading as well. The point I want to make is this, that if this measure had been submitted to a committee of the house—and I ask the minister to consider it even yet—the railway employees could, through the members representing the various constituencies, have secured from the railway companies the information that the hon. member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Heaps) has now asked the Minister of Railways for—and I say in all fairness to him I do not see how he could expect it. I want to point out that the government has some responsibility in connection with the employees. I read during the election campaign of 1930, not the slogan "amalgamation never, competition ever," which has been repeated so often, but the report that the then leader of the opposition (Mr. Bennett) promised the people in the maritime provinces on the 10th of July that if he were elected he would split these big heavy freight trains in two so as to give employment to double the number of engine and train crews in the maritimes. Surely we have to have some regard for this kind of thing. I notice some members of the committee looking askance at me, but I have it here in the Halifax Herald of July 10, 1930, on page 4, under the heading:

The Railway Herald and the Labour Men's Forum

It is a Conservative writer, who writes during election times especially, presenting the railway men's viewpoint and regarding the government railways, he says:

He (Mr. Bennett), will, until times improve, break up present huge freight trains into two trains, thus employing double as many men, extra trains and engine men, as are now employed. He will restore local passenger trains that have been cut off and thus make further employment for engine and train men, and give people the service they are entitled to.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Who said that?

Mr. HEENAN: That was Mr. Bennett. Then the writer goes on to say:

Hon. Peter Heenan, Minister of Labour, says this cannot be done, and apparently will not [Mr. Heenan.]

be done if he can prevent it. Hon. Mr. Bennett declares it can be done and will be done if he is elected to power on the 28th. There you may make your choice on the 28th.

I want to point out to the Minister of Railways—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MacNicol): I should like to read paragraph (2) of standing order 58, because I do not see that the hon. member is confining his remarks to the section under discussion. Section 1 of the act reads:

This act may be cited as The Canadian National-Canadian Pacific Act, 1932.

The minister will have to explain whether that date should be 1932 or 1933. Paragraph (2) of standing order 58 reads:

Speeches in committee of the whole house must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration.

I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the section having to do with the short title.

Mr. VENIOT: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman, before you give a final decision. It is customary to leave the title to be taken up last, but in this case the title has been taken up first. That being so any hon. member has a right to say in general terms why he opposes section 1. He opposes it because he does not think the bill should be cited as the Canadian National-Canadian Pacific Act, 1932; he does not think that should be the title, so he has a perfect right to give in general terms the reason why he does not agree to section 1. If section 1 is defeated the whole bill is defeated. That is my point of order, Mr. Chairman, and I think your ruling that we are out of order in carrying on a general discussion under section 1 is erroneous.

Mr. HEENAN: I know you want to be fair, Mr. Chairman, but before you took your seat a general discussion was proceeding and the minister was being asked questions which he was not able to answer. We are just carrying on from that point. Even though I may be out of order I do not think I should always be the butt who is called to order either by the Speaker or by the chairman whenever I rise to defend the workmen of this country.

The point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that in my riding, which is not large numerically but which covers a wide area, there are several railway terminals. I feel there is the danger, and if I know what the railway companies contemplate there is the possibility, that some of those towns will be