

So I suggest to you, sir, that if those states which you have mentioned would introduce fair employment practice legislation, the situation there would be much better for the negroes than it is at the present time.

Q. Yes, I know. But will you agree that that legislation would be needed more in those states than it is in Canada?—A. Sir, I have no desire to impugn our neighbours to the south. Privately I would agree with you. But the fact that elsewhere it may be needed more is no reason why in Canada we should do without it.

Q. You are just coming to what I wanted to ask you, by logical process. You are a cultured gentleman, Mr. Himel, and you have been dealing with labour problems?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. For how many years? You look to be young?—A. I have dealt with them for about 13 years.

Q. Thirteen years. You may sit down, sir. Now, I want to know if to your knowledge there has been any race, national, colour, or religious discrimination in employment in Canada for the last 13 years? You have been interested in labour problems?—A. Sir, I would not be devoting part of my time, which is voluntary, to the advancement of this cause if I did not believe so. That of course, is a personal point of view. But I can say too, sir, that there is no question in the world, in the mind of anyone who will take the time, that there is discrimination in Canada. Now, much of this discrimination does not exist blatantly and openly, such as you may find in parts of the United States. But it does exist by inference, or, let me put it another way—by circumstantial evidence you can conclude that discrimination exists.

If you want me to be more specific, sir, I can suggest to you that if you have thought for a moment of some of the groups of people who work on our railways, you will be bound to conclude that there is a large area of discrimination in a field which is covered by federal jurisdiction. We know, in our banks, that people of certain races and religions are practically non-existent as employees.

Q. What did you say?—A. I said people of certain races and religions.

The CHAIRMAN: If you will pardon me, Mr. Himel, Mr. Pouliot, and gentlemen, we will now adjourn until after the Orders of the Day and we will resume the sitting of this committee as soon after the Orders of the Day as we notice a quorum. Thank you.

*(Upon resuming after attendance in the House)*

The CHAIRMAN: Well, gentlemen, we have a quorum.

You may continue, Mr. Pouliot.

*By Mr. Pouliot:*

Q. Now, I notice that your contention, Mr. Himel, was that the discrimination was not open. That is what you said, is it not?—A. A great majority of cases in my experience of discrimination have not existed or come to light in an open sort of way where a person is of a particular race and applies for a job and they tell him "no", they will not take people from that particular race. It does not happen that way. But it does happen that they refuse people from that race and because of their refusing people from that race it is concluded that if there are no people or very few, if any, people employed by a large employer of a certain race that that employer must have a policy which involves exclusion or non-employment of people of that race.

Q. What are those people; who are they?—A. As I was saying before we adjourned, the railways happen to be one large employer; the banks are another. I do not merely give you my opinion about that. Several years ago the Trades