

I expect Sir Henry was correct in that statement. He continued:

We have in him one who ardently desires the welfare of the Canadian National Railways system, one whose heart beats with ours—

I did not know that they were Siamese twins:

—and one who, in addition to the performance of his ministerial duties is likewise a really fine friend.

Had I been in Sir Henry's position I should have used the same language but I would have had no fear for the future. The trouble is that Sir Henry shook the minister's foot instead of his hand. The Minister of Railways must have likened Sir Henry Thornton to a giant like Holofernes or Samson, while he put himself in the position of Judith or Delilah. Did he forget that when Samson shook the columns of the temple, the Philistines were crushed under its ruins?

I should like to call attention to a very important document which was submitted to the royal commission on transportation. This was presented by the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees and when this matter is before the house I intend to take an opportunity to refer to it. In the meantime may I remind the house that if the situation of the railways is bad it is because they are not provided with sufficient traffic. We have no trade because of the high tariffs. Railway men are suffering because of the barriers which have been erected against the entry of foreign goods. No one can sell when no one is buying. That is an elementary principle and I am glad to see that the government now intends to lower the tariffs. I should like to point out that during the special session when the tariff agreements then before the house were carried there was one voice which said "carried on division." That voice was mine, and I was backed up by a few of my colleagues. This is not reported in the proceedings of the house but it was reported at the time in *Le Devoir*, of Montreal. At that time I did not agree to the passing of these agreements, and as time has passed the government has been proved to be in the wrong in imposing high tariffs. The government have attempted in vain to cure unemployment but at the same time their action has brought about the dismissal of a large number of railway men. Who is to provide for these men? Will the government pay them an amount equal to that which they received when times were better? Between Moncton and Riviere du Loup nine stations have been closed; four have been

closed in Gaspé and there is talk of closing the stations at Cacouna, St. Arsène, Tobin, St. Anaclet and Routhierville. Caretakers have been appointed at these stations who receive from \$15 to \$20 per month, according to whether or not they live upon the premises. These men may be present in the station but they cannot give any information to prospective passengers or shippers. A farmer wishing to ship goods must go to the next station in order to obtain the information he requires. That is a very bad situation and it will not improve conditions in Canada.

Six stations have been closed between Riviere du Loup and Ste. Rosalie and other ones are supposed to be closed also. Between Moncton and Riviere du Loup the services of twenty-two operators have been dispensed with and those of twenty on the Levis division. Those men are essential for the good management of the railway business. They have experience and they arrange the meeting of trains and so on in order that no accidents may occur. I do not see why their services have been dispensed with while other men who are rather useless are retained in their positions. If there is a man who earns several thousand dollars a year and does no useful work, his services should be dispensed with rather than those of poor men who earn fifteen hundred dollars a year each and who are necessary for the good management of the railway. It is better to dispense with the services of one man than to dispense with the services of four or more and very often, while that man may be set back, the country will not suffer on that account.

Strange things have happened. For instance, at Causapsal in Matane county one operator has been replaced by a man named Miller. At Amqui an operator has been replaced by a man named Jardine. Neither of them speaks French and the people there have to endeavour to get information from those men who cannot answer them properly in their own language. As you know very well, Mr. Speaker, from the old campaigns that have been carried on for the rights of the French language, it is a shame that men who are bilingual have been replaced by men who are not bilingual. I would not object to the appointment of an English-Canadian by birth or naturalization if he has seniority rights, provided that he is bilingual. I do not see a Frenchman who does not speak English being transferred to the maritime provinces or to Ontario. Why are we treated by the railways in a different manner? The *Progrès du Golfe*, a French weekly of Rimouski, published