

Railway Act which ought to shortly come before the House.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals): I beg to say that we have included this in the consolidation of the Railway Act. We have also discussed it with the different railway companies, and I do not find that there is very much objection to it. The wording may not be just exactly as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Graham) has it, but that will be a matter for discussion when the Bill is brought down.

Mr. JOHN WEBSTER (Brockville): It is high time that the railway employees of this country received some consideration from those large corporations by which they are employed. As the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has said, the railway men of Brockville are very much disturbed in their minds regarding the—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is quite in order, on the motion to introduce a Bill, to discuss it, but not on the motion for the first reading.

Mr. WEBSTER: The railway employees of Brockville are very much excited over the possibility that they may have to move to an adjoining town. We have in Brockville some one hundred employees who own thousands of dollars worth of property, representing their life savings, and I have no doubt that, if the change in the terminals takes place, that property will decrease very much in value. These employees have spent their lives in the town of Brockville; they have helped to build up the town; they have contributed to the construction of sidewalks, schools, churches, hospitals, and many other conveniences; they have paid their share of the cost of the sewage, light and water systems, and now, if they have to remove to a town which has not these advantages, it is a great injustice indeed. I hope that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) will recommend the adoption of such legislation as will enable the men to receive some compensation for being knocked around in such a way as this. I will have very great pleasure in giving my support to any measure that will afford relief to railway men under such circumstances as these.

Mr. JOHN A. SEXSMITH (East Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) has brought this question up. I have been approached by the railway men in my riding and requested to bring this subject to the

attention of the House on account of some rumours that the Canadian Pacific railway may move the terminal located at Havelock. This would be very unjust to the men. The railway company have practically created that village, the railway men have put the savings of twenty-five years in their little homes and, should they be compelled to move, they will practically lose the savings of half a lifetime. This is a subject that is well worth the consideration of the hon. Minister of Railway and Canals (Mr. Cochrane). Something should be done to prevent railway companies from inflicting such an injustice as this upon their men. I understand that the minister has made arrangements in connection with his Bill to meet such conditions as these and I am very pleased indeed to hear that such is the case.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland): The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) is entitled to the thanks of the railway employees for his action in bringing this matter to the attention of Parliament. While this Parliament would perhaps not go so far as to recompense others who may have vested interests, still it should be a matter which should weigh very materially with the Board of Railway Commissioners. When a railway divisional point is established the homes of the railway employees are created a small town arises, and people are induced to come in from other sections, make investments, purchase land, and establish business. All these suffer a material loss by reason of any change of a divisional point. When in the interests of the railway or in the public interest changes may become necessary the rights of those who have vested interests should be recognized, and that could be provided for by the Railway Commission taking that matter into consideration before giving their consent to such a change.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IMPERIAL DEFENCE COMMITTEE.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) referred yesterday to some remarks I made on the 7th of April, and called in question the statements contained in those remarks. If my right hon. friend will examine carefully what I said, he will observe that he has fallen into some confusion or error as to what was really intended, or else he is under a misapprehension as to the actual facts. The right hon. gentleman yesterday called attention to the fact that he had, on the 17th of July, 1911, laid on the table of the House the report