

employed on the railways are concerned. I am not quoting Mr. Beatty, Mr. Hungerford, the late Sir Henry Thornton or anybody else, because my experience and the experience of all men who have had to do with railways must teach me that after this bill becomes operative we will never have the same number of men employed on Canadian railways. When this bill becomes operative, men who have worked ten, fifteen or even twenty years on the railways might as well kiss their railway service goodbye. It is designed to amalgamate train services, not for to-day or to-morrow but for all time. As an hon. member on this side of the house pointed out there must be agreement, and a continuance of agreement, because it is so directed in the measure.

With the larger engines—the larger power, as we call it,—and with all the up-to-date facilities there is no doubt that to-day railways are in a better position than ever before to move heavy tonnage quickly. Under the legislation before us one railroad is going to move that tonnage where previously it had been done by two and sometimes three railroads.

Only last week one train was taken off between here and Toronto, and another between Toronto and Montreal. No doubt the people will receive as good service, but the elimination of the service means that over one hundred men must be taken out of the service of the railway companies. I know that is what the bill is designed to do; we might as well face the facts. Unless it is designed to throw men out of service, the bill can have no purpose whatever. I repeat that it is designed so that the railway companies may be induced to cooperate for the purpose of throwing men out of work in order that salaries may be saved.

As the hon. member for North Winnipeg has intimated, in the discussion of this measure we ought at least to have some information from the government as to the number of men likely to be affected by the bill. How many men are going to be thrown out of employment? What are their ages? Are they fit to enter any other occupation, or have they passed the age where they could adapt themselves to other work? Where do they live? Do they own property, and is their property going to be abandoned along with their jobs? What compensation is to be given to them? Surely when we are discussing a measure designed to save \$75,000,000 a year we ought to give consideration to spending a few of those millions so that the hardships of employees might be eliminated.

[Mr. Heenan.]

That is the reason why, upon the second reading of the bill I asked the minister whether he purposed submitting it to the committee on railways and canals. If the bill went before a committee the representatives of the men affected would have a right to appear before the committee, so that members of the House of Commons—not the Senate—might hear them. The House of Commons is now dealing with the matter, not the Senate. I am not one who is content to take his cue from members of the Senate as to the proper attitude to take towards this or any other bill, and I make that statement with all due respect.

We should have had railway presidents before us, and should have been afforded the opportunity to ask them the questions we are now asking the minister. I feel sure they could have given us the information better than the minister because he has not got it. I do not see how he could have it unless he went into this question very thoroughly with the presidents of the railroads. We could ask them how many men their cooperation proposals would displace, what compensation they intended to give these men and their families, what provision they intended to make for the future of these Canadian citizens. We should have this information, because to my mind this bill affects more vitally the railway men of this country than any measure that has been put through this House of Commons. Here we are, the parliament of Canada, legislating to do what? To undo the very thing that prior parliaments did. These railroads were built under the authority of parliament. Private corporations and others secured charters and authority to build railroads through territories whose requirements in the matter of transportation should have been demonstrated and full information should have been laid before parliament as the prospect of the railroads paying, what competition they would have to meet, and so on and so forth. After this authority was given and the lines constructed men and boys were induced and encouraged to leave their homes and farms and enter railroad service. Had not the parliament of Canada given charters to build these railroads, and did not the papers picture in flaring headlines the great development of this country, its prosperity, the opening up of new territories, clay belts, fine agricultural and mineral areas, forest resources and undeveloped water powers? Men were induced to go into this line of work, they were sent out to isolated towns to do their part in carrying on the commerce of Canada; it was a national