

Mr. HEAPS: Why was not a labour man appointed?

Mr. MANION: For the same reason that an agriculturist was not appointed—there was no attempt to have class representation on the commission. If that was to be considered I think it must be admitted that agriculture, which supplies a large proportion of the freight of the railways, should have been represented before labour.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: They should have been; why were they not?

Mr. MANION: Simply because it is not necessary that every class in Canada should be represented on every commission appointed. The commission was very representative, and I am sure it will give a fair deal not only to labour and to agriculture but to all other classes in Canada.

Mr. HEAPS: I do not agree with the hon. minister when he says that this is not a class commission. I should say that men like Sir Joseph Flavelle, Mr. Loree and Lord Ashfield certainly represent a particular class in the community.

Mr. MANION: What about the other members?

Mr. HEAPS: I am not familiar with the other members. I submit that a representative of labour should have been appointed to this commission. If the government wanted to bring someone from England, there were other men besides Lord Ashfield who possessed a very thorough understanding of transportation. I have in mind a former Minister of Transport, Mr. Herbert Morrison, who was a member of the cabinet of the Labour government. This gentleman knows as much about transportation as any man in England. If it was thought necessary to bring Lord Ashfield from England, I think another man like Mr. Herbert Morrison should have been brought also to represent the other viewpoint in that country. I contend that the viewpoint of labour should have been represented on this commission. I do not think it was necessary to go outside of this country to find men who understand the railway situation. We have quite capable men in Canada, and if a representative of labour and agriculture had been on the commission it would have been able to give a better interpretation of the Canadian viewpoint.

Item agreed to.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and concurred in.

[Mr. Manion.]

## WAYS AND MEANS

### SUPPLY BILL

Hon. E. N. RHODES (Minister of Finance) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Maloney in the chair.

Mr. RHODES moved:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1932, the sum of \$1,059,474.33 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Rhodes thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 39, for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1932.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

## Monday, April 4, 1932

The house met at three o'clock.

### ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following letter:

Ottawa, April 4, 1932.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that Right Hon. F. A. Anglin, as deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber to-day at 4 p.m., for the purpose of giving the royal assent to certain bills.

James F. Crowdy,  
Assistant Secretary.

### CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Hon. R. J. MANION (Minister of Railways and Canals): I desire to lay on the table of the house the annual report of the Canadian National Railways for the year ending December 31, 1931, and the annual report of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine and the Canadian West Indies Service for the same period, in English and French.

### QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)