

points, or of any of them, shall, before making such change, obtain an order from the Board of Railway Commissioners approving the same.

3. It shall be made a term of every such order that the railway company obtaining the same shall pay all losses sustained by its employees who may be obliged to change their place of residence from one municipality to another by reason of the change of any such terminal or divisional points.

4. In case the company and its employees do not agree upon the amount of such loss, the board will determine the amount thereof.

This question has been under discussion for some time, and has been brought about in this way: Railway companies construct their lines and form their divisional and terminal points for their own convenience, as they have a perfect right to do. Possibly, in a few years they may seek to change these terminals or divisional points, place them at some other point on the line, or on a new projection of the same line. In the meantime the employees of the railway company have purchased their homes, have beautified their little plots of ground and have become an important element of the community. In some instances the whole town is known as a railway town and but for the presence and industry of these people there would practically be no town at all. In all instances they have taken their share in the payment of taxes and in some cases they have contributed largely for waterworks, electric light, granolithic walks and the building of schools. This has gone on for years, and after they have paid a large amount of money in taxes for these purposes, they awake some morning to find that their employers are moving their works, or their terminal facilities, to some other municipality and if they are to retain their positions they must also move. No provision has ever been made for the loss that these employees sustain in thus being compelled to move. I submit that it is not unfair to railway companies that, in estimating the cost of the removal of a divisional or terminal point, with the necessary equipment, to some other place along the line, they should take into consideration the loss that would be entailed to their employees and that they should be asked to pay that loss. This has occurred in some cases not very far from where we are now. Take Carleton Place, for instance: quite a large number of men, I am told have been compelled to move from Carleton Place to Smith's Falls. It is well known that a large number of the employees of the Grand Trunk railway were compelled to move from York to a point west of Toronto. It is possible that quite a number of men, if what is said to be in the mind of the Grand Trunk railway be carried out, will be compelled to remove from Brockville to Prescott. Many of these

Mr. GRAHAM.

men, I know personally, have put all their earnings in their little homes. These will have to be sacrificed to a great extent to say nothing of the inconvenience to which they will be put in being compelled to remove with their families to new homes and practically to begin life over again. It is possible that the people of Havelock, a village that the Canadian Pacific railway created, will be dealt with in the same way as the Canadian Pacific railway is branching off there to run along the front parallel with the Grand Trunk railway and Canadian Northern railway in order to better its grades and to be able to handle its traffic more economically. In these considerations I think it is time that we placed on the statute-book legislation which will protect employees, when they are thus compelled to move, from any pecuniary loss at least. I have placed in this Bill a clause which says that the terminals cannot be moved except by the consent of the Railway Commissioners. That may seem drastic at first sight but in the present Act the Board of Railway Commissioners are given power to say where a station shall be located and, if the public have any grievance as to the location of a station, they are authorized to appeal to the Board of Railway Commissioners and the board's decision is given in regard to the matter. If it be proper that stations and their location be placed in the hands of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and if it be proper that the location of the line itself, after the general location has been approved by the minister, should be placed in the hands of the Board of Railway Commissioners, then I submit that it is not unreasonable that the placing and changing of terminals should also come under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners. One clause provides for that aspect of the case. The next is that the Board of Railway Commissioners shall, in the terms of the order approving of the removal say that the loss to the employees shall be borne by the company. If the amount of the loss cannot be arrived at by agreement between the company and the employees, then the next clause provides that the Board of Railway Commissioners may settle the dispute and say what the loss is. I think there is nothing unfair in this proposition and if the companies think it over seriously and calmly, I believe that they will come to the conclusion that there is nothing unfair in it. Just one word more: I understand that the consolidation of the Railway Act is now nearly completed and I also understand that, without the consent of the Government, I could not press this Bill further than possibly the first reading, but I appeal to the Government either to allow this Bill to be proceeded with or to include it in their