

real and Halifax. During the war the railway men had more work than they could attend to—not only officials but operators—and what did the Superintendent do when he wanted a vacation? Why, the Assistant Superintendent carried on. Well, honourable gentlemen, when business conditions are so bad, surely the Assistant Superintendent could carry on while the Superintendent took a few days' vacation. There is no doubt that the railway men's wages must be reduced, but I suggest to the nabobs in Toronto that they start in and lay off all the officials that are unnecessary—there must be a lot of them who could be spared—until such time as they are needed again. Then let them reduce their own wages, right from the top down, and I feel sure that the men at the bottom will say: "Well, the high-up officials have taken their reduction; we will take ours gracefully."

I could say a good deal more, but there are several gentlemen to follow, and I will give way.

Hon. GEO. W. FOWLER: Honourable gentlemen, there has been no effective remedy suggested for unemployment and the high cost of living. Everybody seems to think that the labourer should be the one to sacrifice himself—in other words, to put it in a common, vulgar way, that he should be the goat. Now, I can quite understand his reluctance to offer himself as a vicarious sacrifice for the rest of us. I suggest that we sweeten the pill for him—that there be a general reduction all round.

Honourable gentlemen in this House enjoy a certain indemnity which was increased about a year ago on account of the high cost of living. Let honourable gentlemen in this House start the ball rolling, set the fashion for the other people; let them say: "The high cost of living is being reduced; butter was selling the other day at 16 cents a pound in Saskatchewan; prices for farm products everywhere have come down, and will come down very much; now we will reduce our indemnity."

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: Let the members of the Government say to the country, "We will take a reduced amount of money for our services." Let the judges take a reduced amount of money—this will be a very serious and very difficult thing to do.

Now, I would propose this seriously. I intended to introduce a resolution, and I am not joking; I am strictly in earnest; because if you set the example to the man down below, to the cheapest class of labouring

man, he will follow it, and follow it willingly; but when he sees men enjoying higher pay than himself, no matter how well they earn it, and still retaining their emoluments, he feels that he should not be the only person to make the sacrifice, and therefore he resents it. I would suggest this—to apply to salaries of \$10,000 and upwards—and I am only speaking, mark you, in regard to that over which the Government and Parliament can exercise a certain amount of control—that is, the Government railways and canals, the members of the Houses of Parliament, and the judges of the land—everybody but the Governor General—it would hardly be fair to cut the salary of the new man just as he is coming here.

An Hon. SENATOR: Why?

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: Because he would have to set up housekeeping, and I would not like to cut his salary.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: It is not a salary.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: It is an indemnity.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: Ours is not a salary, either.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: I know. My proposition would be that all salaries and indemnities of \$10,000 and upwards should be cut 40 per cent. I am sorry for the Minister of Labour; he seems to grin at that.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: The Minister of the Interior—are you not sorry for him?

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: Cut salaries from \$5,000, say 30 per cent; \$4,000, 25 per cent; and so on down till \$1,000 or \$1,500 are cut say 5 per cent, but the balance are not cut at all. I will guarantee that if that were done the labouring men on the railways would not object to having their wages cut in accordance with the present cost of living. On a railway train, about a month or two ago, an official of one of the labour organizations and I got into a discussion on this question of overtime. I was very severe in my condemnation of the system of extra pay and a half for overtime, while he was violently supporting it, when suddenly a brakeman who was sitting in the compartment with us spoke up and said: "Overtime is the curse of the whole thing; trains are delayed; extra time is made unnecessarily, for the sake of getting a price and a half for overtime." That ended the controversy. My good