

tically charged by suspicion of his friends in the city of St. John with whom he has been living for many years, and who is to-day being ostracised by those people. The minister, because those officials at one time arbitrarily refused to give this man what was his just and fair due, is prepared to stand up and say: It is satisfactory to me and enough to say that he was not guilty. It will not be satisfactory to the friends of Mr. Carvill in St. John, nor to the right thinking people of the city of St. John, nor of the whole province of New Brunswick, nor of the Dominion of Canada, that a man should be placed in this position, not through any fault of his own, but forced in it because of the arbitrary decision of officials in regard to this man. Because he was a poor man occupying an inferior position under them, they were prepared, not only to blacken his character and his standing, but to ruin himself and his family in St. John. Why? Because, forsooth, they did not want to go to the expense of appointing a commissioner to investigate those charges and to give this man a reasonable and fair and just opportunity of placing before the public his side of the case, and to let it be understood that that should be done. I feel that I should place this whole document on Hansard so that every one will realize the position of affairs; but I have placed the matter before the minister and I hope the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Wigmore) whom I see before me will say at least that he is prepared to endorse the request I am making of the minister. The hon. member who lives in the city of St. John probably knows this man. I, however, feel that I have done my duty. I have placed the responsibility where it belongs, and the only avenue through which I could place it is through the Minister of Railways who must take the responsibility of the position taken by his officials. He stands to-day responsible, and if he refuses the fair and just demand that this man should be given a just trial, the minister must take the responsibility. I leave the matter to him, and the public will judge whether he and his officials under him are taking the right course in leaving this man in the position in which he is placed to-day, absolutely helpless under the suspicion that is cast upon him. He is constantly receiving anonymous letters in the city of St. John; he is obliged to ostracise himself practically in the public streets of St. John because of the wilful, unjust and unnecessary pretence of my hon. friend and his officials,

who, as I said a moment ago, are prepared to blacken this man's character for the sake of saving some criticism that might be levelled at officials of the Intercolonial railway at the time this took place.

Mr. CALDWELL: I wish to call the attention of the committee to a condition that exists and has existed for some years in Canada, and that works a great hardship to shippers of freight over both the Canadian National railways and privately-owned railways. To illustrate my point, I wish to quote from the Canadian Car Demurrage Rules authorized by the Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada and put into effect on August 20, 1917. According to these railway rules, shippers of freight are allowed forty-eight hours to load and unload cars, with certain exceptions, some of which are these. The last part of rule 5 of this book reads:

Should bulk freight be so frozen in transit, or before placement, as to render unloading impossible within the prescribed free time, such additional time shall be granted as may be necessary.

Rule 6 provides:

That if cars are bunched in transit—

That is, a firm may be able to handle, say five cars a day and ship them out at that rate, and on account of some neglect or other causes in transit, those cars become bunched and arrive at their destination, say twenty cars a day instead of five. The consignees have only forty-eight hours to unload those cars. There is a provision that in case of cars being bunched they get a rebate on the demurrage, but they must pay demurrage at the point of unloading and put their application into the railway for a rebate. Rule 10 reads:

If payment of demurrage charges properly due on cars held on public delivery tracks be refused, delivery of only the car or cars on which such charges are due shall be withheld by means of sealing or locking, or by placing where such cars shall not be accessible.

I am not quoting these rules to find any fault with them. The rules are absolutely right, because it is necessary to see that cars are loaded or unloaded in the specified time. But I want to point out how this works out in the case where the shipper or a man who receives a consignment of freight by the carload is entitled to a refund. First he has to pay the demurrage before he can unload the cars, and must apply to the railway company for a refund. Before I go further, I want to state that I think this works a greater hardship to the shippers of perishable food stuffs such as potatoes, of