

7. GEORGE V, A. 1917

The Canadian employees of the company, when they started semi-monthly payments in Michigan, asked them to do the same thing in Canada. They agreed to do so and are doing it at the present time. Now, if it is going to cost the railway companies so much to bring the scheme into operation, why was this company so ready to do something that was not absolutely necessary.

Mr. CHRYSLER, K.C.: How many miles has that company in Canada?

Mr. LAWRENCE: It is not a matter of mileage, but of the number of employees. The Michigan Central has got a greater number of employees to the mile than any other railway in Canada. Mr. Chrysler says semi-monthly payments are not practicable. If that is the case, why is the C.P.R. doing it in the state of Maine? There are a number of states of the American Union that require railways to pay their employees twice a month, for instance the following: Arizona, Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, (South Carolina laws apply to shop employees only), Texas and Virginia (Virginia law applies to shop employees only). In the following states the statutes require the payment of wages by railway companies at least weekly: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont. The Grand Trunk Railway is paying its employees who are employed and live in the state of Vermont weekly. The Canadian Pacific is paying its employees weekly who live in the state of Maine. Brownsville is a large junction point in that state, and the employees there are in all cases paid weekly. If the C.P.R. can do that in the state of Maine, why cannot it do the same here. All the extra work that will be required is a duplication. The pay sheets are now made out once a month; if this provision were adopted pay sheets would have to be made out twice a month, and the operation will only take half as long as in the case of the pay sheet for the full month.

Hon. Mr. COCHRANE: How would it work in the case of employees at Vancouver. Would not the pay sheets have to be made out and then sent to Montreal and back? Would not that involve considerable loss of time?

Mr. LAWRENCE: The pay sheets from there do not have to be sent to Montreal. I understand the Western Division is controlled from Winnipeg and the Eastern Division from Montreal. Cheques are made out in Winnipeg for the Western Division and in Montreal for the Eastern Division. According to my understanding at present the C.P.R. employees east of Fort William get pay cheques on the 15th of the month for the month previous. I made inquiries and, as far as I can find out, they receive it on the 15th, so that the company are really doing it now.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What do you say about the objection Mr. Chrysler made, with regard to the difficulty of getting men to do the work on account of the war?

Mr. LAWRENCE: We will guarantee to furnish the men all returned soldiers. I am one of the executive officers of the Returned Soldiers Association at Ottawa, and I can guarantee that we can furnish them with just as capable men as they can get anywhere, and all returned soldiers. In this connection I would like some of the employers of labour, business men, when they require men to let us know, and then the question of taking care of the returned soldier would be greatly facilitated in this district as well as in other districts of Canada. I want to say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that I would like you to remember the fact that a number of members of Parliament in 1911, favoured this measure and the Bill was put through the House, Mr. Martin of Montreal at that time introduced the Bill; the Bill had been introduced and sent to the Railway Committee where it was defeated, but it was introduced again at the same session—I am speaking of the Bill with reference to semi-monthly payments to railway employees, and it was taken up as a Government measure, and the Premier, in 1911, put it through the House. Some members wanted it referred to the Railway Committee again, but that proposition was opposed, and the Bill was put