

Mr. MARTIN: Mr. Neill seems to have touched a point that would interest me as a member of this committee; namely the Americans employ 75 per cent of their own nationals.

The CHAIRMAN: 66 $\frac{2}{3}$  per cent.

*By Mr. Neill:*

Q. You said 75 per cent?—A. I corrected that, Mr. Neill.

*By Mr. Martin:*

Q. I do not think you have answered that—I am saying this with great respect—I do not think you have answered the question; if they can do it, why cannot we?—A. Of course, it can be answered, as we say in this brief in the subsidy. The American vessels are paid practically a million and a half dollars a year subsidy. The type of vessel that the C.P.R. have to-day would cost considerable to look after, if the crews were changed.

Q. You are not serious when you suggest we would lose trade if we employed some of our own nationals?—A. What do you mean when you say "some."

*By Mr. MacInnis:*

Q. Put it this way: do you think the United States ships are boycotted by Chinese because they stipulate that 75 per cent or 66 per cent of the crew must be American citizens?—A. They carry quite a few Chinese.

Q. That is not my question. Do you think that they are boycotted to any extent by the Chinese because they have that stipulation?—A. No, I do not think they are; but they are paid a subsidy to offset it.

Q. To offset what?—A. That is our whole point.

Q. What are they paid the subsidy for, to offset a boycott by Chinese?—A. They are paid a subsidy because they cannot operate vessels without loss, and they lose money even with the subsidy. They cannot operate and get by.

Q. We are also paying a subsidy. The point at issue is, if we were to stipulate that a certain percentage of the crew should be Canadian citizens whether there is danger of our vessels and our ships being boycotted by Chinese?—A. Of course, you are opening another point there where the Chinaman has been on the transpacific service, I imagine, from the day the first C.P.R. vessel was put in the trade. That was not so with the American vessels. The American vessels came right out there and started an entirely new program. The vessels were constructed for certain crews, quarters for white seamen, and you were not taking anything away from the Chinaman. All they were doing was giving the Chinaman something additional by putting the extra boats on and employing so many additional sailors. In the case of the C.P.R. ships it would be taken, in the opinion of the Merchants' Exchange Committee, as the right to put on an absolute boycott, and they would certainly go to it.

Mr. HILL: I think this enquiry resolves itself into this. We have not been told what percentage of Canadian citizens are employed, and we have not been told what percentage the mover of the resolution desires to see employed. If they want 40 per cent, 50 per cent, 60 per cent or 75 per cent, let them say so. I do not think they are asking for 100 per cent. I should like to know the percentage that the seamen want. There are a lot of positions on these boats that our Canadian seamen would not take. There may be as high as 50 per cent of the positions that our seamen would not take. Our people would not act in the capacity of servants, for one thing. It may be that the percentage would not be objectionable to the ship owners, if they knew what it was that the seamen want. If we knew that we might be able to clear up the situation.

[Mr. F. H. Clendenning.]