

HON. MR. DANDURAND: I am somewhat fearful of entering into the labour disputes which may develop from our examining this organization or its representatives. Other organizations may ask to be heard, to support or to contradict what is said by this organization. I thought we had closed that feature of our inquiry last year. I have no objection to standing by the decision reached by the Committee a few moments ago, but I am ready to retrace my steps if there is an impression that by hearing this organization we may be losing a lot of time and getting no further along than we are now.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot envisage anything of very great consequence that we shall have to cover by way of evidence. My suggestion would be this: if another substantial labour organization wanted to be heard, I would not say No, but I would fix a time for getting through with the evidence. As I understand it, we are going to meet again on the 21st, on Tuesday. We could definitely decide to finish that day or on Wednesday.

HON. MR. DANDURAND: On labour matters?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: On everything in the way of evidence. We could definitely decide to be through by Wednesday and hear no further evidence after that date. Nobody could complain, because in that way there would be no discrimination between one group and another. We have been fair and generous in the disposition of our time. From that date on we could direct ourselves to our report.

HON. MR. PARENT: What would Senator Meighen say about paying expenses of representatives?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: That is another matter. I do not think that comes up in the case of Mr. Meikle, but it does come up in the case of Mr. Peterson. A good case could be made either way. We have not paid any expenses so far. There are exceptional circumstances in Mr. Peterson's case. He would not be representing any organization with funds, nor any special interests, as labour representatives do, in the main. He has given more time than anybody else I know of to the study of public matters affecting western agriculture. I want to disabuse anyone of the idea that Mr. Peterson is any special friend of mine. I do not think he has ever supported me in his life; I believe he has been quite the other way. But he is a particularly clear-headed and able man. Senator Riley knows him fully as well as I do. I know how he is regarded in the West. It would be hardly fair to ask him to pay his own expenses here, when he has no fund to fall back upon, no organization of any kind, and he would have to come from a long distance. He wants nothing for himself but his out-of-pocket expenses. It seems to me it would not be unreasonable to make an exception in his case; but if anyone has a different opinion, I would respect it.

HON. MR. DANDURAND: It occurs to me that a gentleman like Mr. Peterson who lives at a distance, could perhaps send us a memorandum. He is a writer, a journalist, and surely he will have his views on paper, even if he comes here. But if he would be content with sending a memorandum that would save him the trouble of coming here and save the treasury the cost of his expenses. Any memorandum received from him could be read by the Secretary of the Committee and placed on the record.

HON. MR. CALDER: I know Mr. Peterson very well. He was in the service of the Saskatchewan Government for some years. He is a very capable fellow, and I daresay what he would have to tell us would be of some importance. But after all he is only a single individual representing himself. Now, if we arrange to bring him here and pay his expenses, why should not anybody else anywhere in Canada who has views on this railway situation have exactly