

berth which I have bought, I do so without worrying, because I trust the man at the throttle, and the conductor—I trust the whole crew of that train. All of you honourable gentlemen do the same thing. These men deserve our consideration. I do not speak on behalf of John, Dick or Tom, but on behalf of men of all rank and file in the Canadian National Railways; I say, they are entitled to fair treatment and they must get it by all means. We never cease to pray, using the old form of petition; we will never cease to pray that those men who are humble, who make no noise, who work assiduously, should be recognized and treated as fellow Canadians by all of us in Canada, especially by the Senate.

**Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck:** Honourable senators, just a few words, if I may, please.

I wish to join the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) in a protest against the way in which this bill was introduced, and the effort that is being made to push it through the house without fair and reasonable debate, or even time to prepare a debate.

The sponsor of the bill (Hon. Mr. Haig) tells us that the officials of the railroad have already been invited to come tomorrow morning and appear before the committee to which this bill will be referred. That is to say, the Government representatives in the Senate have had the presumption to assume that this house will pass this bill after a very short debate, that it will be passed tonight, in order that these men may be properly welcomed tomorrow morning.

I have listened to the very complimentary remarks made about various officials and members of the staff of the railway, and in them I most emphatically concur. I would not for the world present an affront to the officials of this railway when they come here tomorrow morning. Were it not for that fact, I would divide the house right now on a motion to adjourn this debate. But I cannot do that in the face of what the Government representatives have already done in inviting these officials to come on the assumption that this house will dance to their particular tune. I protest, but under the circumstances what can we do? I hope that this kind of jolly of this house will not continue.

When I asked the honourable sponsor of the bill a question with regard to the discharge or the conclusion of the long engagement of George A. Touche and Co. as auditors of the railway, and the appointment of new auditors to fill their place, he referred me to pages 3176 to 3184 of the Debates of the Commons. That is to say, in order to find out what the sponsor of the bill had to tell us, I

must read some eight pages of the *Hansard* of the other house. I have done the best I could with those eight pages, two columns to the page, and I have picked out one point to which I would like to draw particular attention, since this has been made a portion of the honourable senator's speech.

A member of the other house asked why the change in auditors had been made, and the answer, I think, is very illuminating. I would like other senators in this house to know just how old servants of the Crown are being treated by the present Government. The Honourable Mr. Hees made this reply:

The firm of George A. Touche and Company have done the auditing for the past 23 years. This Government is against monopoly; we are fundamentally opposed to it, and believe that in the interests of the free enterprise system various business firms should have opportunities from time to time to do work of this kind. It is for that reason that the auditors are being changed.

Now honourable senators, consider what that means. The Government is opposed to the monopoly of those who have served it well. I would like to know how far this monopoly goes. Does it extend to all those who have served the country well for 23 years or some similar term? How long does a person have to serve Canada well to make a monopoly of his services? Does this apply to civil servants as well as to those engaged by contract or by statute? Where does it stop? What about all those able persons who have managed our Crown companies for the past 15 or 20 years? Are their services also a monopoly to be dispensed with on such a ground as that? Does not long and faithful service deserve some consideration from those now in office, or is the very length and quality of their service a reason for their discharge?

I read further in the statement made in the House of Commons and I learn that the gentleman who is to take the place of these ancient and faithful servants was a candidate for the Conservative party in the last general election.

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** In 1949.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** As I say, my reading was necessarily hurried.

Of course, that fact has nothing to do with the discharge! Certainly not! Politics would never enter into the actions of the present Government, and particularly those of this gentleman, Mr. Hees, who spoke for the Government in this regard. I protest against this clause in the bill to change the auditors for no real reason whatsoever, beyond a phony, miserable statement of the Government being in favour of free enterprise.

I would like to know how long Mr. Hees will stay in his office before he becomes a monopoly, and whether it would not be a