

They charge it on every amount they possibly can. I have seen them in some newspapers swell the deficit to over \$100,000,000. That is what I said. I did not say that the interest on the whole sum is credited to the government on the books of the company.

I am in entire agreement with the minister in his last remarks. Although I do not agree with it usually I do not believe this government is deliberately setting out to wreck the Canadian National Railways. I would not like to make that charge against anybody, no matter how bitter an opponent he might be. The only purpose I had to serve was this, to conserve the Canadian National Railways and to preserve the morale of the Canadian people so that they are not misled. Let them get a true picture of the liabilities of the Canadian National Railways, nothing more and nothing less.

Mr. HEAPS: I would like to say a word on this question. The debate this afternoon has resolved itself more or less into a discussion of the capital structure of the Canadian National Railways. During the whole course of this discussion I have waited for some reason to be given for this change in auditors, but so far I have not heard one word given as to why such a change is necessary in the auditors for the Canadian National Railways, except this, and I do not think this could be given as a valid reason or even as an excuse, and that is that the banks change their auditors every two years. I think, Mr. Chairman, that governments in the past have been too apt to follow the lead of the banks and I think if they would follow the lead of some other interest it might be more beneficial to the people of Canada.

I do not know the firm of Touche and Company at all, and I know very little of the other firm that it is proposed to appoint in their place. But if the services of Touche and Company have been satisfactory I can see no good reason why they should be changed, except for the reason the minister gave in his last sentence or two when he said that bringing in a new and a powerful organization might lead to the government receiving certain suggestions in regard to the railway; in other words, bringing in a new doctor to look over the patient.

Mr. MANION: Or new members of parliament, as is often done.

Mr. HEAPS: Or new undertakers. May I give this illustration to the minister? Probably in the next few months the government

will appeal to the people and no doubt they will tell the people what a splendid record they have behind them in the past four years.

Mr. MANION: Hear, hear.

Mr. HEAPS: The minister agrees with that statement. On the strength of that record for the past four years the government will appeal to the people for a new mandate. They do not expect a change, do they?

Mr. MANION: But they may get it.

Mr. HANBURY: They certainly will.

Mr. MANION: One never knows in politics; the government in Ontario did, you know.

Mr. SPOTTON: Now that the election is over, who is the new Minister of Railways?

Mr. HEAPS: My hon. friends feel that because of the good service they have rendered they ought to be retained in office. Should not the same principle apply to those in the government service? If a firm of auditors have given good service, I do not think there is any valid reason why they should be changed.

An hon. MEMBER: But you object to monopolies.

Mr. HEAPS: This is not a monopoly. When an employee of the government has given good service—and in this instance it is generally recognized by the government, by the opposition and by all parties that these people have—I do not see any good reason for the change. I think the principle is bad, unless it has come to be recognized as the practice to change auditors every few years. But that has not been the practice. I asked the Minister of Railways whether the auditors in the Canadian Pacific Railway had been changed and his answer was in the negative. Well, if that principle is good enough for the Canadian Pacific Railway surely it is good enough for the Canadian National. I was anxious to hear something said as to why there had been a change in the personnel of the auditors but we have been given no reason at all, and unless there is something more valid than the reason given so far by the Minister of Railways for changing auditors, unless it can be shown that their services have not been satisfactory or that better results can be obtained by dispensing with them, then I submit that no change should be made.