

keep Touche and Company? Have not other people some rights? Cannot the auditors be changed without casting any reflection upon Touche and Company at all?

I want to deal now with one or two other points. My hon. friend mentioned that he would like to see the special railway committee meet early. Well, that committee meets when there is business for it to deal with. We cannot meet at the present time because we have nothing for that special railway committee to deal with. The committee meets as a rule as soon as the report of the Canadian National Railways is submitted.

Mr. EULER: It did not last year.

Mr. MANION: It may be that it did not meet quite so soon last year, but it will be meeting soon this year. Last year it met on May 25 for its first meeting, and its last meeting was some two or three weeks later, on June 6. We were entirely in the hands of the committee. I can well remember that some members of the committee, and they were not all on this side of the house, suggested—let us get through with this committee; have we not dealt with the matter long enough? Finally after some lengthy discussions the committee as a body—I do not control the committee—adjourned. As I say, its last active meeting was on June 20, and it did not put in its report until June 29, and consequently we could have gone on and met for weeks after the committee adjourned. I had no way of controlling the meetings of the committee. It can meet just as often and for as long as it likes, providing only that we are willing to discuss the different matters that come before it.

The hon. gentleman said that his chief argument against this change was that he wanted Touche company before the committee again this year. I want to emphasize that they will be there again this year because they were the auditors for 1934, looking into the affairs of the Canadian National Railways.

I just want to say this in conclusion, and I say it very sincerely. I have tried to carry on the debate in a reasonable way, perhaps just a little more reasonably than my hon. friend from West Lambton, but we will let that pass. There is no mare's nest about this thing, no plot, no attempt to strangle the Canadian National Railways in any shape or form. Incidentally it might be of interest to this committee to know that within the last six weeks, in the first six weeks of this year from January 1 to February 14, the Canadian National Railways, according to the reports given to me, increased their earnings

[Mr. Manion.]

over the same six weeks last year by \$1,223,905, while the Canadian Pacific had a decrease in the same period of about half a million dollars. I mention that to show that the Canadian National seems to be taking care of itself pretty well, and that it is efficiently and well managed. It seems to be doing its share of the business and I do not think there should be such a hurry on the part of a member or two to endeavour to show that we are trying to injure the Canadian National Railways in some way or other. I do not think any decent Canadian would attempt to injure the Canadian National Railways. After all we own the road, we have put our money into it, and I do not think any member would intentionally try to damage the road. We may do so unintentionally, as I charged my hon. friends opposite last year with doing, but not intentionally, although perhaps I might have done even that in the heat of the moment. As Canadians, I do not think any of us would try to do harm to the Canadian National Railways. We have too much interest in it, too much at stake. If we injure the Canadian National Railways we injure the credit of the whole country.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Did not the minister try to injure it when he recommended the construction of the Mafeking cut-off?

Mr. EULER: Probably the discussion is more or less purposeless, especially the personal interchanges. I was referring to the statement of the minister when he credited me with a certain amount of intelligence and said that nevertheless I had made a mistake. Yet he himself was so absolutely sure. I say to him, and it may not be for any lack of intelligence because he is intelligent, that he is quite wrong. He says that I stated a certain thing. As a matter of fact we are talking about two different things, and I will be generous enough to say that we are probably both correct. He stated to the committee, and he will probably correct me again, with regard to that \$1,700,000,000 owed by the railways to the government, that I had said the railway figured interest on that amount. I never said anything of the sort. I said that the enemies of public ownership, and he can look for them in a great many places—

An hon. MEMBER: Around him.

Mr. EULER: I do not know that they are around him, but I say that the enemies of public ownership, journalistic or otherwise, do figure the interest on every red cent that ever was put into the Canadian National Railways or is charged against the Canadian National Railways on the books of the company.