

trainmen, maintenance of way men and others, railwaymen who are giving their lives daily in the service of their roads and who have brought into being their large eminently efficient and well managed organizations? Why should their representatives not be seated on the board of directors, having their voice, along with representatives of capital, in the shaping of railway policy? Why should the community generally, taking it broadly, not have directors chosen, not merely by a government exercising its own will in the matter, but by a government having regard for the different elements that go to make up the nation, choosing as its appointees amongst others men who would be representative of the agricultural interests, and of other great interests such, for example, as the commercial and business interests organized in chambers of commerce, boards of trade and the like?

I venture to say that a joint board fashioned in that way, directing the affairs of the railways of the country and having the determination of policy, would have a very far-reaching effect in reconciling the different interests concerned. I doubt very much whether, under a board so arranged, there would be extravagances in the construction of too elaborate hotels, of palatial ships or what in other directions would be regarded to-day as unnecessary if not wasteful expenditure. I doubt very much whether matters might not be so arranged as to make possible the continuous employment of those who are giving their lives to the railway service. Why should not a great industry like the railways be so organized as to take care, under some system of unemployment insurance with the aid of the state in some way, if you like, of all who enter its employment? If such were the case, we would not have lay-offs such as we have at the present time. What can be more tragic than the condition we are hearing about from day to day in the press and in the house of hundreds, yes of thousands of men who have given their lives to the railway service of the country, being laid off at this time without any remuneration whatever? If the railways were organized in the way I have indicated, I believe in the result matters would be so arranged that the unemployment situation would be cared for along with the rest. It would become part of the obligation upon the industry to see that it was run in such a way that those who have their labour as well as those who have their capital invested in it would be cared for.

While undoubtedly a step of the kind suggested would have to be a gradual one, while it would have to be effected by a little here and a little there, a tending in that direction,

taking a single industry in a single country at a time, an example I submit would be set to other industries and to other countries and in that way a natural evolution would come about in industrial management and particularly in control of industrial policy which would go a long way towards improving social and economic conditions. After all, does not each of these parties receive at the present time a certain recognition for its services? Does not capital receive its remuneration in the form of interest? Does not labour receive its remuneration in the form of wages? Does not the community receive its recognition in the form of services performed at a particular rate? Does not management receive its recognition in the salaries paid to it? If all receive recognition for their services in that way, why should not all also receive recognition in the matter of having a voice in the shaping of policy with respect to conditions generally under which they all have to make their respective contributions.

Mr. MOORE (Chateaugay-Huntingdon): Why did the right hon. gentleman not do that while he was in office?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend will take the trouble to look at some of the things I have put on record, he will find that I advocated a step of this kind long before I came into office. May I also point out to my hon. friend that while we were in office, I helped to carry out part of the program by seeing that labour was given a place on the board of management of the Canadian National Railways. We were moving very distinctly in that direction.

Mr. STEVENS: The same man is there now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We also saw that agriculture was given its representation. These things do not all come about in a day, but come about they will in the course of time. I am not surprised that in any effort to deal with social reconstruction opposition comes from hon. gentlemen opposite.

As I was saying, recognition comes in these different forms. I think it should be given equally in the matter of control of industrial policies. If that course is taken in one industry, and in one country it will, I believe, be taken in other industries and in other countries and we shall soon have a condition which will prevent the dislocation of industry whether arising from strikes or lockouts, or from other causes that can be at least partly controlled by those who are concerned in the industry itself. I should like to develop that