

realities. It seems to me he is making this board of trustees a reality, so much so that the government will be reduced to a mere shadow. Let us suppose that a quarrel developed between the government and the board of trustees; naturally the government would ask for the dismissal of the board, and the Senate would have to decide whether or not that should be done. If the Senate happened to be of the opposite political complexion from the government does anyone suppose for a moment that the matter would be dealt with on its merits? The Senate naturally would want to see the government out of office. There is a very simple method of getting rid of them, and that is, simply to refuse to dismiss the board of directors. Let me give an example of what might happen. I have before me the report of the bureau of statistics showing the earnings of the two railway companies for two four-month periods. They are the latest periods I could get, November and December 1932, and January and February 1933, being one period, and the corresponding period of the year before, November and December 1931, and January and February 1932. The earnings of both railways declined in those periods but the decline in the Canadian National Railways was 24.89 per cent and on the Canadian Pacific 19.35 per cent, or a difference of 5½ per cent.

Ordinarily speaking, the Minister of Railways should call before him the board of directors and demand an explanation of such a state of affairs, and if a satisfactory explanation were not forthcoming he would naturally request the resignation of the board. He would ask for dismissal for cause, because they would have shown their incompetence. But what would happen? They would immediately canvass the Senate to see what support they could get if they decided to refuse to resign, and if they could get sufficient support they would refuse and the government would be forced to resign.

I cannot see how the government can escape responsibility for the management of the railways. Set up any structure you like and the people of the country will hold the government responsible; and if they go before the people and say, "We cannot help it; we have created a board which is beyond our control, having given them full charge of the railways," the people will reply, "You had no business to set up any such board because you are the people and the only people we hold responsible for the management of the railways, and if you cannot manage them you had better get out and let someone else do

so." Public control and public ownership are inseparable, and if we cannot control the railways we have no business owning them. If the government, elected by the people, cannot manage the railway, then the sooner we find that out and the sooner we get rid of it the better. That is my opinion.

Mr. BROWN: I have had a good deal of hesitation about intervening in the debate with regard to the railways. When this clause was brought to the attention of the committee my first reaction was that I could not offer any very strong objection to it; indeed, I felt it was possibly an instance in which the Senate might discharge the functions it was originally intended to discharge in preventing hasty action on the part of the government and the House of Commons. But the statement made by the Prime Minister, that the refusal of the Senate to endorse the action of the government and the House of Commons would necessitate the resignation of the government, is a doctrine to which I could not possibly subscribe. In view of that statement I certainly agree with the hon. member for North Waterloo and the hon. member for Quebec East. I cannot support the clause in question under these circumstances and certainly I shall have to register my objection to it.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): I intended to oppose this clause in any event. I do not want any misunderstanding; I am opposed to it in every particular. I believe that the responsibility should rest in the hands of the governor in council. I do not insist, as my good friend from North Waterloo has done, that it shall be the responsibility of parliament, but I do maintain that the responsibility should rest in the governor in council.

Let me put this to the leader of the government and the government itself. When they felt that the interests of this institution would be better served without the services of Sir Henry Thornton, they took the responsibility in that matter and I find no fault with them. The responsibility, I say, was theirs. But do they mean to say that if there had been an adverse majority in the Senate, or if there had been a Liberal Senate, they would have succeeded in having Sir Henry Thornton dismissed, particularly if that Senate thought for a moment that they could put this government out of office on the question? The thing is almost ridiculous. With all respect to the Prime Minister, I cannot conceive that even he would suggest such an arbitrary manner of dealing with the government.

[Mr. Young.]