

put out of office unless the government stakes its life on a resolution which must be adopted by the House of Commons and the Senate. Every man working on the railroad, whether he is a section man, a carpenter, a machinist, a bridge builder, an engineer or a conductor, is just as important in the life of that railroad as the trustee will be, yet now we are going to engage a man for five years, during which time he will have to throw thousands of men on the streets without a moment's notice. We disregard their lives and the lives of their dependents, but we cannot dismiss the gentleman responsible for this unless we have an address of the House of Commons and the Senate. Why should there be this discrimination between Canadian citizens?

We heard the hon. member for East Algoma and the Minister of Railways say that we must have big men. Yes, in connection with the operation of the Canadian National we must have big men, but I think they must be big railroad men. And why should these big railroad men have their jobs ensured for five years while they have the power to dismiss the employees without notice? For the life of me I cannot see why we should be required to ensure their positions while other men, who are just as necessary for the successful operation of the railroad, may be dismissed without very much consideration being given. I believe that a really big man would not take a job such as this unless he knew he was big enough to handle it, and if he handled it to the satisfaction of the country that in itself would ensure his job. I think that is the only barometer we should have.

While we are dealing with this question of trustees I want to repeat that one man on the board should be appointed to represent the employees. I know the government takes the position that the two hundred thousand railway men in Canada should not receive greater consideration than the million or more agriculturists, but I want to point out to the minister that these railway men have devoted their lives to this work. One might say that everyone who deals with or uses the railways is interested. I believe it costs ten or fifteen cents to send a suit of clothes from Winnipeg to Regina, and the gentleman in Regina who pays that sum might be said to be interested in our railways to that extent. Surely, however, he should not be compared with the men who entered the railway service in their youth and have remained there for many years. These men have built their homes and brought up their families in that service, and surely they are entitled to representation on this board. The Minister of Railways said

the door was not closed yet; I am very glad he did so, because I cannot conceive any government appointing trustees for the Canadian National without giving representation to the men who have invested their lives in this work.

The hon. member for East Algoma said that if we emasculated the bill much more it would be better to abandon it because it would mean almost nothing. On the other hand, however, I know that many amendments from this side, and even from the other side, have been refused and that the only amendments accepted by the government have been those which in their opinion would strengthen the bill, so I do not think there is very much in the argument of the hon. member for East Algoma. I should like to point out to the hon. gentleman that these trustees will not be ordinary men after they are appointed; turn to section 16 and see what powers they are to have. They can form new companies, grant leases, enter into agreements, grant licences, agree on the division of earnings arising from joint operations, grant joint trackage, running rights, joint ownerships or joint operating agreements, and so on. Yet these gentlemen cannot be dismissed for five years unless the government in power stakes its life on a resolution of the House of Commons and the Senate. I am very glad the Prime Minister was frank enough to give us that information; I mentioned that fact a few evenings ago to some hon. gentlemen opposite, and they laughed at me. It is no laughing matter now, however, since we heard the Prime Minister make that definite statement on the floor of the house. Therefore I am heartily in sympathy with the amendment moved by my right hon. leader, and I hope the House of Commons will accept it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sorry to say that when the Prime Minister made his remarks he lost a prospective supporter of this section. I was inclined to give my support, but my right hon. friend has given an interpretation which surely we must accept, because this section is the work not of the commission but of the government. The Prime Minister says that if a government undertakes to dismiss one of the trustees for an assigned cause, for mismanagement or something else, and is supported by the House of Commons but not by the Senate, it means the resignation of the government. I cannot follow the right hon. gentleman that far, and I shall vote against the section.

Mr. YOUNG: In his remarks the Prime Minister said we must deal with facts and