

rendered liable to the operation of any penalty imposed in any statute.

Mr. VIEN: Why should they not be stated?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be pretty difficult to go through all the laws and ascertain just what he should and what he should not be liable to. He should be liable to a penalty for malfeasance in office amounting to a breach of the Code. We do not want to get liabilities and penalties in that will debar good men from taking posts as directors, particularly, if the system now adopted is continued whereby men are not obliged to devote all their time, but men of high character and ability are asked to give a part of their time and a general supervision for a small sum per annum, say \$2,000.

Mr. VIEN: Is it wise to give the Governor in Council the right to protect by Order in Council any man against any act. If he is liable under the Criminal Code, the Government, by Order in Council, will be able to protect him from any recourse whatever. Suppose he commits a criminal act, the approval of the Governor in Council will be required in order to prosecute him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: At present the Governor in Council may remit any pecuniary penalty to which anybody is subject, and he may further remit any imprisonment.

Mr. BUREAU: He cannot prevent a man from being tried?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. Perhaps it would be better to insert the word "pecuniary" before the word "penalty." The Government should not have the power to shield a director, at least from trial. I am anxious not to have the section such that we cannot get high class men to take the posts. I move that the word "pecuniary" be placed before the word "penalty" in line 17 of section 60.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the fee of \$2,000 to be continued?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has not been finally decided to continue the system of having a large number of directors at say \$2,000 a year.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not know that for \$2,000 a year very good men can be got.

Mr. KEEFER: That is rather a reflection on members of this House who get only \$2,500 for watching them.

Mr. BUREAU: I think it is. If I should judge the value of members of this House

[Mr. Meighen.]

by the pedigree they got this evening from various members of the Government, I think, at \$2,000, we would be overpaid. Fortunately, in our constituencies we are more highly regarded than we have been this afternoon. The remark of the hon. member is absolutely justified. This is one of the reasons we ought to invoke, if we want to maintain our standing before the country, at least in places where we are not known. I do not think \$2,500 is sufficient for a man who devotes his time here for six months in the year and who has to sit up until half past two in the morning to see the closure put on him.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On schedule A—constituent and subsidiary companies comprised in the Canadian Northern system.

Mr. BUREAU: We want some explanation in regard to these various companies.

Mr. CAHILL: What are the liabilities and assets of the various companies mentioned in the schedule.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That really does not seem enough. These Companies have been in the system right along; they are in it now. We cannot add to or subtract from their liabilities.

Mr. CAHILL: This question has been before the House before. When the \$40,000,000 guarantee was given the question was raised whether it was wise to take over a number of these companies as their liabilities might be greater than their assets. It has repeatedly been asked in the House what were the assets and liabilities of the various companies. It will readily be understood that when we take over these companies the Canadian National Railways will be responsible for their liabilities. We know that in the case of the Canadian Northern some \$100,000,000 of unguaranteed securities were taken over and made good by the Dominion of Canada for the benefit of the friends of the Government, Mackenzie and Mann. I think we are entitled to know what securities are outstanding against these subsidiary companies and what their assets are.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is a little out in this particular—that they were taken over four years ago. They are in the system now; we cannot take them over any more.