

been filled but it exists nevertheless. In this case I am glad to know that both leaders have recognized the principle of ministerial responsibility. We cannot get away from that, and if the hon. member wants to escape it he will have to retire from the political field, because when he goes back to his constituency he will be accountable for everything that has taken place during his term in parliament.

The idea of sharing responsibility between the cabinet and the Senate with respect to the removal of any of these appointees is inviting discord from the inception. Suppose you have a cabinet of one political complexion and a Senate of another. That idea is all right when the appointment is made by parliament; the appointee can be removed only on a joint address of both houses. In this case however the appointments are not being made by parliament but by the governor in council, and the people will hold the governor in council responsible for what occurs. If the new policy is a success the government will boast of it and will receive the credit; if it is not a success they will be condemned by the people. Why therefore should you have the governor in council make the appointments and then compel that body to go to the Senate for approval in the removal of anyone? I do not think it is workable; moreover, it is contrary to the principles of responsible government. In the light of such experience as I have gained here in the period of a third of a century, I think that the more we depart from the old-established rule of responsible government the deeper the mess we shall fall into. The people must rule and the House of Commons are their representatives. The Senate exists for certain purposes, to revise hasty legislation and to make certain amendments which the government of the day, in view of public opinion, cannot make but which may be necessary in the face of conditions that may be inimical to the interests of the country. But the responsibility rests with this house, and when the hon. member for East Algoma goes back to his constituents he will be held responsible not only for this act but for everything that has been done in this house; he will be responsible for the report of the Duff commission if he approves of its conclusions. I can only say therefore that I am opposed to this clause in principle as it stands. I want the whole responsibility left with the committee of this house called the governor general in council.

Mr. McGIBBON: It seems to me there are only two methods of procedure before the house; one is for the government to take full

responsibility in conducting the railways, having the Minister of Railways in the House of Commons responsible to the house and the people; the second method is to remove the railways as far as possible away from politics and political influence. It does seem to me that we are halting between these two methods. I do not think that anyone who has had the privilege of attending the special committee on railways and shipping can conscientiously say that in the past politics has been divorced from the management of the national railways. I am not going to discuss here the results, for they are only too apparent to-day to the taxpayers of Canada, and in my opinion will be in the lifetime of every member sitting in this house at this moment. In that I may be wrong; I hope I am. Rightly or wrongly, however, with the background and history we have had since 1923, when the national railways were consolidated, the Duff commission has taken the view that politics in the past has been evident in the management of the railways. Read the report and it will so inform you as plainly as the English language can state it. As a remedy—and it is time we were finding a remedy—the commission submitted certain recommendations which are reflected in this bill.

I say frankly, as one representing the people of this country, that of these two policies I prefer the first. Under normal conditions I should have preferred to have the minister and the government take full responsibility, but I do not believe that the people of Canada want that; I do not believe that any government could carry it out at the present time. Consequently we are left with but one alternative, namely, for the government to remove the railways as far as possible from parliamentary and governmental influence; and while I prefer the first method, I am not sure that the government were wise in withdrawing the amendment they did a few minutes ago, because that would certainly put the management a little further away from parliament than it is now.

If there is anyone here who thinks that the national railways do not present the greatest problem the country has to deal with, he is an optimist. I for one believe that the taxpayers of the country will be called upon for years to come to put their hands very deeply into their pockets to pay the deficits of the road. All I want to remind the house of at the moment is this, that only in one year did they come anywhere near meeting the interest obligations to the public, and it would take \$20,000,000 more to-day of an operating surplus than they had in 1928 to meet the situation. Does anyone think that business will