

poration. If we had decided on executive officers, the Manager and Assistant Manager and so forth would obviously be at pleasure, or should be, because it is a matter of efficiency. They carry out the executive work and if it should develop that any trouble arises or inefficiency develops or that they are not doing their job, I think, like any other manager of a corporation, they would be subject to dismissal. So we say that actually the President and Vice-President here are going to be executive officers of the corporation, the General Manager and Assistant Manager and so on, and it was felt therefore that there should be some control over them in the carrying out of their executive work, so that phrase was put in, seven years. If the Government had any intention of putting pressure on them without cause we would simply have inserted the words "at pleasure" without the seven years, but here you have a combination of seven years and "during pleasure". There is thus the escape valve there that they can be removed at pleasure, but I can assure you the only reason for which they would be removed would be in a case of inefficiency.

SENATOR KINLEY: You could not dismiss one of them as a director. Both hold positions as directors. The bill reads, "the President and Vice-President and nine other directors", so he is a director and holds his position as a director during good behaviour.

Senator MACDONALD: Well, if he was dismissed.

Senator WALL: Mr. Minister, I fail to see the distinction between the power of the Government to dismiss the President or the Vice-President for lack of good behaviour, and what would be for inefficiency. How do you define good behaviour? Good behaviour would be inefficiency to perform their duties as they should, would it not?

Hon. Mr. NOWLAN: There are various Crown Corporations which have this provision in their statute, and this was inserted there as a method of dealing with executive officers.

Senator CONNOLLY (*Ottawa West*): Are most Crown Corporations set up this way?

Hon. Mr. NOWLAN: Not most of them but several of them are.

I had a list—I regret I haven't it before me—but I think Mr. Thorson could give you the names of corporations that have that provision.

Senator CONNOLLY (*Ottawa West*): I think what Senator Macdonald says has some merit. When you have a public-owned corporation like this, people will feel that if a person is not satisfactory to a political master, his job might be in jeopardy.

Hon. Mr. NOWLAN: That is right.

Senator CONNOLLY (*Ottawa West*): What the minister has said about the right to dismiss for inefficiency or for some reason of that character, strikes me as being a pretty forceful argument.

Senator MACDONALD: But if he can dismiss for pleasure, it means he can dismiss without cause. I can't conceive of a qualified citizen accepting a position of this type where he would have to give up his other work, come to Ottawa and establish a home, and be employed during pleasure. I think you will agree with me "during pleasure" means that he can be dismissed without cause.

Senator BRUNT: Yes, but no Government has ever dismissed a person without cause.

Senator CONNOLLY (*Ottawa West*): That puts an onus on the Government.

Hon. Mr. NOWLAN: The seven-year qualification there makes it a little heavier.

Senator MACDONALD: He can be dismissed without cause.