

this Bill that do not look good to me, and they do not look good to the people. When I criticised the Bill a few days ago I was not only expressing my own opinion, in a large measure I was expressing the opinion of a great many people of the country. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that there is a feeling abroad that if this enterprise is to succeed we must get clear of the Mackenzie and Mann influence, lock, stock and barrel. The gentlemen selected as directors were directors of the Canadian Northern railway, and, according to the statement of the Government, they made a failure of its management. Have the Government looked around to find competent railway men, or even public ownership enthusiasts, who would assume control of this road. It seems to me it would be the simplest thing in the world to get a body of the best railway men in Canada, pay them good salaries, and relieve them as far as possible from political control. Hon. members now say that the directors are relieved from political control. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Railways has a string on every one of the directors; he can pull them back at will, and he does not have to come to Parliament to give any explanation of his action. I made a suggestion when the Bill was in Committee that the directors should be appointed in the same way as the members of the Railway Commission. Some hon. members asked me if I wanted to have them appointed for ten years. I replied that I did not suggest that, because possibly ten years might be too long a period to keep in office some older men in an undertaking of this kind; but I suggested they could be appointed for four or five years in much the same way as are the members of the Railway Commission. The Government would not lose control; they could always add to or withdraw from the directorate. But those directors would feel that as long as they were giving good service their positions would be assured.

I also made the proposal that there should be a profit sharing arrangement. At present we have a commission sitting on a proposal for co-operation between capital and labour. If there is to be any co-operation it must be based on profit sharing of some kind or another. Here is the biggest undertaking that we will ever have directly under our own control where we can adopt a profit sharing system.

We are dealing with a road that is losing some millions of dollars. It would be a simple matter to work out a plan under which, when the road earned a certain amount, all employees of the system, the

directors included, would share in the profits.

An hon. MEMBER: How about the deficits?

Mr. CAHILL: The deficits would not be affected adversely by such a plan; they might even be reduced. You could start with the deficits—with the deficit of this year, if you wanted to, or with the average deficits over a period of years—and begin to share profits even before dividends were earned on the investment. There would be nothing wrong about that. You would be getting the hearty co-operation of every man working on the road; every man interested in the enterprise would have an opportunity of sharing in its profits, and if the commission was appointed for a term of years would feel that he was free from all political control. It would be in his interest and in the interest of all the men on the road, individually and collectively, to make the road pay as far as possible. The deficit, Mr. Speaker, we must get rid of. We cannot go on multiplying these deficits indefinitely. If we do, we shall kill not only public ownership, but the reputation of Canada as well. We must get people into this country. We must get immigration.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CAHILL: (Continuing) Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock, we were discussing the Canadian National Railway system and public ownership generally, but the latter subject is not one that should be discussed on the third reading of this Bill as we own the Canadian National Railways and public ownership of railways is a matter of fact. The only question at present before the House is the best means of obtaining for the people of Canada efficient management of the Canadian National railways. The Opposition was somewhat criticised for seeking for information from the Government in regard to this Bill, although, a number of clauses looked as if they could be amended with advantage to the people of this country and in the interest of public ownership. When the Bill was in Committee and before closure was brought in, the acting Prime Minister asked that clause 3, pertaining to the capital stock of the company, should stand, the question being whether capital stock should be held by the Minister of Finance without power to dispose of it. When I asked the Minister