

sort of management with which the people of Canada will be satisfied. Those railways are not Government roads, they are the people's roads, and the people will have, if not immediately, at any rate in the very near future, a greater control of the railways than they have at present. If the people cannot vote directly for directors, my opinion is that this Parliament should elect the directors. You could have a board representing all sections of Canada—say, two from the Maritime Provinces, and two from each of the other provinces, with a general manager, bringing the number up to fifteen. These men would be elected each year by joint ballot of the Senate and House of Commons. In such a board representatives of the whole of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and non-political—because in the selection of men of that kind in that way politics would not enter at all—you would get the best men that could possibly be got. They would carry out the people's wishes in regard to the management of the people's railroads. In my opinion that scheme is advisable and should be adopted. So far as arbitration is concerned, I say with emphasis, and without any doubt at all as to the wisdom of the procedure, that any question of valuation or compensation to Mackenzie and Mann should be decided by the senior judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not purpose to traverse the speech made by the hon. gentleman from Welland. Nothing new would be brought out in doing so. He has now announced his adherence to what he calls a scheme of solution. In the various discussions that have taken place in the House, he has announced his adherence to almost every imaginable scheme. He started at one end and has gone down the list, and supported each in turn. Now he is simply reverting, turning to the first again, and taking an adverse stand on each of the various schemes he has heretofore supported. However, there is no use following that matter. I only rose to refer to something new in his address. He drew a very interesting analogy between the career of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) and Mackenzie & Mann, Limited, and argued that because the one commenced his career in politics contemporaneously with the career of the other in railroading, there was some link or chain of interest binding them from the beginning. I interrupted him to ask when he began his career, and he said twenty-six years ago, and that continuously

[Mr. German.]

since that he had been a member either of the legislature of Ontario or the House of Commons of Canada, without interruption.

Mr. GERMAN: I withdraw that. I was out one year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He withdraws the statement now. We will see what he will do later on. Let me remind him that if the coincidence of contemporaneous periods of careers is an argument showing connection, then he is much nearer Mackenzie and Mann than the Minister of Public Works. It is sixteen or seventeen years since the Minister of Public Works entered public life. It is twenty-six years since the hon. gentleman from Welland commenced his public career, and Mackenzie and Mann entered public life just at that time. The analogy is more favourable to him, as an associate of Mackenzie and Mann. But he has not been in public life continuously since 1891, if he gave correct information to the compiler of the Parliamentary Guide. He entered the House of Commons in 1891 as member for the county of Welland at the general election, but was unseated. He was elected then to the Ontario Legislature at the general election of 1894, three years afterwards. Is that right or wrong? Will the hon. gentleman speak up, so that it will be recorded on Hansard?

Mr. GERMAN: I was in the House of Commons for two years, 1891 and 1892, and in the winter of 1893-1894 I was elected to the Ontario Legislature—

Mr. MEIGHEN: In 1893 or 1894? I do not know about these matters myself; I am asking for information.

Mr. MARCIL: I would ask the Solicitor General, has the session not lasted long enough, without going into matters of this kind?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Parliamentary Guide shows he was out three years. This is either right or wrong. The hon. gentleman told us he was sitting continuously in one House or the other.

Mr. GERMAN: I said with the exception of one year. I sat in this House in the long session of 1891. I was in this House in 1892, and in that year the Supreme Court decided against me in the appeal from the decision of the election trial, when I was unseated. My unseating and disqualification were confirmed, and in the following year I contested the seat against Mr. McCleary for the local legislature, and defeated him, he being the sitting member