

dismiss many employees, what about the shrinkage in available jobs for coming generations? There will be fewer jobs by the thousand, and Canada must pick up the consequent burden and carry it to the bitter end.

Is it any wonder that the Canadian Pacific Railway is all for unification, particularly if it can manipulate the control. And that is one of the dangers of such a plan—manipulation of control. Under such a “marriage” the term “for better, for worse,” has a particular significance if there is a real unification and one unit emerges. I am afraid that not even a Senate Divorce Committee would have the power to grant relief. That fact must not be overlooked. Then what? Strength will be given to the advocates of public ownership.

The honourable senator from Vancouver has given an apt illustration of what happened in Great Britain with respect to the Grand Trunk stock. A very large part of the Canadian Pacific Railway stock is held in Great Britain to-day. The President’s last annual report shows the following:

	Per cent
Canada holds	12.75
United Kingdom and other British countries	65.47
United States	15.86
Other countries	5.92
Holders of preference stock	26.519 per cent
Holders of ordinary stock	65.706 per cent

From this we must conclude that a forcible expropriation of the Canadian Pacific Railway system would meet with such strong opposition, or with such a clever campaign as to value, that there could not possibly be any satisfactory result; and yet there is much ground for the idea of eventual public ownership unless both railways find the future has hope in store for them. I strongly feel that it is almost as vital to Canada to bring prosperity to the Canadian Pacific Railway as to the Canadian National Railway; but such prosperity must not be one-sided.

Notwithstanding all that has been said, and the impatience displayed in some quarters over the results so far attained by co-operation, it is clear to me that there is a very great opportunity in co-operation, and I do not complain so much over the small results so far accomplished. Caution is needed; and it is quite possible, and indeed probable, that too great haste would be more harmful than helpful. To reduce the costs of operation there must be a curtailment of employees and some distress to communities adversely affected. Such a process should be accomplished gradually, and, so far as possible, an opportunity should be given for readjustments. Impatience is a wrong attitude to take. Do not get into a hurry, but keep steadily at the task. It must not be forgotten that the

problems of unemployment resulting from contraction by the railways will be really serious problems, and that the burden will fall entirely upon the Dominion, not upon the Canadian Pacific Railway.

I come therefore to one phase of the proposed unification which seems to me to be outstanding in its unfairness. It seems to be taken for granted that the Canadian National Railway should not expect more than 50 per cent of the savings achieved, and that that railway would be lucky to get so much. A comparison of property valuation, as given in the annual reports, shows that the Canadian National has about 50 per cent more than the Canadian Pacific; and in view of the shifting of the other burden of unemployment from the railways to the Government, our own railway, which means the Government, should not be expected to take any less than two-thirds of all savings resulting from either co-operation or unification. The tremendous advantage to the Canadian Pacific Railway of restoring its ordinary stock to a dividend basis should be taken into account. Even ten million dollars a year would give a fair dividend upon all the common stock, after the other interest charges were taken care of. So I would call the attention of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the fact that they have the most to gain from all savings made through co-operation, as well as by unification.

In my opinion, the report of the Duff Commission should not be lightly cast aside. The members of that commission, who had a unique opportunity of examining the railway problems, were unanimous, I believe, in condemning amalgamation, which is practically the same as unification. The honourable senator from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Beaubien) quoted from their report, but neglected to quote their conclusion. He was impressed with a part of the admirable and thorough review contained in that report, but apparently thinks the conclusions are wrong. He may have been given an insight into the problems, but I would rather bank on the judgment of the commission.

Now may I offer a word of comfort about our present railway situation without in any way expressing satisfaction or belittling any attempt at improvement. We all know how much the Parliament of Canada was called upon to vote last year under the head of the Canadian National Railway—somewhere about \$54,000,000. That has been repeatedly dinned into our ears. It is a large enough sum to affect seriously the national budget, but it is a long way short of the statement that the sum was one hundred millions. It is only fair to ask if there is any credit side to the account,