

return? Never, in my opinion. I may be wrong, but I do not think I am.

In view of these circumstances I ask: Has anything happened since 1925 to justify anybody who put his signature to the policy then unanimously adopted by this House in withdrawing that signature? The conditions of the railways are worse; the financial conditions of the country are far worse; the emergency is much greater. Yet when one like myself makes bold to take up the policy of the Senate in 1925 and defend it, some people are unjust enough to impute motives that they would regard as insulting if imputed to themselves.

The Canadian Pacific did not agree with the Senate at first. I was not surprised at that, because it was only natural that that great company should want to maintain its identity. I remember that when I went to Europe before the war I found that though in France and other countries all over the continent very little was known about Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway was an old acquaintance. I can understand the determination on the part of the company to fight to the last ditch to keep its identity. But from year to year its directors saw traffic gradually decreasing, and, although they were very courageous and able, a time came when they had to acknowledge that in this country there was not enough business for two railways. In this respect the problem is very simple, after all, and I make bold to say that but for the political element it would be settled in no time.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: The Canadian Pacific found its business was dropping. Not only were the demands for transportation of goods insufficient to keep two railway companies going, but competition from motor cars and trucks was eating into the company's earnings more and more as time went on, and one day the Canadian Pacific's directors had to take off their hats to the Senate and say, "The Senate is right." That was a great compliment to this House, and it was no reflection upon the company.

Now let us look at what we have been warned would happen if unification were adopted. Two cries of danger dominated all others. These cries had a certain political significance, of course. One was, "No monopoly for Canada." I must admit that politically this had some merit. People who have not studied the question are likely to be frightened by the threat of a monopoly. But what is the truth about this threat? A very

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN.

simple way to test whether the threat is well founded or not is to take a look at an ordinary time-table, which may be got in any railway office, containing a map of all the railway lines in the country. Of course, if it is a Canadian Pacific time-table, that company's lines will be more prominently displayed; and similarly, if it is a Canadian National time-table, that company's lines will be given prominence. But all the lines are there. What do we see when we look at such a time-table? We see that fewer than 5,000 miles of lines out of a total of 42,000 miles are parallel. After having heard representatives of both railways at our committee, I know that it would be out of the question to abolish more than half of those 5,000 miles, and the probability is that a much smaller proportion than one-half could be dispensed with. Canadian National officials say that 2,400 miles could be abandoned. That is, only about 5 per cent of the total railway mileage represents duplication that could be abandoned.

If you study the map a little more closely you will find that 95 per cent of our population is to-day, as it has been for years, tributary to one railway. Honourable members will see that the Canadian Pacific possesses monopoly in the Kootenay district of British Columbia, in southern Alberta, in southwestern Saskatchewan, in an area south of the Canadian National Transcontinental line from Nipigon as far as Sudbury, in the territory between Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie, on the so-called short line between Sherbrooke and Saint John, New Brunswick, and in southwestern Nova Scotia; while the Canadian National possesses monopoly between Edmonton and Prince Rupert, between Edmonton and Kamloops, in much of northern Saskatchewan and Manitoba, in the territory between Winnipeg and Quebec, in the Lake St. John district of Quebec, in the northern portions of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and in Prince Edward Island. Generally speaking, the railways compete for traffic in the more populous centres. But I think no one will contest the truth of my statement that 95 per cent of our people are dependent upon one railway. Well, during the two sessions that our committee has been sitting, has any honourable member heard a single complaint about poor service from the people who are served by one railway?

Under unification there would be this same monopoly. In the cities people would have the use of both railways. That is the advantage, which anyone who has been in Great Britain will admit, of leaving a city by one system and returning by the other.