

The CHAIRMAN: Page 9, line 43, re-number subclause 4 as subclause 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

On section 17, subsection 3—particular jurisdiction of tribunals:

The CHAIRMAN: Page 10, line 36, strike out "(e) abandonment of lines, services and facilities." Page 10, line 37, re-letter (f) as (e). Page 10, line 39, re-letter (g) as (f).

The amendments were agreed to.

On section 18—Chairman and members of Tribunal:

The CHAIRMAN: Page 11, line 12, after the word "Canada" insert the following words, "or in the event of such President acting as Chief Commissioner, a judge of the Supreme Court of Canada."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Page 11, line 36, for the word "in" substitute the word "is."

The amendment was agreed to.

On section 23—certain orders of Tribunal require formal written consent of presiding officer:

The CHAIRMAN: Page 13, lines 23 and 24, after the word "requires" strike out the words, "but for the provisions of this Act." Page 13, line 26, after the word "officer" insert the words, "of a Tribunal composed of not more than three members." Page 13, line 29, after the word "assent" add the words, "and on such occurrence and assent having been given, no such leave, sanction, assent or approval of the said Board will be required."

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Page 14, line 20, add the following part:

Part IV
General

27. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to authorize the amalgamation of any railway company which is comprised in National Railways with any railway company which is comprised in Pacific Railways nor to authorize the unified management and control of the railway system which forms part of National Railways with the railway system which forms part of Pacific Railways.

28. This Act shall come into force on the first day of July, 1933.

The amendment was agreed to.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Has the right honourable gentleman (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen) further considered the apparent typographical error in paragraph b of section 3?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. A more careful reading of the paragraph indicates that "Part II" is right. There is some obscurity of expression. The intention is to refer to a "plan or arrangement settled upon or made." Notwithstanding that the words "which is authorized by Part II of this Act" appear immediately after "arbitral Tribunal," they apply to the final arrangement.

The amendments were reported.

On the motion for concurrence in the amendments:

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Honourable senators, I was not present when the Committee on Railways, Telegraphs and Harbours presented its report, and therefore I crave the indulgence of the House while I express my views on the Bill as now amended.

During the debate on the motion for the second reading I stated that the report of the Duff Commission pointed in the right direction, and that the remedy it had suggested, as embodied in the Bill, was worth trying, although I felt there might be some difficulty in reconciling co-operation with continuance of the principle of competition. I expressed myself as being absolutely opposed to amalgamation of the two railways, either under private or under public ownership. I suggested that the Committee should study the report of the Senate Railway Committee of 1925, which recommended joint management of the two railway systems. That report was studied, but the general opinion appeared to be that joint management was tantamount to amalgamation. I know my honourable friend from Parkdale (Hon. Mr. Murdock) thought it was a veiled move towards amalgamation. This being the impression within and without Parliament, I voted for the scheme embodied in the Bill when the question was before our Committee.

I also said I was doubtful whether the scheme would provide the complete remedy which we are seeking, but it seemed to me to be worth trying. I believe that if the managements of the two railway systems co-operate, one with the other, and are given a free hand by the controlling powers, the experiment will prove a success. Every effort must be made to ensure its success, for the railway situation is very serious. This is recognized by the railway executives and by the public generally.

By section 16 the two railway companies are directed:

to attempt forthwith to agree and continuously to endeavour to agree, and they respectively are, for and on behalf as aforesaid, authorized to agree, upon such co-operative measures, plans and arrangements as are fair and reasonable and best adapted (with due regard to equitable distribution of burden and advantage as between them) to effect such pur-