

If unification of our railways is to be put into effect, this paragraph would appear to be reasonably consistent and, in fact, in line with the only business-like way of dealing with the question mentioned.

Objective No. 6 is:

Both parties should agree to such enlargement of the powers and supervision of the Board of Transport Commissioners as may be deemed necessary to protect and serve every public interest.

Here we have the first striking example of the octopus of railway unification in Canada. This proposal would appear to imply that the Canadian people and Parliament have no say in defining the powers and supervision of the Board of Transport Commissioners; that this matter is in the hands of officials of the two railways.

Then we come to objective No. 7:

In view of the very extensive economies to be attained, and to the end that the process may not involve undue hardship on anyone, provision should be made for the due protection—

Note the words, please.

—by both systems, of labour adversely affected by such economies, along the lines lately followed by the railways of Great Britain.

Oh, how magnanimous, how considerate of the 25,000 to 40,000 employees whom it is proposed to let out of their jobs! This is a carefully hidden proposal for the assistance of the Canadian Pacific shareholders. Please note the language, "due protection by both systems of labour adversely affected." No proposal from the pool respecting revenue to take care of labour adversely affected, but each component part, namely, the Canadian Pacific or Canadian National, is to give due protection to labour. Can we not even now visualize the campaign of rivalry contemplated by this proposal to retain, for example, the clerical forces of the Canadian Pacific at Montreal, while scrapping the Canadian National Railway's clerical forces as redundant? Again, can we not visualize the same general effort being made at Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver, Edmonton and Calgary? It would not of course be possible at Moncton and Halifax. Fearfully and wonderfully proposed. It could not have been put in language more safeguarding for the Canadian Pacific if it had been prepared, word for word, by the officials of that company. The same thing applies to shop men. My honourable friend from Winnipeg South-Centre (Hon. Mr. Haig) can, I think, visualize right now the Transcona shops scrapped and all work at Winnipeg being done at the Canadian Pacific Railway shops, which are amply sufficient to

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK.

meet all demands. Thousands and thousands of clerical employees and shop men would be unloaded upon the Canadian people under whatever drastic legislation might be enacted for the purpose.

I come now to paragraph 8:

Agreement to all provisions should be obtained from each separate class of security holders of the Canadian Pacific and of the Canadian National, in so far as such latter security holders are not already protected by Government guarantee.

Of course they are. A very interesting and apparently logical paragraph of the proposals which contemplate giving the Canadian Government and the Canadian people equal status with the Citizens' Shareholders Group for Railway Action, functioning in Toronto and elsewhere, in determining their comparative rights. In short, 61,140 Canadian Pacific shareholders in Great Britain and the United States are to be asked to vote whether the jobs of from 25,000 to 40,000 men on the railroads of Canada are to be scrapped in order that those shareholders may get dividends as they did from 1926 to 1930. That is what that paragraph means; nothing more nor less.

I suggest that the eight paragraphs were carefully prepared with a view to conserving first, last and all the time the rights and interests of the Canadian Pacific and its shareholders, in absolute disregard of all other rights and interests. I know many honourable members will not agree with me in this, but I am confident that if they will do me the kindness to listen, some of them who may be here after I am gone will appreciate what we are going into. I repeat, this means simply nothing more nor less than placing an additional burden of millions of dollars upon the Canadian taxpayers for the express purpose of re-establishing the payment of dividends to Canadian Pacific shareholders. I believe that has been the underlying desire of the Canadian Pacific president and of those who have been supporting his plea for unification.

What a sight we have witnessed this session and last, with four, five, eight or ten lobbyists ever present and on the job to congratulate this or that fellow on his nice speech! No one will congratulate me when I leave the Chamber. Those lobbyists are pleased to give their friends pointers. They will not give me any. The Canadian Pacific interests manufactured "phoney" labour organizations. I can prove my charge if given an opportunity to put somebody on oath. Those "phoney" labour associations were organized to boost their claim that they might continue to bear down upon the Canadian taxpayer on