

000 a year for each road, commencing within a reasonable period after the change had been put into operation. Of course, that would be a worth-while saving, and it would go a long way in helping to pay for unemployment relief.

Two honourable gentlemen who preceded me stressed the value of the Duff report. The members of the Duff Commission were very able men, and their report was a good one. It was tabled six years ago. It recommended co-operation between the railways, and the establishment of a tribunal or appeal board to render decisions in cases where the railways could not come to an agreement themselves. The commissioners did not recommend unification of management. Why? They said frankly that in their opinion the country was not ready for it. What I want to ask now is this: Who can say what conclusion the Duff Commission might reach with regard to unification if it were sitting now? After six years of trial and error—mostly error and scarcely any trial—only very limited co-operative measures have been put into effect, and the savings from them have been almost negligible. In the committee we were frankly told by heads of both roads that they could not co-operate, because they were afraid of each other. That in essence is what they said. We could spend hours going through the evidence on that subject without getting any more out of it than an admission that the railroads are not co-operating, because they fear each other and cannot agree upon proposals.

As I have already remarked, there does not seem any hope of reducing our railway debt for a long period of years to come, but it strikes me that the governments which have been in office from time to time have not gone as far as they might have gone in endeavouring to bring about reduction in the interest on this huge debt. Some of the railway bonds bear interest at 6 per cent, I think; some at 5, some at 4½ and some at 4. It does seem to me that a saving could be made if the railway debts were consolidated, the bonds called in, and new ones issued at lower rates. The immediate effect would be important, but the chief benefit would accrue in the future.

Ever since I came to this House, and indeed from before that time, I have been interested in railway matters. My life has been spent in business of various kinds. I have always believed in economy in my businesses, in saving one dollar where a dollar could be saved, and in giving good service at all times. To my mind, these are the only means by which men can succeed in business, build up a reputation for themselves, make some money and be of real benefit to the country.

Perhaps the first speech of any importance that I ever made—and I do not know whether anybody except myself considered it of importance—was one that I delivered in this House when it was proposed to spend about \$100,000,000 on railway matters in the city of Montreal. Speaking on May 20, 1924, I made some recommendations which in my opinion were appropriate and, if carried out, would lead to considerable savings in the country's expenditure. On March 16, 1932, I again spoke on railway matters. I refer now to what I said then, because I think my remarks are still pertinent. On that date I said:

I am glad to see that, although the Government of that day—

That is, of 1924.

—in its wisdom did not think the economies I proposed should be put into effect, most of my recommendations have been adopted by the present Administration.

That was the Administration of 1932. Of course, I do not for one moment believe that the Bennett Government were influenced by my speech of 1924, but the fact is that nearly every recommendation I made then was put into effect, and almost exactly in accordance with my proposal.

My speech of 1924 was made on the general subject of our economic situation. At that time I suggested that there should be a straight reduction in the indemnities paid to members of both Houses, a similar reduction in salaries paid to Cabinet Ministers, an amalgamation of some portfolios and a reduction in the number of Cabinet Ministers, a reduction of 10 per cent in the salaries of civil servants, a reduction of from 10 to 20 per cent in the salaries of Canadian National Railway employees receiving \$1,500 a year or more, and a reduction in the salaries of all judges in Canada. I also remarked that if the Canadian National Railways system made a cut in its pay-roll the Canadian Pacific Railway would undoubtedly follow the lead.

On March 16, 1932, I pointed out that in 1924 the Canadian National Railways had 99,520 employees, whose salaries amounted to \$140,515,000, and that by 1930 the company's annual pay-roll had increased by more than \$8,000,000, to \$148,600,000. I showed that a 10 per cent cut in all salaries of \$1,500 a year or more would mean an annual saving of about \$8,000,000, and that if salaries of higher officials were reduced, as they should be, a saving of a further one or two million dollars would accrue.

I also reminded honourable members at that time that an important official of one of the railways had said in evidence before a parliamentary committee that if the rail-