

wisdom that it was possible to elicit. Three proposals were suggested to us: voluntary co-operation, enforced co-operation, unification.

I was surprised to hear my honourable friend's remarks on voluntary co-operation. We met with some hope of learning that voluntary co-operation had been effective. What did we find? I appeal to all my colleagues to endorse my statement that we found that after six years of voluntary co-operation the annual saving amounted to less than \$2,000,000. That was all. Last year we threw into the vortex \$56,000,000 of new money. Surprised at such a result, we asked for the explanation. What did we get? Let my colleagues of the committee consult their own memories. What did the railways say? The representative of the Canadian National said co-operation had been useless in the past and was hopeless for the future. As honourable members know very well, time after time the witnesses of the Canadian National rose and spoke. We were eager to extend to them an opportunity to give us some sort of hope. But no! Under co-operation they had done nothing in the past, and they held out no hope for the future.

My honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) is really a marvellous man; I have always thought so; but when he spoke a moment ago I seemed to hear the voices of a host of people, and among them I thought I detected a voice that we often heard in the committee—a voice that can speak at any time and say anything.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Oh, "can" the comedy!

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: I do not understand what my honourable friend says. I never interrupt him, and I have asked him time and again to be as charitable with me as I am with him. I think I could play his game if I wished, but it is not suitable for this Chamber.

I come back now to that clever and versatile Mr. Fairweather, who has said everything and yet has said nothing. To hear him one would think co-operation was to give us everything; practically as much as unification. Co-operation and unification are on the same road and would, of course, reach the same goal if they made progress at the same rate; but the difference between them is that one advances not at all, whereas the other gives promise of reaching the goal. What is the meaning of co-operation carried to its fullest extent? It means the suppression of duplication. The principle is the same as that of unification. But for six years co-operation has

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN.

produced no results, and as to the future the Canadian National say there is no hope.

Before proceeding to cite a far better authority to my honourable friend, I want to tell him that we on this side of the House were bitterly disappointed that in his report he did not say one single word about enforced co-operation. The witnesses of the Canadian National came before the committee, one after another, and insisted that teeth be put into the Canadian National-Canadian Pacific law of 1933. It was a strange proposal, but it held a modicum of hope for those who are asking very little and are easily satisfied. But in the report presented not a tittle can be found in regard to enforced co-operation. I was not surprised at that, but I think that not only we on this side of the House but also some of our colleagues on the other side were rather disappointed. The proposition of the Canadian National was that in the event of a proposal for retrenchment agreed upon between the two railways not being put into execution, for fear of political or social resentment, forsooth, the Government should then come boldly forward, assume the responsibility and enforce the retrenchment. Yet we have had in the report not one word on enforced co-operation. I presume that when my honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) looked at the law of 1933 he found that he had nothing to add to it, and he began to think that at any time during the previous six years the Government, if they so desired, could have ordered the Canadian National to bring immediately before the arbitral tribunal any scheme of retrenchment proposed by either railway. As he could not very well rewrite the law, it already being complete and sufficient, he returned to the policy of purely voluntary co-operation.

As I have said, voluntary co-operation has done nothing in the past, and the Canadian National hold no hope for it in the future. What do the Government say about it? My honourable friend says that if you bar the road to voluntary co-operation the report which has been submitted to us is worth nothing at all; that voluntary co-operation is the only way. But what does the gentleman who on railway matters advises the Government say? Hon. Mr. Howe, who happened to be appearing before the House of Commons Committee on Railways and Shipping on the 18th of April last, was asked by Mr. Young, "Is that co-operation not like the horse and the rabbit?" To this Mr. Howe replied:

Considering all the disturbance up and down the country, and that they have saved less than \$2,000,000 a year for both railways, I think if