

way Company for 1934 and 1935, the words of its president, that failure to proceed farther than they did was not the fault of anyone, but was inherent in the very situation. Still honourable members will say to this House, "Just tell the Canadian Pacific to stop flirting with unification and it will come back and we shall have fine co-operation." Until you can fix on the Canadian Pacific responsibility for delay, you have no right to make such a statement—and you have not fixed it, and you cannot.

Thus this House is to be led to say, "If we will only declare that unification is no more, then the Canadian Pacific will abandon its hope"; its alleged resistance will cease—a resistance which all the evidence shows has never existed.

We are told that the railways could have enforced co-operation and did not do so. That is true. And the reasons are just the same as the reasons why they got nowhere on voluntary co-operation. These reasons were agreed to by every witness. Every time you nailed him down to particulars the witness said, whether he was from one road or from the other: "We have a different objective from the other road; our interests are distinct. We want the problem solved one way because it will best help our road when you get beyond the area of co-operation. We do not want to bear the big end of the burden; we do not want to get the light end of the reward. Our interests are diverse. We are competing, fighting each other for business, therefore we have this balancing of burden and advantage, and it takes us years." Is not the answer clear? Until you get rid of the diversity of objectives you will never get rid of the impediment to progress.

Let me repeat. The reason was exposed clearly by witnesses from both sides as inherent in the very situation, and they did not hold out hope that serious progress could be made. "If we could only keep on," they said, "we think we might get so many million." They did not venture to mention over ten million; they never even expressed the belief that they would ever get to ten million. But still we are told that by co-operation we can hope to solve the railway problem of Canada.

Now I come to the more masculine report presented so ably by the honourable senator from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Beaubien). We who agree with that report felt that we had no right to be forgiven if we came to Parliament without a recommendation as to the best means to be employed to relieve the country of its burden. In order to find such a means, surely it is not necessary to show that the whole burden must go, or none. Surely it is not necessary to show that the whole

burden must go, and go quickly; to show, as one honourable senator put it, that there is some magic remedy which can be applied. There is no magic remedy in this world of affairs! There is no magic remedy for anything. For the ills we suffer by reason of our own sins there is no remedy but toil and straight thinking. I am in unison with every honourable senator who says that from the whole burden we have brought upon ourselves we can never escape. Possibly, had this revolution in transportation not come upon us—it has been coming for fifteen or twenty years—there might have been hope. Now there is no hope. All we can do is the best we can; all we can do is remove every ounce of the burden that is within our control. The fact that it cannot all be thrown off is the greater reason for lifting whatever we can, and starting as soon as we can.

I am going to inquire for a time whether the principle advocated by the report embodied in the amendment can reasonably be expected to lead to relief, and if so, how far and in what length of time. Later I am going to inquire whether in the attainment of that relief we are paying a price in another way that subtracts from or cancels the value of the relief.

On the first point one would not think the onus should be difficult to discharge. I pass to the side for the time being objections to so-called monopoly. These I will deal with later.

Leaving these aside, it should not be hard to establish that you will get tremendous savings by unifying two roads in the way of management. Surely no business man needs to be convinced. He may feel, as a citizen, that he does not want monopoly. That remains to be argued. But the question as to whether you can save money does not need to be argued. The honourable senator opposite me (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) has said time and time again that in that way you will save most, and save it most quickly. I do not know why he signs a report which says you will save just as much in another way. I am sure he does not think so.

I pause to correct the honourable senator from Moncton (Hon. Mr. Robinson). He said we did not have evidence of savings from unified management; that what we had was evidence of savings from unification. In some way in his mind this unification is mixed up with property amalgamation. I do not care what you call it—unified management, unification if you like—it is management by a single board. Such is unified management. It is not amalgamation. Amalgamation has different implications altogether. Once you come to amalgamation of the physical properties of