

look at all these things." We are getting, every country is getting, these services from its ordinary roads. But we have to take this huge sum out of our taxpayers' pockets year by year, taking out more than all the individual income taxes of the whole Dominion. Still we have honourable members of this House telling us that we really have no very great trouble, that we are just marching with the rest of the world through the difficulties of railways! Why, honourable members, figure out the amount in cash that this Dominion has advanced to the Canadian National; never mind the building of the Transcontinental nor the Intercolonial; never mind these pioneer political roads at all; just think of cash advanced and count the interest we pay to-day out of the taxpayers' pockets on the cash we borrowed, and you have to add \$50,000,000 more every year as the cost to this country of the Canadian National Railways!

When I face that situation, five and a half years after we passed the Canadian National-Canadian Pacific Act, I ask myself, "Are we able to conclude we have solved the problem?" Can we honestly look the taxpayer in the face and say, "These troubles are behind us, the legislation is there, and all we need now is to give a little advice to Mr. Canadian Pacific President and Mr. Canadian National President"? Is there a man who sat in the committee through two sessions and who in the bottom of his heart has any belief whatever in the problem being solved if we do nothing more? He may find difficulties in the way of any new solution, but to say we have the job done seems to me simply to defy the plainest truth that ever appealed to the human mind.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Every country is trying to find a solution.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I am talking about Canada. I got rid of other countries some time ago. Our problem differs from the problem of every other country on earth, and the reason it does dates from the false optimism of this Dominion long ago, led by many public men, including my honourable friend.

I intend now to inquire what hope there is of a solution if we depend upon the report of this committee, as sponsored by the leader of this House. If one seeks to put that report in one sentence, what is it? We were a committee commissioned unanimously by the Senate to find a solution for the "extremely serious" railway problem of Canada. "Extremely serious"; so described by this House, and so described with a fidelity to fact which no mind could possibly call in question. Such was our committee's assignment. What is its report? What solution does it offer? I say to everyone here, defying contradiction, there is

no solution offered. The country groaning under \$54,000,000 a year in direct outlay; \$50,000,000 more in respect of interest paid on advances to the road; the country, I say, groaning under this weight, and hundreds of thousands of people standing on our doorsteps out of work because of the consequent stricture of enterprise in Canada; and this committee tells us, "We have nothing to suggest but stay just as you are." In effect, the committee says to the taxpayers of Canada, "Stand and deliver; smile and swallow; grin and bear it." Such is the report which this House is asked to commend.

We are told that we have obtained something out of voluntary co-operation. Yes, last year we got \$1,135,000; precisely that and no more. And that was the fifth year of co-operation. If everything is granted and completed that has been agreed to up to this hour, we shall get \$1,771,000 at the end of six years. At this rate of progress, to reach even the modest figure of savings set by Canadian National officials will take us sixty years.

But that is not the worst. The situation disclosed by the evidence is that we shall never move more than a hair's breadth further; hardly far enough even to calculate. Did witnesses hold out any hope? They did not last session. They tried hard this session, but they did not succeed. I heard no words of hope. Some reason had to be found then by my honourable friend for resurrecting a flicker of hope for the future. What reason did he find? "There is that Canadian Pacific and its propaganda for unification. It did not want co-operation to succeed, so it balked co-operation. If we will just put our foot down on unification, then all will be fine, the Canadian Pacific will go ahead and co-operate, and we shall make our savings." Faith sublime! Did we not put our foot down on unification six years ago? We did. That was the ultimatum of Parliament; that was the declaration of leaders of both Houses. We went into the field of co-operation. Did we get anywhere? Did the idea of unified management die?

Is it a fact that the Canadian Pacific balked co-operation? The report as drafted first by the leader of the House said it was; but when it was called to his attention that there was not a sentence, not a breath of evidence to support such a contention, the report was changed. There was no suggestion from Canadian National witnesses that there was any failure on the part of the Canadian Pacific. No more was there a suggestion from the Canadian Pacific that there was failure on the part of the Canadian National.

There were read to the committee, out of the annual report of the Canadian National Rail-