

cannot provide a system whereby exactly the same number of people will be employed, because it would be uneconomical.

Q. I think it was pointed out that during the five or six years it would be difficult to make an adjustment, that promotions could not be made, and you would not be taking on any new employees, and consequently you would not have men familiar with the work and you might have to import men.—A. No. For the first five years, of course, there would be such an adjustment; but once you got down to the minimum number of men required to operate the railway you would go on just as you are doing now, you would employ just as many men as vacancies occurred, but you would have fewer men in the aggregate.

*By Hon. Mr. Murdock:*

Q. I think that in their presentation before us yesterday labour argued that even in the small amount of pooling that had been put into effect there were 145 employees—

Hon. Mr. HAIG: One hundred and thirty-seven.

*By Hon. Mr. Murdock:*

Q. —137 employees who had been put out of jobs, some of whom, I understood, were on relief.—A. That is true. There were none of the provisions in the pooling arrangements or the other co-operative arrangements that are in the plan outlined here. The reason why we have taken pains to say that we would have a plan is because we would not want that to happen.

Q. I can remember my good friend Senator Meighen, who was then leading in the Senate, co-operating splendidly in putting into the Canadian National-Canadian Pacific Act that which we thought would take care of the displaced labour.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Was not that as to the proper division?

The WITNESS: Yes. That was filed with you yesterday.

*By Hon. Mr. Murdock:*

Q. And it was expected at the time that there would be some reasonable care taken to not impose undue hardships on labour. But right here in Ottawa we know what happened on the Canadian National.—A. There was nothing mandatory in the statute about that as far as I know.

*By Hon. Mr. Copp:*

Q. It could have been done by agreement then?—A. Oh, yes.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: What was to be done by agreement, and after consultation with Labour, was the apportionment of the remaining positions between the employees of the two systems. In the Act there was no provision for taking care of the aggregate reduction.

Hon. Mr. COPP: There was no compulsion, but they could have made an agreement.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The same as they could, I presume in the case of contractions resulting from the depression.

The CHAIRMAN (Hon. Mr. Beaubien): Are there any more questions to Sir Edward?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I asked Sir Edward if he could be here to-morrow, and as he cannot I would like with the authorization of the committee to put him a question. We have been discussing the future savings of the policy to be adopted concerning the two railways, but we have before the Railway Committee to-morrow the Transport Bill, which suggests that the railways be allowed to make agreed charges. I thought that as Sir Edward will not be here to-