

the Canadian Pacific was in opposing cooperation to a much larger degree than favouring it.

It does seem to me that there is a perversity running through our whole structure in connection with the railways. Last session we passed the Transport Act, and I remember very distinctly that when the measure was under consideration in another place the Minister expressed himself very plainly to the effect that the provision for agreed charges as between railways and shippers constituted the most important section of the measure. What has happened in connection with that provision? Within the last few days information has come to me that a short time ago one of the railways, if not both, had made an arrangement for agreed charges with a large shipper. The agreement must have been satisfactory to the shipper, because application for approval was made to the Transport Board. One of the terms was that the agreement should last for three years. Incredible as it seems, the Board refused to give its approval unless the term were reduced to one year. Any schoolboy would realize that no concern which has been engaged in making large shipments in a certain way for many years is going to agree to change its whole policy just for a period of one year. I cannot understand how men placed in such high positions as members of the Board of Transport Commissioners are would be so perverse as to rule that such an agreement should not be made effective for longer than one year. It seems to me there is a tendency to upset every attempt to handle our railways successfully. I may say in extenuation of the action of the Transport Board that shortly afterwards the railway and the shipper asked for reconsideration of their agreement, and got it. I have not been able to find out how long the agreement is to run, but apparently it was satisfactory, as it was accepted by both parties. I refer to the case only as an example of the perversity that obstructs our railways in almost every direction.

I shall not discuss the railway question any further. As I have said, the honourable senator from Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McRae) and myself are the only two members of the committee not adhering strictly to party lines. I believe, however, that all the members of the committee have acted in good faith, regardless of party lines. I give them credit for it, and ask that I be given similar credit. I know that those composing a very small minority are never popular, but I feel that in dealing with the railway question we should not allow party feeling to influence us

Hon. Mr. HARDY.

in the slightest degree. I appeal to honourable members not to be guided by party lines.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HARDY: I do not think that a decision along party lines would be a good thing for the Senate; neither would it be for the country nor for the railways. We should all stand on our own feet and be honest with ourselves when we vote on this question.

Hon. H. H. HORSEY: Honourable senators, as a member of our Special Railway Committee I desire to make a few comments on the report presented by my honourable leader (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) and that contained in the amendment moved by the honourable member from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Beaubien). At the outset I should like to congratulate the mover of the amendment on his very impressive and eloquent speech, though I must tell him that he did not convince me of the soundness of his argument in favour of unified management. Indeed, I fear that if unification leads to amalgamation our railway situation will become far more serious and a still greater burden will be cast upon the people.

The honourable member from Vancouver (Hon. Mr. McRae) gave us an exhaustive address in which he covered considerable ground, and, as well, a good deal of geography. I followed him attentively, but I still cannot understand why he is in favour of government ownership and at the same time proposes the appointment of a commission of judges. To my mind government ownership of all our railways would be fraught with the greatest danger, and I am confident the country would be very loath to see it consummated.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HORSEY: Two things above all others we must avoid: railway monopoly under private ownership; government ownership of all our railways.

As the honourable member from Montarville said, there are certain matters with respect to which the committee was unanimous: first, that we are faced with a serious railway situation; and, second, that we should seek the best means of relieving the taxpayer of the burden of recurring railway deficits. We are also, I take it, in agreement that the identity of both railway properties should be preserved.

Then comes the basic disagreement between the proposals contained in the two reports. We who support the main report feel that