

management, are they not afterwards one rather than two?

Let us proceed along that line. Get your \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000, and what have you done? Just as far as you go, every man is out of work who would have been out of work if you had done so by unified management. Every reduction in purchase is made, every line is abandoned, under co-operation as under unification. All these things which have been pictured as terrible calamities will happen just the same if you get results by co-operation. Oh, no, they will not all happen. You will still have two head offices, both filled with high salaried men, you will still have your Fairweathers and your Hungerfords, and all the flocks around them, but others will be gone. "As long as you proceed by the route of co-operation we are satisfied," say Mr. Fairweather and Mr. Hungerford, though the same things precisely result as result from unified management. "Ah, but you don't hurt us. Go ahead and produce all these so-called calamities, bring them all upon our heads, but don't invade the precincts of the supervising officers. Throw Jim out as a wiper, throw Jack out as a checker, but keep your profane hands off our velvet chairs, and then we shall be happy and satisfied."

Just think of the position we are in! Go if you can the whole length along the route of co-operation that you can go under unified management and you will have thousands upon thousands of men employed on pool trains, in unified express and telegraph offices and the like, half of them under the charge of one set of head office men, and the other half under another set, and both doing the very same work. Can you think of a monstrosity like that? Can you picture such a hydra-headed monster in the realm of business? One long body and two heads! It is beyond conception. So I say, if for a moment you hope to get worth-while results from co-operation; much more, if you hope, as your report says, to go the length you would get under unified management, you have brought upon the country everything that you have pictured as dire calamity if done by unified management, but you maintain a double-headed institution, with two bosses, two authorities over the same job and the same men.

Surely I have gone the length of showing that you get results by unified management. I hope I have shown—I did not need to do so for those who attended the sittings of our committee—that you will not get anywhere worth reaching in this other way, and that the likelihood of your even moving may just as well be forgotten. I have shown further that if by any chance or miracle you do get any

distance along this road of co-operation you are vulnerable to all objections and exposed to all disasters that you in your imagination have painted as awaiting us under unified control.

There is the bugbear of abandonment of lines. It is hard to order one's thoughts consecutively and make at the same time a reply to speeches immediately preceding. Certainly my attempt is imperfect. Abandonment comes under the same general argument as everything else, but, to listen to honourable senators who want to get a vote against unified management and the saving of money, one would think that the whole problem revolved around abandonment of lines. The honourable leader of the House said, and I was surprised to hear him, that if we did not abandon lines we had to take \$16,000,000 off the Canadian Pacific estimate of savings. That is not true. The \$16,000,000 includes far more than mere savings from abandonment. Without abandonment at all you make substantial economies by directing the great bulk of traffic over another line, leaving only perhaps local traffic, and therefore you have a reduced standard of maintenance. Only \$7,240,000 of that \$75,300,000 is attributable to abandonment of lines. You could get all but \$4,000,000 if you did not abandon more than the Canadian National officials themselves admitted was justified to be abandoned. If you did not abandon a single line at all, you would only take your savings down by 10 per cent or \$7,240,000.

Some persons thought of abandonment of lines as something that could happen only under unified management. Unless we use our heads and common sense, abandonment of lines is a lot closer to this country than honourable members would like to think. They talk of these pioneer roads being torn up. No one suggests such a thing. We must keep our pioneer roads in operation on the Canadian Pacific as well as the Canadian National. Maybe they show a loss on the books, but they feed the main lines. Those pioneer roads are needed by the men who have settled along them. But if you do not do something to bring rationalized business methods into our railways you will have to close down those very lines. What is proposed by unified management is not the abandonment of pioneer lines that serve the farmer, the miner and the fisherman, but the abandonment of duplicate lines, lines which double over each other and are still continued because they belong to competing concerns. The leader of the House says the Canadian National is making money out of one or more of these roads. So it is. But does that prove they are any good? Suppose you have two lines paralleling one another for five hundred miles, one Canadian

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.