

All these things only went to establish what should have been obvious from the beginning, that savings of the largest conceivable order, larger far than by any other means, could be made by union of management of the two systems.

Now the leader of the House says, "Well, we are going to get these by co-operation." I have discussed the prospects. I do not think that even in his own mind he believes they are real—though I do not like so to allege. I cannot see how anybody could sit through the meetings of our committee and seriously expect results. But suppose we do. Let us concede for a moment that nearly all of these economies we shall get by co-operation. Let us reason along that line and find out what is the consequence.

I digress for a moment. Be it remembered that an adroit politician, this same gentleman, Mr. Fairweather—whatever he is as a railway man I do not know—laid before Sir Henry Thornton in 1931, and subsequently before the Duff Commission, estimates of savings of \$59,000,000, on the basis of 1930 traffic as resulting from unified management. It is true he added a rider. I do not know when he added it, but I have a suspicion that it was pretty late.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Oh, no.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: All I know is that it is in exhibits of the Duff Commission.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Yes.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Of all the senseless things I ever read this rider is the worst. He gave an estimate of \$59,000,000 of savings and then added a rider saying you could not get those savings. It reminds me of a report made years ago, during the South African war. There was a long, circumstantial account from a distinguished soldier of the capture of 200 Boers by the exercise of outstanding bravery, and then there was a postscript saying, "The Boers escaped." Of just the same quality is this testimony of Mr. Fairweather's. "Oh," he said, "I did estimate for the Duff Commission savings of \$59,740,000. I made it up dollar by dollar. I went to terrific trouble. I had eight technical assistants and thirty clerks and we worked at it day and night for months. We had access to the Canadian Pacific Railway and the benefit of all their organization. We did it on the instruction of the chief of our road for the Duff Commission, and we showed detail by detail, \$59,740,000. But really we could not save that sum. It was all 'theoretical,' it was all in my imagination, and I put a rider to my report saying that while these figures are an estimate of savings, they are savings we can-

not make at all." Such is Mr. Fairweather. I think that "theoretical" idea was an after-thought which occurred when the plans of himself and Sir Henry Thornton had changed.

I will tell you something more. The same Mr. Fairweather before the same commission estimated \$35,000,000 as savings from co-operation. And he did not attach any qualifications to that estimate. He did not put in a rider saying, "Those figures are 'theoretical'; they are savings that might be made if you had a docile public and a servile staff." He did not say anything of the kind. They were definite savings which he estimated as capable of being achieved by co-operation. Does anybody question my assertion that they were given to that commission without qualification? I want to know on what evidence the Duff Commission reported in favour of co-operation. They reported in favour of it, I think, mainly on Mr. Fairweather's evidence. If they did not, I do not know on what they based their report. There he stood committed to that \$35,000,000.

Where does he stand to-day? Before our committee he whittled his figure down to \$10,000,000, and then he did not express any belief that we could get it. He told us it was only a guess. And this is the evidence upon which the honourable leader of this House hangs his report to Parliament! To the Duff Commission Mr. Fairweather gave a definite, unqualified estimate of \$35,000,000 based on his good faith and his reputation; to our committee he estimates \$10,000,000, and then he tells us it is only a guess.

Now—to revert—we will suppose that you really can achieve \$35,000,000, or whatever you want to make it, by co-operation. Think a moment! What are these objections to unified management? We are told that men will be thrown out of work. "They will lose their jobs," says the senator from Moncton. Fewer supplies will be bought, and therefore there will be less sales tax. There will be disturbance by closing a station in some town and using another one hundred feet away. All these terrible calamities will befall our country. "Therefore," declares the senator from Sackville and the senator from Montreal, "let us get these things done by co-operation."

Hon. Mr. BLACK: The senator from Sackville is Hon. Mr. Copp. He is not here.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Let me inquire of the senator from Montreal, who is here. If this same thing is done by co-operation will not the men lose their jobs? Will there not be less material bought and therefore less sales tax paid? If two stations are merged into one by co-operation, instead of by unified