

... we cannot place ourselves in the position to-day of giving out information to the public regarding this submission as to definite trains.

... We do not want to give these details out to the public, because it might be a serious handicap to us.

Then, at page 744, Mr. R. A. Pyne, in answering Senator Copp regarding shops that could be dispensed with, said:

Oh, no . . . There is a political atmosphere that makes it impossible for me to go home if I made a suggestion of that kind.

At page 740, in reply to Senator Hugessen with respect to divisional points which it was proposed to abandon, he said:

I could not give you that. If it is decided to unify the railways you certainly should have it.

At page 861, Mr. Jefferson, when asked with regard to the evidence given by Mr. McNeillie, said:

As with regard to evidence given by Mr. McNeillie yesterday, we do not want to disclose the details of that statement city by city.

I have been endeavouring to find out what part of the \$75,000,000 of savings estimated by the Canadian Pacific Railway could be as well obtained under co-operation, supposing for the sake of argument that the physical task of line abandonments, curtailment of services and abandonment of stations, shops, engine houses, etc., could in fact be accomplished.

We have heard all along inquiry as to the savings which could be made under unification through the application of Canadian Pacific Railway unit costs to Canadian National operations. The President of the Canadian National, Mr. Hungerford, has informed our committee, in effect, that approximately \$20,000,000 of the Canadian Pacific Railway estimate on that score is pure imagination and has no relation to physical matters.

The Canadian Pacific Railway has no basis in logic for applying Canadian Pacific Railway unit costs in this manner, and did so merely upon the bland assumption that the difference in the operating ratios of the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific is the result of loose public-ownership operations. A careful analysis shows that the Canadian National operations are fully as efficient as those of the Canadian Pacific Railway, when due allowance is made for the special problems which face the Canadian National as a consequence of its being a consolidation of five previously existing properties, with resulting duplications, and also for the larger degree of pioneering service which is being performed by it.

The deduction of this \$20,000,000 from the Canadian Pacific Railway estimate of \$75,000,000 leaves \$55,000,000 as the result of the physical changes. I may say without undue modesty that I could not go through these figures except with the help of the experts of the Canadian National Railways. I have tested the \$55,000,000 of supposed savings in a document which itemizes them. There are fourteen items, but no estimate of savings is shown separately for the first six items. I have considered each of these fourteen to see whether the physical changes contemplated could not be made under co-operation, and opposite each item there is a note bearing on that point. Here is the document, which I laid before my right honourable friend (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen) at the opening of this sitting. It is an analysis of the Canadian Pacific Railway estimate of savings under unification, prepared for the purpose of showing the possible earning under earnest co-operation, assuming for the sake of argument that the physical things contemplated in the estimate are in fact feasible.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this some evidence they forgot to give to the committee?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I hope my right honourable friend is not accusing himself of negligence because of not having put a question he could have put in committee.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: It was hardly my business to do so. But I was wondering if they are now submitting to the leader of the Government evidence which they neglected to place before the committee.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I am making these figures my own. I am supported in them by expert evidence.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the same thing.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: I think my honourable friend might make a similar statement.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I shall not need anything.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: When you want a precise date or figure you go to the Bureau of Statistics, or the appropriate bureau, to get it.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: There is nothing in this from the Bureau of Statistics.