

Bill D-1, an Act for the relief of Albert Ernest Curtis.

Bill E-1, an Act for the relief of Annie Swales Barber.

Bill F-1, an Act for the relief of Rebecca Catherine Pitts Duquette.

Bill G-1, an Act for the relief of Edith Mary Stone Ryan.

Bill H-1, an Act for the relief of Pearl Greenspan Abramovitz.

Bill I-1, an Act for the relief of Harry Rudner.

Bill J-1, an Act for the relief of Dorothea Joan Lawrence Gamble.

Bill K-1, an Act for the relief of Walter St. Andre Bawn.

Bill L-1, an Act for the relief of Alison Hamilton Brown Weldon.

Bill M-1, an Act for the relief of Hazel May Wilkie MacLeod.

Bill N-1, an Act for the relief of William Gordon Cascadden.

Bill O-1, an Act for the relief of Romeo Lefebvre.

Bill P-1, an Act for the relief of Kathleen Veronica Thompson Davidson.

Bill Q-1, an Act for the relief of Joseph Arthur Winsorlow Brisebois.

Bill R-1, an Act for the relief of Margaret May Tuck Reicker.

Bill S-1, an Act for the relief of Mabel Kearley Budgell.

The motion was agreed to, and the bills were read the third time, and passed, on division.

### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Senate resumed from Friday, March 17, the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's Speech at the opening of the session, and the motion of Hon. Mr. Golding for an Address in reply thereto.

**Hon. G. H. Ross:** Honourable senators, I wish in the first place to join with those who have preceded me in complimenting the mover (Hon. Mr. Golding) and the seconder (Hon. Mr. Veniot) of the Address. The mover has had a vast experience both in the business world and in the other place, so naturally we expected much of him, and we were not disappointed. As to the seconder, I presume he spoke well in French, but I have asked him next time he speaks in the house to use Parisian French, because a number of us do not understand Acadian French too well.

**Hon. Mr. Leger:** There is no difference.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Oh, oh.

**Hon. Mr. Ross:** I have no doubt that he spoke well in Acadian French, because when he undertook to speak in English he made an excellent job of it.

Honourable senators, I am concerned about the way freight rates have been pyramiding in western Canada, and from the lively discussion which took place yesterday on the simple bill introduced by the honourable senator from Grandville (Hon. Mr. Bouffard), I gather that other honourable senators are equally interested in this question.

I have given this matter much thought, and have come to the conclusion that plans for the amalgamation of the two railway systems should be worked out. The first duty of the company operating the combined system would be to put into effect all measures of co-operation which could be adopted to effect savings by eliminating waste and duplication of service.

Mr. E. W. Beatty, former president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in an address delivered before the Canadian Political Science Association in Montreal on May 22, 1934, advocated that, in order to put an end to the waste of competition, the two railway systems—the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific—should be unified under the control of the CPR for the purposes of administration only. He said:

As the result of an exhaustive analysis of the accounts by our officers, I have stated that under the form of unification proposed there would be a saving of seventy-five million dollars in a year of normal traffic, which amount would be increased as the trade of the country expanded in future years.

Later in the same address Mr. Beatty, in referring to the estimated saving of \$75 million a year, said:

Estimates of those savings were made at various times by the late Lord Shaughnessy, by the late Sir Henry Thornton, by Mr. Fairweather, Economist of the Canadian National Railway, and by the present officers of the Canadian Pacific. These submissions can be regarded with respect as the fruits of deep study, conducted by men of experience. All of their estimates, though made at different times, are very similar in result. The estimate presented by the Canadian Pacific to the Royal Commission was examined and analyzed by independent railway economists of standing and repute in the United States, and was pronounced unassailable.

Consequently, in the opinion of those who should know best, very substantial economies could be worked out under a unified system. I should point out here that since Mr. Beatty delivered that address some minor co-operative measures have been put into effect under the Canadian National-Canadian Pacific Act of 1933, but the economies effected were comparatively small.

For the past seventy years national policy in Canada has required that the railroads be built east and west, and has maintained high protective tariffs in order to channel