

greatest confidence in his judgment. I consider him one of the ablest men it has ever been my privilege to know. In this instance, however, I can only reconcile his recommendation for the appointment of a firm of chartered accountants and engineers with the fact that his legal mind impels him to get to the bottom of all disputes and obtain the correct answers. The precision with which he deals with the daily routine of this honourable House is indicative of his desires with respect to the subject-matter. We all know large savings can be made from consolidation of our railways. Whether the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian National is correct in its estimate of savings is not material. Midway between these two estimates might be a reasonable judgment, and for the point at issue that should suffice.

Why employ that unusual firm of chartered accountants and engineers? I have had much experience with both classes. They are difficult enough divided. With both in one firm, I should anticipate the difficulties would be greatly increased. Picture them in our committee next session defending their report against the men in one or both railways who know the particular branch of the railway work in dispute. Arguments which we have listened to for the past two years would be doubly confounded, and in the end the firm's report would doubtless be pretty well discredited. I do not know that a competent, independent—and I emphasize "independent"—firm of engineers and accountants could be found. The chances are they would be unacceptable to one of the railways at least, and I fear that a year or two hence the public would still cry party politics versus Canadian Pacific, or vice versa. After all, that substantial savings in operating costs would be effected under any plan of consolidation is not open to serious question, and, at best, operating costs are but a part of the problem of amalgamation.

I was much impressed with the use of the word "firm" in the motion of my right honourable leader, with reference to an unusual partnership. I regret that owing to my lack of knowledge of parliamentary technique I called my three judges a "board," which, I am told, means another royal commission. It seems to me the work of my board of judges would include the work of the firm, and would also include a report to the Government on our entire railway problem. Perhaps it is the high standing of my proposed board that necessitates the fitting term "royal commission." If so, that is all right with me.

I submit, honourable members, that such a report to the Government, available at the next session, might start us on the way to definite action. Time is certainly an essence

in this matter, and I am anxious that we make progress towards a solution. And may I repeat, in support of my proposal for a firm of judges—excuse me—I mean a board of judges—that their report would convince the Canadian people, and there would be no opportunity for arguments from the opposing railway camps. Furthermore, it seems to me that the advocates of unification, if they have as much confidence in their cause as their advocacy implies, should have no hesitation in joining me in my recommendation for the highest court the Government can appoint to review this entire matter.

I could not see in the motion of my right honourable leader anything but a rehearsal of the evidence which has been placed before us for the last two sessions, with the probability of our being as far away from the goal this time next year as we are to-day. For that reason I voted against it.

The honourable leader of the House (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) also disappointed me. For him I have the highest esteem,—yes, even more. I think I can count myself in with many members of the House when I say that my feelings are much more tender than the word "esteem" implies. We on this side of the House recognize his untiring energy. Every day, and many times a day, we get a thrill out of the cleverness he displays in protecting himself in the debates, which come, of course, more frequently from this side of the House. His cleverness in this respect is the result of his long and active career in public life. His kindness under all circumstances calls forth from everyone the hope he may continue with us for many years to come.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: Just the same, I was disappointed when he did not adopt my proposal. He is always a man of action; so I thought it would appeal to him.

It would appear, so far as the committee is concerned, there is only one member who thinks along the same lines as I do: the honourable senator from Leeds (Hon. Mr. Hardy). At least we are both for action. We desire to get somewhere with this railway business. For that reason we voted against our leaders.

I can best state my opinion of the report of the committee now before you in the two-word military command, "carry on"—or perhaps "stand at ease" would be just as suitable. The sublime patience of the honourable leader of the House with voluntary co-operation, after six years of such negative results, would, I am sure, entitle him to challenge the reputation of Job, if that patient