

in its behalf. But we recognize that the contentions made there call for some consideration. The feature of the factum is the desire of counsel to reproduce those parts of the Board's judgment that contain any apparent measure of justification for rate advances. The reference at the bottom of p. 7 to the resolution passed by the Board of Trade of Duncan, B.C., in strong opposition to the increases seems to have crept in by error, because all the other quotations are intended to show that public sentiment was practically unanimous in favor of the companies' demands. We would refer, in this connection, to our printed argument where we endeavored to point out that the support received by the railway companies from the public was based on the supposition, *now known to be totally unwarranted*, that the additional revenues were to be used to provide efficient service on the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Railways. It is easy to induce business organizations to fall in line and support the railway companies *when the very existence of their trade is threatened through a paralysis of transportation systems*. It is not going too far to suggest that a campaign with the object of enlisting that support was carefully waged on behalf of the railway companies among the members of business organizations. It succeeded in some parts of the country because the "camouflage" about "efficient service" was cleverly applied. Counsel for the Canadian Northern Railway is too particular in his choice of excerpts. He makes one mistake in the case of the Duncan Board of Trade, as has been noted, but he says nothing about the Vancouver or Winnipeg Boards of Trade, or the Canadian Credit Men's Trust Association, or the Canadian Council of Agriculture or the Retail Lumbermen's Association, or the Retail Merchants' Association. The statement in the factum that "the consensus of the majority of those attending the meetings of the Board was in favor of granting substantial relief to the railways" is not borne out by a review of all the evidence. The opposition, even at the hearings, was vigorous and determined, and it is to be remembered that the railway companies' statements had not at that time come in for the analysis and scrutiny to which they have since been subjected. We know that a decidedly different attitude has recently been adopted by some of the organizations whose opinions are quoted in support of the advances. The Regina and Saskatoon Boards of Trade, for instance, have expressed by resolution their dissatisfaction with the judgment of the Board, while public opinion in other parts of Canada has become aroused over the possibility of immense additional taxation that would be levied if the findings of the Board were enforced. The press of Toronto, with which counsel for the Canadian Northern is more or less in touch, reflects the sentiment of the people on the subject clearly enough. It is loud in its denunciation of the judgment.