

spending, because there is no railway on the north shore, \$80,000 that can be saved. It is paying for the transportation of mail to other railways about \$5,400; for the operation of the Intercolonial railway, Rivière Ouelle branch, \$22,000, and \$52,000 for the ferry from Rivière Ouelle to Murray Bay, or in round figures \$80,000. Add this saving of \$80,000 to the \$83,000 produced by the Quebec and Montmorency and the Lotbinière and Megantic and you obtain a total of \$163,000. Now, honourable gentlemen, is it not fair to think that the Quebec and Saguenay will earn something? On the same ratio of earning per mile as the Quebec and Montmorency, the Quebec and Saguenay ought to earn \$120,000. Therefore in savings, in actual and most probable earnings, we have in sight practically 5 per cent on the amount invested. Under these circumstances I will certainly vote for the Bill.

The purpose of the Bill was to acquire those particular railways in the province of Quebec. And what happened? One of the particular lines which the honourable senator was so insistently pressing the Government to take over was the Quebec and Saguenay, 62.3 miles in length. Evidently his earnest plea to the Government, coupled with other pressing claims of the same kind, was sufficient to influence the Government to take over that railroad on the first day of July, 1916.

What was paid for it? The sum of \$3,489,313.53. What did it cost in addition, in betterments for the purpose of rehabilitating it so that it could be used as a proper railroad? That additional cost was \$4,283,597.50. So, at the behest of my honourable friend the senator from Montarville and others, more than \$7,600,000 of the railway burden that we now have was placed upon the shoulders of the people of Canada.

Has the railroad mentioned ever paid the 5 per cent my honourable friend spoke of? Was his judgment in May, 1916, good? If it was not, is it good to-day? I am going to undertake to show that possibly his views, his aims, his claims and his desires with respect to railway unification to-day are just as far-fetched or as unfair to the Canadian taxpayer as they were in 1916, when \$7,600,000 was paid for a railroad that was never worth \$100,000 to the Canadian people.

I see my honourable leader (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) looking at me. Let us hurry along. I wonder if, for the purpose of showing how far my very good friend from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Beaubien) will go in boosting for unification, with which he is so much in love, it would be unfair to quote from his own speech of a couple of nights ago. He said, as reported at page 427 of the Senate Hansard:

In any event, is it in the power of our railways to exercise monopoly in a way to hurt the public? Everybody knows the companies are completely under the control of the Board

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK.

of Transport Commissioners. Not a line can be abandoned, not a rail can be lifted, not a train can be cut off, not a single service can be discontinued, not a fare or rate can be increased, without permission from that tribunal.

I leave to the judgment and knowledge of honourable members the question whether that is painting a picture which the facts will not justify.

Not satisfied with having said that, he comes back to the point later. At page 485 he says:

Do not forget, he spoke of a supine public.

There he was referring to my distinguished leader (Hon. Mr. Dandurand).

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: Oh, no.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: I beg your pardon. I am incorrect. My honourable friend was referring to Mr. Fairweather. In fact, he referred to Mr. Fairweather on many and various occasions, and critically. He held the view that Mr. Fairweather's evidence was of little use.

Following that remark about Mr. Fairweather, my honourable friend said:

Now, I have already shown that the railways cannot do anything to the public. The Transport Board plays the part of watch-dog, and without its permission not one line, not one car, not one service can be removed; nor can rates be increased. It is laughable, therefore, to hear Mr. Fairweather speak of a supine public.

My honourable friend from Montarville was just 50 per cent right in that statement. He was right in saying that the Transport Board's permission is required for the removal of any line or the increase of rates, but was wrong in saying that not one car or one service could be removed without such permission. With every new issue of a time-table by either road some changes of service are made without reference to the Transport Board. Of course, the board would have to be approached before a line could be discontinued entirely. The point I want to make is that my honourable friend is so enthusiastic about the proposal for unification that he goes far afield, may I say, to emphasize facts in support of that proposal.

Now we come to the question that is before us. I speak as a man who for almost fifty years has been proud to be an employee of the Canadian Pacific Railway. At this moment I hold in my pocket an annual pass over the Canadian Pacific Railway system, issued to me as a conductor on furlough. I have been on furlough since 1905, and I do not think I shall work on the railroad any more. Traveling all over the continent of America, I have always been proud of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I know of no railroad that has been