

Now, only one witness made a frontal attack on the evidence of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He attacked it from A to Z, and did not mince words. I refer to Mr. Fairweather, a very versatile and very clever gentleman—I should say almost too clever. Mr. Fairweather simply said that economies of the kind referred to were out of the question; that they were impossible. When he was asked if the Canadian National had not made an estimate of the same kind, what did we discover? We found that in 1932 Mr. Fairweather had been asked to estimate the savings from the unification of the two roads.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: In 1931.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: I am sorry. In 1931. Every facility was placed at his disposal—all the books of the Canadian National, all the information of the Canadian Pacific—everything. So Mr. Fairweather made an estimate. And who do you think asked him to do this? It was not the royal commission, for it had not then been created, but his own president. There was no reason why Mr. Fairweather should make any error in advising his president. At all events, Mr. Fairweather made an estimate which corroborates in a most formidable manner the estimate of \$59,000,000 made by the Canadian Pacific Railway on the basis of the traffic level of 1937. When Mr. Fairweather was asked what he had to say about that, he replied: "Oh, that is purely theoretical; it could never be put into practice except with a supine public and a spineless personnel."

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: That is what he said before the Duff Commission.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: Yes. He had changed his mind.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: He said that.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: I will let you have Mr. Fairweather as he is.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: He is a very bright officer.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: Do not forget, he spoke of a supine public.

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.

He referred also to a spineless personnel—a personnel to whom conditions have been offered such as never before have been known

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN.

in this country; conditions under which not one of the employees could suffer in any way, shape or form. Yet that was his answer.

Now let us go a little further. My honourable friend has spoken of the enormous amounts that could be saved by voluntary co-operation.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Earnest voluntary co-operation.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: All right, earnest voluntary co-operation. And there I could almost detect the voice of Mr. Fairweather. We asked him what he thought about co-operation, and what was his answer? First of all he said we could save \$35,000,000; then he changed his mind and said, "Oh, I think we can save \$24,000,000." He was stepping down. Then he said: "I should like to change my mind again. I think the saving is going to be \$10,000,000." Of course we were all a little exercised over that. We asked him if that was an estimate or a guess, and he said, "Oh, it is a scientific guess." It was a guess. Mr. Fairweather is certainly very clever to be able to contradict himself so flagrantly and still stand before us as a witness. In order to do anything like that, one requires ability and a little something else as well.

That we have before the Senate to-day a formidable body of evidence in favour of unification, I do not think anybody will deny, and I ask honourable members to reflect and say whether under the circumstances the argument of common sense should not be applied. Here are two enormous industries, both working practically half-time in the same field. For twenty years business has been decreasing. Is it not rational to believe that if those two industries were contracted to a size commensurate with the business to be done there would be great economy?

A further argument in favour of unification is to be found in what has been done in Great Britain. What my honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) has said is no disparagement of the system adopted there, where one hundred and twenty railways were merged into four, and where those four are on the way to becoming one.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: They have 20,000 miles of line divided among four railways.

Hon. Mr. BEAUBIEN: I am thankful to my honourable friend for reminding me of that. In a country with 42,000,000 people and a railway mileage of 20,000 miles it has been found necessary to reduce the number of railways from one hundred and twenty to four. In a country like ours, with 42,000 miles of railway and 11,000,000 people, we do not