

do, ask me to repeat it again. I do not want to bother to touch upon the legal and finance aspects so much; by nature I am more inclined to ask you questions on the human side of it. Mention was made of the argument used by the I.C.C. on that, and right at the beginning of your brief you said, "They must resent it immediately". Do you not agree that, first of all by taking away the "Dominion" service—and it may go further than that later on—the first class of people who will suffer more right now will be the pensioner, the aged and the working class of people in general instead of the industrial, the businessmen, the professionals, who can use air transport and things like that.

Mr. MAURO: It is hard to distinguish, Mr. Boulanger, the specific category of people. I would say for example, if we are doing it on a strict cost basis, that perhaps the bus, as an alternative method of transportation, would be just as inexpensive, would cost no more and, perhaps, less than a movement by rail. So, if I am asked to approach it strictly from the pensioner and the low income group, in fairness to the railroad, I would have to say that there is perhaps an alternative at the same cost level. But I cannot look at it—I wish I could—and say that it is the working man or the pensioner. What I do say is that whoever that man is who has been using the "Dominion" he should not be stripped of his right to go by rail if he would like to go by rail, and the cost incidental is not so fantastic as to make it ridiculous, because the people of Canada cannot be expected to meet that kind of cost—nor should the railway be asked to meet an exorbitant loss figure. But I think there are a number of elderly people, working people who use the rail but I do not know that that in itself would be a reason for keeping it because there are alternative means.

Mr. BOULANGER: The reason I asked you that is because many labour associations have complained about that.

I want to talk about the tourist aspect of this. I am quite surprised that you do not mention in your brief the main purpose of this train because the tourist aspect is so important. You take now in '67, I am known in this committee as a public relations man for Expo. Do you not agree that the CNR, for that one reason, should have the decency to keep it on until 1968?

Mr. MAURO: I could not agree with you more. I think it is an incredible thing that is happening, when we are facing Expo in Montreal and the Pan American games in Winnipeg.

I just wanted to make sure that if there was anyone going to Expo that they would come back west to Winnipeg on the "Dominion" to the Pan American games. I may have underplayed the tour business in my brief, and perhaps enough that you noted it. On the tour business, it is amazing to me that the CPR takes the approach that a lot of these people who use the "Dominion" are tourists and they are just not going to let them get on their trains any more, when we are following a policy, nationally and provincially, of trying to attract people into the country and we have an agency of government—I use the word "agency" in the sense that it is an instrument of national policy—a very critical agency of national policy, saying, "We do not want to advertise in the United States any more; we will accept no tour passengers; we want nothing to do with them."

Mr. BOULANGER: If you accept what I am going to say, first, that the tourists who will come from Europe to see Expo will want to see Canada from coast to