

do so? There is no doubt that for short distances the motor vehicle does the business better than the railways can ever do it.

Furthermore, motor vehicles are increasing in speed and in comfort, and every day the cost of operating them is decreasing. It will not be long before the Diesel engine is generally applied to the motor-truck and the motor-car, and when that time comes the cost of fuel will be greatly reduced. Some people say the cost of oil as compared with the cost of gasoline will be about as one to eighteen. I am using two Diesel engines myself, and the cost of operating them is ridiculously low.

Then there is the aeroplane. More and more the aeroplane will cut into long-distance passenger traffic. It will save days in getting people to their destinations, and in these times the saving of days is a matter of some importance.

Furthermore, it will not be long before there is a transcontinental highway. In fact, it is pretty near at hand now, and I am not at all sure that wheat will not be moved from the West to the head of the lakes by motor-trucks. In the West and also in the East, beef, which used to be moved by the carload, is now transported by motor-trucks. The same is true of many other commodities.

For the last ten years I have tried to give all the freight I could to the Canadian National. In doing so I have sometimes gone very much against my Scotch principles, the cost by railway being more than the cost by motor-truck. The roads are paved and are open the year around, and the trucks can carry many commodities much more advantageously than the railways can do it. I can see no reason why the volume of motor-carried freight should decrease, and I look for no solution of the problem of our railways in that direction.

Certain suggestions have been made for cutting down railway operating cost by means of co-operation, and thus relieving the taxpayers, to some extent at all events. As between the proposal submitted by the honourable leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) and the one submitted by the honourable senator from Montarville (Hon. Mr. Beaubien) there is very little difference. It is just a question as to which is the better method of attaining our objective—co-operation, or the unification of management under the supervision of the Board of Railway Commissioners. Let us discard all the side issues, and the supposition that the railroads cannot be run under one management. They can. It is just a question as to which method will work the more effectively and efficiently.

I am going to support the proposal of the honourable senator from Montarville for no other reason than that the indications are, according to the evidence adduced before the committee, that by unified management we shall get results more quickly than by co-operation. During six years co-operation has produced nothing, and my great fear is that during the next six years it would produce very little more.

In closing I should just like to say this. If any honourable senator in this Chamber has a better suggestion to make than those which have been submitted to us, I will vote for it and against the others. Let us try our best to eliminate considerations of political patronage, political advantage and political disadvantage affecting our actions. If the Senate of Canada does that alone, it will be rendering a very great service to the Dominion, a service which will be remembered long after we are gone, and will do much to purify the public life of this country.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. ADRIAN K. HUGESSEN: Honourable senators, perhaps my first word should be one of appreciation of the great honour I have enjoyed in being allowed to serve on this Special Railway Committee, perhaps one of the most important committees appointed by this body during the last few years. If I might say a personal word it would be that I was particularly glad to be allowed to serve on this committee, inasmuch as I have always been extremely interested in all matters pertaining to transportation. In fact, were it not for one of the railways of Canada I should not be occupying my seat in this Chamber at this time, since it was for the purpose of taking a position in one of the Canadian railroads that I first came to this country as a very young man more than thirty years ago.

The impression made upon my mind by the evidence adduced before the Special Railway Committee was this. The many witnesses we heard dealt with the same set of facts, but some of them came to very opposite conclusions. This brought to my mind an expression used by Lord Baldwin in the House of Commons in England when he was Prime Minister. One of his ministers had been accused of making a statement not strictly in accordance with the facts. On that occasion Lord Baldwin referred to what he called "the many-sidedness of truth." While listening to the witnesses who examined the facts from various angles and came to different conclusions I was led to think of the applica-