

Mr. BYRNE: It is done in the provinces, internally, by public utilities commissions.

Mr. MAURO: Well, you do it by way of carrier. There are regulations on the number of buses, regulations by air, but I did not quite get the question.

Mr. BYRNE: Well this is just exactly what I mean. Would it be practical to give a franchise to a rail operation, whether it was CPR, CNR or someone else running on those lines. Would it be practical to protect that franchise, as is done by public utilities commissions in the province?

Mr. MAURO: Well, I would assume that the very purpose of the hearings before the Board is to determine public convenience and necessity, which is the usual question before a Public Utilities Commission on a franchise case. In effect, what the Board of Transport Commissioners has said here is that the public convenience and necessity is far outweighed by the cost; therefore, you can discontinue. Now I do not know that we need any other procedure for the franchising of passenger operations.

Mr. BYRNE: Was that simply because they were not carrying sufficient passengers to pay, that someone else was carrying the passengers on the Trans Canada Highway.

Mr. MAURO: What would this public utilities approach do? Would it limit the number of buses?

Mr. BYRNE: I am asking you if it could limit or protect the franchise.

Mr. MAURO: I would never agree to a situation where one mode of transportation was gauged on another mode of transportation. In other words, I would resist any attempt to determine aircraft licencing of a public convenience necessity on the basis of the number of buses that were running between Winnipeg and Brandon. I think that each mode of carriage, and I think rail is a mode of carriage, should be considered on its own merit.

Mr. O'KEEFE: Mr. Mauro, first of all, may I congratulate you sir; your submission was very thorough. Most of the questions I had in mind already have been answered. I was particularly interested in what Mr. Boulanger suggested, especially in view of the fact that I come from one of the new lands, the one that made Canada really a country from coast to coast.

Would you advise this committee whether or not we should accept the figures of the MacPherson Commission—and I am referring to the costs analysts, I believe you called them, regression analysts, or should we begin a completely new investigation with the resulting large costs to the taxpayer?

Mr. MAURO: The only thing that I would say on that, Mr. O'Keefe, is that to my knowledge the MacPherson Commission performed no costing on passenger services. The only real cost finding before the MacPherson Commission was relative to the cost of moving grain to export positions, and this is where the econometritions and the cost analysts went to work. As I recall, the MacPherson Commission received certain data from the railways; there was very little investigation, and certainly none of the provinces, to my knowledge, did any real work on the passenger services. There may have been some in; I do not want to speak as if I can recall everything that went in because I think there were 25,000 pages of evidence. But the costing relative to passenger services