

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Would it help in any possible way?

Right Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: How could it?

Hon. Mr. BUCHANAN: Would the burden on the taxpayer be just as it is at present, whether or not there was unification? That is a question which the taxpayer would like to have answered. I desire also to submit this question: If through unification existing lines were put out of business and services reduced, would it not intensify competition from trucks and similar sources? I am inclined to think that it would, and that the trucks would be much more aggressive.

As to monopoly, I am going to make a confession. I live in a part of the country served wholly by one railroad. It has always been so served. If mine were the experience that Canada might have from the operation of one railroad system, I would say there is nothing very much to fear from monopoly. But then again I know I could not get a very warm reception for that point of view throughout the whole of Western Canada, because the people there still remember the time when they felt they were under a crushing railway monopoly. Therefore they have neither sympathy nor desire for one railroad service. They have long memories, and it may take some time to convince them that a railway monopoly would not harm them. At any rate, in any discussion on unification the question of monopoly is bound to be brought forward as a major point for consideration.

I do not wish to discuss the evidence or the figures submitted to our committee, for it would be merely rehashing a good deal of what has already been submitted to the House. I wish to say frankly that I believe every member of the committee was keenly interested in the railway problem and eager to find some way of helping to bring about a solution. We may differ in our respective viewpoints, but I feel very strongly that we should not go further at present than to make a thorough test of co-operation, and make it far more earnestly than it has been made up to the present time. Then, should it be demonstrated that co-operation cannot work, I am satisfied the people would treat more seriously the solution suggested by the members of the committee from the other side of the House, that is, unification.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Black, the debate was adjourned.

PRIVATE BILL

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS

Bill 20, an Act respecting Central Finance Corporation and to change its name to House-

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

hold Finance Corporation of Canada.—Hon. Mr. Little.

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at 3 p.m.

THE SENATE

Thursday, May 25, 1939.

The Senate met at 3 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

CANADA GRAIN BILL

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Hon. Mr. BLACK presented, and moved concurrence in, the report of the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce on Bill 62, an Act to amend The Canada Grain Act.

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION FOR THIRD READING—DEBATE ADJOURNED

The Hon. the SPEAKER: When shall this Bill be read a third time?

Hon. Mr. MARSHALL: Now.

Hon. R. B. HORNER: Honourable senators, before this Bill is read a third time, I wish to move that section 46 be deleted from the Bill. This is the section which authorizes mixing.

I made my objections in the committee, but, as only a small number of members were present, I should like to say a few words here. This clause is not in the interest of the producer. I learned at lunch-time that it was bitterly opposed by four Government members in the committee of the House of Commons; and I am told by the former Minister of Agriculture that it upsets all the good work he was trying to do. He says there is another clause under which almost anything under Heaven can be accomplished.

What is proposed here is, I think, a step in the wrong direction. I therefore move, seconded by Hon. Mr. Aseltine, that section 46 be deleted from the Bill.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Perhaps the honourable gentleman would proceed otherwise. He might move that the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be amended in a certain way.

Hon. Mr. HORNER: All right. I move that the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be amended by striking out clause 46.