

system of control, as the industries of England have done. I certainly prefer the path followed by the British Administration to the one which the United States Government has pursued, and which I think has been attended and will be attended with disaster.

There is one other remark I wish to make. There seems to be a general feeling that we are coming into an age of regulation; that we cannot indefinitely defer regulation. There are those, and I think they are the keenest and most intelligent observers, who feel that more and more liberty must be given to business and to industry in the way of self-regulation.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: Hear, hear.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: And others say that we must have the old-fashioned competition, just as it raged in the days when individuals competed with their neighbours, when business units were small. But competition as it existed in those days does not prevail to-day, and it cannot. We all know that. If it were to prevail it would mean mutual destruction, hardship all around and sacrifice of public interest. We pass some laws to-day that seem to be based on the theory that industries should not communicate with one another, and that if they do, if they have so much as a telephone communication and agree upon certain things that are supposed to be ethical among them, their managers must go to jail. Greater humbug and hypocrisy were never heard of.

It is impossible to import the old unrestrained competition into the economy of this time. Does anyone believe that among the vast industries of Canada competition prevails to-day on the old ruthless scale—that companies have no arrangements with one another? We all know that is not the situation. That kind of competition did prevail in the paper industry, and in consequence we were virtually stripped from coast to coast of our greatest resource, which was being sold out at bankruptcy prices. To-day the Government of Ontario and the Government of Quebec are encouraging co-operation and understanding among the largest units of that industry. We have co-operation in the rubber industry, which operates not to the disadvantage of the consumer, but to his advantage through reduction in prices.

What I am urging is that in adopting principles of regulation we should follow well-ordered plans which have proven successful elsewhere, that we should help and encourage industries to regulate themselves, and not curse and damn them for ever as vested interests when they do agree to regulate them-

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

selves. All that Parliament needs is control over their co-operative actions, and this only for the purpose of seeing that the people, who have to pay the bill, receive a fair deal and are protected from tyrannies which otherwise might be exercised by cold-blooded monopolies.

I should not like for one minute—and I do not believe the Government really wants—to have this measure in operation so far as transport by water is concerned. I venture to say that if it is passed here the Government will never carry it through the other House. I cannot see how the Administration could ask its followers from the Prairies in that House to vote for the Bill as it now stands. With respect to its main feature the Government should proceed along a different line. It should wait another year before submitting a measure to regulate transportation. I do not think it can be doubted that at a later session the Government, with the advantage of study that it can make in the meantime, will be able to present a far more acceptable measure.

At 6 o'clock the Senate took recess.

The Senate resumed at 8 p.m.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: I would remind the House that when the mover speaks he closes the debate.

Hon. RAOUL DANDURAND: As I am closing the debate, I take it for granted that no other member of the Senate desires to speak on this question.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Honourable senators, we have heard considerable very interesting discussion on the Bill which has been submitted to us, and which held our attention in the Railway Committee for more than three weeks. The Minister of Transport declared in the committee that he thought this was a necessary piece of legislation. He admitted that it would be difficult to work out, and that its success would very largely depend upon its administration. He repeated more than once that the primary purpose of the Bill was not the protection of the railways; and he said that the intention of the Government, or of himself, at all events, was not to regulate one industry at the expense of another. He added:

The intention is that regulation shall be applied to each industry in the interest of that particular industry, and having in mind, of course, the protection of the public that uses the industry. But it is not a Bill to protect one industry against a competing industry.