

any discrimination in favour of a shipper who makes all or any part of his shipments by one railroad. The agreed charges provisions, though they may have to come—because justice must be done in the end, no matter what happens—cut athwart the whole principle of the operation of the Railway Act as it is to-day. All I am contending is this. We have not got far enough in the study of these provisions, and particularly in the study of their effect in Great Britain, where they have been in force for a space of two or more years, to make it safe for us to enforce them in this Dominion.

I now come to the second division. The Bill seeks to deal with transport by air and to regulate air traffic upon principles provided in the Railway Act for regulating rail traffic. To this section of the Bill as finally amended I have no criticism at all to make. I do not think there is anything serious to be apprehended in the operation of this part. When we are in the sphere of aviation traffic we are happily in our own hunting ground and we know there is no jurisdiction to dispute us. This is federal; it is not provincial in any way, and whatever regulation there is must be federal. It will be probably meagre regulation for a time. Subsequently it will be adapted to meet the developments of aviation. That there has to be regulation I do not doubt, for I know in corresponding fields regulation has come, and, having once come, it has never departed. I do not object to the Bill on the ground of the aviation provisions.

The third class has to do with motor-truck and bus traffic. As everyone knows, the Bill pretends to regulate this traffic only in the sphere of interprovincial and international trade. It does so because, admittedly, the Government realizes that the sphere of intra-provincial truck and bus traffic is within the sole jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures. It has been stated by the honourable senator from South Bruce (Hon. Mr. Donnelly) and by others that the measure of traffic carried by buses and trucks which comes within the margin of interprovincial trade is limited to less than 2 per cent. I do not know what that percentage would be when you take in international trade, but I am inclined to think the evidence showed that the percentages of international and interprovincial trade together aggregate less than 2 per cent of all the bus and truck traffic.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STAUNTON: What does 2 per cent mean? Is there any large volume of traffic?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Of all the bus and truck trade, whatever it may be, that which belongs to the category of interprovincial and international trade is 2 per cent.

Hon. Mr. LYNCH-STAUNTON: But is it a large trade?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a tremendous trade. The railways estimated that the amount of money it took from their gross revenues was \$38,000,000. But, at that, there would be less than 2 per cent of the \$38,000,000 attributable to interprovincial and international traffic. Honourable members, then, will realize that in respect of truck and bus traffic the sphere we are seeking to occupy and regulate federally is a very narrow sphere; that 98 per cent and more, according to our admission, comes within the purview of the provincial legislatures. And we know, as the evidence discloses, that the provinces, one and all of them, not only occupy the sphere of that 98 per cent, but, occupying it, they are regulating it, and they are determined to continue in their occupation and regulation.

The provinces go further. They say: "We do not admit for a moment your right to come into even the 2 per cent or any part of it. We claim that we are in control of that truck and bus traffic from the moment it starts in our province until it gets to the boundary, and when it gets beyond our boundary it is under control of the jurisdiction within which it comes." They contend that there is no fixed structure joining the provinces and establishing a basis for federal jurisdiction as exercised by the Federal Parliament in respect of railways. Whether they are right in the latter contention or not I do not know. What I do know is this, that if we pass the Bill in respect of bus and truck traffic, we shall only be purchasing a law-suit with the provinces for the sake of occupying a narrow territory where we can hardly turn round after we get in. I ask honourable members, is it worth while?

The Minister told us he looked forward to the time when the provinces would surrender the exercise of the jurisdiction they enjoy, and by their legislatures pass it over to the Railway Board of Canada. Does anyone, after listening to them before a committee of the House, think seriously they will? The tail does not wag the dog in the sphere of legislation any more than it does anywhere else. Those who occupy the 98 per cent are far more likely to invade the 2 per cent than those who occupy the 2 per cent are to absorb the 98 per cent.

I was surprised to hear the honourable leader of the House suggest that those who opposed the Bill were private interests. I do not know why private interests should not oppose if they think the Bill is wrong. But if ever there was a Bill against which public interests were arrayed, it was this Bill. Who represent the public interests of Canada?