

We are told it is better to have all these things than monopoly. The bugbear of monopoly is held before us. I know many people are fearful of monopoly, but I do not think it is the duty of honourable senators to endeavour to inject into the public mind something that does not appertain to railway monopoly at all. Surely it is our part to lure on to brighter, saner worlds, and lead the way. Who is afraid of a monopoly controlled by the country? We are told competition will be gone. When the Canadian National Bill was before us the honourable gentleman (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) was not afraid of the disappearance of competition. Is there any competition in a real sense now?

What have we to fear? Service has to be up to Transportation Commission requirements; fares must be dictated by them; every form of service to the people—railway stations, trains, everything else—is under the supervision of the nation through its commission.

Who should be afraid of monopoly? Monopoly in transportation? We know that vast areas of the country never have had anything but monopoly, and they have not suffered at all. People there get just as good service as people who are situated in the midst of duplication.

But is there not competition enough? New competition has arisen; old competition has been reinforced. New competition has arrived in the form of buses and trucks and motor cars—a keener competition than that of any rival railway. Never fear we are going to lack competition. Unless we get our railways into a sounder economic condition than they are in now, they can never meet the competition they already have to face. Even water competition is more severe than ever before.

The leader of the Government tells us that everything was fine at the end of 1929; that what we need is more population. "Give us four million more," he says, "and all will be well." Sometimes in his speech he forgot the evidence; once he even forgot his own report. What will he find if he reads it? He will find that the door of hope he opened in his speech is closed. He told us in his report that in 1923, when we had nine million people in Canada, our railways had far more business than in 1937, when we had a population of eleven million. Though our population had gone up by two millions, the business of the railways had gone down 26 per cent. If he will consult the figures of 1938 he will find the population had gone up since 1923 a great deal over two millions, and the business of the railways had gone down 30 per cent. Passenger business had gone down by at least 50 per cent. Now, if an increase of population

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

of over two millions means a 30 per cent reduction in business, how does he reason that an increase of four millions in population will mean a 40 per cent increase in business? The honourable leader, as I have said, not only forgot the evidence, but he forgot his own report.

Lastly, he says he is afraid now of unified management because, if it is to be adopted, the next thing we know we shall have amalgamation of the two roads, under Government ownership. I should like to look into that for a moment, just to see how real the bogey is. We have taken over roads before, I admit. We took over the Canadian National, the Grand Trunk, and that precious conception, the Grand Trunk Pacific. Why did we do so? In all cases, because the roads were bankrupt, and we had to operate them, or thought we had to. Does anyone suggest we took them over for any other reason?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: We should have allowed them to go into receivership.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: If the interruption has any pertinence, the honourable gentleman can let the Canadian Pacific go into receivership, and not take over that company. If it would have been prudent to permit receivership in the case of other railroads, where we were guarantors and stood to lose by their liquidation, surely it would not be necessary in the case of the Canadian Pacific, where we are not guarantors. So what is my honourable friend afraid of?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: The Canadian Pacific is not in a bankrupt position to-day.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course it is not. My honourable friend is not afraid of its bankruptcy. Then, why does he fear that we should have to take over the Canadian Pacific? We have never taken over a road unless it had become bankrupt.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Does my right honourable friend want amalgamation under state ownership?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Of course I do not. But I fear that may happen unless we do something sensible. I am not going to predict that the Canadian Pacific will go downhill unless we do something, but I ask honourable members seriously to pause and reflect. In the past some things have happened which we did not expect would happen. I know the Canadian Pacific is a well managed road, that its name is almost synonymous throughout the world with the name of Canada, and that it has been the major contributor to our country's greatness. But in this world of men nothing is so well