

*The Address—Mr. Drew*

are still waiting for some reasonable explanation as to why the government has insisted upon having those emergency powers.

Let no one suggest that in presenting this position we are dealing with some vague entity known as "big business" which should be concerned about this subject. The people who should be most disturbed in this country with its vast opportunities and vast resources still to be developed are the Canadian men and women whose employment has been created in the past and whose expanding employment can be best created in the future by the driving power of competition with all its risks and possible losses.

Let no one suggest that any sinister motive on the part of the government or its supporters is implied in what has been said. This government has a perfect right to believe, and the supporters of this government have a perfect right to believe in centralized power and in legislation under which it can exercise that power by decree if it decides that events justify that course. But let no one be under any illusion as to what it can mean. It does not represent a belief in those checks and balances which were intended under our constitution, amongst other things, to prevent interference with free competition and individual initiative. That was the effect of reserving property and civil rights to the provinces. It does not represent opposition to monopoly, no matter what may be said. The clearly stated policy under which the decision in regard to the Canadian Pacific Air Lines application was made, and which would apply with equal force to any other type of activity, is that the government is ready to substitute its judgment for the judgment of any individual or group of individuals who believe that by their effort and energy they can provide a useful service to our people.

Socialism has its supporters and its very sincere supporters. I have no doubt that those who advocate that doctrine are fully convinced that it would be best for our people. Whatever else may be added, the core of socialist doctrine is government control of the means of production, transportation and communication. That does not mean that a socialist government would necessarily take over all production, transportation and communication. The socialist government in Britain made no such attempt. Presumably, they only created government monopolies in those cases where they came to the conclusion that it was good for the people and for the industry. Of course, as we know from the reported speeches made in Britain, there were

different ideas as to how far that should extend. The important thing to remember, however, is that no one was in a position to know what other industry or activity would at any time be included at some future date.

What it seems particularly difficult for many to realize is that this government now has power to create a monopoly in any industry or other type of production if the government, in its own judgment, without consulting parliament, should decide that this were needed. Surely this newly-announced policy by the government—not the particular refusal of an application but the announced policy of the government—gives new meaning to the words of the Prime Minister when he indicated his own belief some time ago that socialists are merely Liberals in a hurry. If that statement meant anything—and I am sure it was intended to mean something very definite—then it surely meant that the differences between those two parties are only of degree. Certainly those words have a new meaning when we find this government now enunciating a policy which conforms so thoroughly to socialist doctrine that it is not only the right but the duty of government so to plan the nation's affairs that the government in its wisdom will determine when there shall be competition and when there shall not.

This government has had a great deal to say about monopolies. After a period of convenient forgetfulness, it has claimed considerable credit for attempts to break monopolies by proceedings under the Combines Investigation Act. It has refused to permit what are regarded as fair trade practices in the United States, because this, they argue, might prevent our people receiving the benefit of competition. No matter what the merits of the argument were, that was the argument. Now it breaks the very principle embraced in the laws which it has been enforcing. The difference, of course, is that government monopolies are much larger. The difference also is that the government is in the position to prevent anyone from competing with their monopolies. History teaches us that a government monopoly can be just as destructive to the rights and liberty of people as any private monopoly ever was.

Personal liberty is the great issue in the world today. If we are to preserve that liberty, then we must remember that freedom of the individual, or of groups of individuals, to decide their own course, to risk and to venture in new fields of endeavour, is part of the strength of our system. Today we are living in a highly competitive world. Germany