

*The Address—Mr. Drew*

tion. But that has nothing to do with the question before us. Either we believe in monopoly in transportation or we do not. A monopoly in transportation is just as much a monopoly in government transportation as it is in transportation in the hands of private interests.

What was implied by the statement was simply this. If the monopoly were broken in this case, then there would be a chance of the monopoly being broken in the other case, and that, of course, must not be contemplated. In other words, the government in reaching its decision was "under no illusion" that breaking the one monopoly might break the other. That seems to me a reasonable interpretation of the statement made by the president of Trans-Canada Air Lines.

In referring to this statement it should also be pointed out that the president of Trans-Canada Air Lines indicated a knowledge of the attitude of the government toward this question which was hardly consistent with the theory of free competition which has been asserted at all times in relation to government operations of this kind.

We have contended that the government was displaying more and more monopolistic tendencies, but this was stoutly denied. The Prime Minister has now dotted the "i's" and crossed the "t's" of a policy which means the end of free competition where the government has entered any business. It could mean the end of free competition generally, if the government decided at any time to carry this policy a stage farther under the overriding powers of the Emergency Powers Act.

Whatever the facts are in this particular case, business should realize and, above all, the workers whose employment is found by the expansion of new business, that a time when the governments in other free countries are getting more and more out of business our government is getting deeper and deeper into it in many directions.

By this decision the government may have torn away the veil from the mystery surrounding its determination to have emergency powers in peacetime which make it possible for the government, without coming back to parliament, to exercise full control over any industry, any individual activity, or in fact any aspect of the work of our people, by order in council.

In his speech on Saturday, which was so warmly applauded from every part of this house, the President of the United States

made an extremely significant statement. These were his words:

We are people who do not believe in government by edict or decree.

This statement goes to the root of the great issues dividing the world today. The trouble is that so many Canadians have not yet realized that over extended opposition and vigorous argument this government has insisted upon placing on the statute books legislation which makes it possible for them to govern by edict or decree, if in their own belief events at any time justify that course.

Now it is to be hoped that our people generally, and particularly those engaged in businesses which employ large numbers of people, will recognize what those emergency powers, call them stand-by powers, call them what you will, could mean, under the declared policy of the government—that where they are called upon to make a decision they will decide what is good for an industry, and who could and who could not compete.

Although chambers of commerce right across western Canada, and the Manitoba government as well, urged the extension of air cargo service, which could only be provided by effective competition, the government decided that there was to be no competition and under the policy stated by the Prime Minister this meant a decision that it was not good for the industry.

This means that the initiative, the vision, the chances which may result in profit or loss, are to be denied by the decision of the government. If that policy is sound in this case, in what case would it not be sound? If we should enter a period of economic stress, why would it not be equally logical for the government to tell our automobile companies that they must all make the same models of cars because competition, in their opinion, would not be good for the industry? Why should they not do it in other industries where similar things are made and where similar courses must be followed? After all, it has been done in other countries. It could be done; and the government does not deny that it could be done under the laws now on the statute books. The only answer from the other side is that they have complete confidence in the government and what it will do. Do not let anyone say that this suggestion is remote from reality. The power is there. Let anyone who doubts it examine the statutes. That has not been denied. If it is not intended that this power be used under certain circumstances, then we in this house

[Mr. Drew.]