

ning to Prince Albert from one a day to three a week. A deputation came from Prince Albert to see him, and Mr. Coleman asked them by what means of transport they had come. Every one of them said, "By motor." If an honourable member of this House wanted to get up to a mine in the north country, would he go by aeroplane or by railway?

Hon. Mr. LITTLE: By plane.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: Of course. No legislation that we can pass could prevent the growth of these modern means of transportation. But I say to you, honourable senators, the people of Western Canada think, rightly or wrongly, that the Senate of Canada is a place where vested interests are protected; they think we will never stand up and fight for what they consider to be the rights of the common people. Now, the rights of the common people are challenged by this Bill as they have never before been challenged in this House, and I say it is our duty, if we think it is right to stand up for the interests of the common people, to kill this Bill. If, on the other hand, we think it is wrong to stand up for the rights of the common people, then let us pass the Bill. Why transfer the onus to the House of Commons? I do not know what would happen to it if we did send it there, but I do know that if I were in politics and were a member of the Opposition, I should like to have this Bill passed by the Government. Believe me, honourable senators, the Government will have trouble if it tries to enforce the provisions of this Bill with regard to transport by highway, by air and by water. There will be no end of difficulty if there is any attempt to increase the rates charged by lake vessels, which attempt will be made if the Bill is passed. But, honourable senators, we in this House are not in politics. Our duty, first, last and all the time, is to Canada. Therefore, if we consider this Bill to be against the interests of the common people, whether in the West, in the East, or in the central provinces, we ought to kill it.

I intend to vote against the passage of the measure. I hope that a great many members on both sides of the House will join in protecting the interests of the small man. We who vote against this Bill are not seeking to help the transportation companies; we are striking a blow on behalf of the struggling farmers of Western Canada.

Hon. R. B. HORNER: Honourable senators, I have some sympathy with the railways in their struggle against competition from buses. And there is a part of this Bill which I think is good. I refer to that part which would

Hon. Mr. HAIG.

authorize the Board, when considering an application for a certificate of convenience and necessity, with respect to transport by highway, to take into consideration permanency of service. That point, I take it, would come up in cases where a railway suffers from bus and truck competition in the summer months over territory which the railroad serves throughout the year. But the difficulties the railways are facing to-day—I am going to be bold enough to say what I think—are due in no small part to the disparity between wages that they pay to their employees and the wages or income of the primary producers of this country. Labour unions have a strangle-hold on the railways, and in the circumstances the railways cannot make any money. Their employees are highly paid in comparison with farm labourers of the West, who receive perhaps \$20 a month.

I agree with the honourable junior senator from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Haig) that the Western farmers believe this measure would result in an increase of lake freight rates. For that reason I do not like the Bill. Another reason why I do not like it is that one of its results would be the subjection of practical men to control by theorists. Many things which look good on paper do not work out well in actual practice. I can imagine theorists on a Board telling a man who has followed shipping all his life that he must carry only such-and-such a cargo and must charge only such-and-such a rate. Strong objection was taken to the provision in the Bill that a shipper, after having filed a rate, would not be able to increase it for thirty days thereafter. Well, because of certain circumstances, a practical shipping man might find it profitable to carry a ship-load of grain at a much lower rate to-day than, say, next week, but if this Bill were in effect he would not dare to reduce his rate to-day unless prepared to carry on with that rate for at least thirty days. Therefore, as I see it, the stabilization of rates under the Bill would inevitably result in increasing them.

Just recently there was a refusal on the part of the Government to stabilize rates to the primary producer in Western Canada. Now, if we are going to license ships we may soon be asked to license farmers, to set up a board authorized to determine the number of acres that a farmer may seed, with a view to stabilizing the agricultural industry.

The honourable junior senator from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Haig) quoted an editorial from the Winnipeg Free Press. I am rather sorry he did that, for I shall not feel so comfortable in voting against the Bill, since I know that paper is opposed to it. The atti-