

interests than have the people of any other part of Canada. As a result of the insistent clamour of the people of the great Canadian West, who were contending for certain things in order to protect their vested interests, much money has been spent on the Hudson Bay Railway and transcontinental railways.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: The Hudson Bay Railway did not cost the people of Canada anything. It was built on land that was set aside—

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: I do not know enough about it to go into an argument with my honourable friend, but I think it has been charged many times on the hustings—

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: A certain area of land was set aside.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Millions of dollars were paid out. I am not particularly finding fault with that. The Parliament of Canada was prepared to go to the very limit to satisfy the claims of the Western people. It may be that if we had known as much about it then as we do now the Hudson Bay Railway would not have been built. It may be that if we had known as much in 1905 as we do in 1937 the two new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan would not have been created. But now we see the representatives of the people of the great West—wonderful citizens who have helped to make Canada, and to place its name before the world—rising up to oppose this Transport Bill, which contemplates, as I understand it, giving a reasonable, square deal to the established transportation facilities of the country, and the vested interests of the Canadian people in them, in order that for six months of the year, when other transportation systems are not operating, these facilities may be available to the West.

Hon. LENDRUM McMEANS: Honourable senators, I assure you that I will not take up very much of your time in discussing this Bill. I rise to endorse the statements of my colleague from the city of Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Haig). As I understand it, the Senate of Canada was formed for the purpose of protecting the provinces against majorities. I find here a Bill that prejudicially affects the province of which I have the honour to be a representative.

There is one thing about which there is no doubt. It is admitted on every side that if this Bill passes an additional burden will be imposed on the farmer of Manitoba. There can be no question about that when a great Liberal newspaper which has been a strong supporter of all the Liberal governments we have ever had, and which has never said a

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK.

good word about the Conservative party during its existence, says on the editorial page of its last issue that this Bill is framed in the interest of a monopolistic concern and is prejudicial to the grain growers and the producers.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: It has the Western viewpoint.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: It has also the Liberal viewpoint.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: For once it is right.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: I do not know. I was interested in reading this editorial, which attacks the Government for introducing a Bill of this kind and calls upon it to withdraw. I think it is the first instance in which this great exponent of Liberalism ever attempted to damn a bill introduced by a Liberal Government.

There is just one more thing that I want to say. The farmer in Manitoba is taxed to the limit and beyond. As a result of an inquiry I made the other day I find that the cost of the Dominion Department of Agriculture has been increased by \$3,000,000 within two years. I find that even in the small province of Manitoba there are two experimental farms, as well as a huge agricultural college which is large enough for the state of Illinois, probably one of the largest states of the American Union. All this money is being spent in order to do something for the farmer, but in the meantime farms are being sold for taxes. If the expenditure and consequently the taxation of this country are to go on expanding or increasing, I do not know what the end will be. This Bill would increase the burden upon Western farmers, who already are labouring under a burden which is too heavy for them to bear. There is no question about that. The honourable leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) admitted that the measure would result in higher charges for transporting wheat through the Great Lakes. The object of the Bill is to destroy competition.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: The Minister stated before the committee that that was not the object of the Bill, nor would it be the effect of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: I understand that, but I do not place very much value on his words. I would rather take the opinion of that great exponent of Liberalism, the Winnipeg Free Press, a copy of which I have in my hands. That paper says the Bill would undoubtedly destroy competition. The farmer is already overburdened with taxation,