

portion of the enormous debt that has been saddled on the people of Canada by reason of the railway situation.

Let us go back thirty-two years to the time when there came into being in the great Canadian West two brand new provinces, each of which has cost the people of the West—yes, and the people of Canada—tens of millions of dollars. With the knowledge we have at the present moment, and in the light of our experience with respect to too much government, will anybody argue that two brand new provinces would be established in the year 1937 as they were in the year 1905? I think not. Millions of dollars have been spent because the people of the great West were clamouring for the creation of two new provincial governments. To do what? To protect vested interests which they held as citizens of the great West.

If we go back down the years we find that in 1905 there was only one great railroad system running throughout the great Canadian West; but the people of the West, having regard to their vested interests, clamoured for additional railway facilities. Did they get them? We all know they did. Two additional transcontinental lines—part of them scrapped or torn up to-day—were built because of the clamour and the claims of the vested interests and the people of the great Canadian West. This being so, it seems to me the allegation that this Bill tends to serve vested interests comes with very bad grace from one who lives in the West. I wanted to ask the honourable the junior member from Winnipeg what vested interests he referred to. Does he mean the vested interests of the Canadian people, who have to put up approximately \$50,000,000 a year by reason of the railway situation in Canada as it affects the public? If those are the vested interests involved, who is responsible for the burden of debt? No part of the country or no class of people is more responsible than the great Canadian West and its people. In saying this I do not want to be misunderstood, or to be taken as criticizing the claims made by the people of the Canadian West. They were doing at the time what they believed best to protect their own present and future interests. Who can criticize them for that? But it seems to me that it ill becomes any distinguished senator from the West to place the responsibility for this measure—which presumably contemplates dealing in reasonable equity with all parts of Canada—upon the shoulders of others, and to charge that the whole thing is the creation of vested interests.

While we are talking about vested interests—and this is, in a measure, on the side—let us see what our dear Western friends

have done. They have in the years gone by voiced their claims more loudly, perhaps, than any other part of Canada. The facts speak for themselves. Have I not recently read in the newspapers, or heard, that some of these Westerners, reverting to the time, about thirty years ago, when many of them lived on farms and went to schools in Ontario or Quebec, were advancing claims in connection with the transfer to Alberta and Saskatchewan of natural resources as held by the Federal Government before those two provinces came into being? If you can imagine anything more far-fetched or anything more clearly demonstrating the claims of vested interests, I should like to know what it is.

There are about this Bill many things I do not fully understand. I do not know how it is going to work out. I certainly should not have said a word on it had it not been for a couple of entirely illogical points which were raised. I refer particularly to the suggestion with regard to the protection or maintenance of vested interests, presumably in the province of Ontario and Quebec. I will go right along with my honourable friend the junior senator from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Haig) in opposing what appear to be improperly handled or improperly controlled vested interests. But does this Bill not contemplate the reasonable protection of the inheritance that has come to the Canadian people as a result of the railway situation? Does it not contemplate the reasonable protection of the transportation facilities that the people of the West have to make use of during about half the year, when no other transportation facilities are available? Does the Bill contemplate anything more or less than the protection of transportation facilities that have been here for many years, since long before some other transportation interests were ever dreamed of? As I understand it, the Bill contemplates giving a reasonable, square deal to the vested interests of the Canadian people in the railways of Canada, whether those railways are owned and dominated by the Canadian people or by that great private concern which has been of such marked benefit to Canada in the years gone by. I hope the honourable junior senator from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Haig) or somebody else will go into this question of vested interests, because in his speech he made use of the term "vested interests" not once, I think, but two or three dozen times, and it seems to me that we ought to know what is meant by it.

In conclusion I want to say that I think that in years past the people of Western Canada have been louder in demanding their rights and the protection of their vested