

and maintenance of the highways leading in and out of their localities. It seems to me that a special automobile tax may be the only solution to their problem. When I was reeve of my municipality I argued many times with the provincial government authorities that a larger share of the motor vehicle licence revenue should be paid to the municipalities to assist them in meeting their administrative costs. However, up to the present time that has not been done.

The honourable senator from Medicine Hat (Hon. Mr. Gershaw) expressed alarm at our highway traffic death toll. Hardly a day goes by but we read about somebody being killed on the highways. Automobile manufacturers change their car designs every year in order to sell their products, and they keep making the cars wider, lower and more powerful. The law in most of our provinces imposes a speed limit of fifty miles an hour, so why in the world do these manufacturers produce cars of 250 horsepower or more and capable of going well over a hundred miles an hour? It seems to me that only police cars should be geared for these higher speeds. Recently I read that two youths were chased by a police car at a speed of 100 miles an hour through a settled community. It was only a miracle that somebody was not killed. It is the height of folly that something is not done to curb speeding on our streets and highways. The Trans-Canada Highway near Brandon, Manitoba, has a slight curve but the road is wide enough for four vehicles to pass abreast. One night last fall five oil men in one car, and a man and his wife in another, were involved in a collision. All were killed instantly except the father of the four children and he was so seriously injured that he spent a long time in hospital and probably will never be well again. No one was able to explain the cause of the accident but someone told me that the speedometer of one car registered 80 miles per hour. There was some evidence, therefore, that it had been travelling at a terrific rate of speed.

Honourable senators, something was said by both honourable leaders of this house about reform of the Senate. I was grateful to the Prime Minister for the appointment to this house of our dear friend the late Senator Hackett, and I deeply regret he was with us for only a very short time. If the people are to have confidence in this chamber, I think there should be a rule of law that at least 25 per cent of its members must belong to a different political party than that of the majority. Of course, I know there are outstanding examples of men of independent thought here. I recall that on at least two occasions, and on one occasion in particular,

I was instrumental in asking for a vote. There had been a rumour that two independents were appointed to this chamber, and I was somewhat curious to find out just how independent they were. On those occasions there was an absolutely faithful vote along party lines, just as faithful as if this had been an elective chamber; it was a vote, as the saying is, at the "crack of the whip". That is scarcely good enough for the Senate. I think that if my suggestion were followed the people of Canada would have greater confidence in this chamber.

I made a few notes on matters I have spoken about on previous occasions, and one is the opportunity a senator has in a debate of this kind to say something about the conditions in his own province. In the province of Saskatchewan we have about half of all the agricultural land in the dominion. We are, so to speak, in the centre of the prairies. The Alberta farmers have an advantage over us, as a great deal of shipping now goes to the Pacific coast; and compared with the Manitoba farmer, we have a longer haul on shipments to the east; so on shipments to the west and to the east we are under a handicap because we have to pay extra freight. It seems as though a determined effort is made to place my province in the position of the poor relation, for besides having to pay higher freight rates we receive lower prices for our cream, butter, hogs and other produce.

Now, our great hope in Saskatchewan was that we would be able to use the Hudson Bay route for shipping wheat. The British millers who recently made a trip here said they would prefer to buy wheat through Churchill because they got a better grade at lower cost. But how do we in Saskatchewan benefit by that arrangement? Notwithstanding the fact that all down through the years we have received less for our grain than the Manitoba farmers have, the Wheat Board now prices wheat at ten cents a bushel higher through Churchill. But they put that extra ten cents into the kitty and we get no benefit from it.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce in a speech he made some time ago said that about 17 million bushels was the limit that could be shipped through Churchill. Now, that is not a fact. There is no limit short of 100 million bushels, as long as there are adequate storage facilities and the ships will come in there. I have talked to the captains of some ships myself, and I know they like to come to that port. Of course it is not easy to secure shipping through Churchill because of the problem of getting inbound cargo. But I believe a great deal of the materials which go into the building of the pipe lines in western Canada could come as