

years, and so far as I know the sons are carrying on the traditions of their fathers in the very best manner possible.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: We look to the honourable gentleman from Cariboo to carry on the tradition established by his distinguished father. It was a good one.

The speeches of the mover and seconder of the address were—I say this with all respect—typical of the provinces from which these gentlemen come. Everything is booming and humming on the Pacific Coast, and the new member from British Columbia did his province proud by his first speech in this house. Living as I do half way between here and that province, and knowing a little bit about it, I am inclined to think he truly represented the best aspirations of the people out there. The honourable gentleman who seconded the address comes from Quebec and his speech was made in French. I understood some of it at the time he was speaking, but this morning I had the pleasure of reading a translation that was better than mine. It was a speech typical of the province of Quebec, by a distinguished member of the legal profession in that province who probably had never been in parliamentary life before and who came here with all the enthusiasm of a young man on his first adventure.

I congratulate both the mover and the seconder. If the day ever comes when the party which I have the honour to lead here has the right to nominate members to this house, I hope that its choices will be as good as the three that the government of the day has made on this occasion.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr HAIG: Now, honourable senators, I am going to touch for a moment or two on the Speech from the Throne. Parts to which I make no reference at this time will be dealt with under other headings a little later on. The speech begins by referring to peace, and says that the establishment of enduring peace is the corner-stone of our external policy. I shall deal with that later. The next paragraph deals with world conditions. Then there is a reference to the General Assembly of the United Nations. The speech goes on to mention controls, in an omnibus clause that refers also to labour relations, a subject which I shall discuss when labour legislation is before us.

I do not propose to deal with agriculture at this time. I say quite candidly to the house that I am very much disturbed by the attitude that the present government has always maintained towards agriculture. To my mind its whole policy indicates a forgetfulness of the

fact that agriculture, and especially farm agriculture, is the basic industry of our country. I do not believe the government has ever given that industry the rights that it ought to have. I am not going to indulge in a long discussion of this matter, for it is coming up later, but frankly I say that to contract to furnish wheat to Great Britain at \$1.55 a bushel when it is selling on the market for \$2.25, cannot be justified. That was the sole issue in the Portage la Prairie by-election. The farmers gave a most decisive vote against that policy, turning a majority of nearly 1,900 into one of 700 the other way. That shows conclusively how the farmers in that part of the country felt about the matter, and I believe that farmers all over Canada feel the same way. If we want to sell wheat to Great Britain at \$1.55, all right; but let us all pay the shot and give the farmers a fair price.

We hear that the farmers are going to get better prices for a year or two. If I read the papers correctly, Britain is now engaged in a life-and-death struggle to survive. And do you mean to say that in two years from now, if wheat is worth only 70 cents a bushel, we can make Britain pay one dollar? Do not be foolish! It cannot be done. I will not touch on that matter any further than this: my bitterest charge against the present government, from the very start of the war to date, has had regard to the way they have dealt with agriculture. You would think, agriculture being primary production, they would have been interested in putting it on a firm basis. The charge has been made that after the last war there was a great deflation of farm land values. Government policy had nothing to do with that. The situation then existing in the western provinces was common to all Canada; the owners of small parcels of land wanted to buy more. That is not the case at this time. The farmers learned their lesson in 1921; every dollar they got they devoted to paying off their debts. There has never been a greater reduction of debt than has occurred recently among the farmers of our western provinces. But all this has nothing to do with the question of value. If I produce 5,000 bushels of wheat, why should I lose 70 cents a bushel on that crop? It cannot be justified, at any rate, unless you can prove to me that in two years from now wheat will be worth only 50 cents and Britain will pay one dollar—which I know she will not do.

Marketing is much the same problem. I pass on to other subjects.

As to immigration, I wonder if the honourable senator for Toronto Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) is here? I do not see him in the house just now.

Some Hon. SENATORS: He is here.