

how many are unemployed? I think it ought to be able to give us an authoritative figure.

I do not want to enter into the discussion on taxation between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of Quebec, but one thing I have noticed about it is very interesting, and that is the large number of people who will be relieved from paying taxes at all if the exemptions are increased to \$3,000 for married wage earners and \$1,500 for single people. That is where the big tax load is. I am persuaded that that illustrates the problem I am raising today. I do not say that the rich man should not be taxed, but I do say that taxes have got to be cut down so that the labouring man earning a moderate wage can live. Only three months ago a labourer came to my office, and told me that he was earning about \$2,200—I think that was the amount—and his wife, who had been a nurse, was also working. They had two children. His wife, who earned about \$1,500, took the exemption of one child, and he took the exemption of the other. Although I forget the figure, I was shocked to learn what they had to pay in taxes. The man told me that after he and his wife had paid their taxes, and regular living expenses had been met, they had nothing left. At the very first attack of unemployment, such people are on the street. I have a very keen feeling for them. I do not pretend to preach on behalf of labour, but I think we as educated men and women, holding positions of importance, and who control one division of Parliament, should raise our voices to see that fair play is given to that class of people in our communities.

Turning now to another class, our farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta—I do not know so much about those of British Columbia—are demanding parity of prices. Just today, the farmers of Ontario officially—I am not speaking of the men on the line fence—demanded of the Ontario government that agricultural products be put on a parity price basis. Canada sells about 30 per cent of its agricultural products on the world market, and that controls the cost of the other 70 per cent. Remember that in dealing with the farmer, when it comes to getting votes, you are dealing with a different type of man from the labourer. Mr. Farmer knows where he is going, and if he is convinced that he is not getting a fair deal in the economy of Canada he is going to vote for a change in government. That is why the politician, or the statesman, whichever you care to call him, has to consider the interest of the farmer. The Premier of Quebec has given an exemption of 30 per cent on incomes of \$3,000. Why? Because he believes that will exempt the farmers of that province from taxation. He may be wrong, but he believes

it. That is why he is putting that exemption into effect. I have no doubt of that at all. In the next election we shall have to face the fact that the farmers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta—I do not know about British Columbia—and no doubt of Ontario and Quebec, are going to demand that they be given a fair deal in the economy of Canada and receive a very fair share of its earnings. These are matters that we as senators must recognize in time and try to solve.

To change the subject somewhat, I want to make a suggestion to the Government, through the Leader of the Government in the Senate. For many years I have felt that we are not getting the best possible service from the United Nations. By that I mean that we do not send any opposition down to the meetings. We are sending observers, but they are not members on the committee. I have been there, and I know. At the time I was there, Canada had delegates, or alternates, who sat in on all the proceedings. Let me tell you a story. We used to meet at 9 o'clock every morning. On one occasion the then Minister of External Affairs, now the Prime Minister of Canada, had to prepare a speech for delivery before the Committee on External Affairs. When he delivered the speech I happened to be sitting next to him at the table, and he said to me, "What do you think of that speech, Haig?" I said; "Not much, Mr. St. Laurent. I am sure it does not express the best Canadian opinion." Mr. Coldwell spoke up and said, "I agree with Haig". You were there, Mr. Speaker. Sitting across the table was Paul Martin, and he said he agreed with Haig, and John Bracken agreed with Haig, and then Mr. St. Laurent said, "I agree with Haig." Well, he took off for two or three days, and then wrote a real speech, and the funny part of it was this: Mr. Bracken was his deputy on the committee, and on the day that speech was to be delivered Mr. St. Laurent was sick with the 'flu and could not be there, so it was delivered by Mr. Bracken. The press of the United States said that the Leader of the Conservative party had made a great speech before the United Nations. I think very highly of that representation on the United Nations.

I suggest that in addition to her Government representation at the United Nations meetings Canada should have two men or women from the major parties and one from each of the smaller parties. These representatives would, I believe, return from their participation in the work of that body feeling as I did, that while it has its faults and may be far