

Hon. Mr. Farris: Are not the newspaper owners to blame?

Hon. Mr. Davies: They probably are. I will tell my honourable friend something. Last year there had been some criticism of the Press Gallery, and during the debate on Senator Croll's proposals for penal reform I defended the Press Gallery very strongly. Then, dealing with some penitentiary regulations suggested by the honourable gentleman from Toronto-Spadina (Hon. Mr. Croll), I said I disagreed with them. Well, despite my defence of the Press Gallery, not one Toronto or Ottawa newspaper even mentioned that I spoke, and the Canadian Press misreported me, saying that I strongly backed the very things which I opposed. Even our own paper in Peterborough said that I agreed with Senator Croll, and the article was published under a large heading.

I want now to speak of some features of the Speech from the Throne.

First of all there is the problem of Hungarian refugees, mentioned in paragraph 8 of the Speech. We all hope that those who have come here will be heartily welcomed and that they will contribute to the development of this country; but, honourable senators, we must not shut our eyes to the fact that the bringing in of these refugees after a more or less cursory medical examination, and paying for their transportation over here, is not unanimously approved by Canadians. I read quite a number of daily newspapers every day—that is my job—and I notice that there have been a great many letters in the papers complaining particularly about the lack of a thorough medical examination, and also quite a few about the free transportation. The question has been asked time and again in letters: "If we can do this for Hungarian refugees, why can we not do something of the same kind for British immigrants? Why can't we bring over more British immigrants and pay their way too?"

As honourable senators know, until recently immigration from the Old Country—which, as some others do, I like to refer to as the "mother country"—had fallen off. This was not through any fault of the immigration officials, who were doing their best, but because at the time there was in Britain almost full employment at very good wages. The pay of agricultural workers over there is set by the Government. In 1939 the Welsh agricultural worker received 30 shillings a week and a cottage rent free. Today he receives 7 pounds 10 shillings a week, with a cottage, for a working day of eight hours, plus time and a half for Sundays. So the farm labour situation has changed. Much the same has

happened in other businesses: everywhere in industry wages have gone up considerably. Thus the people over there are contented. Their costs of living, largely because of moderate rents, are low. Very good council houses, put up partly at the expense of the Government and partly of the municipality, were and are renting for less than \$10 a week. One cannot duplicate that condition over here. I am not sure that I favour assisted emigration from Britain to this country. I have the feeling that the man who has saved his money and accumulated enough to buy tickets for himself and his family will be more apt to settle here, with the intention of being a good Canadian and helping in the development of this country, than if he relies largely or wholly on the Government for his passage money. Canada, unlike Great Britain, has no scheme of national health insurance, which many of them miss. If one goes to a doctor here one has to pay his fees. This condition, and other differences between the two countries, get "under the skin" of some immigrants, and they write letters to the newspapers criticising things they find here. I was astounded recently to read a letter in one of the Toronto papers in which the writer complained that too many Britishers were being brought over, that they did not make good citizens and would not settle down. It was signed by a Mrs. Jones. I wondered what part of Wales this woman came from that she, with a name like that, should be offended at British immigration. Probably she herself came here with the benefit of an assisted passage or something of the sort.

However, as I have remarked, I do not know whether I favour assisted passages. My parents and I came to this country a long time ago. Today the minimum fare ranges from \$160 to \$185, which, comparatively speaking, is a lot of money. When I emigrated to Canada there were three classes—first, second and third. Naturally I came third. It will astonish honourable senators to know that it cost me only \$17.60, at the then rate of exchange, for the ocean voyage and transportation from Quebec to Brantford, where the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) resides, and which is 65 miles west of Toronto. At today's rate of exchange the cost of the whole trip would amount to \$10.15.

Hon. Mr. Burchill: In what year was that?

Hon. Mr. Davies: 1894.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: I suppose that to get to Brantford was well worth the fare.

Hon. Mr. Davies: Indeed it was. Ships in those days boasted no such equipment as two- or three- or four-berth cabins in the