

only declared war on Japan some six days before that country capitulated. Russia did nothing at all to help in the overthrow of Japan, and it was only after the atomic bomb had been dropped on Hiroshima that Russia declared her intention of going to war against Japan. To my mind the United States should have gone ahead and seen to the signing of the treaty in 1947. It would have been signed at that time except for the objections raised by Soviet Russia, who has endeavoured to block the making of a treaty during the past four years. These are important matters.

I wish the delegation from Canada the best of luck and I trust that when the conditions of the agreement with Japan are made public, the points I have just mentioned will be settled to our advantage. But I am not overlooking two facts: the strength and bulk of the American commission, ten men as against our five, and the more important fact that the Japanese are now sitting with the treaty practically signed. It should have been written into the treaty that the Japanese were to be prevented from fishing off our shores and depleting our fisheries. I trust that the Japanese will be reasonable, for they, unlike the Canadian and American fishermen who have taken the precaution to see that our supplies of halibut, sock-eye salmon and Pribilof seals have not been destroyed, have always been exploiters rather than conservationists of fisheries.

I now come to the proposed legislation as outlined in the Speech from the Throne. I realize that many of the subjects touched upon will come before us later in the form of legislation, and therefore it is not my intention to deal at any length with those matters now. I should like to make the comment, however, that the legislative program proposed in the Speech from the Throne is a little too heavy for the time which has been allotted to us at this fall session. This session was called primarily so that parliament could deal with what we may call a universal pension, but the Throne Speech proposes legislation dealing with freight rates, the C.B.C. and other matters. I think honourable senators will agree with me that it is going to take every minute of our time to get through this agenda before Christmas, and I trust that the many important pieces of legislation will not be dilly-dallied with until the dying hours, so that an honourable senator will not be looked upon as committing a crime should he rise in his place and ask questions or take objection to any phase of the legislation.

I should like to make mention of something with regard to the sending of Canadian troops to Europe. I wonder how many of my colleagues received a small booklet entitled

Canada Off To Europe? I would advise honourable senators to read this booklet, because in my opinion it is one of the finest instruction pamphlets any government department has ever put out. It instructs our soldiers how to conduct themselves when they are in European countries, and stresses the fact that they should not forget that they are acting in the capacity of Canadian ambassadors. I want to commend the government department which published this booklet.

We in British Columbia are watching the St. Lawrence Waterway proposal, because it is our view that when this undertaking is completed all the provinces will bear its cost but the great benefit will go to perhaps one province. It will place a greater burden on the railways because of the loss of railway traffic, and we are a little afraid that this loss of traffic from the great industrial province of Ontario will result in the railways increasing freight rates elsewhere. In my opinion freight rates affect only eight provinces, and in support of this statement may I draw your attention to the fact that in the last rate increase of 21 per cent asked for by the railways, the two great provinces of Canada made no protest or took no apparent interest whatsoever because of the competition provided by water transportation and trucking transportation in these provinces. The result of this is that the railways give the provinces of Ontario and Quebec cheaper freight rates than were given to the other eight provinces.

This special session was called to deal principally with what is known as the universal pension. Legislation on this matter will come before us later on, so I am not going to deal extensively with it just now, but I believe it is important to make one or two remarks on the subject. Personally I wish the government had done away with the means test entirely for people at sixty-five as well as for those at seventy. Any who have had dealings with the means test must have realized the reluctance which many people feel in answering searching questions asked them by investigators and on forms that have to be signed. And if, as is generally agreed, the dollar today is worth only 50 cents as compared with the 1939 dollar, will anyone say that \$40 a month is enough for a needy person in this country?

I cannot enthuse greatly over the granting of \$40 a month to the well-to-do and wealthy. There is a question, I know, of treating everyone alike, but under the proposed system I doubt if anyone who is now fifty years of age or over can pay in all that he will receive or be entitled to receive. I am also opposed to placing a limit of \$60 on the tax. I may be alone in the Senate in holding