

Surely we have troubles enough in our own country to engage our entire attention. The unemployment situation, with its increasing festers on the body politic, is still with us. The graduates of the past four years from our schools and colleges—thousands of Canadian boys and girls—are still unemployed. Such unemployment creates a situation which is destroying the future of our Canadian citizens.

In passing, may I mention a subject that I think ought to have the attention of the Government and of this House? I refer to the thirty thousand destitute farmers in the southwest quarter of Saskatchewan and the southeast quarter of Alberta—thirty thousand farmers whom we have been assisting for three years; thirty thousand farmers whom we shall be assisting as long as they live, unless we take steps to put them into some part of the country where they can earn a living. The right honourable gentleman from Eganville (Right Hon. Mr. Graham) knows well the controversy there was with respect to the settlement of that country in the early days. I was in the colonization business. I inspected that country thirty years ago, and at that time you could not pull enough grass off a section in a day to fill your hat. When Sir Clifford Sifton was Minister of the Interior he declined to open up that country. He said it was a ranching country. He was right. It should have been left to the cows. Now we have thirty thousand families there, and we are feeding them. Relief in Saskatchewan is costing, I presume, \$12,000,000 or \$15,000,000 this year. That cannot continue. The Government allowed those people to go on that land. The Government must take care of them. The people in that section of the country do not need to worry about their debts; they will never pay them, for they have nothing to pay them with; and I suggest that if we ever move them we should give them a blanket bankruptcy and start them all off free of debt. These are some of the things that this country has to deal with.

With the permission of the honourable senators who are wise in their years, and who have been in this House much longer than I have, I want to say a word about the Senate. This Senate, in my judgment, is the ablest body of men in our Dominion to investigate, discuss, judge, and then recommend the best procedure to be followed with respect to the great problems now confronting us. Believing this, as I do, may I express the hope that the Government of the day will see to it that our services—paid for in any event—are made use of for the benefit of the coun-

Hon. Mr. McRAE.

try we all love so much and are so eager to serve.

If in my remarks I have uttered any word of discouragement to any of my fellow-citizens, I wish to take this opportunity to set their minds at rest. We in Canada have much to be thankful for. We are undoubtedly living in the best country in the world, a country rich in natural resources, and our opportunity for recovery and for national welfare is infinitely greater than that of the peoples of worked-out Europe. We are rich in citizenship. Our people have in their veins the blood of the best and most progressive nations the world has ever known. We cannot be lacking in ability to see ourselves through.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.

Hon. J. J. HUGHES: Honourable members of the Senate, in considering the speech with which His Excellency opened Parliament, I have observed that few of those who have spoken—I would include even the mover—have confined themselves to the text of the speech. I am therefore going to follow their example in the few words that I have to offer.

The honourable gentleman who has just taken his seat has said many of the things that I intended saying. This will tend to shorten my remarks. I agree thoroughly with his statement and his point of view; and before going any further, lest I forget it, I wish to make a remark with respect to the question raised by the honourable member from Hamilton (Hon. Mr. Lynch-Staunton) as to whether, if there were an inflation of our currency, we should be compelled to pay a premium on the debts which we owe in the United States and which are payable in gold. I wish to remind the House of one incident. Shortly but not immediately after President Roosevelt was inaugurated as head of the republic, Congress gave him the power to prevent the exportation of gold from the United States. The United States, although a great creditor nation, owed some bills in Europe that were maturing and were payable in gold. The President of the United States refused to pay them in gold. The newspapers of Europe, particularly those of Great Britain, strongly protested against this refusal, saying that it was a repudiation of contract, a violation of agreement, and used all the other expressions that could be used on an occasion of that kind. Nevertheless, the United States simply refused. If we followed their example in that respect and paid in our own currency the bills that we owe in the United States, could they very well refuse to accept that payment, in view of the policy that they themselves adopted?