

touched on in that speech. I feel as if I had been neglected in not having received any of the information which the honourable gentleman has, regarding the new method of shipping Canadian cattle to Great Britain. That farm product is of vast importance to us all, and I say without qualification of any kind that if the new method is as successful as the honourable member deems it to be—and in this respect he quotes very high authority—then what he says is the most cheerful message for the farmers of this Dominion that I have heard in many a long day. I recall that years ago the same gentleman to whom the honourable senator made reference had hopes that there might be developed some method of chilling which would make possible the successful shipment of beef from Canada to Great Britain. Well do I remember with what pessimism the suggestion was received by another high authority in this Chamber, the honourable senator from Marquette (Hon. Mr. Mullins). So far the honourable senator from Marquette has been right. This new method, as I understand it, has not to do with what is usually known as the chilling process, but is some modification, which so far has proved successful, of the shipping process.

The outlook is not bright. I think it is well that a Government to which the honourable member is friendly was in office when he made his speech. Had it not been, I can imagine the changes he would ring, and I can imagine also where he would place the blame. I know what the honourable gentleman would say was all wrong, and the reasons he would give for the depression in agriculture. But now those reasons cannot be given, and he sets out in businesslike fashion to make some common-sense suggestions as to what can be done.

The wheat outlook is not good. Indeed, it is so far from being good that governments, not only in our own Dominion but in all the wheat growing and exporting countries of the world, are exercising their wits to the limit in an effort to think out some plan that will save the price situation over the next three or four years.

We have not made the success which we should have made of our hog production. I presume our failure is largely due to the drought in the West and the killings which became essential there. However, it is a disaster to the country, because the conversion of grains into bacon, where the bacon market is so ample as it is to-day and has been for some years—a market which we have not yet more than half filled—is certainly a much more businesslike process of disposing of our grains than any that has been suggested at those conferences of which mention has been made.

If the outlook for agriculture is not good, there is some reason. The reason is a universal one. There is no way of artificially raising the level of the standard of living for agriculturists. There is a way of artificially raising that level for other people: for labour, for example, through the union, and for people in other lines of production through the cartel. But these things cannot be made to work in an agricultural community. While the farmer thinks that some fiscal system is bearing down upon him and making him pay unduly for the products he has to buy, what is really bearing down upon him is the weight of a social system where others can raise their standards at his cost; for it is at the cost of the primary producer always that standards are artificially lifted.

I heard the Speech from the Throne, and I have read it. It is of extraordinary length. It has no other extraordinary feature. Speeches from the Throne have become pretty much electioneering pamphlets. They become more and more campaign literature as the campaign approaches; and this Speech from the Throne reads to me very much like a prolonged and painful effort of the Government to convince the country that the Government has a very high opinion of itself. Look at paragraph one, paragraph six, paragraph eight; note the subjects touched on and the skill of the hand that makes about each subject the assertion without any particular meaning, and the promise with nothing specific; then look back on other speeches, and you can see pretty well what has happened in the intervening time.

This speech, for example, says nothing at all about the trade of Canada. One would think we were not a trading country at all; the subject is never mentioned. But, of course, any intelligent person knows the reason why: trade has been going down; and things that do not read well for campaign purposes do not appear in speeches from the Throne. Our trade in the year past has diminished by some \$200,000,000 in exports and, I think, about \$90,000,000 in imports. There is no reason given for this decline. Of course, we know the reason: the trade of the world is pretty much contracted. But the subject escaped the notice of the draftsman of the Speech from the Throne.

He mentioned nothing at all about our revenues, although from time immemorial, if there was anything cheerful to mention, it always appeared in the Speech from the Throne. The reason for the omission, naturally, is that our revenues have been going down. They are less for the past year than