

I have noticed that some members start a speech in one year and finish it the next, so I want to do likewise and complete dealing with a rather critical attack made on me last year by the *Toronto Star*. I just want to say to that newspaper that I, like many others, could have been elected to parliament by merely running for a certain party. On one occasion I was assured that if I ran on the Liberal ticket I would be nominated and elected, but I declined the offer, and I ran as a Conservative. Later I was asked to accept the Progressive nomination, and I again declined, saying that I would still be the same man and that I did not believe in camouflage. Honourable senators know that many persons across Canada who forsook their own parties are now holding prominent positions in another chamber, and when they meet an old friend they look like a small boy who needs his mother. I at least was able to maintain the respect of my Liberal opponent, and when he passed away we were the best of friends.

If the *Toronto Star* thinks that I would have been a better man for being elected to office by merely running for a certain party, it is welcome to that notion. There are two prominent members in this chamber who first came to Ottawa as Progressives when, as there ought to be now, there was a great feeling that both old parties were neglecting Western Canada in the matter of tariffs and so on.

My honourable friend from Huron-Perth (Hon. Mr. Golding) spoke about the splendid example our leaders have set. Perhaps in his remarks, he included some of those who have passed on. I am inclined to think of the confession heard in the Anglican Church:

We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done.

Canada has made every mistake that it is possible for a country to make. We should be ashamed when we think of what we have done with our great heritage of land and forest, and realize that we have lost to the United States so many of our sons and daughters, and that the money we have spent to bring immigrants here has been wasted because most of these people have moved on to the States.

I have had a wide experience in meeting people. I was raised not far from here, in Pontiac, in as fine a settlement as there is in Canada. There were a lot of Irish people in the district—Kennedys, Faheys and O'Briens—and in all truth one could apply to them the scriptural saying:

Better is a neighbour that is near than a brother far off.

There was real neighbourliness in that district. I remember that Mrs. Kennedy used to walk sixteen miles to market with a basket of eggs. She raised a fine family of eleven children, including five sons, all of whom it was said could jump over a five-foot fence.

When I went to Western Canada I lived for the most part in entirely different communities, made up of Dukhobors, Ukrainians, Poles and people of other races. I would suggest that when we bring in such immigrants now we let them know that Canada is a democracy, and do not ask them to promise beforehand that they will vote for a certain political party, as those people, before they were nationalized, were required to give their word that they would support the Liberal party. That is not the way to train immigrants to become good citizens; thought I must admit that, politics aside, those were first-class people.

I have before me an article entitled "Fifty Years of Wheat Selling as I have seen it." It is by E. J. Young. He is entirely wrong. He tells about the Wheat Board that was set up under the chairmanship of John I. McFarland. He says that James Murray of the Grain Exchange was appointed as McFarland's successor, that he sold the surplus that had accumulated, and retired from the board. That is an entirely wrong picture. McFarland would not have had any great difficulty had he been allowed to carry on. In 1937 there was the worst crop in the history of Western Canada, only 130 million bushels, and the wheat that the Murray board held was wheat on which the farmers held participation tickets. It was their wheat. And when it was known to every man in the country that there would not be a crop that year, the board was selling wheat at 70 cents a bushel and boasting about it. Yet, all that wheat might have been sold for at least \$1.25 a bushel. I can forgive the premier of the province of Saskatchewan for a lot of his socialism because of the remark he made when Murray was appointed head of the Wheat Board. He said it was like putting a weasel in a chicken coop to watch the hens.

The Saskatchewan wheat pool has been sneered at and called socialistic. But honourable senators from Nova Scotia know of the co-op down there, and the honourable gentleman from Kennebec (Hon. Mr. Vailancourt) has told us about the honours paid to the man who inaugurated the credit union, the *Caisses Populaires* which recently celebrated their fiftieth anniversary. It is right