

any way I hope he will correct me—to lamenting the adverse position occupied this season by the farmers in his province, in the matter of the sale of their wheat, compared with the competing farmers south of the line. The inference that apparently had to be drawn from what he said was that less favourable position was in some way due to the policy of the Government in its creation of the Canadian Wheat Board. I know it has been the practice of many in that country—I hope the hon. gentleman is not one of them—to seek to give the impression down the concession lines that the embargo which the American Government placed against the importation of Canadian wheat was in some way ascribable to the Dominion Government or to the Canadian Wheat Board. I know that impression is very general, but I do not know who can be the author or authors of it, unless it be some who do not wish very well towards the Government of Canada, like the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould). Surely he is fair enough to admit—and if fair enough why did not he admit?—that the unfavourable position of the Canadian farmer compared with that of the man to the south had nothing whatever to do with Canadian policy or with the Canadian Wheat Board, but that the American embargo was the work of the United States Government, and that we were not consulted in any way, nor had we anything at all to do with it. He also knew, or should have known, that the creation of that board with the purposes and functions that it has was not only recommended by the organization of which he is a member, but has since been endorsed by that organization. But he would like to convey in some way the impression that fairness has not been done to the farmers of Canada in the creation of the Wheat Board and in the course that it has pursued.

Mr. GOULD: Might I ask the hon. minister a question? In reply to the charge of lack of information, I might state that I made no reference whatever to the Canadian Wheat Board, neither can anything I said be misconstrued to have any reflection upon that board. I merely made the statement that the man on the Canadian side received approximately one dollar a bushel less than his neighbour to the south.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why did not the hon. gentleman say why? He knew why it was.

[Mr. Meighen.]

May I ask whether he approves of the policy of the creation of the Canadian Wheat Board and of the course that board has pursued?

Mr. GOULD: I am quite sure, Sir, that we are in favour of the establishment of the Wheat Board, and I think that possibly we are on record that we would like to have that Wheat Board continued. I have made no charges against them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then I hope the hon. gentleman will not again seek to convey to the House the impression that he does not like the idea of having to rely on participation certificates of the Wheat Board.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) referred to certain remarks I made at Winnipeg. First of all he quoted me as saying, that we Canadians were subjects of Britain. Well, I do not know that I would be disposed to make any apologies if I had uttered those words, though they would not be strictly accurate, but I have read the speech over hurriedly, trying to fulfil the double occupation of reading it and listening to the hon. member at the same time, and I have not any such words there.

Mr. CRERAR: Oh, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think he is relying on some second-hand criticism. I know that in parts of his speech he quoted pretty much from a criticism in the press that I read myself.

Mr. CRERAR: If the hon. minister will allow me to interrupt him? The words are in his speech. I did not use them in any way to reflect on the hon. minister, but rather to contrast his attitude with that of his esteemed colleague, the President of the Privy Council.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: A contrast!

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is no contrast at all. I am afraid the hon. gentleman spoke too soon. We in this country, as our brothers in Great Britain, are subjects of the King of Great Britain and of the Dominions overseas; that is the correct phrase. As a subject I do not lament the fact; I glory in it. But we can be subjects of Britain's king and at the same time be a nation here with the powers of nationhood that we possess to-day. I think I have stated pretty fairly the common position assumed in this regard by the President of the Privy Council and myself. I do not know that I would feel any better if we