

with that subject to-night. We must have some relief. We are promised in the Speech from the Throne that a committee will be appointed to investigate, with power to make recommendations. I have lived in Canada quite a considerable number of years, for fifteen years I have been trying to raise wheat, and I think I have put in about one-half of my spare time reading reports of investigations by committees, Mr. Speaker, and yet to-day we are still in worse shape than we ever were in respect to the wheat business. We want investigation, but we want something more.

But it is to the amendments that I desire to speak. We have offered an amendment through the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), raising a question which we still think is vital to Canada. We attempted to raise that same question last year, and were ruled out. I am not disposed to question that ruling. However, we had no opportunity of bringing that question to a discussion. Now it is objected that we are attempting to embarrass the government by introducing the amendment at this juncture. Nothing of the kind is intended. Here is a proposition upon which the people of this country are divided, upon which the members of this House are divided. Now if we can bring that to a square-toed issue and draw that line, and this government is defeated, then I am willing to accept the consequences, Mr. Speaker. That is where I stand on that proposition. There are two sides to that question, and I am here to maintain the platform upon which I was elected and the principles in which I believe, namely, that the tariff should be reduced. I do not believe that this country can continue to exist and prosper half free trade and half high protection. The farmers must sell their products in the markets of the world in competition with the cheapest labour imaginable, they must encounter everything that tends to pull down their prices, including an exorbitant spread between them, the producers, and the consumers, and they, the producers, must buy what they require at high protective tariff prices. As I say, we are selling our wheat cheaper than we did before the war. And what are we getting? We are getting a dollar which is worth sixty cents as compared with the dollar we got before the war. The reason for that to my mind is not that Europe cannot buy, for she is buying our wheat. I say we are here to support the amendment offered by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), and we are ready to accept the consequences, even if the government should decide in the event of the amendment carrying, that it was

ready to retire from office. We do not want that, I will admit. Personally I do not want it. It would interfere with my plans to some extent, and I do not believe the country wants it. But I believe the country does want a pronouncement on this question, and if the majority of members in this parliament are in favour of a radical reduction in the tariff, and say so, I do not know but what we could form a government out of that element and run this country in pretty good shape. Therefore, I am going to support that amendment, and I hope everyone here will.

We have another amendment, offered by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw). In presenting his amendment to the House, he was good enough to relieve the Progressives from all responsibility in connection with it. He defined his position in the House, which we have well understood, and with his definition and attitude we fully agree. It is perfectly proper that he should take the position he did; he was so elected. We would like to co-operate with him fully in such legislation as we think should be enacted, and in that respect we would like to co-operate with every member in this House. But we would like it understood that when he says it is not our amendment he is proposing, that that is the position exactly. We have a notion on our side that we will vote as we please on a thing of that kind. What is the amendment of the hon. gentleman? He says:

The House views with alarm the substantial increase in the national debt.

In that sentiment I fully agree. I apprehend we are all of one mind upon that. We must view with alarm the fact that the national debt has been materially increased. It has been fashionable with me to view with alarm any increase in my own indebtedness or any indebtedness of the country, so I think we are all a unit on that. But is it the office of the Speech from the Throne to catalogue all the things we view with alarm? If that is its function, I submit that the list is far too short. The hon. gentleman seems rather to insist on limiting it to one thing. If he would submit the list to my good friend for St. John (Mr. Baxter), who delivered that Jeremiad this afternoon, I am sure he would view with alarm conditions with regard to the potato growers, lumbermen, and everything else in that part of the country, and my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Martell) could also add a lot of things that he views with alarm. My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Hughes) could also furnish him with a list. When the cars on his line, are hot they are too hot, and when they are cold they are too cold. If the hon.