

to come to Ottawa. This sale took place at ten o'clock, and was similar in character to a great many other sales that are taking place in that community—it was a sheriff's sale. That sale was forced by the bank upon a certain farmer, and nine of his horses had been seized. The sheriff came along and inquired "What am I bid for these horses?" I said "Two hundred dollars". He said "We are not taking them as a whole. What bid is made for them individually?" Well, the horses eventually realized the sum of \$187. Then we turned to that farmer's sheet of expenses, to the expenses of the sheriff, the expense of keeping those horses in the livery barn, and the expense entailed by the judgment, and what did we find? So far as the judgment was concerned the farmer's liability was not reduced in the least—he had lost nine horses and his liability under the judgment remained the same. I am told that is the condition generally throughout the West with respect to sheriff sales.

I am not reciting this tale of woe merely for effect, but I want to state what I think will be the remedy. First of all I have no objection whatever to bringing in all the men that can be found to settle on the vacant land in order, as we are told, to help to bear the burden which is crushing us. But we must bear this in mind: In western Canada we are located at least 1,500 miles inland and we have to produce wheat in competition with the rest of the world. Unfortunately, owing to the long railway haul, and other expenses involved in getting our wheat to Europe, it is impossible for us to, at present, compete with others in those distant markets. And if you have an immigration policy whereby thousands of persons are entering upon and cultivating those western lands, can you not understand that it will have the effect of increasing the supply of wheat on the world's market? What does that mean? The greater the supply of wheat the less will be the price paid for it; and instead of the thousands and thousands of new arrivals proving a help to us, their labours will have the effect of detracting from the price we receive for our produce. We are told that our western wheat is demanded by millers generally throughout the world, that it is a product that cannot be equalled or duplicated anywhere, that it is a hard wheat different from any other wheat grown elsewhere. If that is true the fact of our being located 1,500 miles inland is not of so much importance, provided the identity of our wheat is preserved and specified in such a way that the buyers in the world's markets will know they are getting a Canadian hard wheat. I think this provision is one of the

[Mr. Lewis.]

things which is essential to the prosperity of western Canada. Another condition, has reference to possible outlets for our produce. We have been told that the Hudson bay route is not feasible, and a damper has likewise been placed on the Vancouver route; but we believe that if the identity of Canadian wheat is preserved on the markets of the world, and if these two outlets are made available for export, the existing problem will have been, to a very large extent, solved. I do not believe that we are in reality selfish in seeking our own preservation.

There are other matters to which I would like to refer. The practice of economy in the administration of government has been urged, and it is very desirable that we should observe economy. But let me point this out: If the proceedings of last session are carefully studied it will be found that during the first part of the session non-contentious items were brought forward and much time was occupied in discussing them, so much so that two, three and four days were devoted to the consideration of a matter of \$500,000. But when the session was drawing to a close and members were growing tired, the government brought down late at night, or in the early morning, estimates involving the expenditure of millions of money, and many members were too tired to care much what went or "slipped" through. It seems to me that when they are dealing with a body of sensible and intelligent business men, the government should be actuated in its policy by sound business principles, and should bring down these large amounts of estimates early in the session when the proposed expenditures can receive thorough and adequate discussion.

I want to say a word or two in regard to the Near East question. I notice that almost every member who has spoken has eulogized the government on their position to that question. Now, I am one of those who are not afraid to declare that they are not prepared to eulogize the government for the action they took at that particular time. I will state my reasons why. We were told that this parliament is the proper authority to decide any big question of foreign policy, and whether we shall send forces to the Near East or any other foreign point, or engage in any large expenditure for such a purpose. I agree with that contention, but the point I wish to make is that we were denied the privilege in this case—we never had an opportunity of saying whether we should support Great Britain should they go to war or not. I think that is a question for parliament to decide; it is not one which should