

every reason to congratulate ourselves on the stand which the Prime Minister took, and which shows that he possesses that particular kind of wisdom that is required in men who have the responsibility of governing a great country and of meeting issues that are fraught with terrible consequences.

Mr. T. H. McCONICA (Battleford): Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to participate in this debate but circumstances are such that I deem it my duty to myself, to my associates and to the members of the House to make some pronouncement as to where I stand. I should like to go to some extent into the discussion of the Speech from the Throne, but I have decided under the circumstances to forego that pleasure. I am admonished that it is the desire to conclude this debate to-night and I shall certainly not weary the House. I want to congratulate the mover (Mr. Putnam) and the seconder (Mr. Rhéaume) of the Address on the excellent speeches they delivered in discharging that duty. I concur in all that has been said in commendation including the speech that I was unable to understand when the seconder delivered it. I do not think it is entirely my fault if I could not understand it. I spent long hours in my younger days trying to master the French language, and I failed. The trouble was not that I did not study with sufficient diligence, but that the Almighty did not seem to have intended me for a Frenchman. But I would say to the hon. member that I have since given myself the pleasure of reading the translation of his able remarks, and I most heartily congratulate him.

I would say a word with regard to those who are not with us. I was well acquainted with but one of our late members, who have crossed the dark river, and I feel that I should say something as to him. I refer to the hon. member who formerly represented Lanark (Mr. Stewart). My acquaintance with him was all too brief. Soon after coming into the House I met him as an inexperienced, green member meets the experienced member who has reaped the reward of occupying a high position among those with whom he is associated, but I found him to be a considerate, kindly, courteous, polished gentleman. A gentleman in all that the term applies. I had the pleasure of being associated with him as a neighbour on this side of the chamber and in committee work for one session, and I came to esteem him as a statesman, careful, industrious, painstaking, honest, efficient and able—a most valuable member of this House. I esteemed him as a citizen worthy in every respect, patriotic, and devoted to

[Mr. McConica.]

the best interests of his country. In a word, Mr. Speaker, such a gentleman, such a statesman and such a patriot as we may well honour, and therefore I desire to add my tribute to what has been so well expressed concerning him.

I would touch on one or two matters that have arisen in this debate. I am still from the West, Mr. Speaker, and I am still proud of the West. I am proud of her people, and I would admonish you that they are not a whining, complaining set of people out there; they are men with good, strong nerves, they are patriotic, they are intelligent, they are industrious, they are courageous, and they are bound to fight to the bitter end. This they are doing under most adverse circumstances. I can assure you. I am not here to retract anything that has been said as to the arduous conditions existing there. Indeed, I am personally in such a position that I dare not attempt anything of the kind. We are not getting enough for our wheat; that is what is the matter with us. Wheat is the thing we must depend on in that country. My esteemed friend, the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) says he can see that there is a relation between 75-cent wheat and an exhausted, bankrupt Europe with exchange demoralized and credit gone. We can all see that. But I want to remind the right hon. gentleman that Europe has bought all the wheat we could send them. There has been no trouble to find a market for our wheat over there. And they have paid for it. But if the papers are to be credited, the spread between what they pay to-day for our wheat and what we get for it is from 40 cents to 50 cents more per bushel than it was before the war when conditions were normal, when money was plentiful, and when exchange was in their favour rather than otherwise.

Now, where is the trouble? There is a leak somewhere. That is what is the matter with us. The two parties that are interested in this business, the producer and the consumer, are not receiving proper consideration. They are the real parties in interest, and the gap is too wide. We are informed by my esteemed friend from Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) that bread costs about a third less in London than it does in Saskatoon where we raise the wheat from which the bread is made. There is something wrong. I am not going to emphasize this now, although I should like to discuss it fully, and I may say to my hon. friends that I am still for the Wheat Board. We intend to have a board of that kind some of these days, but I won't weary the House