

*Agricultural Conditions*

Mr. DONNELLY: Hon. members may look up the record to see if the minister did not mention the trail of weeds around Regina, and I say that the trail of weeds in Saskatchewan was left there by the Conservative government in 1914.

An hon. MEMBER: Prove it.

Mr. DONNELLY: I am going to do so. That trail of weeds is south of the main line; it is about one hundred and fifty miles long and two hundred or three hundred miles in width. In 1914 the Conservative government at Ottawa sent seed to that district; it was full of wild weeds and stinkweed which polluted the whole country, and no one is to blame but this government, who did it. They are the ones that spread the weeds. And what are they doing to-day? Let me ask the Minister of Agriculture that question. What are they doing to-day to see that no weeds shall be sent in?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): All seed is inspected.

Mr. DONNELLY: This past winter, I know for a fact, they have brought in Canadian thistle and sow thistle, and this in a country which is supposed to be new. Then hon. gentlemen opposite accuse the former Minister of Agriculture of spreading weeds.

Next we hear the story of the drainage of Waterhen lake. I do not need to say more about that, because we heard what the former Minister of Agriculture had to say. He indicated his position in that regard. The Minister of Agriculture went on to tell us what a wonderful market he had obtained for our cattle in Europe. Why? Because the price of cattle in this country had been so reduced that England could afford to buy them. Hon. gentlemen were instrumental in having the price come down in this country. We had Mr. Brown before the committee, and he told us that in the years 1927, 1928 and 1929 we could not ship our cattle to England because there was a better price in Canada than could be obtained over there, and that if we did ship our cattle we should lose money. That is the whole explanation. The hon. gentleman says, "I got a place for you on the ships; I obtained satisfactory ocean rates, a cheap rate for your cattle. I was instrumental in doing that". Well, I looked up Hansard myself—

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Does the hon. gentleman say that I ever at any time took credit for obtaining a \$15 rate.

Mr. DONNELLY: Look up Hansard.

[Mr. R. Weir.]

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I never said so.

Mr. DONNELLY: I am not allowed to quote from Hansard of this session, but apparently the hon. gentleman took credit for obtaining a good price. He says—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member has already heard me rule with reference to quoting from previous debates in the same session.

Mr. DONNELLY: I am not referring to a previous debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought the hon. gentleman was referring to Hansard.

Mr. DONNELLY: I was looking at Hansard to see what the date was which I have in mind. It was on March 27.

Mr. SPEAKER: In order that there may be no misunderstanding I shall quote from Bourinot. After reciting various prohibitions, Bourinot goes on to say:

Neither can a member, in speaking, refer to anything said or done in a previous debate during the same session—a rule necessary to economize the time of the house, and a restraint upon members to prevent them from reviving a debate already concluded.

Mr. DONNELLY: I am not referring to any debate, Mr. Speaker. I asked a question on the orders of the day on March 27, 1931, when the minister made a reply. That is all. That was why I said to the Minister of Agriculture that I could not refer to any of the debates to see what he had said during this session, because it would be out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule is intended to economize the time of the house.

Mr. DONNELLY: The minister also referred to the feeding of cattle and said that he had performed experiments in connection with barley, chopped oats and one thing and another. Well, these experiments have been carried on for years and along the very same lines. The whole question of the marketing of farm produce was referred to the committee on agriculture who apparently were asked to evolve a policy. The minister had no policy of his own, but he wanted to shoulder on the committee on agriculture the responsibility of evolving one for him. I sat in that committee, and after our deliberations the only conclusion we arrived at was that the former Minister of Agriculture had been correct; his actions were justified. Indeed, he had done a whole lot that members of the committee knew nothing about, and our inquiry confirmed in every way the actions of the former minister. That committee brought in a report which has never been concurred in;