

*Farm Prices*

of the history of England is the same as mine. I recall to him that, notwithstanding the fact that the so-called reform measures were first introduced in England in 1832 by what might now be termed a Liberal government, it was the great Disraeli who really gave reform to the electoral system in England and extended the franchise far beyond anything that was ever thought of by the Whigs of that day. History does not bear out what the hon. gentleman said, and I have read my history too.

Mr. GARDINER: I gave Peel credit.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I am reminded that perhaps the greatest reformer of the last century, Lord Shaftesbury, was not a Liberal. He was a son of an old Conservative family, or Tory if you like, in Britain; yet he has to his credit the advocacy of more reforms in the United Kingdom than any Liberal government headed by Gladstone or anyone else.

Mr. HANSON (Skeena): That has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I quite agree that it has not; neither had the minister's remarks. Nearly all the remarks he made to-night were irrelevant to the bill, but he took the opportunity, after the debate had been closed, to chastise and castigate those of us who profess Conservative principles, and to show that we were as dust under the feet of the Liberal party and had no place at all in the sun.

Mr. GARDINER: I was answering what was said when you were not here.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That may be true, and yet I cannot let these things go unchallenged if I am given an opportunity to reply to them.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: You only went back a hundred years; he went back a thousand.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Yes. He went back to the time of the Norman Conquest and blamed the Tory party of England for the system of land tenure that was set up by William of Normandy.

Mr. GARDINER: No. I blamed them for defending it, not for setting it up.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): My recollection of history is that the defence came more from the Whigs of the last century and the eighteenth century than from any other part of the nation.

Mr. GARDINER: You and I have not been reading the same history.

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That may be true, but my recollection is that there was a time when the crown as such was battling manfully against the Tory party of the day for various aspects of land tenure.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): All right. I have said nearly all I want to say on that.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: I have the floor on a point of order. I have spent the whole of this Saturday afternoon in the house; I am going to stay here until eleven o'clock on Saturday night; and I say that this bill, one of the greatest on behalf of the farmers of Canada, should be proceeded with. I do not care a hoot what happened a thousand years ago. Let us get on with the bill.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The point of order is well taken. I will not for a moment dispute that. But the minister took time out himself to raise these issues and I am entitled to a little leeway. If the minister is to have that leeway I claim it for this side of the house. I am in the hands of the chairman. If he decides that I may not proceed any longer I certainly will not.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for York-Sunbury qualified his position in this connection before he stated it.

Mr. CRUICKSHANK: He has gone back a thousand years.

The CHAIRMAN: I thought he had the unanimous consent of the committee to make the statement he did, and that was why he was allowed to continue.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have said nearly all I want to say in that regard.

I wish to make just one or two further observations about this bill. The minister has correctly stated that the fund to be set up is to be a revolving fund and that it is to be used in the discretion of the members of the board who are to be appointed under the authority of the measure to buy surplus commodities. I assume that is perfectly practicable in connection with certain commodities, but I assert that with respect to other commodities it will be found wholly impracticable. I am not referring especially to agricultural products at the moment, but more particularly to the products of the fisheries, and perhaps I shall have something to say with respect to that when a similar bill comes down which is being sponsored by the Minister of Fisheries. Yet this whole thing is to be left on the basis of the judgment of the board, advised, if you