

Or I probably should reverse the question: Is it feasible or reasonable to expect that loans will be granted in the more remote, less settled and less satisfactory districts on the same basis as in the more secure and permanently settled districts? I submit it is not. Again I suggest that there is a grave danger in this bill that we are laying the foundation for distress and trouble and handicap to those in the more remote districts.

I do not wish to detain the house at length; I rather assured the minister that I would try to finish in half an hour. But like much legislation that has been presented to this house in the latter part of this session—and let me remind the house that nearly all this so-called remedial legislation was introduced in the last quarter of the session—this bill is typical Liberal philosophy. It is the proposal of an opportunist government, not seeking to solve the great problems with which we are confronted but rather endeavouring to get away from the distress and perplexities of the moment by covering the problem with palliatives and temporary remedies. I submit that this measure, together with such measures as the 70 cent wheat bill, the cheese bill, the salt fish bill and other similar measures, is subversive of sound principle and is in utter disregard of the ultimate effects that this legislation will bring. I call hon. members on the Liberal side to witness what many of them know from experience, that this and other legislation of this class is no remedy for the problems with which we are confronted; that it is merely a palliative; that it has within it the germs of destruction of some of the soundest principles of national character which form the basis of our national life. All these measures are temporary, transitory, mere palliatives and not remedies, and I regret to say that while I welcome that portion of the bill which, I believe, will bring some relief to the distressed agricultural borrowers or debtors, yet there is a large portion of the bill in those very parts upon which I have hastily touched which will not result either in benefit to the debtors in the long run or in the solution of the problems now confronting this country.

Mr. POULIOT: On a question of privilege, the Minister of Finance is quoted as having said this morning that the member for Témiscouata had vilely slandered one of his officials. According to Funk & Wagnall's dictionary "vilely" is the adverb for "vile," which means "morally base, or abominable, bad, base, brutish, common, criminal, foul, immoral, infamous, sinful."

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I have slandered nobody. In the second place, far

be it from me ever "vilely" to slander anybody. And it is superfluous to refer you to Bourinot, Beauséne or any other parliamentary authority to find that such language is highly unparliamentary. Therefore, sir, I ask you kindly to notify the Minister of Finance to withdraw at once what he said about me.

Mr. ROWE (Athabaska): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. POULIOT: If he does not withdraw I apply to him all that is in the dictionary, and to his deputy minister. He is just a coward.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. DUNNING: There is no doubt about the word "coward" being unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not parliamentary. The hon. member will withdraw that.

Mr. POULIOT: Well, we should both withdraw, because the language the minister used is highly insolent to any member of the house. I am ready to withdraw if he will, and he should set a good example if he wants the rules of the house to be observed.

Mr. DUNNING: I do not know what your ruling will be, Mr. Speaker. I have not my words before me. I do not desire to cause any embarrassment to the chair. I am not expert in conveying my thoughts, which may be unparliamentary in themselves, in language which is parliamentary. My hon. friend is capable of doing that. What I said this morning I really meant, honestly meant. I believe the hon. member was this morning slandering a civil servant who by virtue of his position is unable to reply, and I stated I knew of my own knowledge that the slander had no foundation. That I cannot qualify.

Mr. ROWE (Athabaska): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. ROWE (Athabaska): Mr. Speaker, I have one or two observations to make—

Mr. COLDWELL: On the point of order, do I understand that the epithet used in regard to the Minister of Finance has been withdrawn?

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood the hon. member for Témiscouata to say that he would withdraw it provided the minister would say something. The minister has explained his point regarding the question of privilege of the hon. member for Témiscouata; I think the incident can be regarded as closed.