

Supply—Agriculture

we have been here we have been spending considerable amounts on agriculture, in spite of what has been said. I quite understand that some people may say, "Well you have been spending money, but you have not been getting results." That is not true, either.

Just to indicate that the situation is not exactly as it has been indicated by the last speaker, let me say to him that we were spending around \$10 million a year on agriculture when this government took office, and for a short time thereafter. We are now spending around \$100 million a year. Some may talk about a dollar being worth half as much as it was back in those earlier years. Even so, it is still a long way from saying there is not more money being spent on agriculture today than ever before.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Gardiner: Yes, it is ten o'clock, but I have one more remark. I just wish to say that the \$14 million subsidy on gold my

hon. friend talks about so much is not very much when compared with what we are spending on agriculture.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Sinclair: On Monday we shall resume the debate on second reading of the defence production bill, and then go on to Bill No. 3, which refers to international river improvements. Then we shall take the resolution dealing with the amendment to the Municipal Grants Act and, when we finish that, we shall take the second reading of Bill No. 452, respecting loans to fishermen.

Mr. Nowlan: Optimistic boy!

It being five minutes after ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.
