

If my hon. friend's objection is to the principle of the bill or the voting of the money, objection should have been taken on the second reading. We are now discussing clause 2. Clause 3 sets forth the means of spending the money, and when we come to that my hon. friend can discuss it. But now we are discussing clause 2. My hon. friends may ask to suspend the discussion on clause 2, if they wish, or ask for unanimous consent that the two clauses be considered together. In the meantime my hon. friends will discuss clause 2 and no other.

Mr. VALLANCE: Then I have not the privilege, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the matter which I wished to take up? I do not want to vote \$20,000,000 without information on the questions which I wish to ask, and those questions relate to clause 2.

The CHAIRMAN: My hon. friend can ask for the suspension of the discussion on clause 2, or ask that the two clauses be considered together by unanimous consent.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In all deference, Mr. Chairman, if we are to be asked to vote \$20,000,000, surely we are entitled to ask any question whatever that relates to how that \$20,000,000 is to be spent. It is impossible for the house to be asked to vote a vast sum of money of that amount and to be restricted in its discussion of how the money is to be used.

The CHAIRMAN: The right hon. leader of the opposition knows that it is not my fault that the bill is drafted this way. He might ask for the suspension of clause 2 or that the two clauses be taken together by unanimous consent. But in the meantime, as we are on clause 2, I am bound by standing order 76 of the house to see that clause 2 is discussed and no other.

Mr. RALSTON: Not on the point of order, Mr. Chairman, but in order that it may be understood a little more clearly, I am going to deal, not with the voting of \$20,000,000, but with the purposes to which the \$20,000,000 is to be devoted, and those purposes are contained in section 2 of the bill, in the last two lines, reading "and under such terms and conditions as may be approved by the governor in council."

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is quite right.

Mr. RALSTON: Under that, I am going to ask the Prime Minister a question with regard to the transportation of coal, which I mentioned last night. I want to point out

to him that I think he is under a misapprehension with regard to the existence of an order in council for the cheap transportation of coal from the east to the west.

Mr. BENNETT: I know there is none now.

Mr. RALSTON: I am correcting my hon. friend. I am pointing out to him that wherever he got his information, it is incorrect. There are in existence at the present moment two orders in council relating to the transportation of coal. One provides for cheap rates on coal coming from the west to the east. That is now in force and will be in force until March 31, 1932. There is another order in council providing for the transportation of coal from the east to central Canada and the west. That is in force until March 31, 1931. I wanted to correct my hon. friend on that point because not only does it appear in Hansard, but to-day I noticed one of the daily papers correctly quoting my hon. friend and mentioning that the order in council with regard to the cheap transportation of coal from the east had lapsed. That is not so; the order in council is still in force.

I wanted to ask the Prime Minister, also under this provision with regard to the purposes for which this money is to be voted, if he can tell me whether or not there will be any further subventions or any extension of the existing subventions with regard to coal moving from the east particularly.

Mr. BENNETT: I cannot answer that question.

Mr. RALSTON: May I ask whether or not the government will consider in connection with the general purposes to which they may apply this money the granting of a subvention or assistance in freight rates on fish coming from Nova Scotia to central Canada, and also on fish and fish products moving from Nova Scotia to the United States?

Mr. BENNETT: The Minister of Fisheries mentioned that matter to me yesterday, but no definite conclusion has been arrived at.

Mr. VALLANCE: Yesterday I asked the Prime Minister a question in regard to the marketing of Canada's wheat. I notice that a portion of this money is to be expended in assisting in defraying the cost of distribution of products of the field, farm, forest, and so on. In my humble opinion—I trust that the Prime Minister will correct me if I am wrong—the marketing of Canada's products of the farm is a federal matter coming under the jurisdiction and control of the federal authorities. My first question is, is it the intention