

Mr. HOWE: That question was answered the other day—

Mr. BENNETT: No, it was not answered.

Mr. HOWE:—that the government had no knowledge of the speech.

Mr. BENNETT: There is a serious issue involved in connection with this. The hon. member showed me the answer he received, which was not an answer to his question at all. He submitted to the clerk before placing it on the order paper a question which contained an extract from a newspaper. The clerk struck it out and put on the order paper a question of his own making, which was not satisfactory to the hon. member; however that has nothing to do with this. But the answer does not deal with the question. The hon. member has shown me the extract from the newspaper, which is in quotation marks, a declaration of policy by the head of the broadcasting commission, for which the government now assumes full responsibility, in view of what was said last session, and the question whether or not that policy is authorized by this government is a proper question.

Mr. CHURCH: It is contrary to the British North America Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As to who authorized the statement, I would say that the commission made its own statement, without any knowledge in advance on the part of the government. As to the question having been altered by the clerk, I may say the government had no knowledge whatever of that.

Mr. BENNETT: I am quite certain as to that. But that is not the question; the question is whether or not that statement made by Mr. Gladstone Murray, shown in quotation marks in the Gazette, is a statement which he was authorized to make. I understand the Prime Minister to say he was not. If he was not he certainly should be dismissed at once.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): There is a rule of the house which states that answers to questions must be accepted as given.

Mr. BENNETT: He should be dismissed for making that statement.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): The government answered the question and it should be accepted as it is. I would have been surprised if some hon. member had not tried to bring up some question of this kind before this session ended. We have been free from it so far.

Mr. BENNETT: Is there any reason why the minister should himself violate the rule to which he has just directed attention?

QUEBEC FISHERIES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. VITAL MALLETTE (Jacques Cartier) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an inquiry of the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Michaud). The Montreal Gazette of this morning, April 2, 1937, reports, on page 3, column 3, certain remarks made in the Quebec Legislature yesterday by Hon. Onesime Gagnon, Minister of Fisheries of that province, concerning the relations between his department and the Dominion Department of Fisheries. I should like to know whether the minister has seen these remarks and whether he has a statement to make to this house regarding them.

Hon. J. E. MICHAUD (Minister of Fisheries) (Translation): I thank the hon. member for having informed me of his intention to bring to my notice a statement said to have been made in the Quebec Legislature yesterday by Hon. Onesime Gagnon, Minister of Fisheries, respecting certain words attributed to me by an official of that provincial department. Upon hearing of Mr. Gagnon's statement, yesterday afternoon, I sent him the following telegram.

Informed by telegram that you stated in the legislature that I said to Mr. Gibault, in the course of an interview with him a few days ago: "Not a cent for Quebec." That is contrary to the facts, as can be proved by my deputy minister who was present at interview. I said to Mr. Gibault that the province of Quebec could not be treated differently from other provinces whose fisheries are not federally administered and who receive no subsidies or assistance. I told him that we intended to carry out our obligations in respect of the Magdalen island fisheries which, while in Quebec, are under federal jurisdiction.

I cannot believe that Mr. Gagnon did make the statement attributed to him by this morning's papers. I am still wondering why he should have made use of a subordinate's report to pass judgment on my attitude regarding the administration of fisheries in Quebec, when he could so easily have reported the conversation I had with him, barely a few weeks ago, in his office in Quebec, in the presence of his deputy minister. Hon. Mr. Gagnon certainly cannot say that during that conversation I gave any indication of hostility. On the contrary, I left Ottawa to confer with him regarding the Quebec fisheries, the administration of which is still under his exclusive jurisdiction. This incident goes to show how difficult it is to cast off the old