

alone. Public opinion in Canada, and I believe in the United States at this time, will deal with Mr. Henry Ford. I think we can leave the matter there.

I was astonished that the Minister of Munitions and Supply (Mr. Howe) deduced from my question that I had any reference to the Ford Motor Company of Canada. There was nothing in the question which would indicate that, and he must have misconceived the terms of the statement which I made. However, that is now quite clear. I should not like to have it sent out to the country that in asking the question I did, I had any reference whatever to the Ford Motor Company of Canada. I know Mr. Wallace Campbell, and I can say with very honest conviction that I believe he is one of Canada's best citizens—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): —and further than that, he will aid and assist to the best of his ability the war effort of this country and he will not charge a dollar.

In passing may I say that I wondered why Mr. Campbell went back to his executive office in Windsor, and why he is not still doing a service for the government of Canada. Perhaps the minister will at some time enlighten us and give us the truth. I am not making any charges or any insinuations, but I did wonder why Canada had lost the services of so splendid an executive. It may be that he thought he could do better work for Canada in Windsor than he could in Ottawa.

Mr. HOWE: That is what he said.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): That may be the reason, and I am not going to question it if, as the minister has suggested, that is what he said.

I believe that the hon. member who initiated this discussion on the motion to go into supply (Mr. Coldwell) has based his observations on an entirely erroneous conception of the facts. There is no doubt, as any hon. gentleman may discover for himself if he will investigate the matter, that Mr. Henry Ford and his son Edsel have not control of the Ford Motor Company of Canada; the control is in the shareholders of Canada. While those two gentlemen have an interest in the company, it is not, according to my information, a controlling interest. I believe there is a close business relationship between the Canadian and United States companies. That of course is to be expected. I suggest that on reflection, when the hon. member reads his remarks in cold print, he will regret some of the statements he has made in so far as they may be pertinent to the Canadian company. I am not defending in any degree the United States company.

[Mr. R. B. Hanson.]

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee of supply, Mr. Vien in the chair.

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Experimental farms service.

14. Branch farms and stations, and illustration stations, \$1,309,276.

Mr. LaCROIX (Quebec-Montmorency): I read in the House of Commons debates of yesterday, page 1148, the following declaration of the Minister of Agriculture:

Take the farm at St. Joachim. The expenditure there last year was \$6,000. This year we are cutting that down to \$5,125, with the intention of closing the farm. At the Cap Rouge farm we spent last year \$27,851, and we are spending this year \$10,564, with the intention of closing it.

I want to register a strong protest against the decision reached by the government to that effect. Is it due to war expenses?

Mr. GARDINER: It is on account of the fact that we are trying to cut down expenses in the experimental farms branch in order to release money for the further prosecution of the war.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): In the estimates for 1939-40 under item 14 the amount is \$1,406,427, and in the estimates before us the amount set out for 1939-40 is \$1,494,706. What is the explanation?

Mr. GARDINER: The amount for this year is \$1,309,276. The amount the hon. member has given is the estimate for last year.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Yes, the estimate for this year is \$1,309,276. In this year's estimates the sum of \$1,494,706 is set out as the estimate for last year, but in last year's estimates the amount given is \$1,406,427. Why the difference?

Mr. GARDINER: Supplementaries were added later in the session.

Mr. PERLEY: The item for travelling expenses, given on page 67 of the estimates, is reduced almost by half. How is it they can reduce travelling expenses to that extent in one year?

Mr. GARDINER: Much of that expense is taken up by officials of the experimental farms branch attending fairs as judges and going to meetings from place to place. This year we are not sending these judges, owing partly to the fact that some of the fairs will not be operating and partly to our decision not to give the service. They will have to find judges nearer.

Mr. PERLEY: I understand the minister is going to start some experiments in the