

When those figures go out to the Canadian people, will any of them believe the statement that the hon. member for Souris says he took from the condensed preliminary report of the Department of Trade and Commerce? I do not need to quote other instances, because they were quoted in the press after the Imperial conference, on actual shipments of goods into Canada showing what the increase was, and all along the line they were similar to what I have already mentioned.

I should like to say a word in regard to the stabilization fund. An attempt has been made by some hon. gentlemen opposite to show that we on this side are in favour of it. I have listened to most of the speeches delivered from this side, and if I understood them correctly, what was stated was this: If you are going to establish a stabilization fund for the benefit of some thirteen products, then you should go further and apply it to all other products. I have not heard any hon. member on this side say either that he was definitely opposed to the stabilization fund if it were applied in that way or that he was in favour of it as being applied only to the thirteen commodities to which it now applies. It is something like the wheat bonus. I heard the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Perley) the other afternoon state that we on this side were opposed to the five cent bonus on wheat. I was in the house during that time; I heard the debate on that particular subject and I know from this side we were opposed to the five cent bonus on wheat in the way it was originally introduced; that is, when we thought it was going to be paid to the railways on account of freight, we were opposed to it. Then when we thought it was to be paid to the grain trade, that is to the exporters of wheat, instead of going back to the farmers, we were still opposed to it. I believe many hon. members then stated that they were opposed to the principle of the five cent bonus on wheat, and I do not blame anybody for that attitude. We derived some benefit from that bonus in the west, but the people there who were most in need of help in that particular year, received no benefit at all from the five cent bonus. The same thing applies to this stabilization fund. No one is anxious to take any benefit that may be derived from that away from those who can get the benefit of it, but if a certain number of people in this country are to derive benefit from it, then we believe there is a great body of other people in Canada who are also entitled to derive similar benefits on other products. The fact of the matter is that we believe the government by its tariff

[Mr. Bothwell.]

legislation has so penalized the people, the producers of Canada, it is necessary for it to hand out bonuses of one kind and another in order to keep things moving. Just in that connection I want to draw attention to a report that was made by one of our Canadian correspondents in London, Mr. M. H. Halton, after the budget came down. He said:

"The Canadian plan won't, of course, nullify any Ottawa preferences," he said, "but it's exactly the kind of dumping which, on the part of other countries, raised so much protest here and in Canada. However, it is almost bound to benefit Canadian primary producers."

He went on:

The board of trade said no British law exists against importation of bonused products. Sir Douglas Newton, agricultural expert at the Ottawa conference, expressed intense surprise at the announcement, and said the plan would necessitate much consideration. Sir John Gilmour also seemed surprised but refused to comment. The London Central Markets, the chief British wholesaler meat and meat products associations, however, is frankly cynical. "It's dumping, but what of it?" said an official, "and it won't increase Canadian meat sales over here."

If Britain is going to consider a payment out of this stabilization fund as a bonus to agriculture as a species of dumping, then I think we would be better without it. In any event it is not fair to the people of Canada unless the stabilization fund is established for the benefit of all primary producers who are able to produce goods for export.

On motion of Mr. Rowe the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

### Wednesday, April 5, 1933

The house met at three o'clock.

#### QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

COMPLAINT BY MEMBER OF NEWSPAPER REPORT OR COMMENT—RULING, MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: On Monday, April 3, the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), raised a question of privilege. He quoted, he said, an article from a newspaper called "Le Journal" of Quebec referring to him, and complained that he had thereby been misrepresented. I find, however, on reading a translation of the hon. member's remarks that he went much further than he had a right to in addressing himself to a question of privilege. He attacked the reporter and made remarks concerning members of the house which he had no right to do at that time and in that way.

I therefore direct the Editor of the Debates to expunge from the record the first and