

Supply—Agriculture

politics, how far he thinks he is going to get in really creating an efficient department and doing the things he wants to do, if the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Justice is doing this kind of thing?

I have taken too long, Mr. Chairman, in elaborating this point but it is a worth while one and it has not been answered. I think the Minister of Agriculture might make a great name for himself in this nation just on this one point because, although I hate to try to speak in the name of the Canadian people, I am convinced they want to see an end to this petty, bootlicking, niggling patronage with which some of the parties try to go along and which seems to find a special attraction amongst the members of the legal profession who adhere like leeches to the Liberal party.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robichaud: The Union Nationale.

Mr. Pigeon: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege.

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Robichaud) is addressing remarks to the house from his seat. Now if there is anyone who is often guilty of breaches as regards the patronage he has been referring to, I think he is one.

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Chairman, a while ago I saw the hon. member for Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Pigeon) making signs like this, and I could not help thinking of the Union Nationale.

[*Text*]

Mr. Hays: In reply to the questions asked by the hon. member for Port Arthur, I may say that the only way in which these things can be answered and proven is through the passage of time. You can only be known by your deeds.

So far as the Pearson cabinet is concerned, I can assure the hon. member I never worked with a group of men so dedicated towards doing a good job for the Canadian people. I can only say that time will probably indicate whether we are doing some of the things that we suggested we would do, and some of those things are now in progress.

The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Bagot asked a question as to why we had changed one of the members of the Farm Credit Corporation advisory board. This board has ten members appointed on a rotational basis, some members holding office for one year, some for two and some for three years. The replacement we made was of Mr. Blanchette by Mr. Lamoureux, and we invited farm organizations to list a certain number of

names of people who could serve on the corporation. This was suggested by the president of the U.C.C., and the appointment was made on that basis. I have not met the gentleman but I understand he is of outstanding ability.

May I point out to hon. members of the committee that this is the eighth day the estimates of the Department of Agriculture have been under discussion this session. This is the third day so far as the main estimates are concerned, and we spent five days dealing with the supplementary estimates. I know hon. members do not have to do this, but since we have so much on the order paper dealing with agriculture I wonder would they be agreeable to moving along so that we can go through the various votes of the department.

There is so much farm legislation on the order paper that there will be ample opportunity again to discuss farm problems. We have the Farm Credit Corporation amendments, the farm improvement loan amendments, crop insurance legislation and, in addition to this, within the next few days we hope to put the new farm machinery bill on the order paper. It seems to me this is the sort of legislation that hon. members will want to deal with fairly soon and with some dispatch, because it is important. It will be good for the farmers, and might I prevail on hon. members to help me get along with my estimates since we have already discussed agricultural estimates for eight days this session.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Vincent: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words on the remarks just made by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Hays). First of all, he should not be allowed to leave the impression that this is the eighth day allocated to consideration of Department of Agriculture estimates since it is only the third day. True, we have examined supplementary estimates, but we had good reasons to do so under the circumstances since, as the Minister of Agriculture knows very well, that brought to light things that we might never have learned otherwise.

Moreover, neither the minister nor I were in the house in 1961. But I have been told that in 1961, item 1 as well as the other items of the Department of Agriculture's estimates were discussed for 12 days. This means that in 1961, the estimates for the Department of Agriculture were studied for 12 days, while we have now only devoted three days to them.