

lay eggs for him. In order to get the hens to lay eggs in the proper way the minister spent \$50,000—of whose money? Not his money, oh, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): The taxpayers' money.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, the taxpayers' money. I say to the minister, what right had he to spend \$50,000 of the taxpayers' money in order to get this poultry board established? Why did he not allow the people of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta to decide for themselves? But no; the minister, trying to support this moribund government which has been hanging on by its eyelids in the last five years, deliberately and I believe without proper authority spent \$50,000 of the people's money in order to influence the poultry producers of the three provinces to give a verdict in favour of his own marketing bill, or that of the government. And what happened? The minister's own constituents turned him down, every constituency in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba turned him down, and the only result we have is that the hens are still laying eggs and the minister is still sitting on the roost of the marketing act.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The best test or proof as to whether the marketing act is accepted as sound legislation is the attitude of the producers themselves. Not only are we receiving more and more applications from representative bodies of producers to have made available for them the provisions of the marketing act for the more efficient marketing of their products—

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland): Will the minister permit a question?

Mr. DURANLEAU: Let the minister answer.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): —but applications have been made by the local boards where schemes have been set up to extend further the scope of these marketing schemes. As far as my own constituency goes, I should be very well pleased indeed, and I am sure every hon. member would be pleased, if in the next election he should receive as big a percentage of the votes polled as that in favour of the poultry scheme in the province of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland): Perhaps they would if they spent as much money to get it.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): My own constituency voted over seventy per cent in favour, and some others over eighty per cent. This

money was voted by the House of Commons, and spoken in favour of by members of the different parties represented in the house, to be applied to assist in the organization and development of schemes such as this.

Mr. MOORE (Ontario): May I ask the minister the number of those who voted in Alberta and in Saskatchewan?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): It is already on Hansard but I shall read it again. In Alberta the total votes in favour were 12,635, being 62.5 per cent, and the number against 7,587, being 37.5 per cent. In Saskatchewan the number in favour was 27,749, being 63.4 per cent, and the number against, 16,012, being 36.6 per cent. In Manitoba the votes in favour were 6,070, and against, 18,931.

Mr. MOORE (Ontario): Surely the minister will admit that that was a very small fraction of the possible voters, showing a very slight interest in the movement.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): And a slighter opposition to it.

Mr. MOORE (Ontario): Was I correct in understanding the minister to say he had answered all the questions put to him this afternoon and evening?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I think the hon. member will be fair enough to admit that when hon. gentlemen ask five or six or seven or more questions in succession it is difficult to remember them all. But as far as I can remember I have answered all questions asked.

Mr. BROWN: There is one matter I would like to bring to the attention of the minister now that we have come back to the poultry scheme. Some \$50,000 was spent by the government in promoting the scheme—

Mr. DUFF: Wasted, not spent.

Mr. BROWN: Well, it may have been wasted, but it was spent. The minister said this afternoon that opponents of the scheme had opportunity to present their case at the meetings. I would call his attention to the fact that at some of the meetings opposition speakers were not allowed to speak. I can prove that.

An hon. MEMBER: Serve them right.

Mr. BROWN: That is a curious statement. I have no objection to the minister taking the position that they could not directly finance the opposition; I think his argument on that point is reasonable. But I contend that when public money is spent to promote a scheme