

Mr. HARRIS: There is no doubt that the minister has already on his desk many files of correspondence dealing with different commodities. For instance, he mentioned seeds, which are much to the fore at the present time, and having attended to this correspondence which comes to his desk from suggested cooperative movements of many kinds he must have in his mind an idea of some of the branches of agriculture which would require assistance almost immediately should this bill pass, as no doubt it will. In order that we may take a more intelligent view of the necessities of the different branches of agriculture, would the minister at this stage be good enough to tell the committee, in what particular lines of agriculture we might expect assistance to be given under this bill; but at the same time keeping in mind, Mr. Chairman, that it is now 11.05. I had expected the house would close at 11 o'clock and that you, sir, as chairman, would have suggested that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Quebec East): Does my hon. friend insist on that?

Mr. GARDINER: I understood that there was a sort of understanding that we might continue until a little later, but if the hon. member insists that it is eleven o'clock, it is eleven o'clock.

Mr. HARRIS: I am quite satisfied to go on until six o'clock in the morning, so far as that is concerned. I remember in the old days we sat here until the wee, small hours, and we can do it again in order to have prerogation. I am not suggesting that myself, but whatever the government desires to do will meet with my approval.

Section stands.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Lapointe (Quebec East) the house adjourned at 11.08 p.m.

Friday, May 5, 1939

The house met at three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE

STATEMENT OF MEMBER FOR TÉMISCOUATA IN REFERENCE TO REMARKS IN DEBATE ON MAY 4

Mr. J. F. POULIOT (Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, rising to a question of privilege, I wish to refer to page 3600 of *Hansard* of yesterday, wherein the member for Témiscouata is quoted as follows:

[Mr. Gardiner.]

I know a great deal about agriculture because I have learned it from the farmers of my constituency.

It was very candidly said. Then the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe) added:

You mean you have farmed the farmers.

If it was said with regard to farmers at large, I deny it most positively, and my behaviour as a member of parliament for the last fifteen years is there to prove that I have been acting on their behalf. But if it applies to a farmer in particular, or in other words to the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe, it is true, because in the interests of my party I was "farming" him for more speeches like that which he gave yesterday.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I do not think there is any question of privilege at all.

STATEMENT OF MEMBER FOR PARRY SOUND ON MAY 3 IN DEBATE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. A. G. SLAGHT (Parry Sound): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. Yesterday the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Cahan) raised a question of privilege with regard to portions of a speech I had delivered in the house the day before. Unfortunately I was not in the house yesterday when the hon. gentleman began his address and therefore I did not hear a great portion of his remarks. I have since carefully read *Hansard* and desire after so doing to make this statement.

I find that the references in the biographies to which the hon. member referred and the extracts therefrom which he quoted to the house place the matter of his previous observations on February 21, to which I took exception, in an entirely different light. Let me say that, when he made the earlier speech referred to, he based his criticism of a former president of the United States entirely on something he had learned when in London in 1903 and did not vouch for the name of his informant or give any particulars.

Mr. CAHAN: Mr. Speaker, allow me to interrupt. That statement is incorrect. I did not base my statement entirely on what I heard in London.

Mr. SLAGHT: Well, *Hansard* will speak as to that. If I am unfair to the hon. gentleman I am glad to have his correction. As I read his speech, that was my interpretation. However, let me say to him that had I known of the existence of the biographies and the records which he introduced yesterday I should not have used the language which I used with reference to his conduct in this