

that we should do the work at this time. With regard to the farm relief act I can only say that if my hon. friend will look up the records he will find that very large expenditures have been made under the provisions of that act in all the provinces. The undertakings carried on by the Department of Labour were begun by the municipalities in the first instance and then approved by the province, and to the cost of those undertakings the municipalities and provinces, as well as the dominion, made contributions. I cannot say whether the work to which he refers was ever suggested under that plan; I do not think it was advanced or approved by the province of Quebec. If it had been I think in the ordinary course it might have been undertaken, together with other works of a similar nature, but I cannot tell my hon. friend at this time that I can promise to do that work.

Mr. DUPUIS: The minister states that the work undertaken by the federal government was accomplished. Although his statement is correct it does not show the complete picture, because the undertaking was to drain that river to its source in order to relieve that area of the floods from which it has suffered. That work has not been completed. It is as though my hon. friend and myself started on a trip to France; when we came within ten miles of the coast of France we turned back. We would not be able to say to our friends that we had seen Paris. The provincial department of agriculture was in the same position as the federal government. So far as economy goes I believe Quebec is in the same position as Ottawa; they must make economies in Quebec also. Nevertheless, knowing the great advantages that would result from the completion of this work the Department of Agriculture decided to make a contribution. I have here a letter written by Mr. J. Antonio-Grenier, deputy minister of agriculture of Quebec, to which I referred in my letter to the Minister of Public Works. This letter is dated July 29, 1932, and is as follows:

(Translation):

Pursuant to your last recommendation, the minister wishes me to inform you that he is disposed to reconsider his promise of August 22, 1931, which was for 40 per cent, with a maximum of \$520, and to replace it by another for 50 per cent, the amount not to exceed \$2,000, on condition that a similar contribution be obtained from the Dominion government.

As the minister understands, the letter states that the Department of Agriculture is ready to increase its contribution to fifty per cent of the cost, the amount not to exceed \$2,000, if the federal government will do the same thing. I believe the Department

[Mr. H. A. Stewart.]

of Public Works here would make a very wise decision if they changed their minds and put this small amount in the supplementary estimates. I do not want to obtain anything by blaming the government for having done similar work in other ridings, but the minister knows that even in these days of drastic economy similar work has been done, and probably quite properly done. I am informed by the authorities in Quebec that in the constituency of Laval-Two Mountains dredging and surveys have been carried on, costing a large amount, in order to drain certain areas or to prevent flooding. Laval-Two Mountains is a very nice riding, but it is no nicer than the constituency of Laprairie-Napierville. I have great regard for the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains, but I shall be jealous of him if I am refused that small amount while I know that in 1930, 1931 and 1932 similar work was done in his riding.

Mr. POULIOT: Would the minister be kind enough to tell the committee exactly where the work will be carried on at Isle Verte? Will it be near the old wharf?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I am informed that it is proposed to do the work at the upstream end of the headlock, which is in bad repair.

Mr. POULIOT: The main wharf?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): Yes.

Mr. POULIOT: I will not detain the committee long, but I should like to answer the speech made by the hon. member for Sheffield.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. POULIOT: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: On a question of privilege the hon. member is in order.

Mr. POULIOT: This afternoon the hon. member said I spoke every five minutes; he insinuated that I was imposing on the committee and wasting time. Let me tell him that I saved more money—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. POULIOT: —for the government—

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. POULIOT: —than he ever did.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think this is a question of privilege at all; it seems to be a matter of personal opinion. As the hon. member knows, a question of privilege must