

*Question of Privilege*

Mr. Walker followed the director's instructions there is no doubt that the situation would not have developed.

On the basis of the director's report on the lack of co-operation and disregard of his instructions by Mr. Walker, I approved his recommendation that Mr. Walker's services be dispensed with.

Yesterday the hon. member raised a question of privilege with regard to my statement on Tuesday last that one of the problems arose out of the fact that Mr. Walker was taking orders from the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek instead of the director. I understand it is a rule of the house that if an hon. member rises in his place and denies a statement made by another member, that member must accept the denial. I am quite prepared to accept the hon. member's word and am prepared to withdraw my statement that Mr. Walker was taking orders from the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek, which I had been led to understand had been the case. I would point out, however, that that was not the basis on which Mr. Walker was dismissed as the district supervisor for the Swift Current area. He was dismissed for not giving satisfactory services and for not carrying out the instructions of his superior officer.

**Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek):** Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, is it not a rule of the house that if a report is mentioned by a minister it should be tabled? If so, I make the request that the director's report be tabled, because it is obvious that Mr. Walker is the innocent victim of a dispute between the director and myself. At no time was he told either by the minister, although the request was made, or by the director, to whom also a request was made, the reason for his dismissal. Being an innocent victim, I believe he should be given the chance to refute the statement made by the minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** As to whether the report should be tabled, I will leave that to the discretion of the minister.

**Some hon. Members:** Table it.

**Mr. Hays:** Mr. Speaker, this is a departmental report and I am sure the hon. member knows that this cannot be tabled.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. McIntosh:** Then, Mr. Speaker, I have no alternative but to move this motion:

That the question of privilege I raised respecting the statement by the Minister of Agriculture that:

"Apparently he does not understand that the problem arose out of the fact Mr. Walker was taking orders from the hon. member for Swift Current-Maple Creek instead of the director. This

[Mr. Hays.]

was one of the problems, and was not satisfactorily fulfilling his job."—be referred to the standing committee on privileges and elections.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

MR. GREGOIRE—FAILURE OF POSTMASTER  
GENERAL TO TABLE DOCUMENTS

[Later:]

[Translation]

**Mr. Gilles Gregoire (Lapointe):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on another question of privilege.

On Wednesday, October 23 of this year, this house ordered the Postmaster General to table certain documents. Six weeks have gone by since that order was given to the Postmaster General and the documents have not been tabled yet.

I feel the minister should comply with the order given to him. So we ask him to explain why he has not done so.

**Hon. Azellus Denis (Postmaster General):** Mr. Speaker, I got in touch this morning with the officials of my department and I believe the documents will be tabled presently, to the satisfaction of the hon. member for Lapointe.

[Text]

## AGRICULTURE

EGGS—ANNOUNCEMENT OF DEFICIENCY PAYMENT  
PROGRAM

**Hon. Harry W. Hays (Minister of Agriculture):** I wish to inform the house that the agricultural stabilization board has been authorized to support the price of eggs by a deficiency payment program for the twelve month period, October 1, 1963 to September 30, 1964, at a national average price of 34 cents per dozen to producers for grade A large size eggs. The support price of 34 cents is the same as last year and represents 92 per cent of the base price or ten year average. Last year the 34 cent support price was 90.7 per cent of the base price.

There has been no change in the procedure established for claims, and payments to any one producer during the support year will continue to be limited to 4,000 dozen grade A extra large size, grade A large size and grade A medium size eggs. Producers must be registered with the board and have marketed their eggs through registered grading stations, or have sold their eggs to retail outlets as producer-graders to be eligible for any deficiency payments which may be made.