

factured and sold by the Massey-Harris company in that country. A hoe, 16-run small seeder drill, very few of which are manufactured in this country now sells for \$375.30; a three-furrow disc plough sells for \$412.20. An eight-foot binder, four-horse hitch, sells for \$525.60; a mower, six-foot, sells for \$202.95; a nine-foot rake sells for \$79.65; a 26/36 horse-power 102 senior sunshine Massey Harris rubber tires sells for \$2,187. In other words, the price of the agricultural implements that they have to buy is nearly one-third higher than in this country and the price of the goods which they have to sell is about one-third less. Is it any wonder that there is dissatisfaction in that country among the agricultural people with regard to the way in which they are being treated? On the other hand, some of our friends over in the corner do not seem to know that we sell our goods at the world's price too. The fact of the matter is that when England wants to buy wheat we ask her how much she is going to pay and we sell to her at the world's price. It may be 75 cents it may be seventy cents; it may be 80 cents; it may be \$1.50. We sell it to them at the world price, whatever it is. Supposing the Englishman says he will pay us seventy-five cents; we take the other fifty cents, to make up the \$1.25 that we receive, from the mutual aid appropriation. We do the same in connection with pork, beef, butter, cheese and all our farm produce. That is why we are able to get the prices we are receiving at the present time, regardless of what world prices may be. These are things I think we should tell our people, because they do not know how well they are being treated. In my opinion there was never a time in western Canada when the people had as much money as they have now. They should realize in what manner they are receiving the prices they are being paid for their products at the present time.

Mr. POULIOT: Would the minister please tell me why some Canadian butter has been sold to the United States at higher prices than those prevailing in Canada, without any extra benefit to Canadian farmers?

Mr. CRERAR: I am afraid I cannot give my hon. friend the information for which he is asking, although I will request the officers of the department to send him the explanation if there is one. To-night I am pinch-hitting for the Minister of Agriculture, who is away. As a matter of fact, the point raised by my hon. friend is not covered by any of the items in the list of supplementaries. If it had been so covered I would have endeavoured

[Mr. Donnelly.]

to inform myself as to the matter, but I really must ask my hon. friend to be kind to me to-night because I have not the information here.

Mr. POULIOT: The minister knows the regard I have for him. I could have brought up this matter under the floor prices measures, or it could have been mentioned under item 466, which has to do with cold storage warehouses. It was because the cold storage space was insufficient that this extra quantity of butter, which could not be stored, was sold to the United States.

Item agreed to.

#### DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

47. Departmental administration, \$581,751.

Mr. POULIOT: Will the Minister of Finance be kind enough to inform the committee if it was the practice during the last war to have Sir Sam Hughes, the Minister of Militia, as perpetual acting minister of finance? I wonder how the present Minister of National Defence can find time to be also acting Minister of Finance. This is something I cannot understand, and I would ask the minister to give me some information about it.

Mr. JLSLEY: The Minister of National Defence was Minister of Finance for a period; and owing to his experience, as well as his outstanding ability and qualifications, it is thought desirable to have him named as Acting Minister of Finance in my absence. I am very grateful indeed to him for acting in my behalf when I am away.

Mr. POULIOT: That is the minister's view about it, and it is most complimentary to the Minister of National Defence, but the hon. gentleman does not touch the grave of the late Sir Sam Hughes, who was busy as Minister of Militia and who was never the perpetual Acting Minister of Finance.

Here is the reason I object to it. I believe that in time of war the job of Minister of National Defence must be a full-time job, and that a member of the cabinet who acts in both capacities must neglect one of them. Either the Minister of National Defence pays no attention to his duties as Acting Minister of Finance or the perpetual Acting Minister of Finance pays no attention to his duties as Minister of National Defence. I am reminded of a world character who has lost some of his popularity—Mussolini, who held five portfolios. The Acting Minister of Finance is the deputy Prime Minister, a full-time job; he is Minister of National Defence, a full-time job, and he is Acting Minister of