of reducing or terminating a contract was actually a legal matter and was not within his area of purchasing jurisdiction. As I have already mentioned, this contract ran to its normal completion date of March 31, 1964 and it was not reduced or terminated; and as the hon. member first made reference to this contract on April 24 of this year, it is quite apparent that there was little substance to the fears which were apparently or allegedly expressed by Mr. Trach.

Then as reported at page 3018 the hon. member went on to quote a statement which Mr. McKay was alleged to have made to Mr. Trach, which reads as follows:

—"we can, in accordance with instructions from Ottawa, find something wrong with your product".

Mr. McKay did not make any such statement, and anyone who says he did is guilty of telling untruths.

Again at the same page the hon. member stated that Mr. McKay was alleged to have said the following words to Mr. Trach, and these words are in quotation marks in *Hansard*:

—"I do not like to bring this up in reference to having your products declared unfit, but it is my superiors and the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa that I take my instructions from".

This likewise is not only false but patently false. Mr. Trach knows that Mr. McKay is an employee of the Department of Defence Production. Mr. McKay knows that he is responsible to the Minister of Defence Production, and he knows he is not responsible to, nor does he take instructions from, the Minister of Agriculture. I say again that this alleged statement is not only false, it is manifestly false.

On May 7, Mr. Chairman, I stated that I would be quite prepared to get an affidavit from the Department of Defence Production employee concerned. I now have that affidavit dated May 8, 1964 from Mr. McKay. One of the paragraphs in this sworn statement I will now quote. It is the concluding paragraph, which is as follows:

After seeing the report set out above I was in touch with Mr. Trach and referred to the said report and Mr. Trach, on the telephone, admitted to me that I had never made such a statement to him or in any other way threatened him and that the report arose from the fact he—

—that is referring to Trach—

—assumed that steps might be taken by the department to have the approval of his establishment rescinded.

That is the end of the quotation from the affidavit. The report to which he makes reference is the Canadian Press report appearing in the Edmonton *Journal* of April 25, 1964 of a statement made in the House of Commons.

At the time of the earlier discussion, Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. member for Yukon, who I regret to say is not in the house today, to produce some kind of evidence to substantiate that Mr. McKay had made these statements. I now have the sworn statement of Mr. McKay that he made no such statement, and I challenge the hon. member for Yukon to produce an affidavit from Mr. Trach to the contrary effect. I regret that he has been unable to do this, and perhaps in the light of his inability to do so he will withdraw his remarks.

Mr. Hamilton: Mr. Chairman, in view of the statements by the Minister of Agriculture and by the Minister of Defence Production this morning, and in view of the absence of the hon. member for Yukon, I should like to make one or two requests. The first is that the Minister of Defence Production table in the house the affidavit of Mr. McKay. Second, I ask we hold this matter in abeyance until the hon. member for Yukon is back in his place in the house. I think the gravity of the situation can be measured by the fact that we have so many ministers in the house here today. I for one, as an ex-minister of the department, would hope that the Department of Agriculture keeps free from any type of action which this country has been trying to move away from for several years.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Hamilton: I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that I can speak for the whole house when I say to the Minister of Agriculture that we have a feeling that he has tried to resist any efforts to bring patronage into his department, but that we also have a feeling that there is great pressure being applied to him; and I do not know whether he will want to speak about this pressure.

I should like to mention one matter to illustrate the type of thing which concerns me, because I have been told about some of these activities in connection with Farm Credit Corporation lawyers; and it is very clear that the chairman of the Farm Credit Corporation has not advised this sort of thing.

Now I should like to ask the minister whether he received a letter from a Mr. Nichols from the town of Indian Head, Saskatchewan, dated April 22 last, dealing with a similar type of matter which has concerned his department. I think that to keep the matter clear on the record I should read the letter, and I simply want to know what the