

to fairs. I say this in the kindest way possible; I should like to get those statements on Hansard so that those who read it may know what is to be done. I should like the press to-night, if they so desire, to be able to state that the Minister of Agriculture has laid down his policy regarding agricultural fairs, whatever it may be. I think it is only fair to the government and to the Minister of Agriculture, so I hope before the house does prorogue he will give us a short statement with regard to his live stock policy, his bull-loaning policy and the policy of assistance to fairs.

Mr. GOBEIL: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. VALLANCE: I think now is the time for the minister to make that statement, if he has one.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Compton has the floor.

Mr. VALLANCE: I have asked for a statement, in the most kindly way. If hon. members opposite want me to be otherwise I can accommodate them.

Mr. GOBEIL: As some latitude has been given the hon. member for Melville to discuss items already passed I wish to take the opportunity to make a few remarks in connection with item 115.

The CHAIRMAN: With the unanimous consent of the committee.

Mr. GOBEIL: I did not like to say anything when the item was passed Saturday evening because we were expecting to prorogue, but after the fine exhibition given by hon. gentlemen opposite Saturday evening and this morning I think I might very well take up a few minutes without being accused of delaying the house. First I want to congratulate the Prime Minister for having adjourned the house Saturday night.

Mr. VALLANCE: Stay with the estimates.

Mr. GOBEIL: I will come to them, but this is the reason I am speaking. After what was said this morning I feel that my remark the other night to an hon. member on this side of the house was justified, when I said that hon. gentlemen opposite were seeking to go back to their constituencies and tell their people that this government had overlooked the interests of the farmers of this country.

Mr. VALLANCE: I rise to a point of order. What we did was to prevent the government from doing that very thing.

Mr. GOBEIL: Everyone in this house and everyone in Ottawa expected the house to prorogue Saturday evening. Knowing that,

hon. gentlemen opposite took up the time of the house until eleven o'clock with trifles. Even the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth, who ordinarily has a sense of proportion, took up half an hour talking about the dismissal of all political partisan.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GOBEIL: Then at eleven o'clock hon. gentlemen opposite thought this government were so anxious to prorogue that they would force through the estimates, so my hon. friends would be able to go home and tell their people that this government were not interested in agriculture.

Mr. PERRAS: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I understand that item 115 was carried Saturday evening, so why debate it again?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is quite right; the point of order is well taken and this discussion is out of order. It is going on by the unanimous consent of the committee, but it is strictly out of order.

Mr. GOBEIL: Now I want to come to item 115, and to refer the committee to some criticism which was directed to it on a previous occasion, and even this morning to some extent. On May 18 of this year the hon. member for St. Johns-Iberville, in criticizing the government for not raising the indemnity on slaughtered cattle, said that in his constituency cattle had been slaughtered in the months of April, May, June and July.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. GOBEIL: I am in order; this comes under the item I am discussing.

The CHAIRMAN: The item before the committee is 117, but the hon. member for Melville was given leave, by unanimous consent, to discuss item 115.

Mr. CHEVRIER: What does item 117 cover?

The CHAIRMAN: The administration of the Destructive Insect and Pest Act.

Mr. GOBEIL: The hon. member for St. Johns-Iberville told the government that they had not done their duty; he said that the indemnity for slaughtered cattle should be increased. The hon. member for Laprairie-Napierville also criticized the government for not having increased it. He said that if the Liberal government had been returned to power in July last the Quebec government would not have had to offer an indemnity for slaughtered cattle. The hon. member for