

until the United States agrees to take the question into consideration before coming together as a whole. Those sixty-three nations had to wait for the United States to have stabilization of money which is essential to world trade. Stabilization was not brought about and because of this I do not see how the Minister of Agriculture can mention the ups and downs of the pound sterling as, if it has affected our trade, this is mostly because the government have had no policy in regard to the matter.

I asked the hon. gentleman several questions. I asked him first whether the vote for this bureau was necessary seeing that we have Howard Ferguson as High Commissioner in London. This is a fair question. If Howard Ferguson is such a genius, such a mixer in trade as well as in politics, we do not need this bureau. It is a waste of money to vote \$21,000 and the government should rather give half of it—

Mr. GOTT: On a point of order, we are on item 50, page 20, and the hon. member has consumed forty minutes of the time of the committee and is now attempting to repeat his speech. Is this permissible on the same item?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gagnon): In supply a certain amount of latitude is given to members.

Mr. POULIOT: I asked my questions in the mildest language. I am just as nice as one can be. As one of the two hundred and forty-five members of this house my only intention is to seek to defend the Canadian exchequer. When I speak now I do not speak for the pleasure of speaking, I speak on behalf of the farmers of my constituency, who have been told that the Prime Minister is a superman and that the Minister of Agriculture is his right hand in matters pertaining to agriculture. It is all very well to tell the farmers to produce more tobacco, produce more hogs, produce more sheep, produce more eggs, produce more butter, but when the time comes to sell them they get no decent price. I am not against trade with Great Britain, I am not against that item in itself, but I find that the result is disastrous, that this government is neglecting our home trade in order to promote an artificial British trade or to justify the silly Ottawa agreements. In the debate on the address their merits were extolled, the hon. gentlemen who proposed and seconded the address in reply both praised the Ottawa agreements very highly. But what have they produced? Our trade has been destroyed, and when I ask information about the work which Howard Ferguson is doing in England with

regard to Canadian trade I receive no answer. Who is responsible for that loss of \$5,000,000 in the exports of cheese? Is it the empire bureaux or is it Howard Ferguson or is it this government? Someone must be responsible. We are told it is the pound sterling, but the pound sterling is not drafting the policy of this government with regard to agriculture and marketing.

I also asked another question of the hon. Minister of Agriculture; I will repeat it because he does not seem to have understood my English well. It is not my native language but I speak it with all earnestness and to the best of my ability. Another question that I put to the hon. gentleman, as the hon. members who are here will remember, was this: What was the average price of butter from the year 1922 to July 1 or August 1, 1930, month by month? What was the price in January, February, March, April and so on; and on the other hand what has been the average price of butter in each month of the second period, from July 2 or August 2, 1930 to the present time. I have no answer, yet the hon. gentleman must have that information before him all the time, he must have it with him here in order to answer these questions, which are fair and reasonable. When we hear hon. gentlemen opposite say that the price of butter is higher now, they do not take that earlier period into consideration, but it is most essential to do so.

Therefore my first question will be: Who is destroying the Canadian trade? Is it Howard Ferguson, the empire bureaux or this government? If it is Howard Ferguson, why is he kept there as high commissioner? If it is the empire bureaux why do we have this item in the estimates? If it is the government, why do they not resign? If I repeat a third time the second question I do so in order to be understood clearly; I also hope to have an answer about the average prices of butter in those two periods.

Then I would ask the hon. gentleman, how is it that if the exports of honey have increased the home consumption has decreased by 9,500,000 pounds? Can he explain it to me? Some Conservative members tell me often that I am not an expert in agriculture. I admit it, but I am here to defend the rights of the farmers and make known their grievances to this government; I do that conscientiously, when I ask a question I do not ask it to make trouble, I ask it to get information because my mind is not yet satisfied. I want to get that information. I may be laughed at by those who do not know how to read and write, but sir, I do my work