

Supply—Agriculture

With this desired end in view, your committee strongly recommends the appointment of a royal commission to inquire into:

(a) The causes of and remedy for soil drifting, especially on the open prairie;

(b) Precautions to take in seeding down to grass or clover, or the planting of trees and hedges, as possible remedial measures;

(c) Any other matter pertaining to or allied with the livestock and livestock products industry in any part of Canada.

There was a proposal to recommend the appointment of a royal commission to look into the matters contained in this recommendation. In committee my hon. friend and his associates voted down this recommendation proposed by Mr. Totzke and said that the departmental officials would take the matter up and make a similar inquiry. I would tell the minister that the Department of Agriculture officials, while quite capable to do so, have their hands full with their regular work. There is no money, either, set aside to pay for an additional inquiry from the experimental farm vote, and the proper course to take I think was to follow the recommendations contained in the document I have read. But no, the committee did not want to have it that way, and the majority voted down these recommendations.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): There was no vote taken.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: And my hon. friend with a majority was at the back of the the opposition to it. What did he do with this report? He has not had the courage to ask for concurrence in the house because he knew he was wrong; that is the reason. We are going home with both agriculture reports in the air and dead on the roost because my hon. friend did not submit them for adoption.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Oh, did I use another unparliamentary remark?

The CHAIRMAN: No, I was just calling the members to order.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I beg your pardon; for once at least my hon. friend in the chair is innocent.

The CHAIRMAN: No, it is not the first time. My hon. friend does not understand me.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: So much for the minister's new policies. I have referred to them because probably unwittingly he has been deceiving the entire electorate with regard to what he is doing. He is merely carrying on old policies, and I may tell him if he

Mr. Motherwell.]

continues to do so he will not do badly. But to tell the people that they are new policies is absolute non sense and downright hypocrisy on his part.

Let me tell the committee what the minister was going to do about chickens. Every cockerel and every little hen was to be rounded up and be depolarized. My hon. friend has been using the word so glibly that he can say it much more quickly than I can. There were to be depolarization stations here, there, all over. It would seem as if this is the first time in Canada depolarization has been advocated. I say to him that during the war, in the year 1916, this poultry disease became prevalent among chickens in the maritime provinces. I hope the maritime representatives will not take objection to my statements. The disease became very prevalent—I hope it does not spread to the human family, and expert work was undertaken at once to eradicate it; blood tests were taken and as a result nearly all experimental farms across Canada have had this disease called Pollorum (white scours) eliminated. Ask the chickens whether this is a new policy; they have been suffering from it for a long time, and they can tell a different story.

What is the use of that kind of nonsense? The minister will not get anywhere with that. This depolarization business has been in existence during the regime of at least four former ministers—the Hon. Martin Burrell who inaugurated it, the Hon. Mr. Crerar, the Hon. Doctor Tolmie, myself and my hon. friend. I hope he will not lay claim to doing something wonderful which has been in course of correction for fifteen years, because if he does he will just do himself injury and no one any good.

The story goes that when the Minister of Agriculture attended the North Atlantic shipping conference on cattle he came back or met their representatives in Montreal with a reduction in ocean freight rates from \$20 to \$15 per head. It went all over Canada like a prairie fire; he was extolled everywhere, as he should have been if it were true. But here is a return brought down indicating that there have been no changes in ocean rates since 1927, when they were reduced by the North Atlantic conference, for what reason I do not know. I think it was due partly to the fact that the number of cattle shipped overseas was beginning to fall off, and the rate was lowered in order to encourage the continued shipment of cattle. Even his own staff thought he had secured a reduction; I called up and they told me the rates were reduced. Then I asked the hon. gentleman himself through a return, and he reported