

Having said that, may I say this, that the greatest job to be done in connection with this war is still to be done on the battlefields. As Minister of Agriculture I am going to make an appeal to every farmer in Canada to produce this year all he can with the labour available, and I am going to make an appeal to the government—and I am sure it will be listened to—to provide as high returns as possibly can be given for the commodities that are produced, always keeping in mind the fact that funds must be found for other things, as well as for paying for food.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GARDINER: My hon. friends over here smile when I say that. Well, I have known many people in my lifetime who did not seem to know the value of money; and I have never known any of them to improve their position by laughing. After all, money is only the means by which we measure the real wealth, the things that are produced in the country. If we have the parity prices which have been asked, we are of course giving what has been asked by those who are most concerned. If in some other direction parity has not been given, and if that applies to those foods which are going to be surplus at the end of the war, I would suggest that we are not yet in a position to determine whether farmers will obtain parity. That cannot be fully determined if their labour has resulted in the production of grain which may be fed or required by allied countries toward the end and following the end of the war.

I think hon. members will agree that the government has been keeping a fairly close check on all three activities necessary to winning the war. In so far as the battlefront is concerned, only one thing will bring about the defeat of our forces. If we have not a sufficient number of men at the spots attacked most heavily by the enemy—and they may choose some of the spots at which they are going to attack—if every man is not supplied with the best equipment which can possibly be supplied, and if every bit of that equipment is not supplied with the best ammunition possible of production the allies may lose. If we do not permit any such deficiencies, and if we place behind those forces the food necessary to feed them, and supply the food necessary to assist in feeding the British people, the food necessary to assist in feeding the people in North Africa, and the food necessary to assist in feeding the people in the countries on the continent of Europe, once they are won back to the side of the

allies, we shall have accomplished all that is possible toward the successful conclusion of the war.

Mr. COLDWELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am sure no one wished to interrupt the minister during the exposition which he made of government policy. But I would point out that the minister has had one hour and twenty-five minutes in which to speak.

Mr. GARDINER: Within the rules.

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not think the minister was within the rules, since the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) spoke on behalf of the government, following the leader of the opposition (Mr. Graydon). If the privilege is going to be extended, then I think it should be extended with the consent of the house. Other hon. members have been interrupted and called to time when forty minutes has expired.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend, will recognize that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Gardiner) was replying to his amendment, as well as to the amendment which had been moved earlier. And as a minister replying to an amendment containing additions he is entitled to whatever time he wishes. As a matter of fact the minister, if anything, was considerate in being as brief as he was.

Mr. COLDWELL: Is every minister entitled to make a reply for the government?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I raised no objection at the time to the minister's speaking for more than forty minutes, because we will all agree that it was a most interesting and instructive statement; and from the standpoint of view of his party I have no doubt it reflected great credit. However, I wondered about this question.

I rise now only for the purpose of asking for a clarification of the point. Standing order 37 was passed on March 22, 1927. I remember the committee which framed it. I should like, however to ask how many ministers can reply to an opposition amendment. By the way, may I make it clear to the Prime Minister that the Minister of Agriculture in his opening remarks made it quite clear that he was replying to the amendment of my leader, and not to the subamendment moved by the leader of the socialist party. This is what the standing order says:

No member, except the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition, or a minister moving a government order and the member speaking in reply immediately after such minister—