

is to create dissatisfaction and dissension and a measure of unhappiness and uneasiness in the community, area or province, and I suggest it is a procedure which should be avoided. I make the criticism because it has come to my attention that there have been many such cases, and that they have not occurred by accident but have been done by design. Knowing something of political considerations as they affect the judgment of men, I am simply pointing out that the government should take steps to prevent action of that kind being taken.

The Department of Agriculture has desired to expand its activities, and I suggest without regard to the provision of the statute—for after all, there are statutes which have to do with the powers of ministers, statutes which state that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has one power and the Minister of Agriculture another. All ministers, under the statutes creating their departments, are supposed to discharge the duties devolving upon them and arising from those statutes. We have a singular circumstance here, for we have the statute creating the Department of Agriculture and indicating the work that that department is to do, the definite purposes for which it was created, the duties which it is its responsibility to discharge. I was going to read them, but I shall not take the time to do so. The Department of Trade and Commerce has certain obligations. The obligations of the two departments do not agree, of course.

I would point out that there has not been a time in this country when there has not been some measure of conflict between these two departments. On the one hand we have the Department of Agriculture contending that it is interested in goods or commodities after they have left these shores. On the other hand we have the Department of Trade and Commerce, with its emissaries in all parts of the world, contending that the duty devolves upon them of seeing to the distribution or sale of the commodities which the Department of Agriculture has properly prepared for sale.

The Minister of Agriculture appointed a commission to go to England. I observe from the report of that commission that the report is made to the Minister of Agriculture. That report deals with matters overseas, matters which under the statute come properly within the purview of the duties of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. It is not for me to determine how these matters are to be settled, but it is my duty to point out the fact that there is conflicting au-

thority. I recall that the Minister of Agriculture warmly espoused the cause of the Committee for Industrial Organization in a recent provincial election, while the Minister of Labour was censured by at least two papers for, as one paper said, butting into the Ontario political situation and stating that he was opposed to the attitude of Mr. Hepburn with respect to the Committee for Industrial Organization. I cannot but think that this is a clear manifestation of an effort by the Minister of Agriculture to see what can be done in the way of having the Committee for Industrial Organization unite the forces of the high commissioner's office in London with those of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in this country. I cannot explain it in any other way.

I fancy the Minister of Agriculture has his little joke as he reflects at night upon the achievements of the day. He has been able to bring a measure of order out of chaos. Applying the C.I.O. principle to his colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce and his legionnaires, and to the Minister of Labour and his wide-scattered army, he has been able to achieve a measure of success as is indicated in the speech from the throne by these words:

The Department of Agriculture has been reorganized and its services consolidated along lines designed to improve the standard and acceptability of Canadian farm products.

Where? At home or abroad? That is where the fine Italian hand of the Minister of Agriculture is at work, in leaving out any reference to where the acceptability of Canadian farm products is to be improved. Is it to be among the peoples of the world? That is the job of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, so let us leave it out. Do we travel abroad? Do we set up our new standards for use here or somewhere else? Perhaps the Prime Minister will explain why no reference is made in this document to the community to which the statement refers.

It looks like a brilliant stroke to talk about reorganizing the Department of Agriculture, but I have not seen any statute which authorizes this reorganizing. I can remember that the right hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Lapointe) pointing out on more than one occasion that there must be statutory authority for anything that is done, yet we have the reorganization of this department without any statutory authority. The law as it stands upon the statute books has not been altered, and it indicates with certainty and clearness the authority of the respective ministers. I regard this as important. It is the old story as to