

will formulate its demands and make its recommendations. The recommendations will go up to the second board, which will approve or disapprove or modify them, as the case may be, and then pass on to the uppermost board of all, the dominion marketing board, which will issue the effective orders and directions. That machinery is complicated, cumbersome and of necessity will be expensive. The first point, however, that I want to make is not precisely that, but the fact that we are talking about setting up in the dominion not one board, but many boards, not only in the fruit industry, but in all the other natural products industries.

A second feature of the proposed legislation we should have clearly before us is that it is designed to deal only with natural products. But the definition of natural products is, I am afraid, not clear as given in the bill. It certainly applies to the products of the farm, the forest, the sea, the lake and the river, but it also applies to certain manufactured products, namely, "any article of food or drink wholly or partly manufactured or derived from any such product." One question I should like to ask the minister is this: Is the proposed legislation confined to manufactured products so defined or is it applicable also to other manufactured products which arguably may be products of agriculture, the forest, the sea, the lake or the river? Does it apply to lumber, or is that a manufactured product and not within the section because it is not a food or a drink? Does it apply to pulp or paper? Will they be considered products of the forest or manufactured or derivative products and not within the section because they are not food or drink? That point should be cleared up. There is no such ambiguity in the British act which applies to agricultural products alone.

A third feature of the bill to which I desire to draw attention is that these marketing boards are not to take the natural products of Canada and market them. They do not buy them, handle them, process them, or sell them; they leave the marketing of the products in the hands of the producers or shippers themselves. They issue a series of orders to the shippers; they say to them: You shall send your goods to this, that or the other market; you shall keep a certain quantity of them at home; you shall feed your goods on to the market both in and out of this country in accordance with this series of orders or directions which we shall issue to you from time to time. If the system were one under which the marketing boards acquired, handled, processed and disposed of

the total natural products of the country, it might to some extent be a more effective way of dealing with the matter. It would be far more socialistic than this, but perhaps not any worse on that account. I am not advocating that alternative; I am merely pointing out that this measure imposes upon a competitive capitalistic economy such as we have in this country a bureaucratic interference from above through a series of marketing boards.

The fourth point I should like to mention is that this bill does not follow the British marketing act. The hon. member for *Lost Mountain* made that very clear, and he read the provisions of the *Agricultural Marketing Act*. He watched, as we watched, very carefully the provisions of this legislation to see in what respects it departed from the British marketing act, and without going into technicalities I think the matter may be summed up by saying that there are four points of departure. They can be stated very simply. The first is that the *Agricultural Marketing Act of Great Britain* does not set up a marketing board at all. There the minister and the department, subject to parliament, preserve full sovereignty and authority over marketing activities so that there is no duplication of governmental machinery as there will be under this bill. That is the first point of difference between the *Agricultural Marketing Act of Great Britain* and the legislation now proposed for Canada.

The second is that the producers in Great Britain are protected under their legislation and our producers are not protected under ours—and I use the word "protection" not in the fiscal or tariff sense but in the ordinary dictionary sense. The hon. member for *Lost Mountain* indicated the manner in which the producers over there are protected under the British legislation. In Great Britain they must originate the scheme; it cannot be forced upon them from above as it may be under this legislation by the minister himself, and elaborate provisions are made for voting by polls. Two thirds in number and two-thirds in productive capacity must approve a scheme in Great Britain before it can be forced upon the other one-third; and not only that, but half the registered producers in the industry must vote at the polls. There is no such protective provision in this legislation; it is wide open. Moreover, there is no provision for any particular majority or even for a majority at all. A number of persons in the industry may come forward with a scheme, and if the minister thinks they constitute a representative number he may approve the scheme or may himself originate a scheme without any-