

in freedom and personal liberty. Whatever may be the intentions of my neighbours, I do not like the idea of finding myself having to comply, whether or not I like it, with the carrying on of agriculture along certain defined lines both as to quality and quantity. To-day I have to raise grain of a certain standard of quality, I have to produce bacon of a standard quality or I do not receive the price that I should receive. There is a real incentive to me as an individual to raise the quality of my goods in order that I may receive the highest prices, and that is all to the good. But under this bill if I do not do that I may be told that my goods will not be marketed, that they will be delayed, or that anything may be done with them. I may be allowed to sell only so much and told to hold the rest. Not only is quality involved, but quantity is involved as well. This seems to me to be the most drastic provision of all.

Have conditions come to such a point in Canada that we must be regulated not only with regard to the production of natural products but with regard to the production of our secondary industries? We are to be regulated from the top to the bottom. These are the days of societies and associations for all sorts of purposes. Personal liberty is to go in the interests of the state. This is a splendid socialistic idea but may I say to my hon. friends opposite that it sounds rather curious coming from them. Ever since I have been engaged in political controversy with them they have been the custodians of personal liberty and loyalty. Again I say, have our fiscal and trade policies brought us to such a condition that we find we have a superabundance of labour, a superabundance of natural products and superabundance of secondary industries? Is it not a tragedy of statesmanship when we find ourselves in this unhappy position? We have more goods than we know what to do with, and yet throughout the world millions of people are starving.

The method adopted by the government is curtailment all along the line in order that consumption may catch up with production. We are not the only country in this unfortunate predicament; it appears to be common to the world at large. We seem to be a country willing to adopt the most drastic measures of control. We have swung from a country standing for freedom of individual action to a country which is to be regulated in every

regard. We are to be regulated by boards under the authority of the minister in the production of our natural products, and we are to have our secondary industries regulated as well.

I do not think this is the way out. While a properly constituted marketing board, not one as outlined in this bill, could be helpful, I doubt whether it would be of any material benefit. The drastic control provided by this bill may prove to be a boomerang rather than helpful, may do more harm than good. As has been pointed out by the hon. member who preceded me, this has been the result of regulation in other countries. There are many aspects of the bill which I do not like. I do not like the drastic measures which will be employed against me as a farmer if I do not take out a licence and all that that entails. The government pointed out this afternoon that it did not intend to put into execution all the extraordinary provisions of the relief bill, and I do not say that this board will enforce all these regulations. But why set up bugaboos if you do not intend to use the powers provided? Everything the government wants to do can be done after these drastic provisions for dealing with individuals who do not agree to come under the provisions of the bill have been eliminated. I ask the minister to consider this. I agree with practically every word of the minister's statement, but he carefully avoided a discussion of the intimate details of the bill.

Mr. BENNETT: The rules of the house require a discussion of the principle only on second reading.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): We did not even discuss the principle.

Mr. BENNETT: Oh, yes.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Then the bill contains very wide provisions because the minister covered the marketing of live stock, of dairy products and of natural products. If the compulsory features of the bill were mentioned, I did not hear them, and yet they are the principal features of the bill. For these reasons I intend to oppose the second reading of the bill.

On motion of Mr. Stirling the debate was adjourned.

At eleven o'clock the house adjourned without question put, pursuant to standing order.