

do? In the first place, such a board should be given fairly ample powers, to be exercised in connection with regulations passed, I should suppose, with the approval of the governor in council. Those powers should, I think, include one of having some control over the quality of the products which we export. This may sound to some as dictatorial, but it would be intolerable if, during the process of developing an export trade, any individual through short-sightedness, greed, selfishness or mere ignorance, were to be permitted to destroy our hopes by shipping abroad some trashy product of a kind of which we still find too much in this country, but which is in no way typical of this country's products as a whole. You cannot over-estimate the damage which might be done to our reputation or the financial loss that might be incurred by such a thing. Just as we guard the quality of our wheat as it is distributed throughout the world and also as we guard that of our eggs, poultry and other products, so should such a board have power to exercise some control, and for the same reason, over the quality of our goods sent abroad.

In the second place, the board should have some control over transportation facilities, particularly the ocean space, in relation to beef cattle and other items. It should have, as was intimated by the minister, the power at least to inquire into the spread which prevails as between the producer of farm products and the ultimate consumer. In that connection it should have and eventually I think it must have, control over a fund out of which losses incurred in our overseas trade in farm products may be met. As to that—and I imagine it is one of the greatest difficulties—so much has been said on one side or the other, I hesitate to say more. But two questions are being and should be asked in respect of such a fund: How is it to be financed? How are you going to get the money? Second, how will it be expended in order to bring about the greatest results? I suggest—and this is no suggestion emanating from myself; it has been indicated already by the minister as a possibility—that such a levy should be placed on the goods themselves, on the total production in this country of that class or kind of farm commodity, in such a way as to impose no great hardship, and that could easily be done.

Let me take live stock as an illustration: last year we exported something like five per cent of our total production and that five per cent, hanging over our heads at this time, is sufficient to depress our market. A levy of one-tenth of a cent per pound according

to the weight of the animal, placed upon our total production, would prove approximately sufficient to pay two cents a pound, or \$20 a steer on all the animals exported. Further, this is obvious and it is most important: This assistance should not be given by way of a fixed bonus. If you do that, you defeat the very object you have in view, because if this is paid by way of a fixed bonus, it is obvious it would be to the interest of the buyer or shipper to keep the Canadian price as low as possible in order that the bonus might add to his profit and not to that of the producer. I suggest that it should be used to pay the actual loss involved in the shipment of those goods. This would be a varying amount. In this way two difficulties would be met: first, it would in no way induce the shipper to depress the Canadian price, and, second, it would in no way put us in the position of attempting, by bonusing articles, to undersell our competitors in foreign markets, neither of which actions would be sound.

Other items might be attended to similarly. Owing to the time of the day and the desire to prorogue, I am not going to go into this as I might and perhaps should. The main object of the whole thing is this: to replace this chaotic, disorganized condition under which this modicum of exportable goods becomes a curse which crashes the price of all, with an organized, systematized method of controlled marketing, semi-cooperative in character, financed by the industry itself and having in mind as an objective, as a watchword: continuity of supply, uniformity of quality and stabilization of market conditions and of price levels. Create that slight shortage; permit to be created or reestablished that healthy competition, which, under our present system, is the life of trade, and you go some distance in solving the marketing problem of the farmer and in placing his domestic as well as his export prices upon a reasonably stable basis. You put hope into his heart, and while no one could expect that this would solve all his problems, because it would be wrong to think the millennium would come. I believe it is one step which could be taken towards the solution of these problems and the placing of agriculture upon a basis which would bring reasonable returns to those engaged in the industry and put hope into their hearts. I believe that it would be one factor in raising the cloud of depression under which we are labouring at the present time.

Mr. H. J. BARBER (Fraser Valley): I wish to pay a compliment to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir) and to his depart-