

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland): I did not say that. What I am trying to bring out is this. The minister admitted that under Bill 51 I as a producer am subject to fine—

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Stated rather than admitted.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland): He stated then that under Bill 51 if I did not comply with the regulations embodied in a local scheme under the Natural Products Marketing Act the board would have the right of fine and imprisonment. Is that correct?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): That is my interpretation of it, yes.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland): They have not only the right of fine and imprisonment; the board has the right of taxation. I was taxed in 1935—

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The board has not the right of fine and imprisonment, and only if that were included in the conditions under the scheme would it be applicable. The board has not the right of fine and imprisonment; the court has.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland): Under Bill 51 the courts have the right of fine and imprisonment, but the board has the right of taxation and it exercises that right. I was taxed without having a voice in the matter. I paid a tax though I had no say as to whether or not I should be charged. The tax was levied on my exports. My contention is this. In the first place the act is *ultra vires*; in the second place, neither the minister nor any court can send me to gaol for selling an honestly grown Canadian product to a Canadian consumer; and in the third place, the right of taxation is—

Mr. HACKETT: There are a lot of fellows in gaol now under that misapprehension.

Mr. FRASER (Northumberland): The right of taxation is vested in this House of Commons, in the parliament of Canada, and not in the board, to decide whether I am to be taxed or not to be taxed. But the board in this case decides; let us not forget that. The power is conveyed in the act. The act does not say how much the tax shall be. The local board sets the levy per acre and per bushel; the export board sets the levy per barrel of the export shipment. But the act transfers the right of taxation as well as the expenditure of taxes from the jurisdiction of the Canadian House of Commons to the board set up under the act. That is the iniquitous part of the whole matter, plus this fact—and let me

repeat it and get it once again on the record—we could not stop bootlegging in liquor; how can we stop it in apples and potatoes? I repeat that as a Canadian fruit grower I defy the right of this or any other board to fine or imprison me for selling an honestly grown Canadian product. Is the Department of Agriculture in alliance with the Department of Justice? Is there a conspiracy with the Department of Public Works to build more gaols in this country? Is there by any possibility a set-up between Agriculture, Justice and Public Works and contractors and suppliers of materials behind this iniquitous piece of legislation? Let us get the situation cleared up and let us see where we stand.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Fraser) in connection with this legislation. I have given some thought to the drift of public opinion, legislative opinion I might say, not only in this country but in some others. I am discussing this question impartially; I am not interested in this side or that side of the house. What we must remember is that the only places in which we have been able to carry out a planning scheme are the gaols, the army and the navy, where every man wears the same kind of clothes, eats as the government says he shall eat and sleeps as the government says he shall sleep.

I have had some practical experience in Ontario and in the city of Hamilton. I am speaking as a sailor, not as a soldier, and I know whereof I speak. I want to be very frank about this because I think the consumer has some rights; let us not forget that. While producers and distributors sit down and say: This is the price that shall be charged, let them not forget that my people have some rights as to the price that shall be charged. The labouring man who is working for \$12 or \$14 a week has some rights in this matter. After all is said and done, we all speak from the viewpoint of our experience. Some speak from the viewpoint of what they have read, but I speak from the viewpoint of my practical experience. I remember when the big chain dairies, representatives of the Borden interests in the United States, came into this dominion and began to buy up the dairies of Ontario. They took within their orbit, in the boards of directors, members who were prominent in the public life of this country. I have no objection to that. In Hamilton, whence I come, the working men are practical. A man can be well educated and be a damn fool at the same time; let us not forget that. They said: These chaps are buying up these dairies, and naturally in order to meet the