

rightful privileges which should accrue from the labour and energy which he has put into his operations? Will anyone deny that? No; it cannot be denied. It is one of the travesties of the times, as has been shown in this report, that so far as farm implements are concerned, so far as his relations in the marketing of his products through the packers are concerned, so far as his relations to the canning industry are concerned, the primary producer has held the bag, to use a colloquialism. The primary producer is the one who has lost out. Have we been invited to take adequate steps to correct these iniquities? I submit that no adequate steps have been taken. I quote:

So long as I am head of the government of this country, I will see fair play between the producer and the consumer, between industry and the public. I have no prejudices, I hope, and I play no favourites. But I could not better show my concern for industry than to rid it of those practices which unfairly affect the pocketbook of the great bulk of the people of this country and work a damning injury to industry itself.

These are noble words, but I fail to find in the measures so far submitted to parliament that degree of remedy which was indicated in these words of the Prime Minister.

Let me call the attention of the house to what we have before us. We have had an amendment to the live stock act. One can dismiss that and say that it is little more than worthless. It does propose one or two things which were recommended in the commission's report, but had it been drawn up by the great packing institutions of this country it could not have been more satisfactory to them.

The next are the amendments to the criminal code. Has there ever been a time in the history of Canada and in the history of this parliament when a measure was introduced to parliament in response to the recommendations of a commission which sat for fifteen months with such words as those used by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Guthrie) when he introduced the measure and later when the discussion was finally brought to a head? The Minister of Justice said that these things were offered to parliament but it was not considered that they could be made effective because of constitutional difficulties. Whose business was it to draw them so that they would be effective? I say to the Minister of Justice that had he simply made the offences stated in that bill crimes, they would have been within the powers of parliament. I know what will happen when I say that; I shall be laughed at and ridiculed as a sort of ignorant layman who presumes

[Mr. Stevens.]

to talk on constitutional matters. I submit that an impartially minded legal man could draft these measures in the light of the chapter on labour of the report so that they would be within the constitution. Subsection (a), I think it is, of section 5 may be questionable, but I submit that most of the sections could have been brought within the criminal code. How were these amendments introduced? Parliament was told first by the Minister of Justice and then by a leading legal mind of the opposition that they were so much nonsense, on the one hand, and would not be effective, on the other. Did ever legislation start out on a career of reform under conditions such as that?

What was next? We come now to the amendments to the Companies Act. The minister who introduced this legislation stated in one part of his remarks that if he were in private practice he would like nothing better than to be briefed to contest the very measures he was introducing. I ask the serious minded hon. members of this house: Did ever legislation which was supposed to give effect to the solemn words and noble sentiments contained in the three speeches from which I have quoted start on its career of reform under auspices such as that?

We come now to the most important of all, the bill which is before us for third reading. I expressed previously my views on this legislation and I shall not repeat them other than to say this: The bill is drafted and confined to the narrowest interpretation of constitutional law when the report is as clear as day that there are prevailing in this country practices and customs which the report has indicated cannot be covered by statute law but if a commission were set up that would review these matters and make declarations on them, you could build up in this country a corporate practice that would recreate the fair practice of man, that practice which passed away with the open market place. That is what the report suggested. I still submit, not as a lawyer, but just as an ordinary member of the house, that if that board had been set up in that spirit, was given as wide constitutional powers as possible, having placed upon it the administration of the various acts, but also being made a referee between conflicting business interests in Canada, a very great service could have been rendered.

But what is the chief weakness of this bill? It has been turned over to the tariff board. I have referred to that before. Let me repeat this: In so far as the worthy judge who presides over the tariff board is con-