

flue cured tobacco scheme, October 26, 1934. British Columbia lower mainland milk marketing scheme, January 1, 1935. Eastern Canada potato marketing scheme, January 18, 1935. Western Ontario bean marketing scheme, February 1, 1935. British Columbia interior vegetable marketing scheme, March 4, 1935. British Columbia coast vegetable marketing scheme, March 4, 1935. Dominion of Canada jam marketing scheme, April 10, 1935.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): The minister mentioned two boards operating in Ontario; what do they deal with?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Flue cured tobacco, the western Ontario bean marketing scheme and the potato marketing scheme. There is the dominion apple marketing scheme and the eastern Canada potato marketing scheme.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): The minister mentioned that there were two or three schemes functioning in more than one province. In what provinces do these operate?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The jam marketing scheme operates in all provinces, as does the fruit export marketing scheme.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Is that under the jurisdiction of a provincial or a dominion board?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): These schemes are all under the jurisdiction of the dominion board.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Is there any instance where there is concurrent jurisdiction of a provincial and a dominion board?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The milk marketing scheme in the lower mainland of British Columbia and the coast vegetable marketing scheme.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): What does the minister say about those?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): They are schemes in which the dominion is cooperating with the provinces.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): The dominion jurisdiction is operating concurrently with the provincial jurisdiction. Will the minister tell me what schemes have been rejected in connection with demands that were made in any province of the dominion with respect to products under the Natural Products Marketing Act?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The schemes voted on and not passed were the Manitoba poultry marketing scheme, the Saskatchewan poultry marketing scheme, and the Alberta poultry

[Mr. R. Weir.]

marketing scheme. Schemes not acted upon as not considered expedient, the export butter scheme—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Was that by the dominion board?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Are there any schemes now pending before any of these jurisdictions that have not yet been decided upon?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I had better finish answering the first question first. Schemes returned to petitioners, Montreal lumber; British Columbia sheep and sheep products; Manitoba vegetables; British Columbia eggs and poultry; British Columbia doors; oyster shell and poultry grit.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Were those rejected?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): They were returned to the petitioners.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): By whom?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): By the dominion marketing board.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): That is practically rejected.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Yes, but not voted on. Just the first three were voted on.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): Mr. Chairman, apropos of this item in the estimates I desire to make a statement in regard to the marketing of potatoes. In the Charlottetown Patriot of May 20, 1935, reference was made to a speech delivered by the hon. member for Prince (Mr. MacLean) at a Liberal convention held at Summerside. In this speech the hon. member is reported to have stated as follows:

Two reasons were ascribed by A. E. MacLean, M.P.—

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): What is the hon. member quoting from?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): From an extract from a Charlottetown paper.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver): Which paper and what date?

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The Charlottetown Patriot, May 20. The extract reads:

Two reasons were ascribed by A. E. MacLean, M.P. at the Liberal convention held at Summerside on Tuesday night for the