

of regulation when it is a matter of regulating the quality of human food. But now we are asked to extend the act to leaf tobacco. I do not object offhand to that, but I merely wish to point out to the Senate that it is a very strong piece of legislation which can be used to restrict trading in the articles to which it refers, very severely indeed, and we should, I think, be careful before we add more products to the list of articles that are to be subject to this act. That is why I would support reference of the bill to a standing committee.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** That is quite agreeable.

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** Did I understand the honourable leader of the house to say that he was agreeable to reference of this bill to a committee?

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** Yes.

**Hon. Mr. Croll:** That makes my speech unnecessary.

**Hon. W. Ross Macdonald:** Honourable senators, I agree with the proposal that the bill should be sent to committee for the reasons which have already been stated. Also I think we should have an explanation as to why the bill which was passed in 1955 and received royal assent that year has not been proclaimed. That is, I think most unusual. There may be other unproclaimed statutes that have been standing on the statute book for that length of time or longer, but there must be some special reason for the delay in this case. I can imagine the Government introducing a bill and, after it has been passed, coming to the conclusion that it would be better not to proclaim it. But in this instance that is not the case. The Government says this act is a good one; in fact, so good that it is desirable to extend its provisions. Now if that has been the case for the last three years, why has it not been proclaimed? I think we should be given a clear explanation of that. I may be wrong, and it may have been thought for some time that it was not a good act. In any event we should be told why it has not been proclaimed. Was it considered to be bad? And has it now been decided that it is good and will be proclaimed?

As I have said, I agree that we should send the bill to committee. There we shall be able to see if there is any objection to it. I followed with great interest the address of the honourable senator from Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Taylor). He knows a great deal about the grading and selling of tobacco and he has explained that within the last year there has been a change in the method of selling. Certain proposals as to grading have now

been made. I recall that when the change in procedure was first proposed there was a great deal of controversy among the growers as to the advisability of making this change. My recollection is that, when the vote was taken, there was quite strong support for the change, but there was some objection to it. Now, honourable senators, I think we have always taken the stand that a minority should be heard, so if there is a minority which objects to the proposed methods of grading we should hear their voice in our committee.

For that reason, honourable senators, I cannot see the need for any rush in passing this bill through the house. I do not think the committee should sit tomorrow and put the bill through. The act has been standing for three years, so surely we can wait a couple of weeks. I would suggest to the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Aseltine) that if this bill goes to committee we should not set a date for the hearing on this bill for at least a week or ten days.

**Hon. Felix P. Quinn:** Honourable senators, I also am wondering why this act has not been proclaimed, and I am also wondering why the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) wonders, because no member of this chamber should be in a better position to know the reason than he is. He was a member of the Government that passed the legislation in 1955 and that same Government held office until June of last year. Now, why should he not be able to tell us the reason why it was not proclaimed?

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** Honourable senators, I happen to know one reason why it was not proclaimed but I think we should hear the officials of the department. This act was a consolidation of the Canada Dairy Products Act, the Fruit, Vegetables and Honey Act, the Livestock and Livestock Products Act, the Meat and Canned Foods Act and the Maple Products Industry Act. I understand that there are regulations under all these acts, but apparently over all these years the department was not satisfied with the regulations that were proposed in connection with this act. I do not wish to go into the matter any further until we get some information from those close to the responsibility for carrying out that act as to why it was not proclaimed.

**Hon. W. M. Aseltine:** Honourable senators, I think I could give the explanation but I do not propose to do so. Like the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) I would prefer to have departmental officials give us the explanation in committee. I suggest that the committee should meet tomorrow and plan how it is going to