

members of the committee that this bill contains a provision authorizing the government to bring the legislation to an end by order in council. The hon. member for York-Sunbury dealt briefly with what took place following the last war, and I should like to enlarge on that a little. The transition period then was from 1918 to the early twenties. It is quite true that in the early twenties we had a little slump, but I am sure hon. members will agree that if nothing worse than that had had to be contended with, we would have come through pretty easily. Certainly by 1925 the period of transition from war to peace was ended; and if this legislation had been in effect at that time, and the then government had held the views of this government, an order in council would have been put through suspending the measure. But what happened after that? We all know what took place after the boom period from 1925 to 1929, and that is what may happen again. Therefore I say that in connection with some sections of this bill we consider ourselves justified and, in fact, in duty bound to suggest to the government that it be strengthened in certain details.

I am a new and comparatively young member of this house. The minister went back a very considerable period of time, but he did not quite go the length of trying to tell some of us that he had thought of this kind of legislation while we were in our cradles or in kindergarten, although he got very close to it. I want to tell the minister that we are quite prepared to give him and his government credit for having brought in this bill, but I want to tell him further that the people out in the country have been asking for legislation like this for a long time, and have not had it. I may not be as old and as experienced as the minister, but I have been told many times that it does people good to go through trials and tribulations because it makes them face up to their wrongdoings in the past. Yes, it is very often quite beneficial to face sinners with the consequences of their wrongdoing. The only trouble is that very often the sinners see the error of their ways too late. However, if even at this late date we can help to make their repentance complete and sincere, we shall have performed our duty as an opposition.

The CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed further I must state here that the Chair has a duty to perform. I believe I am voicing the sentiments of the great majority of the members of this committee when I suggest that we should come down to earth now and discuss the bill which is before us.

Mr. PERLEY: I did not intend to say anything at this stage, Mr. Chairman, but I was very much surprised this evening—

Mr. GARDINER: Did you change your mind and decide to make another speech?

Mr. PERLEY: I did not interrupt the minister when he was making his speech, although he had three shots at this measure. I was surprised when the minister took advantage of the opportunity, at this stage of the proceedings, to make what could only be termed a political speech. I should say he made a campaign speech; perhaps it will be the last one he will have a chance to make here.

The CHAIRMAN: I just gave a ruling, by which I would ask the hon. member to abide. The hon. member for York-Sunbury qualified his statement before making it, by saying he knew he was out of order and asking for leave to make a few remarks. However, I would ask hon. members to discuss the bill itself.

Mr. PERLEY: Then I shall refer to the section you have called. The principle underlying this bill is similar to the principle underlying the wheat board act of 1935. Why was that bill brought in? Because we were facing a situation similar to the one we are facing to-day with respect to the marketing of wheat, the chief product of our agriculture.

Mr. HATFIELD: Wheat is not under the bill.

Mr. PERLEY: No; but the underlying principle is the same. On that occasion the measure was brought down early in the session and, as I said this afternoon, this measure should have been brought in much sooner. Then it could have been sent to the committee on agriculture, where it could have been considered section by section. We could have had before that committee men like the present chairman of the bacon board and others who have had something to do with the marketing of these products for the last two or three years. I protest once more against this important measure being brought in at this very late stage of the session. We have to find a solution of this important problem of the marketing of agricultural products. We shall not find it along political lines, or in listening to political speeches. We must work as a united parliament.

I just wanted to make this statement before we went farther. I think it would have been a fine thing if this bill had been referred to the committee on agriculture early in the session, where it could have been thoroughly studied. I am in favour of the principle, but in closing let me say that you will not see