

come to the conclusion that it is distinctly against his interests. Those who already have approved have done so, in my opinion, either without knowledge of the contents of the bill or without due appreciation of their significance.

When the bill was placed on my file I availed myself of the first opportunity to take it to my room, read it and study it. I tried first to discover how a marketing scheme would be brought into existence, then the kind of products which would be regulated, then the degree of regulation, and finally the nature of the regulating authority. I found, as all members who will study the bill will find, that the products to be regulated are natural products, products of agriculture, the forest, the sea, and of the lakes or rivers.

Probably at this point I would do well to read the section to which I have referred, namely, subsection (e) of section 2:

"natural products" means any product of agriculture or of the forest, sea, lake or river, and any article of food or drink wholly or partly manufactured or derived from any such product.

I believe if hon. members will examine this section they will find that the expressions contained therein cover practically all the food we use. They include wheat and other grains, milk and eggs, fruit, live stock and cattle, hogs, either in their natural condition or processed.

Then as to how the scheme may be brought into operation, I find that a representative number of persons engaged in the production and marketing or in the production or marketing of any one of these natural products may approach the governor in council with a petition asking that a scheme be set up. I suggest the proposed legislation is deficient in that it does not define what may be a representative number of persons. My suggestion is that it should be more definite in that respect. Perhaps the president and two or three directors of an organization may approach the minister with a petition. May I add at this point that I am not referring to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Weir) because the act does not state what particular minister shall control this legislation when it becomes law. The fact remains however that a representative number of persons may ask for a marketing scheme, and the minister is the sole judge as to whether these petitioners really represent the whole of the producers of that product. In his wisdom he may decide that these three or four officials who have approached him are really representatives. In fact, they may assure him that they represent 20,000, 30,000 or 40,000 producers. I suggest

however that that would be no evidence that they do represent those producers. Within the past few years there have been instances where the directors and officers of organizations have represented themselves as speaking for the whole of those organizations when, in fact, the truth was that in many of those cases the majority of the producers have not held the same views as were held by their officers. I suggest the bill should be much more specific in this regard, and at a later point in my remarks I shall compare this legislation with the British marketing legislation in this respect.

Then, I believe that only those who are engaged in the production of one of these natural products should decide whether or not there should be a marketing scheme in connection therewith. That decision should not be left to those who are simply marketing the product. The minister has to decide, but the measure does not state what shall be the basis of his decision. If the minister is satisfied that the petitioners represent the whole of the producers he may refer the matter to the marketing board. The board may report to the minister who if the report is favourable will bring the matter before the governor in council. The scheme will then be put in force subject to two reservations only. I think there is a great weakness in the bill in that respect, but I propose to touch on that a little later when referring to the British marketing act.

There is another section of this bill to which I object even more strenuously, and that is section 9. Without offence I would say that the discretion provided for in this section should not be left to the minister. Section 9 reads:

Notwithstanding that no petition in relation to any natural product has been filed, the minister may, if he is satisfied that the trade and commerce in the said product is injuriously affected by the lack of a local board to regulate such product, at any time propose a scheme for the marketing of such product, and the governor in council may approve of such scheme and authorize the board to administer such scheme directly or through any agency which it may establish. Such scheme shall continue in force until terminated by the governor in council.

It may be observed that the minister does not have to invite the board to make a report on the proposed scheme. He proceeds to propose the scheme to the governor in council and the governor in council may authorize it. Again I intend to refer to the provisions of the British Marketing Act a little later on in connection with that feature of the bill.