

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Then each local board will be restricted in its movements as to the time and place at which, and the agency through which, the regulated product shall be marketed, and as to the manner of distribution and the quantity, quality and grade or class of the regulated product. The freedom of action of the local board will be limited by the general ruling of the central board, permitting or prohibiting sales during a certain period, with a view to the best marketing conditions and prices. The boards dealing with the same product in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, for instance, would be controlled by the central board, and because of obeying certain general regulations they would function in some respects as though they were one board?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: I think that is correct. It must be borne in mind that the Governor in Council is not obliged to take action when the request for a board comes from too small a portion of an industry. My own view is that it would not be common sense to have three boards for the potato industry in the Maritime Provinces. It would seem to me that those three provinces would probably be the smallest possible unit that could possibly operate as one board in relation to that one product. A different arrangement would probably cause difficulty, for friction might arise if one province were asked to withhold sales while the other provinces were selling. It would be the duty of the central board to advise as to whether or not any unit is big enough to function by itself with respect to any product, while other units handling the same product are also functioning nearby. It would seem to me to be the part of wisdom that the handling of any one product in the Maritime Provinces should be done by one board.

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: That is where the danger lies. The potatoes of Prince Edward Island being of superior quality, the demand would perhaps be stronger for them than for those of the other provinces. If we were unable to take advantage of that demand we should be penalized to some extent.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The merging of the boards would not merge the potatoes.

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: I should be satisfied if it were made clear that we shall be free to do the best we can with the product that is peculiar to Prince Edward Island.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Prince Edward Island does not need to go into the scheme at all.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

Hon. Mr. HUGHES: That is an important statement, that we do not need to go in at all.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Honourable members, when we were in Committee I moved an amendment which was rejected, and I stated that I would move it again on third reading. I desire to do so now. Subsection 3 of section 5 reads as follows:

Upon receipt of a report from the Board recommending the approval of the scheme as submitted or as amended by the Board, the Minister may recommend the approval thereof, or may require that a poll be taken and state the necessary percentage of voters favouring the scheme to warrant its further consideration; upon the recommendation of approval by the Minister, the Governor in Council may approve the scheme and fix the date when the same shall become effective.

I move that this be amended by inserting after the word "and" and before the word "fix," in line 34 on page 5 of the Bill, the following:

may then lay before Parliament that scheme, and if Parliament resolves that the scheme shall be approved, the Governor in Council may.

The discussion to which we have just listened strengthens my opinion as to the necessity of such an amendment. As I said on the motion for second reading, this proposed legislation is experimental, and is far in advance of any we have formerly had for the purpose of regulating the marketing of natural products. It seeks to introduce into our statutes a coercive element which is entirely new. The views expressed by honourable members this evening show the differences of opinion that exist as to the working of this Bill, and prove that some people fear they may be deprived of that freedom of action which hitherto they have been able to exercise as they deemed best in their own interest. The honourable gentleman from Gloucester (Hon. Mr. Turgeon) urges that the fishermen from the part of the country which he represents should not be included in such a scheme as the Bill contemplates; and opposition to the Bill has been expressed from the Maritimes.

Radical though the marketing legislation of Great Britain is, I feel we should be well advised to follow more closely the policy adopted in that country. Under that policy no marketing scheme can be put into operation until it has been approved by both Houses of Parliament. I believe the people of our country would be less disturbed over the possibility of an invasion of their right to dispose as they please of the products of their labour, if it were made clear to them