

*The Address—Mr. Pickersgill*

except doing better work. Therefore I suggest this new approach by Lincoln to industrial economics. I prescribe a chapter of it every day for manufacturers, and if they are not cured in one reading then I would prescribe "the mixture as before" until they are cured.

**Mr. Fisher:** May I ask the hon. member a question? His argument is a persuasive one but has he thought of presenting it to the national productivity council and, second, does it not seem possible that his argument may be an indictment of that organization which his own government set up not so long ago?

**Mr. Macdonnell:** I am so glad you asked that question because I intended to mention the national productivity council. I would hope very much that the national productivity council would follow this line of reasoning and would stress it in their work. Thank you very much for asking that. I would like to think I am not treating the question too lightly. What I say, is, don't neglect this subject. I do not think anyone who takes the trouble to dig into this book can possibly reach any conclusion but that, it is very well worthy of serious consideration and I hope my manufacturing friends will mark, learn and inwardly digest what it contains.

**Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Bonavista-Twillin-gate):** Mr. Speaker, I have only a very few minutes before the vote will be taken on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), but I think it would be interesting to compare the amendment—which undoubtedly the hon. gentleman did himself—with one of the points in the summary of the submission to the government of Canada by the national farmers union, which reads as follows:

Short of bringing the three largest meat packing companies under public ownership, the N.F.U. sees only one other measure to counteract their dominant market power, namely by giving farmers countervailing power in the market place. The N.F.U. therefore asks for enabling legislation to establish national marketing boards with mandatory powers and controls over the marketing of commodities produced on farms, including those owned or operated by processors, distributors and manufacturers. It therefore asks the federal government to use its power under section 95 of the British North America Act and enact enabling legislation.

As the hon. member well knows, and as every distinguished lawyer knows, there have been many difficult cases heard in the courts, some carried to the privy council, about where the real jurisdiction lies over marketing of farm products.

The question was settled in the case of wheat because, if I remember correctly, it enters so largely into export; but the trend

of the decisions as I recall them, and I am speaking very much from memory as I have not looked up these cases for a long time, was that in most commodities the jurisdiction would be in the provincial and not in the federal field. I would doubt very much if the jurisdiction could be founded under section 95 in any case; that section relates to agriculture, not to marketing.

But, sir, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture also presented views to the government of Canada and I have a copy of the views that they presented. In their presentation they indicated very clearly that marketing legislation may be necessary. They say, after referring to certain things that relate especially to Ontario:

Continued study should be given to the difficult question of what further national marketing legislation may be needed to implement national programs of producer marketing as they develop in the years ahead.

We agree completely with this view. I do not think there is any doubt where the Liberal party has stood about the rights of producers to market their products in their own way, if they wish to do so. We have stood solidly behind the wheat board because it undoubtedly is within the jurisdiction of parliament, and we feel that farmers, whether the jurisdiction is federal or provincial, should have this right if they want it. But we fear that, since we are asked to make a mandatory statement, without examining whether in fact it is suggesting a serious invasion in a field of jurisdiction that was given by the British North America Act to the provinces, and not to this parliament, this would not be a proper motion for us to support at this time without having a careful opinion from the law officers of the crown that this would really be within the jurisdiction of this parliament. For that reason we shall not find it possible to vote for the motion.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Peters) which was negated on the following division:

**YEAS**

Messrs:

Fisher  
Herridge  
Howard

Martin (Timmins)  
Peters  
Winch—6.

**NAYS**

Messrs:

Aiken  
Aitken, Miss  
Allard  
Allmark  
Badanal  
Balcer  
Baskin  
Batten

Beech  
Bell (Saint John-Albert)  
Benidickson  
Boivin  
Boulangier  
Bourbonnais  
Bourdages  
Bourget