

Canadian Livestock Feed Board

the board may wish to acquire and move. This cannot be done by a broker on the Winnipeg exchange; but it can be done under the bill, if the board designates an agency to act on its behalf under the power which is given in clause 6(i), where it says the board may—

—authorize any officer or employee of the board or any other person to act on behalf of the board in the conduct of its operations under this act.

So, I maintain—although this is not the interpretation given to it at this time by the minister—that the board under the terms in this bill is given absolute power to designate individuals, companies, or segments of the trade, to act on its behalf. I suggest that this could be to the detriment of the rest of the industry. Can the minister assure me that this is an incorrect interpretation and can he show me where those powers are not contained.

Mr. Sauv : This deals with the powers of the employees of the board. The board will have authority to hire employees who will have power to act under authority of the board. I think the hon. member is giving to this clause a much broader interpretation than is there. This relates to the duties of the board, and the board undoubtedly will have some employees who will act under the authority of the board. There is no other intention. What the hon. member fears was not the spirit in the drafting of this particular clause.

Mr. Danforth: Mr. Minister, the reason I am labouring this point is that some marketing schemes are set up in almost identical terms, including such a power; and I fail to see that if, in the wisdom of the board, they felt that such a situation existed, they could be curtailed in any way, with the absolute power given them in these terms, in doing just what I pointed out. So far as the trade or the producers of feed grain in eastern Canada are concerned, I cannot see where their interests are protected. In subsequent clauses we will see some things which amplify the powers given in clause 6(i).

Mr. Sauv : I do not see the difficulty. I am giving the hon. member assurance that I think this pertains only to the employees of the board in the normal discharge of their responsibilities. The hon. member is giving a much wider interpretation than I do to this particular paragraph.

Mr. Danforth: Although I give a much broader interpretation—and I admitted at the first that I would be speaking of extreme

powers which the board could take to itself under this measure—can the minister assure me that anywhere in this bill there is anything which would prevent such action on behalf of the board, which is in effect a marketing scheme set up under the federal parliament.

Mr. Sauv : If the hon. member would read clause 8(2) he might have an answer there to his problem.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Nowlan: Let me return to the constitutional point raised by the hon. member and say first of all that I appreciate the minister's concern. I do not intend to indulge in a long discussion of this subject, as I realize the minister has put in a long afternoon, but quite frankly I am not satisfied with his answer to my earlier question.

Having had some experience before the bar I have some understanding of statutes and I am afraid that what the minister said regarding a mechanical process to provide some stimulus and incentive to eastern farmers to grow feed grain will not in fact be the case as far as this bill is concerned. Perhaps the minister would consider and accept an amendment to clause 3 along the lines suggested in order that payments could be provided in support of the growing of feed grain in eastern Canada. I believe this to be the way efficiently to stimulate the growth of feed grain. I feel strongly enough in this regard that I am prepared to move an amendment, but I would ask the minister to consider this situation seriously.

Similar anxieties arise in respect of the provisions of clause 6; but in view of the minister's assurance that consideration is being given I do not intend to say a great deal about them. I do hope that, instead of leaving this clause with its present obtuse language, there will be some attempt made to spell out the intended meaning in relation to transportation and storage payments so far as feed grain in eastern Canada and British Columbia is concerned. Surely that would alleviate some of the fears expressed by individuals in the east and other parts of the country.

We should adopt some measure to provide a clear incentive to the administrators of this measure to follow the suggestion of the hon. member for Medicine Hat, in order that the production of feed grain will be in closer relation with the raising of beef cattle.