

of section 8 something which is entirely reworded. It now reads:

The board may, where in its opinion a by-law or rule of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange relating to trading in grain futures operates injuriously to the public interest, after hearing representations, if any, on behalf of the association by order revoke or vary such by-law or rule.

Certain members of the senate had representations made to them, and the fear seems to be that under that clause it might be possible for the board to cancel all the rules of the exchange and thus close the exchange altogether. My own thought is that there is no practical likelihood of that happening, because the whole bill is predicated upon the continued operation of the exchange, and it is intended only to supervise it. However, as it does not conflict with the purpose of the bill, it is proposed to insert this instead of the clause which is there now:

The board may, where in its opinion a by-law or rule of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange has brought about or is threatening to bring about a condition which is prejudicial to the public interest arising from trading in grain futures, after hearing representations, if any, on behalf of the exchange by order revoke or vary any such by-law or rule: Provided, however, that this subsection shall not authorize the closing of the grain futures market or any limitation of future trading other than as set out in subsection one of this section.

As the amendment does not conflict with the purposes of the section, the government has no objection to it.

Mr. E. E. PERLEY (Qu'Appelle): I suggest that these two amendments definitely limit the powers of the board; the supervisor would be a mere visitor to the clearing house or the exchange. A man who has had considerable experience in grain dealing and is much interested in it has made the suggestion that, even under the measure as originally drafted, the supervisor would be just a visitor. These two amendments make the act practically inoperative as a useful measure.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING AIR FORCE, MEMBERSHIP IN TRADE UNIONS, ETC.—CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENT

Right Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of and concurrence in the amendment made by the senate to Bill No. 90, to amend the criminal code.

He said: In order to bring back the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr.

Woodsworth) to his usual happy mood, I am pleased to tell him that no amendment was made to section 11, which both he and I have at heart. The only amendment which has been made is to section 7, concerning publication of false advertisements to promote sales. The words of the section as printed were:

... any advertisement for either directly or indirectly promoting the sale—

The senate put the words "either directly or indirectly" after instead of before "promoting." I am not enough of an authority on grammar to know whether this is better than the first version, but I have no objection to it.

Motion agreed to; amendment read the second time and concurred in.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

OTHER THAN WHEAT—ENCOURAGEMENT OF CO-OPERATIVE MARKETING BY GUARANTEEING INITIAL PAYMENT

The house resumed from Thursday, May 4, consideration in committee of Bill No. 89, to assist and encourage cooperative marketing of agricultural products—Mr. Gardiner—Mr. Sanderson in the chair.

On section 2—Definition.

Mr. BARBER: I should like a little information with regard to this section. Take a case, we will say, in the lower mainland of British Columbia where a group of producers might wish to form a cooperative and to come under this bill. Would the regulations specify, or is the minister in a position to-day to say, what proportion of the growers or producers in that particular district or defined area would be required? Second, if they were successful in forming a cooperative, would provision be made for the setting up of what they call the scheme under which they are to operate? Third, would there be provision or powers given to levy assessments—which of course, as the minister knows, has been a source of trouble in the past—under the marketing act?

Hon. J. G. GARDINER (Minister of Agriculture): As far as the first two questions are concerned, a provision will be made under this bill. The percentages of producers which would be required to enter into an undertaking of that kind would depend entirely upon the question of the financial soundness of the organization which might be set up. If the government were going to guarantee up to 80 per cent of the payments, of course they would not enter into an agreement where the percentage of people in any particular