

be carried out. Such losses may arise, not immediately, but at a future date, and the reserves would be only sufficient to take care of them on a proper accounting basis. It seems to me there would not be any great need for reserves with respect to other products than grain. One can readily see that when the Board is authorized to take care of losses that are incurred only because of the operations of the legislation—not losses related to poor quality, for instance—it is necessary to make provision for the creation of reserves.

Subsection 7 was agreed to.

Subsection 8 was agreed to.

On section 5—marketing schemes:

Subsections 1 and 2 were agreed to.

On subsection 3—Minister may recommend approval:

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: This is the subsection to which I wish to move an amendment. I will not repeat the reasons I have given for the amendment, but I desire to add one further argument. This experiment may have a far-reaching effect. It is, I believe, at the outset, when the first attempts at regulation are being made, that Parliament should be especially careful not to abandon its control. Parliament will be particularly interested in the early development of the scheme and the activities of the boards that are appointed shortly after the legislation becomes effective. If we wish to provide every possible chance of success for this experiment, we should make sure that it starts off with the blessing of Parliament as a whole. We all know that the membership of the House of Commons changes at each general election. If my amendment were accepted the people would, I believe, feel reassured by the knowledge that their elected representatives would be able to pass upon any scheme and modify it, if modification were deemed advisable. Therefore I move the following amendment to subsection 3 of section 5:

Add after the word "and" in the thirty-fourth line the following words: "may then lay before Parliament that scheme, and if Parliament resolves that the scheme shall be approved, the Governor in Council may."

The latter part of the subsection will then read:

upon the recommendation of approval by the Minister, the Governor in Council may approve the scheme and may then lay before Parliament that scheme, and if Parliament resolves that the scheme shall be approved, the Governor in Council may fix the date when the same shall become effective.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Yesterday the honourable senator opposite (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) intimated that the British Act contained a provision of this character. I admit quite frankly I was surprised. It did not seem to me quite in accord with the principles of legislation and administration that after Parliament had approved of a general plan details of its application should require legislative approval, on the assumption that Parliament was a better judge than would be those charged with the administration of the Act. However, I accept my honourable friend's citation.

What I want to emphasize now is that the positions of the two countries are radically different. England is a tight little island, and agricultural conditions there are practically uniform throughout the whole country.

Even if conditions here were the same as in Great Britain, this would not in my opinion be good legislation. I do not see how the members of Parliament could be as well qualified or in as good a position to judge of the merits and workability of a scheme for a particular industry as are the Minister and the officials of the department, who are living with the industry all the time. How could Parliament, representing the whole Dominion, pass intelligently on the merits of a plan for marketing the apples of British Columbia or the potatoes of Prince Edward Island? Would we seriously compare the value of our conclusion with the value of the conclusion of men who are familiar with the industry? We could not reach as intelligent a decision. The conditions of one industry in one territory differ so much from those of the same industry in a territory three thousand miles away that it would seem to me to be by no means wise or prudent legislation to require the imprimatur of Parliament on the details of an individual case in order to give effect to the legislation.

There is still another contrast. In Great Britain Parliament sits virtually the year round; there is only a short recess. But on the average we sit five months in each year, usually less. So there would be an interval of seven months when everything would be tied up. Nothing could be done, because of the necessity of submitting to the senators from Ontario some question about the apples of the Annapolis Valley or the potatoes of Prince Edward Island.

I do not think the honourable senator will on reflection insist on his amendment. On the suggestion he advanced last night I made no remarks, hoping that *locus poenitentiae* would be of value to the honourable senator.