

we considered in the preparation of this bill, and after the fullest consideration we felt it better to allow the freedom for which we have provided; yet the approval of a scheme by the dominion board will in itself provide for uniformity.

Mr. NEILL: Just one more question. The minister says he is going to leave the greatest latitude to the local boards. That is desirable, perhaps, but there are certain standard things, not questions of right and wrong but of good business principles, that cannot be gainsaid and must be accepted, and that we could accept right now. For instance, suppose a little local board, interested only in its own affairs, arranged that an advance payment which turned out to be excessive should be made to the fruit growers; they pay perhaps what they think is ninety per cent of the value and it turns out to be one hundred and twenty per cent. There is trouble right there which could be obviated if we or the board set certain standards suggested by common ordinary business sense. Some people would think it a fine thing to get all they could out of the fruit in the first place, but later they would be confronted with the situation that it sold for less than they expected, and who is going to pay the expenses? All kinds of things like that might happen from lack of business experience. Why not set certain standard gauges within which the local board would have to operate? The minister says he is going to see that they are in agreement with general business principles. Why not put that in the act so that they may start off in that way, instead of starting off wrongly and getting into trouble for having done so?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): I feel that too many conditions must be taken into consideration to place any narrow limit in this regard. I fully appreciate the difficulty of the hon. member, but so many conditions may arise that we feel it much better to retain this provision.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Before we pass on to part II of the act, which is the investigational rather than the marketing part of the bill, might I ask the minister if he intends to have any proviso inserted with regard to the status of the local boards? I was unavoidably absent one evening when this bill was under discussion, and it may be that this was dealt with at that time. I remember bringing up the matter, not by way of amendment but merely as a suggestion a day or two previously. Will the government or the central board have a representative on the

local board, providing the very necessary contact between the central board and the local board and in some measure at least representing the consumer? Will the provincial government of the province in which the petition originated have a representative on the local board? Will the producers themselves have two or more representatives on the board and will the unorganized producers, the coerced minority if you like, or any organized body other than the one presenting the petition, have representation? That would give a total of five members of the board. It seems to me, with the tremendous powers to be exercised by the local board, that it would give some assurance to the public if the central board had some representation on the local board, which has to do with administration salesmanship. It would give some little feeling of security to know that the consumers would be kept in mind, at all events, by the board administering the marketing scheme of which it had charge. I do not think anything has been done in that regard and it is in the interest of even the producer himself that it be provided for. I have asked a number of members, and they were not aware that any change of that kind had been made, so the minister will forgive me if I have dealt with something already covered.

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): In the absence of the hon. member the other evening no constitution of the board as such was set out; it still remains open, so far as the selection goes; no change has been made. I see a great deal of merit in my hon. friend's recommendation. If the majority of the board were producers, in many cases it would be advantageous for them to have the trade represented, and also to have a representative of the provincial or federal department. But in the province of Ontario, for example, a scheme might be submitted and the province might desire very strongly to have a representative on the board, while in some other province that would not be thought the best course of procedure. So I feel, as I have stated, that the board in its supervisory capacity in connection with all schemes will be in a better position to work out the constitution of a local board than would be the case if we set it out in the bill.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I had in mind the strong argument—not my argument, I may say—used so frequently against this bill; I refer to its compulsory nature. Under present conditions that does not worry me very much, but I should like to have that difficulty minimized as much as possible. By