

*Marketing Act***After Recess**

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bury): The amendment, I believe, was to subclause 1 of clause 4, dealing with pooling. Has the amendment been read?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): It has been read.

Mr. NEILL: Perhaps the minister would give us some idea how he proposes to arrange for the carrying out of this pool. I spoke about it the other day, and I do not propose to repeat my remarks. The minister said at that time that he was going to have the item re-drafted. I pointed out—page 3225 of Hansard—that in the New Zealand act of 1923 they provide for pooling. But they go further. Pooling is a very general term; we do not understand anything very particular concerning it except the general idea that the receipts shall be pooled and divided, presumably equitably. But there is no provision for that in this bill. In the New Zealand act they prescribe what shall be done, and I think it would be desirable to follow that procedure here to some extent. They provide that the receipts from the produce shall be paid by the board into a separate account in a bank. I think that is highly desirable so that it will be earmarked. Then it says it shall be applied by the board in certain ways. The minister may say that he is going to arrange for all this by regulation, but in New Zealand they thought it worth putting in the act. They provided for six different things; for payment of expenses and commissions and other charges; salaries and wages; travelling expenses, and repayment of advances made by the board to owners. Then provision is made for creation of a reserve fund—that is a very important thing; and finally the balance is to go to the owners of the products. The minister may say: Well, the local scheme will provide for all these things. But the local schemers are more intent on their local problems; they see it only in the light of their local conditions, and I suspect they are not going to provide for all these features. I am not going to press the matter to an amendment; if the minister will not listen, the responsibility is his. But would it not be a good thing to provide now that the receipts shall be pooled, and to set up some safeguards for the benefit of the producers and also of the board as to the handling of the funds, what expenses are to come out, and the final balance to be paid to the producers?

[Mr. Neill.]

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): We have traversed this ground in our preparation of the bill, and we feel that these features can best be handled with it in its present form. Different schemes of pooling may be submitted, but as the direction will be under the dominion board we feel that through it uniformity will be attained as far as is desirable, at the same time leaving enough latitude to meet the different plans of pooling that may be brought forward. Regulations required to give effect to the particular manner of pooling suggested by local boards will be submitted to the governor in council on the recommendation of the board. The board itself will be the instrument to give uniformity.

Mr. NEILL: The dominion board?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): Yes.

Mr. NEILL: I hardly gathered that from some previous remarks. I understood that the minister was going to allow a great deal of latitude to the local boards. Now I gather that he is going to keep the control in the hands of the dominion board, to which I take no exception; I think it is a good thing, but it makes it all the more reasonable that the powers should be defined. I thought he said he was going to leave it to the local boards, which require perhaps some vagueness in definition, but if it is to be done by the dominion board, and he is going to get a certain basis of policy that will extend to all these groups, what objection can there be to putting some of the conditions in the bill? I feel he is going to make a good deal of trouble for himself. For instance, the idea that the money should be earmarked; is there any reason why the money should not be put in a separate fund instead of some common fund?

Mr. WEIR (Melfort): The hon. member misunderstood me if he got the impression that we were not allowing as much latitude to local boards as I have at previous times stated. Because of the flexible nature of the bill, ample freedom will be allowed for different suggestions or policies to be set forward. The principle will be under the control of the dominion board, but it will be capable of variation. For example, in Ontario they might wish to form a board to deal with one kind of fruit, setting aside funds to equalize the proceeds from that particular kind of fruit. They might also wish to set up a fund to equalize payments over different kinds of fruit. I can assure the hon. member that he is just covering the same difficulties that