

Canadian Livestock Feed Board

minister reconsider his answer and distinguish between how these advances will be made and what the law will be in so far as the procedure in this house is concerned?

Mr. Fairweather: I am anxious to see this bill passed, but I wonder if we could not stand this section? With great respect, I am quite sure the minister is not correct in what he said. I do not see how a statute which restricts monetary expenditure in other parts can come along a little later and give a blanket authority to the Governor in Council. This section must be copied out of other statutes and we should interpret on the basis of the earlier sections. I suggest that we stand the clause and that the minister get advice on this because an amendment may be needed to make it subject to the earlier clauses if my interpretation is not correct.

Mr. Lambert: If there is to be advice taken from the law officers of the crown with regard to clause 17 and its relationship to clause 16, I should like to point out the possible need for a further revision to that suggested by my colleague from Royal. In line 13 there is an indication that no payment can be made out of the consolidated revenue fund exceeding \$10 million and, *inter alia*, that any amount can be advanced under clause 17. Payments out under clause 16 could readily exceed, \$460 million if \$450 million were advanced under clause 17 because under subclause (4) (a) we have a \$10 million excess. If the advances under clause 17 are, \$450 million, then the payments could exceed \$460 million. There is no authority for the \$450 million or any limit on the amount, and this is what we are trying to get at. I strongly urge upon the minister, as suggested by my colleague from Royal, that we stand this clause for advice from the law officers and that we go on with the others.

Mr. Sauv : I agree.

Mr. Kindt: Is the minister prepared to make a statement?

Mr. Sauv : I said I was agreeable to have the clause stand.

The Chairman: Is it agreed that clause 17 stands?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause stands.

Clause 18 agreed to.

• (5:50 p.m.)

On clause 19—*Regulations.*

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I used the phrase, "act which is not before us." This is precisely what happens under most of these acts which are of some length and where there is a nice, beautiful sounding clause concerning regulations. However, those who have some concern about the rights of individuals examine all the fine print in this particular clause. I am not going to say anything about clause 19(a) but I am going to talk about 19(b) and also 19(c), as well as some subsequent sub clauses.

First of all, let us look at what section 8 authorizes the board to do. The Governor in Council may make regulations which authorize the board to exercise the powers conferred on it by section 8 for any period or periods prescribed by the regulations, but in no case shall any period so prescribed be of a duration that is less than the remainder of the crop year in which such regulation is made. Section 8 tells us that the board may go into the buying and selling of feed grain in eastern Canada and British Columbia and in the designated areas, which are the prairie provinces. Beyond the prairie provinces, through the agency of the Canadian Wheat Board it has many other powers.

I am wondering why it is that so many of these regulations are considered to be necessary and yet parliament never gets the chance to look at them. There is the strongest case here for the introduction into our system in the House of Commons of a committee to review delegated powers. There is such a body in the United Kingdom, and I am sure that is one example we might copy. After all, under the powers conferred by clause 19 the Governor in Council may make a whole spate of regulations. True enough, he must publish them, but the chances of accountability are extremely rare. Action may be taken within the four corners of this act and this may be quite at cross-purposes with the intention of parliament. It may also infringe upon the rights of individuals. All sorts of things may happen under these regulations and no one is called to account.

This is not the first time I have spoken about this, Mr. Chairman. It is not because I am expert in agricultural matters that I now rise to make this protest; it is because of the feeling of many of my confreres in the legal profession that under these omnibus-type