

foolish criterion would this establish? If a farmer were to receive a high price today, his neighbour would grow barley tomorrow to pick up his friend's or neighbour's losses of yesterday. To me this is nonsense. It should be automatically and categorically rejected in devising a new policy for the handling of grain.

The minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board announced on October 29 that losses due to sales made on long-term arrangements below the commercial rate of interest should be passed on to pool accounts. This, also, is sheer nonsense because it would encourage poor salesmanship; it would encourage salesmen to sell a product and pass on the losses to a third party. I have always believed that good salesmen can substantiate the case they are making. Losses being passed on to pool accounts would further encourage dissatisfaction among good customers who buy grain every year at the commercial rate when other customers buy at a lower rate. The loss is then passed on to the producer. The salesmen, in this case the government, would be doing a great disservice to the Canadian farmers. I believe that this policy should be rejected categorically.

Next we come to the stabilization plan. No government should put forward a concept according to which producers are guaranteed, on an individual basis, a formula worked out on a national basis. According to this policy—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. I regret to advise the hon. member that the time allotted to him has expired.

**Mr. Horner:** May I conclude my last sentence, Mr. Speaker?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** There is not unanimous consent of the House.

**Mr. Horner:** I did not know that my remarks were so cutting that government members would not allow me to continue.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Perhaps hon. members would grant me their indulgence for a moment. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) at the beginning of this evening's session raised an interesting point of order with respect to the matter of royal consent and whether or not it was required in the bill now before the House. I asked hon. members if they would grant me the opportunity to look at some authorities. I now have had that opportunity and, if I may, I would like to rule on the point of order raised by the hon. member for Peace River and to thank him for a very novel and ingenious argument.

● (9:10 p.m.)

My concern, among other things, was in keeping straight in my mind the distinction between the point

#### *Canada Grain Bill*

raised by the hon. member for Peace River with respect to the occasion when such consent is required, as he argued, and the occasion when a recommendation might have covered the particular point, as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) argued in his presentation. It seemed to me that perhaps there was something I wanted to consider further to see if there is a distinction that I might bring out for the benefit of hon. members. The hon. member for Peace River argued that the consent of the Crown is required before the right can be given to waive the penalty which is referred to in clause 108 (10) and (11) of the bill. The question is whether without the consent of the Sovereign, given before the bill is passed, there can be such a waiver in the bill.

I will not take much more time of the House in making this decision. I thank the hon. member for Peace River and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) for their presentations, because it seemed to be a new point—certainly to me, with my very limited experience in the Chair—and there may have been a distinction I should have considered before rendering a decision as to whether the recommendation required for what we generally call money bills—this was the argument put forward—was required here or whether the recommendation of His Excellency did in fact cover the point with respect to consent.

With respect, it seems to me that we have to go somewhat further in considering the argument of the hon. member for Peace River, that in this case where the right to waive the penalty is given in the bill there would have to be the consent of the Sovereign. The matter has been dealt with by Mr. Speaker and I would refer just very briefly to his decision. Before doing so, I would say that generally speaking one might say that consent, as argued by the hon. member for Peace River, is required where the personal property of the Sovereign is affected, as distinguished from property that the Sovereign may hold for the Sovereign's subjects.

I would refer hon. members to the ruling of Mr. Speaker in the 1963 session, volume 3. The matter is dealt with at page 2980 during consideration of the Municipal Development and Loan Board bill and in circumstances which did not affect the personal property of the Sovereign. Mr. Speaker, then Mr. Deputy Speaker, made this distinction which I shall read briefly:

—I should like to turn to the citation which has been quoted by the hon. member, that is, citation 283. It is obvious that his whole argument, as has been suggested by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Mr. Favreau, is based on the premise that certain rights and privileges of the Crown are affected. It says:

Here Mr. Speaker quotes as follows:

The consent of the King or Queen, as the case may be (to be distinguished from the royal assent of bills) is given by a Privy Councillor to bills (and occasionally amendments) affecting local and personal interests which concern the royal prerogative, the hereditary revenue or personal property or interests of the Crown or Duchy of Cornwall.

I would mention, without reading them, the two other citations on which Mr. Speaker based his decision—Campan at page 329, and Beauchesne, citation 283.