

*Canadian Livestock Feed Board*

**Mr. Bell (Carleton):** So the answer to that is yes. I think there may be other hon. members who want to express some views in relation to this. So far as I am concerned I am prepared to vote against any clause which gives such unlimited arbitrary power to the Governor in Council. The very essence of parliament is that it maintains and controls the right to vote the money that is necessary for the operation of the government and all the instruments of government. If the minister says that \$10 million is not enough, that \$20 million is necessary, then I will go along with him in voting \$20 million, but I am not prepared to vote with him and say that he can have a blank cheque and can by-pass parliament whenever he and his colleagues sitting in the secrecy of the Privy Council chamber think it expedient to do so.

• (5:40 p.m.)

**Mr. Lambert:** It is precisely on this point that I should like to add some comments. I certainly underline all that has been said by my colleague from Carleton. The interpretation of clause 16(2) takes us back to clause 8(1) which frankly authorizes this board to go into the grain market and gamble on market conditions. It is authorized to go into the market and buy and sell. Not only is it authorized to buy and sell feed grain in eastern Canada and British Columbia but, in competition with the Canadian Wheat Board, to buy feed grain in the prairie provinces. This power is clearly spelled out in the legislation.

I should like to refer the minister, if I may, to clause 8(1) which deals with buying or entering into contracts or agreements for the purchase of feed grain in eastern Canada and British Columbia and in the designated area of the Wheat Board. But it is still in competition with the Wheat Board because when we come to clause 19 concerning the regulations we see that the Governor in Council has authority to deem a grade of wheat grown in the designated area not to be a feed grain. When we come to clause 19 I shall discuss this bill that is not before us.

In any event, as my colleague from Carleton has said, this clause authorizes the board to gamble on feed grain. It is precisely the underwriting of this gamble to which members of this house may have some objection. If the minister gives us a finite amount, then that is all right and the house may be prepared to give its agreement. However, as has been clearly pointed out, clause 17 authorizes the Governor in Council to write a

[Mr. Sauv .]

blank cheque. We all hope that the board will operate successfully. We all hope there will not be such stupendous losses that the moneys provided for under clause 16 will not be sufficient. There is no guarantee of that, none at all, particularly for the purposes under clause 8(1). Therefore there has to be more than just the safeguard of an annual report to parliament.

I want to say something too about clause 19 and the laying on the table of the regulations that may be made. In so many places in these acts we have acts which are not before parliament, but we will come to that in greater detail during consideration of clause 19. I share the opinion of my colleague from Carleton and I would oppose this clause.

**Mr. Olson:** I wonder if the minister really meant what he said or what the hon. member for Carleton interpreted his remarks to mean? Surely the minister does not suggest there will be a statutory provision for an unlimited amount to be advanced to this feed grain agency?

**Mr. Bell (Carleton):** That is precisely what he did say.

**Mr. Olson:** If it is the intent of the government to provide for an unlimited statutory amount, I would object to it.

**Mr. Bell (Carleton):** That is what he said.

**Mr. Olson:** If, on the other hand, a provision were written into Bill No. C-218 whereby the Governor in Council could make advances and an item were put in the estimates to cover those advances, that item would come before this house for authorization. This would be a different thing. This is the reason I asked if the minister meant to say that clause 17 would be statutory authority for any amount. Surely any additional amount over what is provided under clause 16 would have to be in the estimates and would require the approval of the house.

Hon. members know that statutory amounts do not require approval of the committee of supply because there is a previous authority. Surely the minister is not suggesting that we should now give an over-all authority for all time to come until the statute is repealed. This would constitute a blank cheque. Surely any additional amount beyond what is provided under clause 16 must be included in the estimates of the department or the Department of Finance. Would the