

*Canadian Livestock Feed Board*

function under an act of parliament. Parliament is the supreme authority, and every year it will review the report. There are a lot of tricky points here, and it is rather hard for the administrators to go beyond the powers established by an act of parliament.

**Mr. Olson:** I want to make it abundantly clear to the minister that I do not see anything sinister in this bill. I cannot think of anyone who would be plotting to do anything wrong under the authority granted in the bill. The minister has admitted quite properly, and I am sure I heard him say this on Thursday and Friday, that a very delicate balance has to be maintained between the subsidies that are paid through this board. If it were not for the subsidies on freight and storage, and the other function of distributing feed in eastern Canada, then there would be no purpose in the bill at all. The minister said, and I agree with him—in fact I suggested it to him before—that there is a very delicate balance between helping one region and avoiding to do damage to another one.

The minister asked whether the amendment would require that the House of Commons review and approve these regulations before they can become effective. The amendment does not say that, Mr. Chairman. All it says is that those regulations shall be subject to annual review. It is certain that such regulations as are passed by the governor in council would become effective on the same date following the passage of the order in council, as would be the case with any other order in council. All the amendment would do would be to make it mandatory that the government, at least while this board is being set up and going through its trial period, be required to refer this to the members of the House of Commons or a committee thereof to ensure that the regulations are in keeping with the spirit and intent of the act, and also to see that the board is functioning in the way in which we think it should. The minister is quite right when he suggests that almost every political party—he said in fact all political parties—has been in favour of setting up this kind of feed grain agency. That is right; but we are also anxious, as is the minister, to see that this balance is maintained between how far you should go without doing one region damage, and trying to help the other.

The minister also raised an objection to the amendment because of the statement in clause 22 that an annual report is to be made to parliament. That is true, but the clause

does not require the regulations under which the feed grain agency is to operate to be reviewed by the House of Commons or by a committee of the house. This is the intent and purpose of the amendment I moved, Mr. Chairman. I therefore think the minister is being a little unfair when he suggests that the only reason for moving this kind of amendment is our suspicion of some sinister plot. As far as I am concerned this is simply not so. We have a great deal at stake in passing this kind of legislation to see whether it does what we want it to do, because under the legislation we are setting up an authority, and giving authority to a feed grain agency to make regulations. Serious damage could be done to livestock feeders and even to feed grain producers in certain parts of the country if a mistake were made.

I hope the minister will revert to the statement he made earlier today that he would be in favour of an amendment which would in fact subject these regulations to an annual review by members of this house, to ensure that what was being done was in line with what was intended. That is the purpose of my amendment. It does not interfere with the effective date of the order in council respecting these regulations any more than do other orders in council.

Clause 22, unless amended, does not require that an annual report be sent to a committee for a review of the regulations. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing superfluous about the amendment in so far as other clauses of the bill are concerned. As I said, I hope the minister will revert to what he said earlier this evening, that he would accept an amendment requiring an annual review of the regulations, at least until the feed grain agency is a well established body.

● (8:50 p.m.)

Amendment (Mr. Olson) negatived: Yeas, 59; nays, 80.

**The Deputy Chairman:** I declare the amendment lost. Shall clause 19 carry?

**Mr. Winkler:** No, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that a number of members of the party across the floor came in late and voted.

**Mr. Churchill:** A few minutes ago the hon. member for Carleton drew the attention of the committee to paragraph (d) of clause 19 which reads:

—designating any city in eastern Canada to be the city in which the headquarters of the board shall be situated.