

Canadian Wheat Board Act

his advisers had read with care the report of the parliamentary committee on agriculture, they would have found therein specific recommendations as to desirable changes that could be brought about within the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board. One has to do with the matter of bringing rye and flax under the purview of the board.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Winters: May I raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I should like your ruling on this. It is my understanding that on third reading of a bill it is not possible, or at least it is not the custom, to introduce new matters of principle. These have been disposed of during the debate on second reading. If I interpret correctly what the hon. member is saying, he is asking us to broaden the principle of the bill in order to include items that were discussed and disposed of during the debate on second reading.

Mr. Schreyer: Speaking to the point of order, I just say that I am not suggesting the bill be amended in order to accommodate my proposals. I am merely expressing my regret that this has not been done. I believe this is in order, since the bill refers to grains coming under the jurisdiction of the wheat board. Unless your honour wishes to be very strict in the application of the rules, I feel I should be allowed to proceed.

Mr. Douglas: One of the procedures allowed on third reading is the moving of an amendment to refer a bill back to the committee of the whole with the instruction that a certain section be changed in certain particulars. My colleague is not proposing to move such an amendment, but the fact is anyone can move such an amendment. One could not move such an amendment without pointing out the discrepancies or deficiencies in the bill, and this is what the hon. member is doing. If one can move an amendment to send the bill back to correct certain deficiencies, then one is quite in order in discussing the deficiencies or discrepancies in the bill.

What my colleague is seeking to do is simply point out that, while he agrees with the provisions in the bill, he regrets that certain other provisions are not in it. I suggest to your honour that this type of discussion is within the provisions for debate on third reading.

Mr. Olson: In speaking to the point of order I should like to say that to attempt now to confine the debate on third reading to a strict interpretation of the rules, after the speech

we just heard from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) on subjects which have been raised at least 50 times, would not be proper. Surely at this stage anything goes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps I should point out to the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Schreyer) that the debate on third reading of the bill can be similar to the debate on second reading. However, having once decided the principle of the bill, the debate on third reading is just a little more restricted than that on second reading.

Mr. Schreyer: I am aware of this. I was not sure of the rules respecting debate on third reading. I just took for granted that we would be allowed to make reference to almost any subject matter that comes under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board. I have some further references to make to the subject matter of this bill.

I was saying that the effect of this bill really is to make certain procedural changes, but not any substantive changes, in the organization or administration by this board. I do feel that flax and rye, as I say, should have been put under the administration of the wheat board by legislation, since we have had repeated representations to that effect by various organizations and also had the opinion of the parliamentary committee on agriculture to the same effect.

Another matter which relates to the operation of the board has to do with the quota system presently in operation in the west and the ways in which it may be modified. It seems to me that the quota system really works to the disadvantage of the small and medium grain producers. If a means could be found somehow to make an adjustment in favour of the small and medium sized operators, it would sit well with a large number of producers in western Canada. I do not believe such a change would militate to any appreciable extent against the larger producers. Obviously, a change of this nature would affect them to some extent but not to the degree where they would find it painful or particularly disadvantageous. In this connection, I hope that the minister, his officials and the officials of the board will give consideration to the short run effect of such a change. I certainly hope that within the course of the next 12 months the board might find it possible to recommend such a change in operation, thereby making it easier for many small and medium sized grain producers on the prairies to conduct their operations.