

result in the disappearance of all our surplus and there would be no problem of disposal. I well remember that twenty years ago, when I left this house in July and travelled across Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta to see what condition the crops were in, I found no crops at all; it had gone, burnt up with drought. Yet the board boasted that they were selling wheat at 7 cents a bushel. Afterwards the price rose to \$1.55. I held tickets on some of it, on which I had merely got the first payment. The then Government having sold the great bulk of the crop at 70 cents, and the price for the balance having risen to \$1.55, it was necessary to ship large quantities back to western Canada to provide feed and seed. Of course that was a mistake.

Then we have been reminded that by a reduction of only 5 cents per bushel we could have held Britain within the International Wheat Agreement. I remember that I met the head of one of the pools in the Chateau Laurier while the subject was under discussion in New York, and I told him they would have to accept a lesser amount from the United Kingdom. I made the same statement in this chamber, and said I hoped that the Government would not hold out for the additional 5 cents, and I knew the western farmers hoped so, too.

If there are any questions, I have no doubt that they will be dealt with by the honourable senator who introduced the bill.

Hon. Jean-François Pouliot: Honourable senators, I move, seconded by the honourable senator from Bruce (Hon. Mr. Stambaugh) that this bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

I will explain the reason for this motion. When speeches on a subject of this kind are made, on either side of the house, they are rather academic, and the only information that we can get is through asking questions of the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Haig) or the sponsor of the particular bill, so that we may know the precise meaning of each provision of the bill. For a long time that procedure, which exists by virtue of the rules of the house, has been disregarded. This is a great mistake, because very often honourable senators have not had the opportunity of gathering the information to which they are entitled; moreover, even the largest standing committees of this house contain only a fraction of the total membership of the Senate. The result is that some of us are prevented from asking questions because we do not belong to the committee to which the particular bill has been sent. If this bill were sent to the Committee of the Whole, each senator—

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: Honourable senators, I rise to a point of order. The debate is not completed. This motion to refer the bill to the Committee of the Whole House should be made after the close of the debate.

Hon. Mr. Euler: And the motion has not been put.

Hon. Mr. Pouliot: If my honourable friends will permit me,—debate may be resumed upon the third reading after the bill is reported from the Committee of the Whole, so what is the use of having this discussion meanwhile? In committee we can ask for the information we want, and any honourable senator who is willing to answer can do so, or he can refuse to answer. But I am discussing a question of order with regard to this bill. Is there a motion to send the bill to any committee?

Hon. Mr. Farris: The time has not arrived.

The Hon. the Speaker: A point of order has been raised, that the debate on the motion for third reading is not yet completed.

Hon. Mr. Haig: I want to say just one word. I made a promise, which I want to carry out, to the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Macdonald), when he raised, and very properly so, certain questions. I promised that we would send this bill to a special committee, and I arranged with the Minister of Trade and Commerce that he and his deputy minister, together with the solicitor from the department who drew the papers, would be present at the meeting to explain why these particular words were used. While I do not want to force honourable senators to agree to this procedure, I think it would be a good idea, because everyone would be free to ask questions. I promise honourable senators that they will be given every facility to make inquiries and pass comments. If the bill is to be dealt with in Committee of the Whole I could have the deputy minister here but not the other officials. I do not think that would be as satisfactory. We are very anxious to answer the questions raised as to the legality of the bill. We want to be certain we are right about this feature, and I think my honourable friend from De la Durantaye (Hon. Mr. Pouliot), being a well-known lawyer himself, will understand my point.

Hon. Mr. Pouliot: I understand very well the point raised by the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Haig) and I appreciate his courtesy. I must tell him, too, that as Leader of the Government in the Senate he follows the great tradition of leadership established by past Government leaders in this chamber.