

Canadian Wheat Board Act

proposed amendment being accepted, using the precedent of the reference to the Board of Transport Commissioners. I appreciate the argument he advanced; I think it is a good and valid one. However, in reaching a decision I believe a distinction must be made, because in the particular case cited the amendment was a declaratory one adverse to the principles of the bill. Reading the amendment moved by the hon. member for Palliser, I find some difficulty in bringing myself to believe that the amendment is declaratory in opposition to the principle of the bill. It might be helpful if at this juncture I were to read the proposed amendment. It is as follows:

That all the words after "That" be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

Bill C-238 be not now read the second time but that the subject matter of the bill be referred to the Canadian Wheat Board to determine by way of producer plebiscite whether the provisions of the Canada Wheat Board Act which may by regulation apply to oats or barley should be extended to include rye, flaxseed or rapeseed or any or all of them.

The Chair has this reservation in mind and it is an important one. The factor which seems to me to be the determining factor, and the one upon which the Chair would like to base its ruling, is the well established principle that a reasoned amendment is not in order if it purports to do something which could be done by the committee considering the bill after it had passed second reading.

Clause 5 of the bill deals with the authority of the Governor in Council to bring flax, rapeseed and rye under the authority of the Canadian Wheat Board. Since authority to legislate is vested in members of this chamber and not in the Canadian Wheat Board or other agencies, it seems to me the hon. member could, if he wished, ask his fellow members on the committee, by moving an amendment, to make the decisions called for in his amendment: this could be done by moving an amendment to delete or amend clause 5 of Bill C-238 which is before us.

For these two reasons, and particularly for the second reason that the bill could be amended in committee along the lines suggested, the Chair regretfully cannot accept the proposed amendment from the procedural standpoint.

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, there are a few observations I should like to make with reference to Bill C-238. First, I should like to make it clear that I agree heartily with what has been said by some of my hon. friends, particularly by the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher), the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) and the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) who have drawn attention to the satisfaction felt by rapeseed growers over the past few years in being able to produce a cash crop. I can say from experience that the growers I represent feel the same way.

We heard the minister say a few moments ago that during the committee stage an amendment could be moved which, if approved, would allow a plebiscite to be taken. But we cannot always take messages of this sort at their face value. Not long ago we heard a report that wheat exports from Canada would be in the neighbour-

hood of 500 million bushels during the 1970-71 crop year, compared with 347 million bushels last year.

An hon. Member: With 374 million bushels.

Mr. Simpson: Since then we have heard the minister say that wheat exports may amount to 400 million bushels. So it is a little difficult to accept statements coming from the minister. I am interested in one or two aspects of this bill particularly as they pertain to exports from the port of Churchill. I should like to draw attention to the fact that up to the present the Wheat Board has not seen fit to indicate what quantity of wheat is to be exported from Churchill in the year ahead. Each year we experience difficulty in getting the board to make an announcement. I asked the Wheat Board to make an announcement that some 30 million bushels would be shipped out of the port for sale abroad; however, the Board has not seen fit to do this.

The bill before us seeks authority to enable the Wheat Board to assume responsibility for the marketing of rye, flaxseed and rapeseed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. In accordance with Standing Order 40, a motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been moved and seconded at this time.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**ORDER AS TO DISPOSITION OF BILL C-207**

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the consent of the House to revert to motions to put forward an order which I have discussed with my colleagues on all sides of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The minister has asked for consent to revert to motions. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. MacEachen: We have held discussions with respect to the further progress of Bill C-207 and we have reached certain conclusions. After I have read the order they will be revealed as being the result of painstaking discussions over a period of time.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Results painfully reached.

Mr. MacEachen: They involved change in positions by all persons concerned in the discussions. However, I hope the order will be acceptable to members of the House generally. It reads as follows:

● (10:00 p.m.)

That the order for resuming consideration of Bill C-207, an act respecting the organization of the government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto, shall be the first order of government business called on Tuesday, May 25, 1971, and on Wednesday, May 26, 1971, and that the consideration of private members' business on Tuesday, May 25, 1971, shall be sus-

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]