

agricultural products, then would it be too much to ask for a reasonable two-price system for our own agricultural products? If you talk of \$2 on a shirt, could we not talk of \$1 on a bushel of wheat, which in turn would mean an extra two cents on the price of a loaf of bread? I am sure this is not too much to ask the people of Canada to pay towards the support of our very important agricultural industry. By doing this we would not be solving all the financial problems, but it would mean an increase of \$60 million to \$70 million to the coffers of the industry.

In conclusion, let me point out that I consider it to be very important that this board should have regional representation. Let me add that when other boards are being set up, either under this or a similar bill, the primary producers of our country should be considered.

I hope that these arguments will be kept in mind when this bill goes to committee, and when important discussions on tariffs, surtaxes and duties take place in the future.

Hon. Mr. Benidickson: Honourable senators, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Mr. Martin: Honourable senators, may I point out to Senator Benidickson that the chairman of the appropriate committee has made arrangements for the committee to meet on Wednesday morning next. I mention this because the minister is out of the country at the moment, and following next Wednesday he will likely be out of the country on Government business. In view of this situation it was hoped that we could get this bill to committee for consideration on Wednesday next. However, if we leave further debate on the bill until Tuesday night, there is a danger that it might not receive second reading in time for committee consideration on Wednesday. I am aware that Senator Benidickson has strong views on the subject matter of this bill. I wonder if perhaps he could express these views in committee and as well on the third reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Benidickson: Honourable senators, I spoke to the Leader of the Government on this matter a few moments ago. I told him I was not sure that I would be in a position to speak tomorrow. However, when this item appears on our agenda tomorrow I shall have the option of speaking or not speaking.

Hon. Mr. Martin: That is satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. Grosart: Honourable senators, before the motion for adjournment is put, Senator Benidickson has informed the house that he has the option of speaking or not speaking to close the debate on second reading of the bill tomorrow. This, of course, comes within our rules.

Hon. Mr. Benidickson: It could go on until Tuesday night.

Hon. Mr. Grosart: I was not controverting the statement made by Senator Benidickson, with which I am in complete agreement, but I would hope that there

[Hon. Mr. Sparrow.]

would be no suggestion that this bill should go to committee before Senator Benidickson has the opportunity of fulfilling an undertaking he gave me that he will answer certain questions before this bill goes to committee.

Hon. Mr. Benidickson: Those questions arise out of a different bill, senator.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Benidickson, debate adjourned.

PRESS REPORT—QUESTION

Hon. Allister Grosart: Honourable senators, may I ask leave of honourable senators to revert to questions? The reason I ask for that leave, which is rather unusual at this point in our proceedings, is that a matter has come to my attention which involves perhaps the privilege of the whole house. I believe that an early answer would be of some importance to the Senate.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it agreed?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Grosart: Honourable senators, my question arises out of a report concerning a bill which is currently before the chamber. I seek the indulgence of the house to make a few brief remarks to explain the purpose of my question, as this is a matter which involves the whole house.

The bill to which I refer is C-215 on which comment has just been made. It is called an Act to establish the Textile and Clothing Board and to make certain amendments, and so on. The short title is the Textile and Clothing Board Act. Clause 3(1) reads:

There shall be a Board to be called the Textile and Clothing Board,

My question arises from a report concerning the progress of this bill through Parliament which appeared yesterday, April 20, in the business section of the *Toronto Globe and Mail*. The report reads in part as follows:

The Textile and Clothing Board, for which legislation has passed third reading in the Commons, is seen as recognition by the Government of the depressed state of the industry.

The board, although not legally constituted until the legislation has passed the Senate, has been operating by order in council and has already held two hearings—one on cotton and cotton-blend yarns, the other on the shirt industry. Following complaints of injury from imports in these sectors, the board has made recommendations to the Government based on its findings.

On the surface that statement would appear to infringe on the authority of the Senate. Normally we would expect that a board established under an act would not be established until the act had received royal assent.

I believe there is an explanation of this. I gave notice of my question to the Government Leader only a few minutes ago. My question is: Will the Leader of the Government assure the house that the board mentioned