

allowed, if for no other reason than that it was not ruled out of order, and we must at least allow the motion to proceed to a vote.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It seems to the Chair that the situation is as I indicated earlier, that from the point of view of strict procedure I have considerable doubt as to the acceptability of the motion. Hon. members have referred the Chair to discussions at another time among hon. members. May I point out, with respect, that the Chair has the responsibility to rule on the procedural acceptability of motions such as this. Normally consideration is given to motions when they come before the House for debate.

I have indicated the ruling I would make but am not anxious to make a ruling now, if hon. members would prefer that I defer it. If it is the wish of the House, as was suggested by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin), the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) and the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) who are generally in accord, I will defer my ruling until the next time the matter comes before the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House would be pleased if you would do that. When you are giving further thought to your ruling, I wonder if you would take into account in a particular way the point just made by the Minister of Justice regarding the royal recommendation. I draw your attention to the fact that he was speaking not only about the royal recommendation in last session's bill but about the royal recommendation that is attached to this session's Bill C-204 in which there is a reference which reads, "to extend application of the act to flaxseed, rye and rapeseed".

As the Minister of Justice has pointed out, in the bill as it is before us, which is in the form in which it was reported from the committee last session, there is no such reference. So as I tried to say before, we are dealing not with a situation that is governed by the normal rules but with a situation that is governed by the fact that we have carried over a matter from one session to another and have done it by a clearcut understanding among the House leaders of all parties. If Your Honour will give the matter consideration overnight, perhaps we can deal with it more acceptably the next time it comes up.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With respect to the point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, may I say that I am aware of the terms of the recommendation but that is not the basis on which I feel that the motion is not in order. I indicated that I thought it went beyond the scope of the bill before the committee.

I consider that in so far as the royal recommendation is concerned, there would probably be no objection on that point. I feel that whatever hon. members, through the House leaders, think they should do is a matter for them to consider. In so far as the Chair is concerned, as I have indicated I will defer my ruling if it is necessary to make it. However, I would prefer hon. members, through the House leaders, to give this matter further consideration and when the matter comes before the House, to indicate to the Chair if any agreement has been reached.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

**GRAIN—REQUEST FOR FORGIVENESS OF
OVERPAYMENTS TO FARMERS IN LIGHT OF
FORGIVENESS OF DUTIES AND TAXES OWING BY CAR
MANUFACTURER**

Mr. Bill Knight (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, on May 25 I asked the minister in charge of the Wheat Board the following question:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice who is also in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. In view of the fact that a major car manufacturer owes the Crown \$6 million in duties and sales tax and that this debt is to be forgiven, I wonder whether the minister or the government would give consideration to a similar forgiveness of overpayments to farmers, as described in the Auditor General's report?

The answer I received was extremely insufficient and incorrect. The minister said:

Mr. Speaker, I do not see the connection between the two situations described by the hon. member.

I think this points out a lack of continuity in government policy. There are certain groups in our society which are put into a privileged position, such as the large automotive industry, especially in terms of a company that ships cars from the United States. They receive a write-off of \$6 million, but the farmer who is affected, as reported in paragraph 64 of the Auditor General's report, by the wheat inventory reduction payments is not in the same position.

The Auditor General's report sets out a number of weaknesses and inconsistencies in the administration of this program. The department has established that some 4,000 farmers have been overpaid approximately \$540,000. Of this, \$177,000 has been recovered and attempts are being made to recover the remainder.

When it comes to the complaints of farmers in western Canada we are in a situation where 4,000 of them will have to repay the overpayments. This is the position under the Lift program due to misadministration of the government. Yet the government is writing off \$6 million for a large corporation. That is the inconsistency of the government. They are the financial backers of this government; let there be no question about that.

Throughout his report we see all kinds of inconsistencies pointed out by the Auditor General. In paragraph 69, on the cost of unused accommodation in Ottawa, we find that \$32,000 was spent for unoccupied space in moving the Canada Council to new accommodation. In paragraph 73, on royalties not reported by a foreign licensee, we find