

Canadian Wheat Board Act

other hand, indicated that there was some degree of consent or agreement among hon. members and that this might be considered notwithstanding the fact that the Chair might find the motion is not in order procedurally. The hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) has quoted *Hansard* of May 9 and the words of the House leader of the government, but I would think with respect, that those statements were predicated upon amendments being in order before they could be accepted unless there is consent of all hon. members.

I gather from the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and the parliamentary secretary that there would not be such consent. In the absence of the consent of hon. members I would have to find, as I indicated earlier on the basis of the citation in May's Seventeenth Edition, page 549, that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am uncertain just how to handle this, but it seems to me as House leader for the New Democratic Party I have a point of privilege I must raise tomorrow with the government House leader. There was no suggestion earlier that consent would have to be obtained at a later stage to the moving of certain amendments. There was a clear understanding among the four House leaders that this bill would be advanced to the report stage on the understanding that members would be able to present at that stage the same amendments they were able to present at the last session, plus any others they might wish to present. This amendment is one that was presented at the last session. It was in order then because it was simply restoring something which had been taken out. I must say, if this is the result, we were taken in by the kind of agreement into which we entered as House leaders which in turn was confirmed by the House.

I feel very strongly that if you do not see fit to accept this amendment tonight, the matter should stand until we have a discussion among House leaders. We get along very well and when the four of us reach agreements those agreements stand. I do not quarrel with the right of the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Lessard) to oppose the matter in principle, but there is not any doubt in my mind concerning the agreement reached. If I may say so, one reason the bill concerning the Northern Canada Power Commission is still standing as a notice and has not been proceeded with is that the same type of agreement sought in respect of it was not reached. But in the case of Bill C-204 the agreement was clear and iron-clad. If Your Honour feels that the procedural niceties do not allow the Chair to accept it, I suggest it be allowed to stand until the House leaders clear the matter.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I must say I would probably be opposed to the amendment moved and yet I must also say that in my view the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has stated in essence what I thought was the understanding, that is, that hon. members would be able to offer amendments at the report stage in the way in which the hon. member indicated.

I have not had an opportunity to look into this thoroughly, but I notice there is an amendment at the report stage standing in the name of the minister. It would appear to

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

deal with sections in the act which are not covered by the amending bill. I am referring to amendment No. 2. I may be wrong but it strikes me, on the basis of the reasoning of the Chair, that we must only look at amendments at the report stage which can be related to the amending bill before the House. If that is the case, I wonder whether amendment No. 2 of the minister is in order.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege I should like to confirm that my understanding certainly agrees with that of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). Perhaps I might on this question of privilege draw Your Honour's attention to the fact that the reference of the extension of the act to rapeseed, flax and rye does not appear in the bill. I take it that it appears in this form because that was the original form of the recommendation to support the amendment.

I say to the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and to the parliamentary secretary that I would propose in due course to urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment, not because I am against it in principle but because of the nature of the deliberations which took place upon it. That, however, is a different issue. I hope at this stage we might go to the substance of the amendment knowing that the history of the matter is as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre says. That was the understanding concerning the bill at the report stage.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I have one further comment. In respect of your words to the effect that this amendment goes beyond the context of the bill before us, may I say that while it may not have gone beyond the context of the original bill before the committee it now, in your words, goes beyond the context certainly of amendments at the report stage. If this is so, conceivably it is out of order.

While I know good will must prevail between the House leaders of the various parties, I would suggest at this late hour that perhaps the best way in which to proceed would be to call it ten o'clock and let the House leaders meet again to discuss the pertinent points. Then we could proceed tomorrow with a better understanding of how to deal with the suggested amendment.

[Translation]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, after listening to what the hon. minister has just said concerning the position which may be taken when the bill is examined, I have no objection to this amendment being debated, except that I reserve the support which, for instance, I may give to the said amendment.

• (2150)

[English]

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, with respect may I add one further point. I say this not in criticism of the Chair but perhaps in criticism of all of us here. It seems to me that when the amendment at the report stage appeared on the order paper, as this one did in the previous session, at no point in time did anyone in this chamber draw to the attention of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) that his motion might be out of order. After all the time that has elapsed, surely the motion should be