

strict, regular fashion—and I do not really quarrel with Your Honour's approach to the interpretation here—we are in a peculiar situation, having the bill restored to the report stage with the bulk of the original proposal as contained in the original bill. I think the recommendation is broad enough to support this amendment and for that reason I would not argue against its admissibility at this point.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lang) for the comments he has just made and I trust Your Honour will take that point of view into consideration. It is the point I wished to make. Surely Your Honour does have to look at the circumstances under which this order is now before the House. There was an agreement among all four parties at this session that we would put this bill back on the order paper at precisely the point it had reached in the last session.

If at this point in the last session we had been faced with this amendment there would have been no question as to its admissibility, because it was part of what had been in the earlier draft of the bill and removed by the committee. In other words, all we would have been doing at the report stage of the last session would be putting back into the bill what had been taken out in the committee.

In view of the fact it was an all-party agreement not to debate the bill on second reading again and send it back to the committee, but to resume the matter exactly at the stage it had reached the last time, I suggest Your Honour should take that into consideration. Whatever was admissible at this stage in the last session should be admissible now. Since there does seem to be agreement on both sides of the House that this is the way we ought to treat it, I hope Your Honour will see fit to allow the amendment.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment briefly on the point raised. What the amendment does is reinstate the bill to the position it had reached last session. That portion of the previous speaker's remarks is correct, but the bill would never have passed the committee if this section had not been deleted. It was with the deletion of this part that the committee agreed to pass the bill, hoping it would get passage at the last session.

If one checked the record he would see that another bill, doing essentially what this amendment does, was presented to the House for first reading. I think that was Bill C-255. Technically it might be in order, if we really consider that this bill is now at the report stage of second reading, to accept the amendment. Certainly the understanding reached in committee at the time this bill passed the committee and was returned to the House was that this part should be deleted. This was done almost unanimously, though I see an hon. member shaking his head in a negative fashion. In any event, it was passed by the committee only because there was an agreement in committee to facilitate the passage of this bill without the contentious part in order to continue the operations of the Wheat Board.

I suggest you should rule the amendment out of order at this time and that Bill C-255 should be re-submitted so that the whole question of rye, flax and rapeseed could be dealt with. If this were done I could understand that the

Canadian Wheat Board Act

consideration of Bill C-204 would be facilitated and it would be passed before the end of this month.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few words in the same vein as the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). When the bill was examined in committee, we agreed practically unanimously to delete that clause from the bill and when we reported to the House it had actually been deleted. It was the hon. member for Saskatchewan-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) who deemed it advisable to move an amendment at the report stage in order to include the clause once more in the bill.

For my part, I should much prefer not to have the amendment incorporated into the bill because it extends the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board. Past experience has demonstrated that powers vested in the Canadian Wheat Board have not resulted in making us very happy in eastern Canada and our argument against granting greater powers to the Canadian Wheat Board was the iniquity of the Board's present regulations.

I do not feel this is the right time to extend the Board's powers to other types of grain and I suggest that the amendment be rejected.

• (2140)

[*English*]

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, arguments about whether hon. members wish to have this matter dealt with one way or the other would seem to be totally irrelevant at this time. What is to be taken into account, I submit, is set out quite clearly in *Hansard* for May 9, at page 2081, where the government House leader, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), rose in introducing this bill and said:

I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. With respect to this bill of which notice is given on the order paper. There have been discussions among the House leaders and because this is the same bill as was reported out of committee last session it is understood that when and if it is given first reading it will be moved forward to the report stage on the understanding that hon. members will be able to move amendments in the usual way and will not be confined to the amendments that were moved in the last session. If the House is of a mind to do so, I should like to have an order which would put this bill at the report stage, where it stood at the prorogation of the last session, on the understanding that hon. members might move amendments either as in the former session or new report stage amendments.

In the exchange that followed it was clear that there was agreement, and Mr. Speaker concluded by saying:

Pursuant to the order made a few moments ago this bill stands for consideration at the report stage.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The difficulty the Chair has, of course, as I indicated initially, is that it would appear the motion in the name of the hon. member for Saskatchewan-Biggar is not procedurally in order. I suggested at that time that it does reach back into the act itself. It goes beyond the scope of the bill before the House for consideration.

Hon. members who have directed their remarks to assist the Chair on this matter have not quarrelled with that submission. Some of them have, however, on the