

Government Orders

capabilities of all the diverse elements of Canadian society.

It is possible that the board could still function comprising entirely white, male, middle-class managers in the Public Service and white, male, middle-class managers from the private sector. But it is my contention, and it is certainly the point of this amendment as I understand it, that the meeting of those objects will be rendered greatly the more likely if the board itself reflects to some substantial degree that diversity which the bill proposes to foster.

I must say, Madam Speaker, that I am rather distressed at the remarks of the previous speaker, the government member who appears to reject this commendable amendment solely because, in his opinion at least, it violates some previously struck procedural deal. I would counsel him and his colleagues on the government benches to set aside those questions, however reasonable they may be, however warranted his concern in that regard, and concentrate instead on the merit of the amendment itself, which I commend to the House.

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Madam Speaker, I wonder if you would be kind enough to inform the House whether we are debating the amendment now.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Yes, we are.

Mr. Domm: I would like, in that case, to point out that there was an agreement in the committee. I was acting as chairman of that legislative committee and there was an agreement in the committee that the amendments that were withdrawn in committee would not be brought forward and debated in this House.

I think the member will acknowledge that fact. I also think that the opposition House leader would want to acknowledge it since it was his statement that we would not go through this procedure twice. It was agreed that if there was unanimous consent to withdraw, and the member proposing this amendment did give her consent to that withdrawal, that amendment would not be brought forward at the report stage in this House of Commons.

I call upon the House leader of the Official Opposition to stand up and confirm that in order that we can move along to new business, new debate, which was the understanding of not only the House leader but the

member who is proposing this amendment. It was pointed out at the committee that this would be a complete waste of time. It was agreed to by the Official Opposition and the government in committee that we would not do this.

I would hope that we could move along in a more orderly fashion in getting this bill out of the way. I bring you that information as chairman of that legislative committee in order that we can get on with more productive work in this House of Commons.

• (1040)

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Hawkes: Negatived on division.

Mr. Gauthier: On division.

Motion negatived.

Madam Deputy Speaker: We will proceed with Motion No. 5.

Hon. Robert de Cotret (for the President of the Privy Council) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-34 be amended in Clause 12 in the English version by striking out line 13 at page 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"duct and management of the affairs of the".

Mr. Murray Cardiff (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister, President of the Privy Council and Minister of Agriculture): Madam Speaker, very briefly, this is strictly a technical point to bring back the wording as originally formulated. It was the intention of the committee to put forward an amendment to have the board of governors responsible for the conduct and management of the affairs of the centre and not the officers of the centre.

Members will note that the French version reads correctly. It was just a technical error that needed to be corrected.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.