

have interference of the worst kind, and the minister cannot evade that charge.

I am not too sure whether the amendment he has introduced has been accepted, but I will not be surprised if an additional amendment is proposed by a member of the committee. However, the fact remains that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) said that the Transport Committee should not have set aside an act of parliament. No one on that committee had any intention of setting aside an act of parliament. The basic fact is that we made a recommendation to the house, and as a recommendation it should not cause any problem for the government house leader.

Committee members had no intention of saying that the Canadian Transport Commission should not be entitled to carry out its obligations. We know what the particular order of that commission said, and we know that it has not really been implemented. If any standing committee is to have a useful function in parliament then surely a recommendation submitted by it should be accepted.

As an example I refer to a recommendation which came to this house from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications on December 3 last. The committee said in its report of that date:

Your committee recommends that its order of reference be enlarged allowing it to consider the following—

That was in the second report of the standing committee, and the next day the chairman of the committee moved that that report be concurred in. That was just a recommendation to the house, and there is absolutely no difference between that type of recommendation and the last report of the committee with which we are now concerned.

The recommendation of the committee at that time was that it be allowed to consider:

The problems of transportation in the Atlantic provinces.

If the house leader was concerned about that recommendation he should have raised the matter at the time the second report of the committee was submitted and should not try to play around now with words in order to gain a particular point he wishes to make.

It is important that we take a close look at the directions given to the committee by the house before the committee went on its trip

*Transport and Communications* to the Atlantic provinces, as recorded in *Votes and Proceedings* for Friday, January 17:

On motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), seconded by Mr. Hellyer, it was ordered,—That the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications be empowered to consider and report on the problems of transportation in the Atlantic provinces, and that, for the purposes of its inquiry, the Committee be empowered to adjourn from place to place within Canada and the Clerk and the necessary supporting staff be authorized to accompany the committee.

If it was the intention of the cabinet to exclude rail transportation from the committee's terms of reference then that should have been specified in that motion. I suggest it would be advisable for hon. members opposite to take a look at exactly what the word transportation means. In the Dictionary of Sociology and Related Sciences the definition of transportation is:

The carriage or removal of persons or things by a conveyance on land, water, or in the air e.g., by beast, human or animal drawn sledge or vehicle, boat, railroad, automotive vehicle, or aircraft. Also, the material instruments involved.

I suggest that is what we went to the Atlantic provinces to study. The second definition of transportation that it gives is:

A method of punishment originally devised by England for the most hardened criminals. It had a precedent in that country in the practice of outlawry whereby certain persons could escape hanging by abjuring the realm.

I suggest that the government house leader should take to heart that second definition of transportation and leave this house in the light of his actions over the last two days.

When the committee visited the Atlantic provinces the whole concept of transportation had to be taken into consideration. Members of the committee knew at that time that a bill was before the House of Commons dealing with growth areas, and transportation policy must be considered in the context of growth areas. If the government is really concerned about the problems of slow growth areas it must realize the real meaning of the word transportation. It must realize that good transportation can be very helpful to growth areas.

We know that the recommendation made by the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications was unanimously adopted by that committee. I suggest it is a myth to pretend that the members of the committee who were absent would have voted otherwise. We know that the house leader did not communicate with anyone not to allow this particular