

*Transport and Communications*

proper form, and I submit that it is not in order for the house to be asked in effect to amend the report. We are not allowed to do that. It is out of order for the house to be asked to tell the committee precisely what it shall do.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** All that the house has the right to do is to give the committee power to make any change it wishes. It can even spell out what particular power it is giving to it. I submit that the form of the amendment in the first place was correct, but the form of the amendment as submitted by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce is out of keeping with the usual way of doing things and violates the basic principle that you cannot amend a committee's report on the floor of the house. I suggest to hon. members opposite that they put their amendment in the correct procedural form.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak on the point made by the hon. member. As he indicated Beauchesne is quite categorical. I suggest it is a sophistry or quibbling on the part of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. The citation is perfectly clear. It reads:

When the motion to concur is proposed the report may be referred back to the committee for further consideration or with instruction to amend it in any respect.

There is none of this sophistry about the word "power" as opposed to the word "instruction". As Beauchesne indicates, it is a direct instruction.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** That is a misquotation of Bourinot.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** It is a direct quotation of Beauchesne. Why does the hon. member not open his ears?

**Some hon. Members:** Temper!

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** What I said was that Beauchesne is misquoting Bourinot.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** I was not misquoting Bourinot, I was directly quoting Beauchesne. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is coming through with great high fidelity today, but that empty sound box of his makes him come through a little more strongly this afternoon.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

The point is that there is no limitation, as the hon. member seeks to invent, on the power of the house to give instruction in this regard. The house has full power to instruct the committee to make a deletion of the kind that is referred to in this amendment. I should like to refer to a citation at page 479 of Bourinot's fourth edition, and particularly to footnote (g) on which the citation is founded, part of which reads as follows:

It was then moved and agreed that the question be referred back, with instructions to present a plan of reporting to the house.

There is an example of specific instructions by the house to a committee. If the house wishes to re-open the whole question and review the entire report it can say so, but it is also in order for the house to instruct the committee to deal with one specific point in the report, the only one on which there is any real question.

**Mr. Baldwin:** This is a most appropriate day, April 1, to have proceedings of this nature and I only hope, if I can correctly prophesy what will be done, that if the amendment moved by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce is ruled out of order the government, even on April 1, might be able to come up with the right form of amendment the third time.

If Your Honour will direct your attention to citation 322, I think the last sentence outlines what the house cannot or should not do, and the second part of the sentence indicates the method which can be adopted when the house wishes to send back to a committee for its consideration part of a report which it feels should be changed, amended or deleted. It reads:

It is not competent for a committee to reconsider and reverse its own decision—

Consequently the house can direct it to do so.

—but if the House resolves that such reconsideration is necessary—

Here I ask Your Honour to note carefully the pertinent wording.

—the correct procedure is for the House to give the committee instructions which will enable it to consider the whole question again.

The word used here is "consider", not "direct". I am reinforced in the view that this is the proper way to proceed because on turning to page 397 of Beauchesne I find form 95, "On Concurrence in a Committee Report", which