

before. The second report of the special committee was presented to the house on April 8, 1937. In view of the lack of opportunity for adequate consideration, concurrence in the report was not proceeded with. The house will recall that we were anxious to prorogue in time to permit hon. members to be present at the coronation ceremonies in the old country, and an undertaking was given by the government that if the request for concurrence was not pressed at that time arrangements would be made to permit of concurrence being asked for at the present session.

Consideration of a report tabled during a previous session is a new departure for the House of Commons of Canada, but there is however precedent for it in the procedure followed at Westminster. The citation in reference thereto will be found in Beauchesne, paragraph 659, as follows:

By a motion made for that purpose in the British house, the report of a committee presented during a previous session has been taken into consideration.

The record will be found in the English journals, volume 86. I have in my hand a copy of what appears in the record of the journals. The propriety of the course I am proposing is also indicated in Bourinot, third edition, at pages 554-5, in the following words:

It (i.e., a report) remains in the possession and on the journals of the house as a basis or ground for such further proceedings as may be proper or necessary.

Adoption of the present motion will enable the house to consider the report at an opportune time during the present session.

Mr. DENTON MASSEY (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, in looking over the recommendations of the committee to which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has referred one finds a recommendation concerning cream separators.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The time to discuss the report would be when concurrence is asked.

Mr. MASSEY: I was not going to discuss the report. I was going to direct attention to the fact that during the course of that investigation no evidence was taken from Canadian manufacturers of cream separators, yet one of the recommendations contained in the report is in connection with cream separators. My thought was that it might be desirable to have the committee meet again in order to take evidence on a matter with regard to which they did not take evidence previously.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may say to my hon. friend that the report of the committee was made to the house. It was complete at the time concurrence was being asked last session. The undertaking at that time was that an opportunity would be granted at the present session to seek concurrence in the report, and I think the government is obligated to carry out that assurance.

Mr. MASSEY: It seems to me that before concurrence is asked the committee should complete its work. The committee may have figured that it had concluded its work, but since hon. members have had time to look through the report they may find that one of the recommendations is based upon wholly inadequate information.

Right Hon. R. B. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) is quite correct with respect to the suggestion that the report should stand over until this session. I think I suggested it to the hon. member for Melfort (Mr. McLean) when he began his discussion. The motion is not only highly proper but is one which this house is obligated to pass—not the government but the house as such; because we did agree to postpone consideration of the matter until this session.

The point that has been just brought to the attention of the house by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Massey) is intended to intimate that there was no Canadian evidence taken with respect to cream separators. I suppose, like most of us, the hon. gentleman has received a communication asking if it would be possible to have that done. I think the government would be the first to realize that it is desirable that there should be no possible thought of unfairness with respect to a matter of this kind. I have no opinion to express with respect to the merits of it at all. I only know—and I fancy many other hon. members of the house are in the same situation—that I was advised as to what was the position, and wondered whether or not it would be possible for these Canadian producers to have an opportunity to present their evidence. The report could then be brought back to the house with the additional evidence, because in the report there is a recommendation that deals with cream separators.

It seems to me quite clear, however, that this motion must pass in the first instance. Then when the motion for concurrence is made it would be proper for that order to be discharged for the moment and for the report to be remitted for one sitting of the committee, or whatever may be thought