

*Transport and Communications*

must be done. We cannot just stop this service and put these men out of work without finding them other employment. The C.N.R. has tried to provide them with alternative work in the bus service, but there are still some who will be laid off work. It is up to the railway and the government to make sure that they have work. But from the transportation point of view I submit that the bus service is providing better service to the people of Newfoundland. They recognize this because they are flocking in greater and greater numbers to the bus service and abandoning even more the rail passenger service.

In summing up, Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat the argument made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), that if we are going to set up boards and courts of record to do certain things it is wrong for us, while the board or court of record is making its decision or has under review a certain question, to make recommendations to it as to how it should reach its decision. What we are then doing is interfering politically in a situation which we have said should not be political.

I submit that for these reasons the second part of this report should be sent back to the committee where all those who made the trip to Newfoundland would have the chance to contribute to the report. I am sure we would then come up with a much better report which would receive the acceptance of this house.

● (4:40 p.m.)

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I thought I would get the afternoon off so far as speaking is concerned, but with these amendments being moved it is not possible.

The reason the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce moved this amendment was to correct the defect in the amendment moved by the President of the Privy Council. But I notice that he has made another change, and it is with respect to this other change that I raise my point of order. The amendment of the President of the Privy Council had the following words in it:

—with instruction that they have power to amend the same by deleting—

The hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce changed it to read:

—with instruction that they delete from the report—

I submit there is quite a difference between giving a committee the power to make a

change and instructing it to make a specific change.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame.

**An hon. Member:** It would make their work a lot easier.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** It would also spell the death of committees that much faster.

**An hon. Member:** Do you want to move an amendment to the amendment?

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** I shall ignore these voices that come from members in their seats. Citation 323(2) of Beauchesne's fourth edition reads:

A report from a committee cannot be amended by the house, but it must be referred back to the committee.

We were told a number of times in the last couple of days that you cannot do indirectly what you are not permitted to do directly. That is precisely what this amendment does. It amends this report on the floor of the house. It says that this report must come back to us with the final paragraph deleted.

I submit that the amendment as the President of the Privy Council moved it in the first place was to give the committee power to make the proposed change. I am aware of the fact that citation 322 in Beauchesne's fourth edition seems to say that the house can give an instruction to amend the report in any respect. But I think you, sir, have been in this house long enough, and I have been here a little longer, to know that you have to go to the source of just about everything that Beauchesne put in his book. In this case he tells us where to go, to Bourinot's fourth edition at page 480. Actually the paragraph in question starts on page 479. It is a long paragraph and I will only read the pertinent parts, the first of which is as follows:

A report may be referred back to a committee for further consideration, or with instructions giving them power to amend the same in any respect. In this way a committee may regularly reconsider and even reverse a decision it has previously arrived at.

Then if you go through all of the words in that paragraph and come to the end you find the following sentence:

Consequently the correct procedure in all analogous cases is for the house to give the committee instructions which will enable it to consider the whole question again.

I do not favour this amendment at all but I think the government should at least put it in