

*Motion for Concurrence in Report*

allowed to pass by unanimous consent it has to be given under Standing Order 42 and that is what was done.

Then paragraph (4) of Citation 325 reads:

When a motion is made for concurrence in a Select Committee Report, it is competent for the House to adopt it, reject it, refer it back to the committee or decide that consideration of the report will take place "this day six months".

I thought since I referred to Citation 325 I should read the whole of it, but surely the crucial part of it is in paragraph (3) which gives the right, under what is now Standing Order 42, for a motion to be made and dealt with under motions for concurrence in the report of a committee. I emphasize that there is nothing in either of those citations, and I cannot find anything anywhere else, which says this right is limited to the chairman of the standing committee or says it is even limited to a member of a standing committee. It says the House shall make this decision, and every time there is any reference as to when the House shall make such a decision it says it shall be done under Routine Proceedings. It shall be done under motions, which is precisely where it is on today's Order Paper.

I submit, therefore, that in the absence of any prohibition against the hon. member for Athabasca making this motion at this point, and in the light of statements that this is the place to deal with motions for concurrence in a report of a committee, that the hon. member had every right to ask that his motion be placed where it is and that Your Honour had every right to see that it was put on the Order Paper in this place and that it be called at this time.

The other comment I wish to make is perhaps in the vein in which the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) was speaking. At least, in a sense, it is in the same vein. He talked about the implications of this course of action in relation to the planning of the business of Parliament. I should like to talk about the implications of what he wants to deny to this House in relation to the professed aim to strengthen the work of our committees.

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

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** What on earth is the value of strengthening our committees, so they can make these strong reports and say the excellent things that are said in this report, if those statements are to die once the reports are tabled in the House of Commons? I do not have them in front of me, and perhaps it is a good thing I do not or I would be reading at length

from the reports of one of our procedural committees back in November and December of 1968 when we went into this whole business of the work of committees and our desire to strengthen them. This is like motherhood around this place. We all support this. Committees are wonderful. They must be given more to do and more support. Private members on the government side welcome them because in committees they can speak their minds; they can pass resolutions and bring in reports and say something. To what effect is the result of all that if, when the report is presented in the House, it is printed not even in *Hansard* but in *Votes and Proceedings*, which not very many people see, and that is the end of it? If we are going to talk about implications let us talk about the implications of what we are trying to do for our committee structure and accept the fact that when a committee goes to the trouble of making the kind of report this committee did we should have the right to deal with it here in the House of Commons.

I recognize that there are not very many precedents for this being done. It is the usual and traditional thing for the chairman of a committee or for someone designated by the committee to make the report, but there is no rule under which such a person does it. There is no rule which says no one else can do it. In fact, as I have already said, I go so far as to say that any private member of the House should be able to make the motion. Supposing for example the hon. member for Athabasca had been removed from the committee after it had made its report, would he not still have the right to move the motion? And what about some of the rest of us?

In any case, because there are no rules against it, because this is in line with what we are trying to do to strengthen the work of committees, and because Your Honour and the table saw fit to put the motion where it is, I suggest it should be called and proceeded with at this time.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière):** Mr. Speaker, Standing Order 51 of the House of Commons reads as follows:

51. Whenever Mr. Speaker is of the opinion that a motion offered to the House is contrary to the rules and privileges of Parliament, he shall apprise the House thereof immediately, before putting the question thereon, and quote the standing order or authority applicable to the case.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) is asking that you