

*Standing Committee on Agriculture*

would have never been published, because its recommendations could not but blame the government.

In fact, I agreed to it on the express understanding that the findings of both special studies would be recorded in the same report. But the minister did not want to reply, claiming he would rather avoid a debate—needless to say—and he left it to the committee.

Again I refer to page 2118 of *Hansard*. At the end of my remarks, one can read the following and I quote:

We lay down a stipulation.

Since our stipulation was not met and the committee in its study did not take into account the conclusions reached in another study, subsequent to a special trip concerning the matter, I submit that this report cannot be tabled because we had not given unanimous consent.

If I were not now rising on a question of privilege, that would amount to contradicting myself. I put the matter to the House, in the hope of finding understanding and co-operation, for an essential standing order is at stake, the need to have unanimous consent to refer a question to a committee.

Mr. Speaker, since we have not given unanimous consent and the committee has not indicated its position on this matter, as was suggested by the minister himself on December 18, I move the following:

That the report of the Committee on Agriculture submitted to the House in accordance with a motion to that effect on December 18, 1969, not be concurred in but be referred to the Committee so that the latter may add, as an appendix to the report, the findings and recommendations of the special study made in May and June last, pursuant to an order of the House.

I am also sending you a photostat copy of *Hansard* for your information.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. The hon. member has kindly informed me of his intention to rise on a question of privilege. He has done so in accordance with the Standing Orders, thus enabling me to study during the few minutes at my disposal, the very interesting point that he has raised.

Basically, the hon. member for Lotbinière suggests that a committee has looked into a matter subject to a condition that he had stipulated himself. He now suggests that the condition was not fulfilled and, in consequence, he asks the Chair not to accept the report that has just been submitted to the House.

[Mr. Fortin.]

The hon. member will understand that it is quite difficult for the Chair to study all the reports laid before the House in order to determine whether the stipulations laid down for their consideration have been complied with. I doubt very much that this is a question of privilege. I rather think that the hon. member has aired in the House a grievance which, in my opinion, is serious.

I recall very well the circumstances under which the motion to which the hon. member for Lotbinière has referred was made and I also remember that he had given his approval, subject to that stipulation.

He now says that it has not been complied with. I doubt very much that even in such serious circumstances it is possible for me to reject the report just brought before the House.

May I suggest to the hon. member that the point he now raises could be put forward when the motion for concurrence of the report is moved in due course.

I deem it necessary to draw the attention of the member for Lotbinière to citation 318(2) in Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, fourth edition, which reads as follows:

It is the opinion of the committee, as a committee, not that of the individual members, which is required by the House, and, falling unanimity, the conclusions agreed to by the majority are the conclusions of the committee.

And further on:

If a member disagrees to certain paragraphs in the report, or to the entire report, he can record his disapproval by dividing the committee against those paragraphs to which he objects, or against the entire report, as the circumstances of the case require; and can put on record his observations and conclusions, as opposed to those of the majority, by proposing an alternative draft report or moving an amendment to the question for reading the draft report a second time.

Paragraph (3) of the same citation reads as follows, and I quote:

A member will not be permitted in presenting a report to make any remarks on the subject-matter; he can only properly do so on a motion in reference to the report.

In other words, the objection raised by the hon. member deals with the substance, and in my opinion, should be considered when the motion for concurrence in the report comes before the House.

The hon. member has raised an interesting point which I shall consider with sympathy during the next few days. But, I may possibly err in ruling at this time, that there