

properly come from this bill. One such recommendation which should be considered, I submit, is to insure bank loans made to secondary producers in respect of the products of primary producers.

Mr. OLSON: First of all, I would like to say that the discussion which has taken place respecting the good or bad features of Bill C-5 are out of order, within the context of the motion before the committee now. I think that all we have to decide is the effect of the motion that was moved last Friday, (a) that it simply adjourned the meeting for that day, or (b) that it was intended to kill the bill. I am not going to go over the evidence and citations which Dr. Ollivier presented, but as far as I am concerned, I believe that this committee has no power to kill the bill. We must obey the instructions we get from the House of Commons, and that is to make a report. At the same time the report that is now under consideration by motion from the subcommittee asks whether what was done was contrary to the rules. Do you believe that the motion that the Chairman do now leave the chair is contrary to the rules? I think the motion was in order. It is the effect of the motion that I am concerned with. As far as I am concerned, it was simply that the meeting be adjourned for that day.

Mr. SCOTT: I have one brief word arising out of Mr. Nugent's remarks. No one quarrels with his right to use the rules in any way he wishes in order to achieve his purpose. But if by the use of the rules he does it in a way which the committee may later feel is not in accordance with the rules, I do not think it should be attributed by him that we are making fools of ourselves before the committee. He certainly should be given an "A" for effort in bringing up this idea. But because we may later feel that it is contrary to the rules, I do not think he should impute motives to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

Mr. AIKEN: In reply to Mr. Olson, I think there is a distinction between a motion to adjourn and a motion that the Chairman leave the chair. To my mind the latter motion that was made is a technical motion which must have some effect. I think there is no problem if there is a motion to adjourn, if it is an adjournment which terminates the meeting for the day. But a technical motion that the Chairman leave the chair is always interpreted—certainly in committees in the house—that the Speaker leave the chair, and that it terminates the proceedings, or whatever we are discussing. So to that extent I cannot agree that it is merely a question to adjourn. I feel that it is a technical motion which surely must have some effect. If it has no effect at all, well then we have merely wasted our time. But I cannot believe that it has no effect, and I cannot feel that it has any other effect than what Mr. Nugent had in mind.

I respect Dr. Ollivier's opinions very much. As a matter of fact, I accept them, but I still will vote against the motion from the subcommittee, because it has not been clarified to my mind what the effect of the motion was that the Chairman leave the chair. Is it a technical terminating motion? What it determines is certainly not the proceedings of that day but merely that the committee adjourn. Maybe we did not make the motion in the committee, but if this is the case, we should make it clear. I have always understood that it terminated the proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question? The question is on a motion made by Mr. Gray seconded by Mr. Basford:

- (1) that this committee supports the opinion of the subcommittee on agenda and procedure that the action of this committee on Friday, November 22, was contrary to the rules;
- (2) that this committee should forthwith resume its examination of and inquiry into Bill C-5 in order that the committee may report