

achieved and if it had been taken off the order paper we would not have had to bother with this bill any more.

As to the rules, I may say that while Dr. Ollivier has given us valuable testimony from his great experience, the most significant part in connection with the rules is that the rules in standing committees are governed for the most part by the rules in the house. Dr. Ollivier in his testimony has been very careful to point out those cases where this has been distinguished, where he wants or finds it useful. But it does strengthen my own belief that the rule in standing committee is the same in the house unless one can find a specific argument for excluding it; and since there is none here, since there has been no quotation to that effect, then the rule in the standing committee that a motion such as mine, a ruling in general of the house, the committee of the whole, having gone into effect still applies in the committee unless you can find authority saying directly it does not, and there has been no such authority. One can belabour the point, but I still think the disposition made last week was the soundest, the best, and would save us all a great deal of time. We are now going to be put in the curious position of reversing the considered opinion and voice of the committee last week, and we are now going to be in the position of saying it does not matter who has a majority one day, you can always correct it next week. It has never been done before.

If this committee ever looks really foolish in the eyes of the public, then I suggest this is going to be the time when we really will look foolish.

For that reason I cannot vote for the motion. I have to vote against it, because I think it is an abuse of the power inherent in a majority I think it is an abuse of the rule, that the steering committee brings it back again, and I think it is an abuse of the committee generally to go back to this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Let us carry on with the questions.

Mr. MOREAU: I appreciate some of the points you have been making. I have no serious disagreement with them. Perhaps you can tell me this: why in the committee last week did not you make a motion that the bill should not be proceeded with, and that this be our report to the house. My conviction is that if we had taken a decision in that form last week, that would have been "it" as far as Bill C-5 is concerned, and that would be our report. I wonder why you proceeded with undebatable motion?

Mr. NUGENT: Such a report would have to go to the house. It would be purely a report of the committee, which would have to be adopted, and it might mean that this bill would get further debate. I was trying to find a method to get rid of it once and for all in order to show by the way it was handled just how bad I thought it was.

Mr. MOREAU: Would you not say that this was a form of closure which you were trying to apply?

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I have more people who wish to speak on the motion. I have Mr. Ryan, Mr. Olson, and Mr. Scott.

Mr. RYAN: Mr. Chairman, I thought I would say something. I think this committee is in much the same position as a court. I believe Mr. Nugent is confusing this committee and its terms of reference with an appeal or a magistrate's court. I think any civil court would hear all the evidence. I think there should be a fair hearing of this bill, whether we agree with all of its provisions or not. For myself, I think there is something very interesting in this bill, something which should be followed up, maybe not by the passage of the bill the way it is. But I think that the committee is really duty bound to examine it carefully and to make recommendations in respect of the proposition mainly outlined in the bill. The proposal itself may not be acceptable, but there are two or three other alternatives we could examine. I submit we should in our report back to the house make recommendations that we consider could