

referring Sir T. Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 16th edition, on page 655 as follows:

Reporting of bills to the house before their consideration has been concluded":

It is the duty of standing committees, as of all committees, to give matters referred to them due and sufficient consideration. Accordingly, the Chairman of a standing committee will not accept a motion that the committee do not proceed further with the consideration of a bill from a member who is not in charge of the bill, nor will he accept a motion for reporting a bill to the house before its consideration has been completed by the committee . . .

And here I underline this, and repeat:

. . . before its consideration has been completed by the committee, or any other motion which conflicts with the obligations imposed on the committee by the house.

Among the obligations of the committee to the house is the one that they should report the bill.

Mr. AIKEN: It would not matter what was done last week or at any meeting. We could not determine it.

Mr. OLLIVIER: No. I mean it is the same thing as a motion to adjourn.

Mr. OLSON: That is the point I was going to raise, too. It is argued here that the intent of the motion that the Chairman leave the chair was to kill the bill, and from the quotation that Dr. Ollivier just repeated it is quite clear that this was the intent of the motion, but that it was completely out of order. If the motion was in order at all, then the substantive nature of it was that the committee should adjourn.

Mr. OLLIVIER: I cannot answer that because you have just repeated what I have said.

The CHAIRMAN: At your request the clerk has got for us the evidence at the last meeting. I shall read it to you.

Mr. OLSON: I would like to hear the motion, not the evidence.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall read the secretary's report of the motion taken from the first page of the evidence at the last meeting as follows:

Mr. NUGENT: It is a very simple point, Mr. Chairman.

I move, seconded by Mr. Skoreyko, that the Chairman do now leave the chair. That is a undebatable motion, and it has the effect of killing the bill.

Mr. OLSON: That is an opinion, but it is not binding.

Mr. CAMERON (*Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands*): It has nothing to do with the motion.

Mr. OLSON: That may be his opinion, but the motion is that the Chairman do now leave the chair. His opinion has no binding effect upon what passage of the motion would mean.

Mr. SCOTT: His opinion would be binding only on himself.

Mr. KLEIN: If I understood Mr. Nugent correctly, he is saying in essence today that even if the motion was illegal or out of order, the fact that it was adopted made it legal and in order. Therefore we cannot proceed today. I would say that even if it was illegal and out of order, we should not be prohibited thereby from doing something legal today, simply because something illegal was done last Friday. Furthermore, if the motion in effect was to kill the bill, the motion should have said, if I understand it correctly, that this