

that if examined carefully that particular term could be an impropriety in respect of a description of the actions of a chairman. The traditional means, of course, for examining that conduct would be, first of all, by appealing the ruling of the chairman or his conduct to the committee as a whole, by requesting that the committee make a report of the incident or raise a debate on a motion of censure by any other Member at any time.

Perhaps and fortunately for the Chair I do not feel a case has been put which causes me to decide that because when the honourable Member for York Centre raised that complaint originally, he sought at the conclusion of his alleged point of privilege a remedy which is as follows: "That the question of my chairmanship ruling as to a quorum in the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, as referred to by the honourable Member for York-Simcoe in *Hansard* on May 20, 1975, be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections."

In other words, the remedy sought by the honourable Member for York Centre in raising his question of privilege initially was that his decision or handling of his decision be reviewed by the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections not on the allegation of a member in that Committee. It may seem a technical point, but I hope it is not taken that way. The fact of the matter is that it seems to me that the question of privilege raised by the honourable Member for York-Simcoe is invalid from a procedural point of view because, once again, it relates to proceedings in a standing committee.

The subsequent question of privilege raised by the honourable Member for York Centre is equally invalid because although the problem may have had some validity—I will not decide that at the moment—it seems to be that a different remedy ought to apply than the question raised by the honourable Member for York-Simcoe. In that case both Members made subsequent representations in the House, and it would appear that both cases recognized the inherent difficulty in his own case and endeavoured to remedy it with a subsequent representation each in his own way, the honourable Member for York-Simcoe by endeavouring the following day to accomplish by consent that which in my opinion could not be accomplished by his original point, and the honourable Member for York Centre on Friday by seeking to attach to his original complaint the remedy which might have been more appropriate to it in the first instance.

In any case I can only reiterate—and I think I ought to observe in setting aside both alleged questions of privilege—that by permitting the honourable Member for York-Simcoe to proceed as I have on several occasions already in this Session, by permitting a Member to go on initially with an alleged question of privilege concerning events in a standing committee, that we are only inviting difficulty. It is a well established practice of this House, and one which recommends itself upon

reflection, that the events which take place in a standing committee can not only be questioned there in the manner in which I have cited but also in other ways, and that this Chair ought not to sit as a court of appeal in respect to the proceedings in a standing committee.

I therefore simply indicate that this difficulty having arisen on both sides by first permitting the honourable Member for York-Simcoe to establish this question of non-privilege and to speak for some time provoked responses from the other side, and in fairness it seemed to be desirable that in that situation the Chair allow equal comment from both sides notwithstanding the fact that the Chair is firmly of the opinion that no question of privilege exists.

Accordingly, it seems to be the proper course in the future to insist that where questions of privilege are to be raised concerning the events in standing committees, that the notice must contain some singular feature which takes it out of the general area of the proceedings in standing committees, otherwise the Chair ought not to allow the Member to raise his question in the House at all.

Finally, I will make two other observations. First, both Members at one time or another suggested that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections ought to have these questions referred to it, which to me would seem to establish a precedent and initiate or encourage a practice wherein the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections would become some kind of court of appeal on the proceedings of other standing committees. It seems to me that nothing could be more unacceptable as a practice which ought to be more directly discouraged.

I will conclude simply by saying that if either Member feels that the grievance he has put forward, and which I feel compelled to set aside, is still of sufficient strength that it ought to be dealt with further, the remedy of the substantive motion of censure of either Member still remains, although it certainly seems to the Chair at this moment that the matter has had a pretty full airing.

Mr. Smith (Saint-Jean), from the Standing Committee on Agriculture, presented the Sixth Report of the Committee, which is as follows:

Pursuant to its Order of Reference of Friday, March 14, 1975, your Committee has considered Bill C-50, An Act to amend the Agricultural Stabilization Act, and has agreed to report it with the following amendments:

#### Clause 2

Strike out lines 31 and 32 on page 2 and substitute the following therefor:

"the index referred to in section 8.2 and, after consultation with producer groups, recommendations respect-