

then we would have the other motion made by Mr. Aiken. I think there is some merit on balance, so that we do not get into a useless argument.

Mr. OLLIVIER: The only thing you have to do is to vote against the motion and if you have considered the subject sufficiently, you can vote for the motion.

The CHAIRMAN: On a point of order, although Mr. Olson thought I must accept it, I think I would like to look into the point brought up by Mr. Olson, if the committee feels that this is feasible. We have had a very long discussion this morning on this question of procedure, much of which is unprecedented, as all members will well realize. Since this particular motion now touches on some points which were raised, I would not like to accept this motion until I was absolutely sure that I was doing the correct thing. So with the committee's permission, and in view of the time being a quarter to eleven with the house sitting at 11 o'clock, I would like to consult legal counsel on this and to look at the precedents and to report back at a meeting which the committee might permit to be held at the call of the Chair. I would also ask for another meeting of the steering committee in order to ascertain that we do not get into another long procedural discussion by accepting this motion. I would ask you to give me this permission.

Mr. GELBER: I would like to make a suggestion to Mr. Aiken. I agree generally with Mr. Aiken's motion. I also agree with what Mr. Cameron says. I agree that these hearings should not be interminable, and I think that is what is concerning Mr. Nugent; it is concerning others, and it is concerning me.

I wonder if you would include Mr. Cameron's amendment in this motion and also a schedule. There are two or three more witnesses it has been suggested we should hear. Why does he not say that we hear these witnesses and then report to the house?

Let us have an omnibus resolution. If we were to have such a resolution I would be prepared to vote for it.

As a courtesy to the sponsors and as a courtesy to the people who have said they would be prepared to be heard—and there are only two or three—I suggest we should hear the witnesses in one sitting and then terminate these discussions.

If Mr. Aiken could so phrase his resolution, I would be prepared to vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN: I may be a little out of order because we are still on a point of order, but I have a suggestion to make in relation to the people who have indicated that they would like to be heard. The Canadian food processors association were to be heard, at the suggestion of the committee; and the committee requested that they be asked to submit a brief. We asked them to come. They have submitted a brief. They were to have been heard today, but as some of their members come from as far away as Vancouver the steering committee took it upon themselves to suggest they should not come today in view of the situation that has arisen. However, they have sent a brief. We might suggest that their brief be incorporated as an appendix to the proceedings, and then the steering committee or the committee could decide, after having read the brief, whether or not we should have them appear as witnesses. I think this might be considered from common courtesy.

We had also requested the deputy minister of agriculture, Mr. Barry, to be here. He was here this morning but he had to leave.

The committee had also informed the bankers association that they would be given an opportunity to be heard again. In this particular case—and if you will allow me to make another suggestion—we might indicate to that association, if they have further things they would like to say, that they should put them in the form of a brief. This could also be printed as an appendix. This procedure would allow all members to take cognizance of their views.