

There was a motion with an amendment by Mr. Cameron which, in effect, would have referred the bill back to the government for re-consideration. In order to facilitate things I offered to withdraw this motion but my seconder did not consent. Mr. Cameron's amendment, I presume, stands. I think there should be some clarification of where we stand now with that.

Mr. GRAY: In respect of the comments made by Mr. Aiken, in my opinion, I do not think strictly speaking, you need a seconder on a motion made in committee, so the fact your seconder did not consent is irrelevant.

I think we have cleared up the matter by adopting the report of the steering committee. In effect, we have adopted the procedure which is somewhat alternate to what you proposed at the last meeting, but which will have a similar effect in bringing this matter to a speedy conclusion.

The matters in issue were discussed fully and I would suggest we proceed to the study of the bill, based on the evidence we have heard over the preceding weeks, at the next meeting. In doing what we did at the beginning of this meeting I think we have clarified the point concerned.

Mr. AIKEN: I requested a ruling from the Chairman but I think maybe Mr. Gray has given it.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it all cleared up to your satisfaction?

Mr. AIKEN: Yes, as long as the record is clear.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not consider I had actually received the motion in that you had withdrawn it, and while I did during the course of the long and labourious discussion we had at the last meeting reserve at one point my decision on the motion I have not gone into the study of it that I might have had you not withdrawn it.

Mr. AIKEN: My only concern was the lack of unanimous consent but I assume there is unanimous consent at this time.

The CHAIRMAN: The report of the subcommittee was adopted unanimously. Would you proceed now, Mr. Robinson.

Mr. ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one point clear before I read the submission to you.

This submission had been prepared with the hope that it would be presented to you a week ago. However, this did not happen. At that time I had witnesses who would have been representative of processing firms and associations across Canada. I felt this was very important because in my own office we do not deal with negotiations. This is all done at the provincial rather than the national level and, therefore, that was the purpose of bringing these witnesses before you at that time for questioning.

However, gentlemen, I will do my best, with the help of Mr. Limoges, who is the president of Quebec canners. As I said, other than Mr. Limoges, you have not as good witnesses this morning as we would have had last week, if we appeared when scheduled.

I shall now read the brief.

The fruit and vegetable processors of Canada welcome this opportunity of presenting this submission to the committee on behalf of their members.

The membership of these associations, all of which are non-profit organizations, is made up of firms engaged in the canning, freezing, pickling, and preserving of fruit and vegetable products. Because of their operations our seasonal products are made available to Canadian consumers and others all year around. The membership of these organizations would account for over ninety percent of the Canadian production of processed fruits and vegetables. This submission is presented jointly on behalf of the following associations:

The Canadian Food Processors Association
The Ontario Food Processors Association