

of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs;

And a point of order having been raised by the honourable Member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid).

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: I return to the original difficulty, the proposal of the honourable Member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) that these motions should all be ruled out of order at the same time, because their combined effect would be an expanded negative at this stage of the Bill. Having listened to argument, I am not persuaded that that ought to be done. The question is, if these motions pass, will there still be an act, and a bank? There is considerable difference of opinion about that, which is exactly the point. Whether the bank survives in the form which the proponents of the Bill want or in some other form is a matter for debate and discussion. I must be persuaded absolutely that there would be no bank as a result of the combined effect of these motions.

Bearing in mind that, individually, each motion ought to be considered. I do not say, because all these motions ought to be considered one at a time, that I am ruling all of them as being in order. Far from it. Some of the motions may clearly offend our procedures in being expanded negatives in respect of the particular clauses to which they refer. That may be the case. But, because one, two or three motions may fall in that category, that does not lead me to conclude that I have power at this stage to so rule on all of them.

To carry the argument further, if three or four motions are out of order for the reasons stated, presumably they will be set aside by the Chair for discussion and argument. That means that the remaining motions are in order, within our procedures.

If the effect of this process is to reduce on the *Order Paper* the number of motions, some of which are out of order, to a smaller number all in order, then, obviously, that is the right course for the House to follow in this procedure.

For example, to consider Motion No. 1, I can hardly accept the argument that the Bill would fall to the ground, or the bank cease to be a bank as envisaged by the proposer of the Bill, if Motion No. 1 were to carry.

It is in fact an accepting provision which is being taken out. That being the case with one of the motions, it is obvious that argument ought to proceed on each motion individually. Of course, procedural arguments can be raised as we go.

I may say at the same time there has been a suggestion that a point of order will be put forward on the opposite point of view. That is because of some regulation concerning the Bill *vis-à-vis* a pro forma bill respecting the incorporation of banks. I may give advance warning. I will hear argument and discussion on it, but I must say that if there is any merit to the argument, and I have not examined the details to see whether there is, there seems to be a funda-

mental difficulty with that argument that this is an improper stage of this legislation to raise that kind of argument.

This Bill has gone through all stages in one House and all but the last two stages in this House. It certainly seems to the Chair to be totally improper to now raise general objections to the form the Bill is in. If that was a valid argument at any time, it ought to have been made at some other stage rather than now at the report stage. I would certainly have to be persuaded there is some reason why this Bill ought to be stopped at this stage when that argument either was not advanced at all or not advanced at the earlier stage when that kind of argument should have been considered.

Having said that, if there is any further consideration of that or any other point of order, I will be pleased to receive it. Otherwise, the House ought to move on to the consideration of these motions *seriatim*.

The hour for Private Members' Business expired.

Debate was resumed on the motion of Mr. MacDonald (Cardigan), seconded by Mr. Lang,—That Bill C-86, An Act to amend the Veterans Insurance Act and the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, be now read a second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to a Committee of the Whole.

After further debate, the question being put on the motion, it was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Bill was read the second time, considered in Committee of the Whole, reported without amendment, concurred in at the report stage, on division, read the third time, on division, and passed.

The Order being read for the consideration of the report stage of Bill C-61, An Act to provide a maritime code for Canada, to amend the Canada Shipping Act and other Acts in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential or related provisions, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications;

Mr. Marchand (Langelier) for Mr. Lang, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Bill C-61, An Act to provide a maritime code for Canada, to amend the Canada Shipping Act and other Acts in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential or related provisions, be amended in Clause 8 of the French version by striking out lines 16 to 18 at page 12 and substituting the following therefor:

"a) le transport par eau, ou par eau et par voie de surface, des marchandises ou des passagers, ainsi que le remorquage, directement ou avec escale à l'étranger,".

Mr. Marchand (Langelier) for Mr. Lang, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Bill C-61, An Act to provide a maritime code for Canada, to amend the Canada Shipping Act and other Acts in consequence thereof and to enact other consequential or related provisions, be amended in Clause 11 of the French version by deleting subclause (2) at pages 14 and 15 and substituting the following therefor: