

*Transport Commission of Inquiry*

substantiated areas in which the transportation industry is calling for this type of investigative body. I would have dramatically pointed out from the information available the admissions of government that near conflicts can in fact result.

I let the matter rest with an appeal to Your Honour not to curtail discussion of this bill for the next few minutes on the ground that it might invade the right of the executive to determine expenditure of money. I ask that you let hon. members who wish to participate in this brief discussion direct their points, not to the very narrow technical arguments that have been raised, but rather to the urgency of Canada removing any possibility of conflict of interest within our total transportation system, not only for our own sake but for the sake of international carriers who move in and out of our air space and our waters on a daily basis.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. The Chair appreciates the interest of the hon. member in the bill now before the House and also the objective that he wishes to achieve by presenting this proposal to the House. I thank him for his comments, particularly those relating to the point of order regarding the acceptability of the bill. The hon. member said in his remarks that the object of the bill is not to spend money. However, the Chair has no authority to remove clause 8 of the bill, which definitely calls for the expenditure of money by parliament. This is clearly indicated in the last two lines of that clause.

Because of the importance of this matter in the hon. member's opinion, he is asking the Chair to put aside the rules, practices and precedents of the House and to base its decision on acceptability on the importance, in the mind of the hon. member, of the proposal contained in Bill C-33. The hon. member also said that the rules are designed to help hon. members, not to limit them. I am sure the hon. member, who has been in the House for many years, will find that the rules are really protective. The rules the hon. member seems to find restrictive today could well become protective, as they have been protective for hon. members in years past.

The hon. member did not seem to contest the hesitation of the Chair in accepting the bill on the ground that it infringes upon the financial initiative of the Crown, so unless hon. members request me to do so I shall not cite the relevant citation in Beuchesne. If hon. members refer to citation 362(2) of Beuchesne, I think they will find clearly set out there that an hon. member cannot introduce a bill which imposes a charge on the treasury without a recommendation. The same is also said in citation 249.

● (1730)

I am sure that if hon. members looked through Beuchesne's and May's they would not find many citations with which to defend the cause of this bill. Because hon. members have been lenient and seemed so interested in the subject matter of the bill before us, the Chair did not try to intervene too early, which I think was more than fair to the hon. member. He did make his point, perhaps under cover of a procedural argument, so I think he has had a chance to fully present his case.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

At this time the Chair has no alternative but to refuse the bill in its present form unless there is agreement among hon. members to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East and refer the subject matter of the bill to a committee. Otherwise, I cannot accept further discussion of the bill in its present form.

**Mr. Reid:** Mr. Speaker, as a result of your decision there is no other private members' business scheduled for today and I believe there would be agreement in the House to call it six o'clock now.

The second thing I would like to do is to draw Your Honour's attention and that of hon. members to item No. 17 on the order paper, which is the bill on residential mortgages now under debate. The motion calls for the bill to be sent to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs. There have been consultations among hon. members and I think there is agreement to changing the motion so that the bill would be sent to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Hon. members have heard the proposal of the parliamentary secretary. Is it agreed that the motion be changed accordingly?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Does the House give unanimous consent to calling it six o'clock at this time?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

At 5.35 p.m. the House took recess.

-----  
AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE FINANCING BILL

ESTABLISHMENT OF CORPORATION, RECOGNITION OF  
SPECIALIZED MORTGAGE INVESTMENT COMPANIES  
UNDER LOAN COMPANIES ACT AND TAX TREATMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-135, to provide additional financial mechanisms and institutions for the residential mortgage market in Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, when I began my speech earlier this afternoon I made the point that members of the NDP were opposed to the passage of this bill because it really does nothing to change the fundamental reliance of the government on the private sector of the economy to meet the housing needs of the people of Canada. I pointed out that the private sector has failed to meet the needs of ordinary citizens and that