

Order Paper Questions

exceptionally, to extend defence industry productivity program and industry modernization for defence establishments program to routine equipment where more advanced equipment is inappropriate and, if so, what was the government's reaction to the recommendation?

Did the sector task force on the Canadian Aerospace Industry recommend to the government in June, 1978, that the government should seek a renegotiation of the defence production sharing agreement to remove impediments to technology transfer which have developed in recent years and which are against the spirit of the original understandings and, if so, what was the government's reaction to the recommendation?

Did the sector task force on the Canadian Aerospace Industry recommend to the government in June, 1978, that the government should review and reduce restrictions to the export of Canadian aerospace products and services, by seeking to eliminate through MTN foreign tariffs on aerospace products and services and, as a *quid pro quo* to permanently eliminate the Canadian import duties which are effectively waived on an annual basis and, if so, what was the government's reaction to the recommendation?

Did the sector task force on the Canadian Aerospace Industry recommend to the government in June, 1978, that the government assist industry in reducing the financial risk of entry to major international aerospace programs where this is identified to be in the long-term national economic interest and, if so, what was the government's reaction to the recommendation?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The question is derived directly from the report of the Consultative Task Force on the Aerospace Manufacturing Sector. This report was released on June 30, 1978, and its contents are available to the general public. The reaction by the federal government to each of these points was published in "Response of the Federal Government to the Recommendations of the Consultative Task Force on the Canadian Aerospace Industry". This report was made public May 29, 1979.

PASQUA-MUSCOWPETUNG—SCHOOL-PROJECT

Question No. 1,399—**Mr. Schellenberger:**

1. What is the present amount of the cost overrun for the school at Pasqua/Muscowpetung?
2. Is this the final cost overrun on the project?
3. Are steps presently being taken to prevent further cost overruns on the project and, if so, what are they?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. \$345,000.

2. Yes.
3. The project has been completed.

MOSQUITO RESERVE—SCHOOL-PROJECT

Question No. 1,400—**Mr. Schellenberger:**

1. What is the present amount of the cost overrun for the school at Mosquito Reserve?
2. Is this the final cost overrun on the project?
3. Are steps presently being taken to prevent further cost overruns on the project and, if so, what are they?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. \$124,000.

2. Yes.
3. The project has been completed.

[Translation]

Madam Speaker: The questions enumerated by the hon. parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Stand.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BANKS AND BANKING LAW REVISION ACT, 1980

MEASURE RESPECTING BANKING INSTITUTIONS

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-6, to revise the Bank Act, to amend the Quebec Savings Banks Act and the Bank of Canada Act, to establish the Canadian Payments Association and to amend other acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

• (1230)

Madam Speaker: As hon. members are aware, there are 59 motions standing on the order paper at the report stage of Bill C-6, an act to revise the Bank Act, to amend the Quebec Savings Banks Act and the Bank of Canada Act, to establish the Canadian Payments Association and to amend other acts in consequence thereof. The Chair has had a cursory look at all of the motions. However, it is my intention to deal only with a few motions for the time being, since some of them were filed as recently as yesterday.

Motions Nos. 1 and 2 could be grouped for debate and voted on separately.

Motions Nos. 3, 4 and 6 will be debated separately and voted on separately.

Motions Nos. 5, 12, 13, 16, 19, 20 and 21 could be grouped for debate. However, motions Nos. 5 and 16 will be voted on separately. The question on motion No. 13 will be put to the House and this will dispose of motions Nos. 12, 19, 20 and 21 which are consequential motions.

Motions Nos. 7, 8 and 9 shall be grouped for debate and voted on separately.

Motions Nos. 10 and 11 could be grouped for debate and voted on separately.

Motions Nos. 14, 15 and 18 will be grouped for debate and voted on separately.

Motions Nos. 17, 52, 55 and 59, all in the name of the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. Bussi eres) can be grouped for debate but voted on separately.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West) moved:
Motion No. 1.

That Bill C-6, an act to revise the Bank Act, to amend the Quebec Savings Banks Act and the Bank of Canada Act, to establish the Canadian Payments Association and to amend other acts in consequence thereof, be amended in