

*Bank Act*

When the order of the day for committee has been reached and called in due form, the Speaker will put the question, "That I do now leave the chair". Now is the time to move any amendment to this question. Members opposed to the bill may move that the House resolve itself into committee that day three or six months; or may propose motions adverse to the principle or policy of the measure.

It has been frequently decided in the English House that on the motion for the Speaker to leave the chair, a member is at liberty to discuss the main provisions, but not to proceed in detail through the clauses nor to discuss amendments to the same until the bill is regularly in committee.

It was my purpose not to discuss amendments of details, but rather to bring to the attention of the House certain very important principles that are involved in the recent Merchants Bank case.

Mr. SPEAKER: In order to be fair to the hon. member, I might recall to himself and to the House that when Bourinot, and later, Flint, commenting on Bourinot, expressed the views which the hon. member has just read, rule 17A was not in existence. This is a new rule. It was enacted in 1912-13. I was a member of the House when it was enacted. I opposed it strenuously, and I was defeated at that time with many others. I was aware of the views expressed by Bourinot and by Flint, but they fall to the ground when one realized that rule 17A was enacted after those views were expressed.

Mr. GOOD: May I speak to the question of order?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. GOOD: Would it be possible by unanimous consent to waive the rule?

Mr. SPEAKER: I have given my ruling, and as I stated a moment ago, if it is not the wish of the House that the Speaker leave the chair, a vote can be taken. But I take it for granted that the motion is carried and, therefore, I leave the chair.

## BANK ACT—IN COMMITTEE

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee on the bill, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. GOOD: We have received no copies of the amended bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was distributed on Friday.

The CHAIRMAN: Copies have already been distributed. If the hon. member will look at his file, he should find a copy.

Mr. GOOD: It is not on my file; it is not in the post office, and I have not received [Mr. Bird.]

any copies. I understood that we would not be expected to proceed with the bill unless we had copies.

The CHAIRMAN: The bill was distributed on Friday.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Definitions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think it is fair to the members to rush on in this way until they can locate their copies of the bill. I know I was given a copy of the bill and I put it on my desk on Friday; but I cannot locate it myself, and it is not on my file. I am quite sure that the bill was distributed, but copies are not on our files.

Mr. LAPOINTE: A copy is on my file, and I think a copy should be on everybody's file.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see it is in the middle of the file.

Mr. FIELDING: It is in the proper place having regard to its number.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Bank charters continued to July 1, 1923, as to some particulars.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I think the time has come in the discussion of this bill, when I may with perfect propriety make a few remarks; also probably at the close of my remarks, I may find occasion to move an amendment. During the discussion of this bill before the Banking and Com-  
4 p.m. merce committee, I took occasion to bring forward a resolution asking for postponement of the revision of the act and asking that charters should be extended for one year. This proposal was not acceptable to the committee. As a matter of fact, the proposal itself was ruled out of order in the committee as not being within our powers at that time. My reasons for bringing forward that motion were several, but I shall state them very briefly. I am speaking now, not for purposes of obstruction, or simply because I wish to be contradictory to the action of the committee or of this House, but because, rightly or wrongly, I have come to the conclusion that the best interests of the country will not be guaranteed by passing this particular clause in this particular shape.

In the first place we have had a great deal of discussion in committee and have taken an enormous mass of evidence. I think the committee has worked faithfully and has tried