

Adjournment Motion

confidentiality throughout the whole government on some occasions when we are a little cautious. But the particular case of certificates under section 21 and what I am proposing here is quite different from the matter of how many points a person has accumulated. I am open to see how we can open that area of information more, but I know that this one must be kept confidential although I do want to find some cushion of independent examination which can help me make those kinds of decisions without the concern I have often felt when I have been looking at these files in the middle of the night and have had to make a decision rather quickly as a lonely person, and I know that my colleague has felt the same way. I have some ideas on that question but I cannot put them in place at this time; they will have to await the major legislation.

Amendment (Mr. Brewin) negated: Yeas, 26; nays, 32.

Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

● (1700)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath)—National Defence—Reason for delay in starting search for missing fishermen—Possible reassessment of search and rescue capability; the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Howie)—Regional Economic Expansion—Liaison with Manpower in reporting job opportunities in companies funded by department; the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall)—Transport—Possible discussions on use of *Manhattan* to move oil through northern waters.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills and notices of motions.

Mr. Blais: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It has been agreed that for private members' business we will proceed to private bills and to Bill S-30 which stands on the order paper for Thursday, February 26, at page 13.

Mr. Speaker: Is it understood and agreed that the House will proceed to the consideration of Bill S-30?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I understand, however, that there are some procedural arguments to be put forward in respect to the consideration of that bill.

[Mr. Andras.]

PRIVATE BILLS

[English]

CONTINENTAL BANK OF CANADA

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill S-30, to incorporate Continental Bank of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: There are a number of motions placed on the order paper at the report stage the first of which is in the name of the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman).

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If I may use a phrase our new leader used yesterday, "Here we go." That is so because at this point I suggest that all the motions appearing in the name of the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman) are out of order in the place in which they are positioned. If one consults our Standing Orders, chapter III of Standing Order 75, and bears in mind that the order paper posts these private bills under Standing Order 75 and then gives notice that there are motions under Standing Order 75, I suggest first that that is an abuse of language. All the rules under chapter XIII come under the heading of proceedings on public bills.

Then chapter XVIII appears at page 91 of our Standing Orders, and it deals with private bills. Chapter XVIII specifically states that any bill dealing with incorporation of a bank shall be a private bill, and the reason private bills dealing with the incorporation of banks or dealing with insurance companies go to the Senate first is the difficulty of incorporating them in this House, or proceeding with them in this House and getting them before this House for consideration. There used to be so many private bills here with regard to divorces which were dealt with in this chamber, that a private bill to incorporate a bank just could not be considered. So the procedure always was in reverse.

I suggest that the chaptering, paging and numbering of our Standing Orders has meaning and relevance. I think it is quite wrong to consider a bill which comes down the route from the other place, a private bill sponsored in this House, coming through the private members' channels, being considered in committee, coming back and then suddenly appearing under provisions which deal with public bills. I suggest that that is wrong. There is Standing Order 75(5) under which we are alleged to be working with the amendments put forward by the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge. The procedure at this moment under which Your Honour is proceeding is 75(8), but of equal import is Standing Order 109, which is found in chapter XVIII, and I cite it as follows:

No important amendment may be proposed to any private bill in the House unless one day's notice of the same has been given.

I agree that the hon. member has conformed to notice, but under a heading dealing with public bills and rules of procedure purporting to deal with public bills. I remember the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) many years ago, when a bill was coming down the pipe from the Senate and there was an amendment suggested which