

*Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act*

provides for improvement in an area in which, though improvement may well be necessary, it will serve no useful purpose in dealing with what we have seen occur in banks and near-bank trust company operations over the course of the last 10 or more years.

We offer these amendments in good faith and we do so because we believe that they will improve, in a perhaps marginal way, what the Minister has offered to the House as a change to the law governing the insurance corporation. However, when this Bill is passed and becomes law, we will still be faced with the same problems we have already faced. There is nothing now in place that was not in place at the time the Northland and Canadian Commercial Banks collapsed. There is nothing in place now that was not in place at the time of the collapse of the trust companies. I think it would be fair to say that there is not a Member in the House who was here at the time who would not have proposed that we needed some fairly drastic, dramatic changes to the system in place at that time.

• (1610)

When the commission has completed its work and reported, I hope it will be evident that the major problem which confronted the industry and consumers was that there was no adequate provision for guaranteeing that the law, even if it were correct, was being policed adequately. When we find in the banking system the kinds of unusual occurrences which were clearly taking place in the early and late parts of last year, when we find those unusual manipulations, if one can accept that term, of the assets of the banks over and against their liabilities, and still not have before Parliament provisions to guarantee that the banks, through whatever imaginative bookkeeping mechanism, cannot undertake that again, then I say to my colleagues in the House that we are not dealing with the problem.

Two of the institutions about which I am talking are very close to your heart, Mr. Speaker, coming from western Canada as you do. Although I cannot recall actually hearing you say it, no doubt you were as perplexed and angered by what took place as were most of us. I would not be at all surprised if in discussing it with your constituents you raised the necessity for a stronger method of dealing with such situations before they arise again. I would be willing to bet, Mr. Speaker, that you even said at some point, as most of us did to our constituents, that we would take measures and bring forward changes which would result in a system that would be, if not foolproof, certainly less vulnerable than the system which then existed. I can see the disappointment in your face as you listen; I can see it.

**Mr. McMillan:** I don't see it.

**Mr. Deans:** I see the Acting Speaker sitting there, agonizing and wishing that he could rise in his place to put on record his own views, which I suggest, and I hope appropriately, would

parallel my own views. They would not be identical, I concede, but they would be similar to the views I have expressed.

Having said that, over the course of the day we must deal systematically with these amendments. In that process we must extract from the Government the promise that it will bring forward the changes which must be brought forward in order to clear up a system that does not work properly and to ensure that no depositor will have to rely upon the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation because of inadequate banking and management practices being perpetrated upon them by people who do not follow the direction of Parliament.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in this debate on the report stage.

Earlier I heard the Minister say that according to the Government, this was an important Bill and it was urgent that we adopt the Bill and the measures it entails.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are wondering about this, because we know that the Bill before the House today was introduced for first reading on December 29, 1985, while the debate on second reading did not take very long, only one day, on January 27, 1986. After that it went to committee. The Bill came back to the House this year on February 5, if I am not mistaken, which is four months ago.

And now the Minister informs the House it is all very urgent. I think we should try to agree on the meaning of that word and be consistent, or at least have a good excuse, because quite frankly, even if the Bill is retroactive, something to which we object, there is some urgency involved. We agree with the purpose of the Bill, but we believe that the Government should not come before the House and make us believe it is urgent, when the Bill has been before the House for four months and we were just waiting for it to be called by the Government. After all, the Government calls the Bills here, not us. We dispose of the legislation but the Government has to propose it first.

In future, I think they better not pretend the matter is urgent when it has been nearly four months since the Bill was reported back from committee, in this case the Legislative Committee on Bill C-86, where it was considered.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill and the proposed amendments—the amendments before the House that are numbered, 1, 2, 3 and 5, which have been grouped according to a decision by the Chair and which are now being considered—these amendments are of course concerned with the membership of the Board and are also aimed at changing certain aspects of the Bill dealing with conflict of interest.

And since I only have a few minutes, I would like to have the following considerations put on the record with respect to these two points.

In 1982 and 1983, certain Canadian trust companies, such as Crown Trust, Greymac Trust, Seaway Mortgage, Greymac