

Mr. Trudeau, seconded by Mr. Sharp, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-38, An Act respecting the office of the Secretary to the Cabinet for Federal-Provincial Relations and respecting the Clerk of the Privy Council, which was read the first time and ordered to be printed and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The text of the Message and Recommendation of the Administrator pursuant to Standing Order 62(2) in relation to the foregoing Bill is as follows:

His Excellency the Administrator recommends to the House of Commons a measure to provide for the appointment of a Secretary to the Cabinet for Federal-Provincial Relations.

The following Bill from the Senate was read the first time and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House:

Bill S-16, An Act to revise references to the Court of Queen's Bench of the Province of Quebec.—*Mr. Lang.*

The Order being read for the consideration of the report stage of Bill C-14, An Act to incorporate the Federal Business Development Bank, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs;

Motion numbered 1, standing in the name of the honourable Member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick) having been called, as follows:

That Bill C-14, An Act to incorporate the Federal Business Development Bank, be amended in Sub-clause 2(1) by inserting therein, next after line 8 on page 1, the following definition:

“‘business enterprise in Canada’ means an enterprise carried on in Canada in anticipation of profit by

(a) a person who is

(i) a Canadian citizen,

(ii) a landed immigrant within the meaning of the *Immigration Act* ordinarily resident in Canada other than a landed immigrant who has been eligible to apply for Canadian citizenship for more than one year, or

(iii) a British subject who has not ceased to be ordinarily resident in Canada since the twenty-fifth day of June, 1967, or

(b) a corporation incorporated in Canada with or without share capital, a co-operative or partnership, that is not less than fifty-one per cent beneficially owned, directly or indirectly, by a person or persons described in paragraph (a);”.

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick) has on the Order Paper an amendment at this stage of the Bill pertaining to the definition clause. I am sure that the honourable Member is aware of the fact that the Chair has some very grave reservations about the procedural regularity of the amendment. However, in view of the fact that the amendment would appear to add a totally new clause to the definition section which in turn would add a totally new principle or concept to the application of the Bill as a whole, and therefore would offend a couple of basic rules pertinent to amendments even at this stage, I would not want to make a final ruling without giving the honourable Member an opportunity to defend his amendment from a procedural point of view. It seems to me that an amendment which adds to the definition section of a Bill, a definition which was not contemplated in the original drafting of the Bill, which thereby seeks not simply to clarify the definition section but to limit the application of the Bill to the kind of activity that is defined by the proposed amendment, would go not only beyond the scope of the clause which is under consideration but would probably be outside the principle and scope of the Bill itself. Under those circumstances, I have grave reservations about the amendment, but I will be pleased to hear from any honourable Member who might want to contribute to the procedural point before we go on.

— — — — —

It may be suggested that we reserve the consideration of this amendment and proceed to the consideration of two others that will be before us, if the honourable Member wants some time to prepare himself to defend its procedural aspects.

— — — — —

I thank the honourable Member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) for his contribution. I propose to hear other honourable Members in order to clarify my difficulty. I wonder if honourable Members in contributing to the point might also direct themselves not only to the question, as they have, of whether the proposed amendment goes contrary to the basic principle of the Bill. In other words, by establishing that the application of the Bill would be restricted to strictly Canadian corporations, as it were, as opposed to having a wide open application which was the original intention, but in addition to that basic problem as to whether or not, even accepting that that is permissible and I have some doubt there, but even accepting that, going on to the point as to whether it is proper to endeavour to do that by a change in the definition section. What is happening here it seems to me is that by changing the definition section an attempt is being made to make a very important substantive change to the basic principle of the legislation itself. Surely that is not the basic nature of the definition section. That change, if it is to be made by way of an amendment, ought really to be put forward, it seems to me, in the form of a very substantive amendment to the basic principle of the Bill