to the Standing Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, where they go on a fishing expedition; they inquire generally into the subject, and that is where it ends.

I am no expert on the rules; that's for sure, and I bow to Senator Grosart on that. However, it seems to me that there is a rule which says you do not discuss the same question twice in the same session. If we kill this bill through adoption of this negative motion, which is a proper motion and one which is designed to kill the bill, then that would kill the bill for the balance of this session. The Banking, Trade and Commerce Committee can study the subject, but the rules do not allow the reintroduction of a bill during the same session.

● (1500)

I do not think the Senate needs to be afraid of the Senate. This is the last institution I am afraid of. I cannot see this house getting so revolutionary that it is going to pass a bill that is going to do all of the terrible things that have been suggested, and that the Banking, Trade and Commerce Committee, of all committees of this house, is going to let this revolutionary bill, somehow or another, get out of that committee and back into the chamber, at which time the revolutionists within the Senate chamber will pass this terrible bill with all of the dire consequences that flow therefrom. I think the Senate—

Senator Flynn: Don't get excited. You are getting more excited than any one of us.

Senator Argue: That's right. I don't mind getting excited. There is nothing wrong with being excited.

Senator Grosart: Make some sense.

Senator McElman: Would the honourable senator permit a question?

Senator Argue: Certainly.

Senator McElman: If there were such a referral of the subject matter to committee, is there anything to prevent the committee from making a report and returning the bill to the house?

Senator Argue: I am subject to correction on these matters, but I would think that if we took this negative attitude it would preclude us under the rules from discussing the same type of bill in the same session.

Senator McElman: But could the committee not return the same bill to the chamber?

Senator Argue: But we would have defeated the bill if we adopted this negative motion. In any event, that is my position; that is my understanding. I do not think the question removes the validity of what I have said; namely, that this is a negative motion. And the way to handle a negative motion, if you are positively in favour of this bill, is to defeat it. I am not afraid of the bill. To my mind we could pass the principle of the bill. We could take a chance on the learned members of the Banking, Trade and Commerce Committee dealing with the bill in a fair and reasonable manner. I am sure that committee would not return to the chamber a bill that would not warrant our sympathetic and immediate consideration.

So, I am going to vote against the amendment. If the amendment is defeated, it is my intention to support the bill.

Senator Austin: Might I ask the honourable senator whether he would agree that, if the motion for second reading of the bill were adopted and the bill was referred to committee, the committee would be obligated to work on the bill and refer it back to the Senate in an improved form? That would not be the case if the bill had not received second reading.

Senator Flynn: No, no.

Senator Argue: I would think that is right, and the Banking, Trade and Commerce Committee would decide, after hearing all the evidence, whether it wished to go forward with the bill, with some necessary amendments. If the committee thought that the bill should not be proceeded with, it would refer it back to the chamber with that kind of report. In any event, the Senate will deal with the bill on third reading. If at the third reading stage I see the bill as having many objectionable features, I would not hesitate to change my vote. A bill does not become law until it has received three readings in the House of Commons, three readings in the Senate, and royal assent.

Some Hon. Senators: Question!

Senator Godfrey: Honourable senators, I should like to point out that it was not my intention, in moving this motion, to kill the bill. I spoke to the Clerk this morning to determine the effect of such a motion. I was told that it would be perfectly in order and that the committee, when it reported back, would simply request that the bill be restored to the order paper to be proceeded with. The intention is not to kill the bill. The purpose of the motion is to enable us, when we continue the debate on second reading, to know more about what the bill will look like in its final form.

Senator Grosart: Of course.

Senator Molson: Honourable senators, I raised a point of order and I should like to have it dealt with. I do not know how important it is, except that half of this discussion has been on the question of whether it is right or wrong to refer this bill to committee at this stage. In that respect, I should like to know whether or not rule 94 applies.

Senator Flynn: On the point of order, we have to decide whether it is a private or public bill. I agree it was privately initiated. About that, there is no question. However, we are not able to ascertain from the text of the bill whether this is to be a private or public institute.

If I were to rise in the Senate and request the incorporation of an insurance company, that would be a private bill. If I ask for the incorporation of a charitable organization, that, again, would be a private bill. It is only when a bill puts any obligation on the public in general that it can be a public bill.

Senator Smith (Queens-Shelburne): Oh, wait a minute!

Senator Flynn: Well, try to explain your objection. In the case of the establishment of the Canadian Development Corporation, that was done through a public bill, but with private