

know in what manner it is to be replaced. However, we should be made aware of what we are to consider this bill which has been withdrawn, the government having announced that it will redraft it. It is a strange situation, to say the least.

My second point is that, apparently, the House of Commons committee will deal with this bill, even though it has been withdrawn. How do they look upon it? Do they consider it a white paper?

Senator Hayden: May I answer your first question—

Senator Flynn: I have another point, if Senator Hayden will permit me. If I am correct, the Commons committee will deal with the bill, although it has been withdrawn, and we will deal with the same subject matter at the same time. Does that mean that we will hear the same witnesses? And how will it be determined what we will do in the Senate committee as compared to what is done in the Commons committee? In my opinion, the situation is rather complex and I would like the honourable senator to attempt to shed a little light on it.

Senator Hayden: My interpretation of what has taken place is that Bill C-42 has been reduced to the status of a white paper by the action which has been taken and—

Senator Flynn: A weak white paper.

Senator Hayden:—it is ordinary procedure for us to study the subject matter of a white paper.

Senator Flynn: A fading white paper.

Senator Hayden: So, I see no reason for concern in that regard. The committee, as appears from the notes which I read from the *Votes and Proceedings* of March 25, does indicate that it is proceeding to deal with Bill C-42. It must be on the basis that it is in the nature of a white paper, because it is no longer on the order paper as a bill.

I notice, also, that in the course of the debate, before the vote was taken and after the Speaker had commented, "The procedure is a little extraordinary, but if it is simply to allay a concern of the hon. member perhaps the minister might answer," the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs said:

Mr. Speaker, I welcome a chance to allay that particular apprehension. In the discussions I indicated we would provide a list of persons and organizations who in the past years have expressed interest, but I think the committee would probably want to issue a more general invitation.

So, obviously they are proceeding on the basis that it is a white paper. It is the only basis on which they can proceed.

Senator Flynn: It is interesting, however, that we are in an even more difficult situation than when we face a white paper. This is so because, since the minister decided to withdraw the bill, it has not been indicated that it is the intention of the minister or his department to introduce the same type of legislation. They may well have other very different ideas in mind. It seems to me that, at least, we should begin studying this bill with the minister explaining the changes he intends

making when he introduces a new bill, or even a real white paper.

Senator Hayden: There may be, and undoubtedly are, points in the bill, which is now reduced to a white paper—

Senator Flynn: Even less than that, I suggest.

Senator Hayden:—that should be considered at this stage. So far as I see the point, we have in this chamber at times approved resolutions in which we have referred the subject matter of a white paper, including the authority to study any legislation proposed to implement the proposals contained in the white paper, to a committee. So in the past we have taken authority to do two things, and the situation as I see it now is a parallel to that situation, because there is no bill. Therefore, what we are looking and—

Senator Flynn: There is no white paper, either.

Senator Hayden: We are looking at something which was a bill and which has had its status changed to that of a white paper. I do not know what else we could call it.

Senator Flynn: I do not contest the possible usefulness of either study. I am just attempting to obtain a clear indication as to what the committee will do. If it considers the no-longer-existing bill a white paper, in my mind that is not sufficient. The mere withdrawal of the bill indicates that the department and the minister have new views, so we would be operating in the dark. That is why I suggest that it would not be sufficient to take the bill as some form of white paper. We would have to start with a general statement by department officials or the minister as to the direction they now intend to take with regard to the bill which will be introduced to replace Bill C-42, in order that we know where we are going. If the minister or the department have abandoned the idea of this bill, we will be operating in a no-man's land.

Senator Hayden: If you assume, as I think you do, that the present position of the matter is that C-42 is tantamount to a white paper—

Senator Flynn: Not exactly; I do not think so.

Senator Hayden: Not exactly, but give it another name.

Senator Flynn: That is what I was attempting to suggest. How would you describe it—a green paper; a red paper?

Senator Hicks: An off-white paper.

Senator Choquette: Am I correct in assuming that in the past—

Senator Hayden: May I continue answering Senator Flynn?

Senator Choquette: I am sorry.

Senator Hayden: If it is not a white paper, it is proposals for legislation—

Senator Flynn: It is a former white paper.

Senator Hayden: We are in that position at the present time with respect to the White Paper on the Revision of Canadian Banking Legislation, because there will be a bill at some stage implementing what has been proposed. So do not call it a