

*Private Bills*

**Mr. Dupuis:** We can discuss it now since we are in committee.

**Mr. Gregoire:** I should like to point out to the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville (Mr. Dupuis) that it is quite easy to change a formula like that but it might be a good thing to know the intent of those who requested the adoption of the bill.

**Mr. Dupuis:** The mover is here, he could represent the petitioners.

**Mr. Gregoire:** Is the hon. member himself convinced that this French version is erroneous, that there is a mistake in the bill now before us?

If there is a mistake in the passage I have shown, there can be many more in the bill. That is the reason why I think it would be advisable still to refer this bill to the private bills committee to be re-examined so that, when it is before us, it will contain no errors and above all, there will be no difference between the English version and the French version.

[Text]

**Mr. Macdonald:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this bill has been before the standing committee on miscellaneous private bills not once but twice, at two separate sittings. First of all, it was called for consideration last July. At that time the sponsor of the bill agreed to adjourn consideration until the parties who appeared to oppose it could make representations with regard to it. Then it also appeared before the same committee some three or four weeks ago, perhaps longer, at which time the hon. member for Lapointe acknowledged that he was examining the bill for the first time.

I would suggest that the proper forum in which to consider it and amend the wording if it is proved defective in the French version—because I submit that it is not defective in the English version—is in committee of the whole. It makes no sense to say that the bill should receive no further consideration now but be referred back to the committee on miscellaneous private bills. This committee is the proper forum for making such technical amendments to wording as may be necessary for the purpose of giving both French and English versions of the bill the same effect. Therefore, for that reason I submit that the motion which has been moved should not be entertained.

[Translation]

**Mr. Dupuis:** Mr. Chairman, I point out that when the bill was introduced in its original form, it was in English. It is in the French translation that you find a comma, but the original presentation was made in English.

That is therefore a translation error, and if a comma must be taken off, I think we will have unanimous consent to do so. I do not see why this bill should be delayed any longer.

**Mr. Gregoire:** Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member for St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville raised an extremely important point.

When petitioners introduce a bill in the House of Commons, while it is a known fact that this house is made up of English and French members and that the country is bilingual, that bill should be introduced in both languages and necessary precautions should be taken for that purpose.

If we had all the Senate and the House of Commons bills as well as the reports in both languages, we would not know what to do with that pile of documents. That is why they are given to us in only one language. But having this bill in French, I took the trouble to check the French version. If it is a French translation rather than a French drafting, it is not enough.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette):

That the said Bill S-7, which differs in French from the English version and which is not very clear, be referred to the committee for a period of six months.

**The Chairman:** Order. The hon. member for Lapointe moved:

That the said Bill S-7, which differs in French from the English version and which is not very clear, be referred to the committee for a period of six months.

[Text]

**Some hon. Members:** Question.

**Mr. Knowles:** I do not think we should just listen to calls for the question to be put. I think it would be setting a risky precedent if this question were put. The bill is not before us. What is before us is clause 1. If the hon. member does not like the bill he can move that the committee rise.

**The Chairman:** Perhaps I should make a ruling. It is a simple one, and along the lines suggested by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I pointed out previously to the hon. member for Lapointe that every amendment had to relate to the clause under consideration. What we have under consideration now is clause 1. The proposed amendment does not refer to clause 1. It is, therefore, irrelevant and cannot be considered at this time. Perhaps I should add a citation from May, sixteenth edition page 554:

An amendment is out of order if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the bill, or if it is irrelevant to the subject matter or beyond the scope of the clause under consideration.