

provides under Clause 5 that "Section 4 shall be deemed to have come into force on February 1, 1986".

Mr. Speaker, that is almost five months ago. The amendment introduced by my colleague for Trinity (Miss Nicholson) is merely aimed at amending the Act to read, like all other pieces of legislation, that this Bill will be deemed—that the effective date shall be: "5. Section 4 shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation".

This by the way is being consistently done in this House, when the Government acts responsibly and normally.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we oppose such retroactivity and we feel the Government should provide explanations. This House has still to hear explanations; it has not been told why they waited for so long. We did not prevent the Bill from going through. We have had a very responsible approach to this debate. Second reading stage lasted one day; committee proceedings took hardly one day for preparation and another day for debate. But since that time, nothing was heard from the Government. However, the Minister comes in this House and suggests this is urgent. Well, this will be all, but the Government should understand that retroactivity should not become a habit.

• (1650)

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The question is on the motion standing in the name of Miss Nicholson.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to Standing Order 114(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at the report stage of the Bill now before the House. Call in the Members.

• (1720)

And the division bells having rung:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The first question is on Motion No. 1.

Mr. Ian Deans (for Mr. de Jong) moved:

Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-86, be amended in Clause 1 by striking out lines 16 to 18 at page 1 and substituting the following therefor:

"intendent of Insurance, the Inspector General of Banks and the Deputy Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs; and

(c) not more than three other members".

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Deans for Mr. de Jong) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 260)

YEAS

Members

Althouse
Angus
Axworthy
Benjamin
Blaikie
Boudria
Broadbent
Copps
Deans
Fulton
Gagliano

Gauthier
Gray
(Windsor West)
Guilbault
(Saint-Jacques)
Jewett
Langdon
Malépart
McCurdy

McDonald
(Broadview-
Greenwood)
Nicholson
(Trinity)
Nystrom
Orlikow
Ouellet
Penner
Waddell
Young—26.

NAYS

Members

Blackburn
(Jonquière)
Bourgault
Brightwell
Browes
Cadieux
Chartrand
Comeau
Cook
Cooper
Cossitt
Côté
(Lac-Saint-Jean)
Crofton
Daubney
de Cotret
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Fennell
Ferland
Fontaine
Forrestall
Fraleigh
Fretz
Gagnon
Gass
Gormley
Gottselig

Gray
(Bonaventure-Îles-de-
la-Madeleine)
Guilbault
(Drummond)
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
Hawkes
Hnatyshyn
Hockin
Horner
Howie
Hudon
Jardine
Jourdenais
Kempling
Kindy
Lewis
Mantha
Marin
Masse
Mayer
McCain
McDermid
McKnight
Merrithew
Nickerson
Nielsen
Oberle

Pennock
Peterson
Pietz
Plourde
Porter
Ravis
Redway
Reid
Reimer
St. Germain
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scowen
Thacker
Towers
Tremblay
(Québec-Est)
Tremblay
(Lotbinière)
Valcourt
Vankoughnet
Vincent
Warner
Wilson
(Swift Current-
Maple Creek)
Winegard
Wise
Witer—78.

• (1730)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe it might be possible, if you were to seek the consent of the House, to have the vote just taken applied to Motions Nos. 2, 3, and 5.