

As with the hon. member who just spoke I have no difficulty with the use of the term "natural person". It is one of those nice terms of art in the law. We all know what it means, but maybe in itself it is an argument for finding a more plain language explanation for it.

The what he calls the weasel words but what I would call the qualifications of the hon. member's colleagues reflect the fact that we are still perhaps not quite ready to entrench this principle in the statute. However, I want to compliment the member for Malpeque because I think she has put her finger on a very important issue of public policy that all of us who deal with legislation should be conscious of. I want to indicate to her that I am quite prepared to take the meaning of the amendment on advisement and work with my colleague to see whether we cannot as a matter of policy push for the use of more accessible language in the documents that are so important to Canadian people.

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in supporting this amendment. Frankly I am rather puzzled at the minister's response because basically she says she supports the spirit of the amendment but she will not move it forward by way of legislation. The fact is that plain language as a premise should be entrenched in the law. Frankly I do not think it should be the purview of only lawyers to sit down and determine what is plain language.

We are legislators who are charged with the responsibility of developing laws. My colleague, the member for Malpeque, has enshrined a very important principle, which is to advise by statute that when forms are provided by financial institutions they be in language that everybody can understand. That is simple. That is plain language. That is clear thinking and clear speaking. If the minister supports the principle she should be prepared to support the amendment and allow it to move forward. Once it has moved forward presumably the specifics of how it will be regulated can be dealt with at the regulatory stage.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

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 76(8), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mr. John R. Rodriguez (Nickel Belt) moved:

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-28 be amended by adding immediately after line 49 at page 272 the following new clause:

502. Notwithstanding anything in sections 495 to 501, no company may acquire or increase a substantial investment in

(a) a bank;

(b) a body corporate to which the Loan Companies Act or the Trust Companies Act applies; or

(c) a body corporate incorporated under the laws of a province if the activities of the body corporate are substantially similar to those of a body corporate described in paragraph (b).

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is the last opportunity to appeal to members regarding the concerns we are trying to express in this motion.

The concern we have is about the concentration of activity. In previous amendments on Bill C-4, Bill C-19 and Bill C-28, we raised our concerns about the concentration of ownership. We said that these bills, once they are enacted and are in force, will allow one of the greatest concentrations of financial activities that we have ever seen in the history of this country.

Therefore, we went back to the green paper and picked out a sliding scale of ownership that would to a large extent produce wide ownership for large financial institutions, including banks.

This motion arose from our concerns about the concentration of activity. Therefore, we put into this motion an amendment that will prevent insurance companies