

clause of the bill it seeks to amend or anticipate on those which might be moved in the standing committee that will consider the said bill.

As indicated in citation 382 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, a member may, at the second reading stage, move a declaratory resolution of some principle adverse to those of the bill. Such is not the case here.

Citation 381 of the same author reads as follows:

On the motion for the second reading, it is out of order to discuss the clauses of the Bill.

Similar restrictions can be found in citations 388 and 389 of the same volume.

Therefore, for the reasons I have given, with the co-operation of my colleagues, I regret to say that the amendment moved by the honourable Member is out of order and unacceptable at this stage of debate on the bill.

---

[At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)]

(Private Bills)

The Order being read for the consideration of Bill S-6, An Act respecting The Canada Trust Company as reported without amendment, from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs;

Mr. Saltsman, seconded by Mr. Peters, moved to amend the said bill as follows:

That Clause 1 be deleted.

And a point of order having been raised by the honourable Member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) with regard to the said motion;

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

MR. SPEAKER: There are considerations which the Chair cannot overlook, in particular the very words used in the Standing Order which indicate clearly that an honourable Member may do certain things at this stage of the proceedings, one of which is to move the deletion of a clause.

If the committee did not think this should apply to a bill which has only one clause it seems to me this should have been spelled out in some way by words or explanations. If the honourable Member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) thinks that was not what was contemplated by the committee, this should be looked into. At this time we are trying to interpret the rules to the best of our joint abilities, by putting our heads together to decide in what way these rules can be interpreted reasonably. I see no possibility of interpreting this rule in any other way than what it clearly suggests.

The honourable Member has cited a number of interesting quotations from Beauchesne's and May's, but it is my understanding that the citations were based on precedents which did not occur at the same stage of consideration of a bill. That is my understanding of the citations from Beauchesne's and May's.

I should like honourable Members to consider this citation from May's seventeenth edition at page 566, dealing with a Report Stage which is substantially the same as we have under our new rules: "Amendments are moved to the bill, not to a particular clause, and amendments to leave out a clause,