

Private Bills

In the committee of the whole the motion is to adopt a clause. At that stage, if an hon. member moves an amendment that the clause be deleted, it is an expanded negative. However, at the report stage there is no motion to adopt a clause and a motion to delete stands by itself; so we have an absolute motion.

What the hon. member is suggesting is not an amendment to a clause but a motion to amend or, in effect, modify the bill itself. For this reason, I respectfully suggest to the hon. member that the precedents to which he has referred are not applicable to this stage of the proceedings.

I might also say that I am worried about the possible consequence which would result from a decision that this motion is out of order. If there were three clauses to a bill and there were three motions moved by three hon. members, each one of them feeling that for good reasons the particular clauses should be deleted, the Chair would then have to rule that these three motions, having as a consequence the loss of the bill, would not be acceptable. This example would indicate that it would be very difficult to make a distinction between a motion to amend a bill which contains only one clause and a motion to amend a bill which contains two, three or more clauses. For these reasons I would be inclined to think that the motion proposed by the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) should be accepted by the Chair.

I thank hon. members for their valuable contributions. If it is felt that this interpretation of the rules results in difficulties, I suggest that hon. members who take part in the deliberations of the procedure committee should give the situation further thought. Then, the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, who plays such an important role on that committee, would be placed in a particularly strong position in advancing the views he has submitted to the house this afternoon.

In view of the proceedings with which we will be faced in a moment, is it agreed that this bill be allowed to stand for consideration?

Mr. Peters: No.

Mr. Howard: Proceed with it.

Mr. Peters: Call the bill.

Mr. Speaker: It is my understanding that the motion has been put to the house. In order to be sure that hon. members are familiar with the motion, perhaps I should repeat that the hon. member for Waterloo moved that clause 1 be deleted from the bill. Is it the

pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, I felt there was sufficient controversy without raising any more about the amendment. It is very important that we have an opportunity to debate this bill. I opposed it at the committee stage and I was perhaps the only one who objected to it at that time. I am very grateful now for the opportunity of presenting my arguments to the house.

The arguments I wish to place before Your Honour are not just arguments concerning this particular company, namely the Canada Trust Company. My arguments relate to all financial institutions in this country, and whether or not they should be granted increases in their authorized capital at this time. There is no desire on our part to single out this particular company. The bill concerning this company happens to be before the house, and is therefore the one that has to be debated. Other companies who make the same request will receive the same kind of scrutiny. We intend to raise the same kind of questions in respect of companies asking for an increase in authorized capital.

● (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Blair: Mr. Speaker, I did not raise the point of order but have spoken to it. I was quite surprised that a way was not found whereby this matter could stand over for debate. I rise now on a point of order. We are debating a bill to increase the capital of one company. I suggest, for the consideration of Your Honour, that my hon. friend is placing himself out of order immediately by saying that he does not really consider it important to speak to this measure but is speaking to the general issues. He is simply using this measure as a vehicle for the propagation of his particular views on public policy.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Don't show your annoyance.

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, I regret that the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton misinterpreted my remarks. That is the kindest way I can put it. I think it is fairly obvious that we are definitely opposed to this bill. The point I was trying to make, and I hope the hon. member appreciates it, is that we are not singling out any particular company.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to remind the hon. member that the point of