

third report, and there is nothing in the third report which says that it is conditional upon what is in the second report.

I do not want to go on for a long time in an attempt to prevent the Chair from doing something it wants to do, but somehow we are getting into an order that is not before us, and that is irregular. No member of the House at this moment is trying to do anything that is out of order, but if a member were to try to move concurrence in the second report, then I certainly think that the Chair would have to rule on that.

Mr. Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I ask Your Honour to reserve judgment. We will have some material showing that it is not a precedent in requesting that the \$200,000 payment be left in abeyance. We will have some material prepared for Monday, and if you will allow us to present it before you make a final judgment on the motion, we would appreciate it.

Mr. Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, I rise to say how much I agree with what my colleague to my left has said. I do not understand why the chairman of the committee is talking about the \$200,000, which has nothing to do with what is before the House today. We have before us a private member's bill set down at report stage and for third reading, and the House agreed to get the bill through. There is a real need for passage of this legislation in my province so that this company can obtain further capital.

As I say, I cannot understand why this topic is now raised; it deals with a report from the committee that is not before the House, a totally separate matter. Certainly the bill is not contingent upon the \$200,000 fee that we have been talking about. I hope the Chair will allow the House to continue with the report stage and third reading of the bill so that we can pass it today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I see the point made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I am advised that before we can even dispose of Bill S-11, the fees have to be paid. We have a report of a committee, giving direction that a certain sum of money be held in abeyance. This is why the Chair feels this would be the time to make a decision as to the acceptability or legality of this report of the committee, and that is what I was about to do.

If the hon. member insists that I do not do this, then I am ready to proceed with consideration of the report stage of Bill S-11. Of course, the hon. member will argue with me that the second report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, not being before the House at this time, cannot be recognized as a decision of the House as such and that it does not prevent these fees being paid. If that is the interpretation, then I am ready to look into the matter and perhaps bring it back tomorrow before orders of the day. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Now that I have decided to hold this whole matter in abeyance and perhaps bring it back tomorrow after examining it more deeply, I think the House should proceed immediately with consideration of the report stage of Bill S-11.

B.C. Telephone

[Translation]

Order. Before proceeding with the study of the motion of amendment moved by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) and even agreeing to broaching it, I feel I should draw the attention of hon. members precisely to that amendment which, according to the Chair, falls completely outside the scope of the bill before the House. The motion of the hon. member is, to my mind, out of order, first of all because it adds a new clause to Bill S-11. In fact, through his amendment to Bill S-11, the hon. member is attempting to reach the main act governing the company which has already been incorporated, and his amendment is contrary to Standing Order 105 in that it seeks to alter Bill S-11 which itself seeks to amend the act. I doubt very much that such an amendment is in order. I should like to invite hon. members to comment on this point.

[English]

In my opinion, by this amendment the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) is trying to reach the main act of this corporation by changing the name of the corporation, a matter not contained in the bill at this time. However, I am ready to invite comments from the hon. member before making a decision.

[Translation]

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Speaker, you pointed out an irregularity in my amendment by saying that the first introductory lines, instead of reading as follows:

That Bill S-11, An Act respecting British Columbia Telephone Company, be amended by adding immediately after line 9 at page 8, the following new Clause:

You are quite right to remind me that instead of section 25 of chapter 66, I should have written: "to add a clause to Bill S-11".

[English]

The way I am presenting my motion is this. I am amending the law of 1916 by adding a clause to Bill S-11, so the preliminary notes have, of course, to be changed. With regard to the history of the amendment I am presenting, I made a suggestion at the committee hearings to the company, namely, that in the French version of the act—

[Translation]

—the French version uses the name "La Compagnie de Téléphone de la Colombie-Britannique".

[English]

Members of all parties who were there were sympathetic to the idea, the representative of the company was sympathetic to the idea, and earlier this week I received a letter from the company in which it says:

● (1720)

... I am enclosing clause for proposal as an amendment... which you have kindly stated that you would be prepared to introduce at the report stage in the House of Commons.

This was done with the mutual consent of every member of the committee. At that time we said we would consult as to how this should be done, and the company got in touch with the clerk of the committee and indicated it would be prepared to propose another clause which would be to the effect that the company may use, as the French form of its name, in the transaction of business and its