

In any case they are going to become larger, there is no question about that. If there is to be an argument made for two auditors, it should apply to those institutions as well.

Yesterday the hon. member for Malpeque said why load them with all this extra cost, and the hon. member for Mississauga South used that same argument as well. They made it sound as though having two auditors is twice as expensive as having one. I argued against that yesterday and suggested that what they are really saying is that two individual audit firms are going to go in as totally separate entities. One is going to do the same work as the other, follow along in the footsteps of the preceding one or take turns leading. They certainly do not have much faith in audit firms if they think that they are going to go in and double the work just for the fun of doing it. If that were to actually happen, it is one reason the government would want to have two audit firms. That would at least beef up the GST revenues, and goodness knows they need a lot more of that these days.

However it would not happen. There might be a nominal increase in the fee having two firms, but there is another argument they used. Something might be missed if there were two firms on the job, since one might assume that the other had covered it. Again, I dealt with that argument yesterday and said that two audit firms would sit down and plan their work. With two of them looking it over, they are more likely to cover everything. Neither member who raised concern about this matter raised the argument that I made. They did not deal with it. They did not deal with the cost. I said that the cost might be a little more, but only because there were two looking over it to make sure it was a complete audit. Neither was that argument dealt with.

• (1640)

It seems to me that I have dealt with the only arguments the member for Mississauga South and the member for Malpeque raised with respect to the tremendous increase in cost of having two and the likelihood of missing something if there are two people looking. There has been no response from either one of those members on those two arguments. It would seem to me their case in favour of reducing it to one auditor has been de-

stroyed and they have not tried to revive it. I just wonder if either one of them would like to comment on that.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The question is on the Motion No. 3G. The vote on Motion No. 3G will apply to Motion 11C.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Motions Nos. 4, 5, 11 and 12 are grouped for debate.

Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque) moved:

Motion No. 4.

That Bill C-28 be amended in Clause 347 by adding immediately after line 38 at page 191 the following:

“(3) A person who in good faith makes an oral or written communication under subsections (1) or (2) shall not be liable in any civil action arising therefrom.”

Motion No. 5.

That Bill C-28 be amended in Clause 366

(a) by striking out line 4 at page 198 and substituting the following therefor:

“366. (1) On the request of the actuary of a”;

(b) by adding immediately after line 15 at page 198 the following:

“(2) A person who in good faith makes an oral or written communication under subsection (1) shall not be liable in any civil action arising therefrom.”