

went to the heart of the bill, quite successfully utilizing what is now Standing Order 109 in order to block the amendment, as he quite properly was entitled to do. This is quite a meaningful amendment, but Standing Order 109 says that no important amendment may be proposed to any private bill in the House unless one day's notice of the same has been given. I also draw to the attention of the House Standing Order 116 which provides:

Except as herein otherwise provided, the Standing Orders relating to public bills shall apply to private bills.

However, our Standing Orders do apply with regard to amendments to private bills; therefore, Standing Order 116 is exhausted and cannot be used to bring in Standing Order 75(5), which apparently someone thinks is the procedure. What we have before us is a committee report and the motion should be as to the acceptance of that committee report with any rights of debate or amendment, which I do not think exist, at that time for the adoption or the rejection of the report. What the hon. member is trying to do indirectly, he cannot do directly: he is trying to kill the bill.

● (1710)

An hon. Member: Oh, no!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): He is trying to kill the bill, because his second amendment deletes any reference to provisional directors, which is required under the Bank Act. He moves to delete the whole of clause 2(2) which names by reference the provisional directors and a number of other things. I suggest that the only avenue open to the hon. member is not putting down those amendments, but to vote against the motion to adopt the report, and at a latter stage, at third reading—if we reach that—then the hon. member is limited to third reading amendments and recommitment with a recommendation. Then he can draw up all the amendments he wants.

Mr. Peters: Why do we have report stage, then?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The hon. member asks why we have report stage, but he is confusing it with the procedure on public bills. Our rule book has particularly divided chapters, some dealing with public bills and some distinctly with private bills. I ask, why proceed, under public bills, with a private bill? My final argument is that if we are proceeding with a private bill under the public bills section, then the government should adopt the bill because public bills, if they are of this nature, and government bills should appear under government orders, not in the Thursday afternoon slot every second week. This is the point I want to have clarified.

It has been pointed out to me that there have been previous occasions on which a private bill has been proceeded with under the report stage procedure. That was Bill S-7, in February, 1969; and Bill S-6, on February 13, 1969, to which the same hon. member put down an amendment that clause 1 of the said bill be deleted. I recall the incident, Mr. Speaker. It was soon after this new procedure had been adopted. With the greatest respect, the Table and the Chair misled themselves in that the bill in each case was a one-clause bill, as I recall it. One was providing a French name for the Canada Trust Company, and the

Continental Bank of Canada

other concerned its affiliate, the Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation. Those amendments were put down in the name of the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Seconded by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters).

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): There was one reason why the amendment should not have been accepted. The amendment was an expanded negative. The alternative was to vote against the bill, because deleting the one and only clause in the bill was, of course, negating the bill. It was an expanded negative and should not have been accepted. I say, with the greatest respect, if this is to be the principal precedent on which this present procedure is founded, then it is extremely thin ice on which to walk. I think it must be established once and for all that there are rules for public bills and rules for private bills. Each must be respected and they must not be confounded. With the greatest respect to all, sir, it is my view that they have been terribly confounded on this particular occasion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before hearing the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) I want to be clear that we are not dealing with an argument about the individual motions themselves, which were referred to by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) in his presentation, as attempting to do indirectly what the hon. member could not do directly; that is to say, indicating they were in fact negating the provisions of the bill rather than voting against it.

That may be an argument when the House moves to individual motions, but I take it that is not the point at this moment. The procedure which is being proposed by placing the motions in the name of the hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge (Mr. Saltsman) on the order paper pursuant to Standing Order 75(5) is the procedure used in public bills for report stage after consideration by committee. The point made by the hon. member for Edmonton West is that that procedure ought to be followed on public bills and not on private bills.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, even though I disagree with the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), I appreciate the clear way in which he has stated his case and I appreciate also the fact that he has forced us to consider the very point that Your Honour has now identified. At this point the hon. member for Edmonton West is trying to argue that it is not open to a member of this House to put down report stage amendments to private bills. I disagree with him thoroughly and I thank him for drawing attention to the Standing Orders and citations and precedents—which I think are on my side of the argument rather than his.

As for the argument that Standing Order 75 is in chapter 13 of the book which is headed proceedings on public bills and that therefore you cannot use any of the rules or rights in that chapter on private bills, may I point out there are all kinds of rules all though the book that are not repeated in the chapter on private bills. There is no repetition of the rule about 20-minute speeches, voting procedures or any of those things. They do not need to be repeated. As a matter of fact, I do not think the chapter headings can be used to any great extent at all as to what is meant. The very