

Canada Corporations Act

hon. friend knows, the board is an independent tribunal, but I am satisfied that they do consider, in the exercise of their discretion, the political position of an individual in a country for which he may be destined. On more than one occasion the board has allowed an individual to remain in Canada on the very grounds referred to by my friend in connection with Greece; the board has certainly considered that factor.

ESTABLISHMENT OF APPEAL BOARD PANEL
IN TORONTO

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the tremendous backlog of applications for landed immigrant status in Toronto, and again the tremendous backlog of cases before the Immigration Appeal Board in Ottawa, would the minister seriously consider setting up another Immigration Appeal Board in Toronto?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it is proposed in the fall to establish a panel to hear cases in Toronto, as is now the case in Montreal. This will certainly provide a more convenient service for the large number of interested persons appearing before the board, though it will not in itself fully remove the backlog or even partially remove the backlog of work facing the board.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

• (3:30 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA CORPORATIONS ACT

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CONSEQUENTIAL
AMENDMENTS

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-4, to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Before we proceed with the motions listed for consideration at the report stage of Bill C-4, may I be allowed to suggest to hon. members that there might be procedural difficulties with respect to a few of the motions which appear on the notice paper. I have in mind particularly motions 2, 3 and 5. Any decision with respect

to motion 2, would, of course, affect motion 1, which I understand is consequential. It seems to me that motion 2 is in the nature of a substantive proposal, and perhaps hon. members who have been able to understand the amendment proposed by the hon. member might like to guide the Chair in this respect. I am not making a ruling now but I would appreciate being enlightened by the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) who has proposed this motion that has caused considerable difficulty to the Chair and to the Chair's advisers.

In regard to motions 3 and 5, the difficulty, as the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) will recognize, is procedural and stems from the fact that it might well be considered that there is therein provision for a possible charge against the Crown. The hon. member must have given this matter serious thought, and probably also has some advice for the Chair.

I have been studying the other amendments closely, and to the Chair all appear to be procedurally in order, though it may well be that some members of the House may have objections to other motions to which I have not alluded. For the moment, the Chair might hear from the hon. member for Waterloo.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, the amendment we are seeking in respect of clause 38A deals with ownership. We are seeking to change the nature of the clause to make it more encompassing so that it will deal with the matter of foreign or non-resident ownership. The effect of this amendment would be to put into this section a clause which exists in the Bank Act, and in some other financial legislation, which would restrict foreign ownership in Canadian corporations generally to 25 per cent, unless any corporation is excluded by the minister. One of the clauses in the amendment would give the minister discretion to exclude any company from the provisions of the act if there should be a good and compelling reason for so doing. We think it is important that such a provision be included in the bill because, if it is not, the bill itself does not go very far and does not do too much in respect of dealing with the question of ownership. I think this is a fundamental point. The House has put this provision in other legislation in the past. Mr. Speaker, I hope you will accept the reason as offered and accept the amendment.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, on a point of