

Private Bills

principle may be, this amendment in application to this company is discriminatory. If the group who have brought in the amendment were sincere in this request they would have raised the matter in committee. Certain questions were raised but not with respect to all the directors. At that time the sponsor would have been able to provide an answer concerning whether or not there would be objection. He is now unable to obtain that information and is not in a position to give an answer.

Mr. Winch: Will they object to this?

Mr. Morton: I assure the hon. gentleman I have no objection to the general principle but I object to this attempt to discriminate against one company that happens to come before the house at a particular time. I believe it is wrong to apply against one company a general principle not applicable to all similar companies. I do not think the committee should be put in the unreasonable position of acting in the arbitrary fashion suggested.

Mr. Winch: Will the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Morton: Certainly.

Mr. Winch: This company has to come before the House of Commons to get this authority. Am I not correct in saying they could have gone before the legislature of Manitoba and obtained the same authority?

Mr. Morton: If the hon. gentleman will recall the answer that was given, it was a matter of policy that they should be required to come before parliament in order that there should be more control over companies of this type. I think the company has every right to come to the house and be given the same treatment as any other company that comes before us.

Mr. Winch: Could they not have obtained the same authority under an act of the Manitoba legislature?

Mr. Morton: Technically, no. They could have obtained authority to act within the province of Manitoba but if they wish to go outside the province, as they may wish to do, they would require a federal charter.

Mr. Winch: Where is authority for that statement to be found?

Mr. Morton: It is a matter of jurisdiction.

Mr. Smith (Winnipeg North): I believe the hon. member for Peterborough, who can correct me if I am wrong, mentioned something to the effect that this amendment would ensure Canadian control of this company and that these people would desire this amendment. May I say to the hon. gentleman that

these people are, have been and always will be Canadians. Anything they can do in this business will be, and anything they have done in any other business has been for the benefit not only of the city of Winnipeg and province of Manitoba but every Canadian in this country; and this will continue to be so. The hon. member need have no worry about that.

Mr. Howard: The emotionalism exhibited by the hon. member for Davenport and the sponsor of the bill indicates they are on the wrong track. This amendment has nothing to do with the individuals concerned.

Mr. McCleave: It is anti-Semitism.

Mr. Howard: The sponsor said they are Canadians, which is fine and dandy. We are concerned with the principle that the directors at all times should be Canadian citizens.

Mr. Macdonnell: Would the hon. member not agree that the principle of the amendment has everything to do with them?

Mr. Howard: It would if they were not Canadian citizens. It would mean they could not be on the board of directors. These are the directors of the company. They are fine, outstanding Canadian citizens and there is no argument about that at all. We say that the directors at all times should be Canadian citizens ordinarily resident in Canada. It will apply to these directors as long as they are directors, and it will also apply to the company and future directors. The emotionalism displayed by the two hon. gentlemen about the individuals concerned reveals they are on the wrong track. This is not a discriminatory approach as the hon. member for Davenport indicated.

We have only one bill before us, which is all we can deal with. We draw a distinction between this bill and the next with respect to which we propose to move exactly the same amendment. We can deal only with the bill before us. If that is discrimination, every hon. member discriminates when he participates in any debate on the measure then before the house.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North did not answer the question of the hon. member for Peterborough. Would he be prepared to accept an amendment which would say the majority of directors shall be Canadian citizens if the present amendment is so objectionable?

Amendment (Mr. Howard) negatived: Yeas, 4; nays, 30.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, we believe this is an important principle.

The Chairman: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but it is now six o'clock.