

Private Bills

all the circumstances surrounding the situation that exists and the situation the bill aims to correct.

We agree with the hon. member who introduced the measure that the bill should go before the banking and commerce committee. This committee would have the opportunity to call witnesses and hear evidence and obtain the views of the witnesses for or against the bill. In this committee there would be an opportunity to call officials of the appropriate departments of government to give information as to the effect this measure would have in achieving the objectives outlined by the hon. member who introduced the bill.

It is a complex subject, and its many ramifications want a thorough study, in the opinion of this group. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard):

That this bill be not now read a second time but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the standing committee on banking and commerce.

Mr. J. A. Habel (Cochrane): Before the question is put, Mr. Speaker, I would say I have no doubt in my mind of the sincerity of the intention of the hon. member who introduced the bill. I represent a riding which has a large investment of United States capital, for which we are very thankful indeed. My riding contains an industry which provides employment in the whole district, for which I am thankful. It seems to me that this bill is being introduced at a very bad time. In fact, if one just thinks of the happenings of a few days ago one recalls that two ministers of the present government went to the United States to meet the new administration down there to try to sell more oil in that country. The more we talk about preventing the United States selling or investing in this country the more harmful it will be to good understanding between the two neighbouring countries.

I hold in my hand a number of clippings. I will not mention them all; but only a few things in connection with them. I have a clipping from the *Ottawa Citizen* dated January 25, 1961, and the heading of the article is:

Bark of Canada worse than bite.—U.S. Investors.

I find the following in the article:

Most expressed annoyance, not alarm. They feel that the move will not hit their present holdings too hard, but they might be reluctant to invest further in Canadian plants if they are to be singled out by the tax collectors.

This indicates how careful we should be when we are dealing with our neighbour.

[Mr. Herridge.]

I have a clipping from the *Montreal Gazette*, dated January 26, which reads in part as follows:

Canada's trade relations with the United Kingdom have reached a critical point where imports from the U.K. may be restricted by measures designed to solve other problems.

This goes to show that if on the one hand we are to lose the United Kingdom market it would be wise for the present government to consider our neighbour's market. As I said a moment ago, a delegation went to the United States to try to bolster our oil sales to the United States.

Regardless of what my good friend in the C.C.F. party who just preceded me had to say about our being more or less silent, I think I can speak on behalf of the official opposition and say it was simply a case of giving way to the hon. member because it was understood that I was going to speak on this matter. I thought it was my duty and also the duty of the official opposition to make our position quite clear about the whole matter.

I should like to refer to an editorial in our local newspaper, the *Timmins Press* of January 25, which is headed, "What Is Our Trade Policy?" If I try to link trade policy with the bill, Mr. Speaker, it is because we must be careful if we want to find markets in which to sell our own goods. The first paragraph of the editorial reads as follows:

In any discussion of worsening relations between Canada and the United States, the Diefenbaker government must be regarded as the chief sinner.

The last paragraph reads as follows:

What they are concerned about—or should be—is the development of our business and industry. The vacillating and self-contradictory position of the government has puzzled United States investors. Perhaps it may force Canada to go it alone economically at a time when more investments are vital to our continued economic growth.

So, Mr. Speaker, although the bill may have been presented in all earnestness and sincerity, I think this is a matter that should be dealt with, very carefully; and we should seek to understand what would be the result of such a move with respect to our trade with other countries.

I also noted that the sponsor of the bill stated there was a clause in it providing that the governor in council may, when it is found to be in the interests of the public, exempt any group or class of goods. What is the use of having such a bill if it has a clause in it stating that the governor in council can do whatever he likes? It means that the bill will be absolutely useless. In the explanation of that clause it is stated that group exemption regulations become invalid if not approved by the house in 30 days. What would happen if