

since and today his invention is spread throughout the world. We are grateful to him for that.

I would like us to do the same in other fields, even in the financial or monetary field. This coming year—and that is only a suggestion on my part—I feel that while reviewing bank legislation, committees should take as much time as needed to scrutinize all financial operations to see if it would not be possible to improve the banking system. I am sure that bankers themselves would agree with Parliament to amend section 72 of the law so as to remove that power which reaches beyond Parliament and which makes it possible to establish and create a monetary system which runs parallel to that of the state, to that of the people of Canada, which falls under the jurisdiction of Parliament and which would be one of the responsibilities of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Macdonald). Mr. Speaker, at the rate things are going we are bound to have a superpower type of system.

● (1710)

This is the power of finance over Parliament, over the judicial power, where we are dominated by four powers: finance, Parliament, the executive and the judiciary—and I would add a fourth one, the power of the press or of the media that gives people the information they want to give and this power is in the hands of the economic dictatorship.

Let us lift up the veil and try to find out who are the real owners of the big newspapers, of the privately owned radio and television stations. Let us try to find out and we will soon come upon all the same people we find in finance; because they have the monetary power, the financial power, they can also establish a press power which is serving their own interest. In spite of the willingness of reporters who are trying to give impartial information to the public, the owners of these big media employ people to censure the news they get and let through the news which will serve the interest of the economic and financial dictatorship, and people increasingly lose interest in public matters, because they cannot find anything in there that can truly and efficiently inform them.

Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday Parliament had the pleasure of being visited by a group of students, boys and girls of 16 to 18, from every province in Canada. Someone responsible, whom I thank, organized a meeting in Room 200 with those students and one representative of each of the political parties represented in the House. We went to meet them and they put the following question to us: Does Parliament control the administration of Canada? Those young people wanted to know that, unmindful of political considerations.

The four hon. members recognized that, unfortunately, the Canadian Parliament does not in fact control the administration of our country because it is asked to pass bills which are not, generally, initiated by Parliament. Cabinet introduces them at the request of advisers placed at its service. Then Parliament is asked to either pass or reject them. But, as the majority decides, usually the bills are accepted by the majority. Further down the line, the executive council has all it takes to implement the will of Parliament, to be answerable to it and

Continental Bank of Canada

to make it responsible. I say no to that. So, we agreed on that, since it is impossible. Let us put any minister, with the best of intentions in the world, at the head of a department such as transport, for instance, where he has to manage the fields of communications, air transport, water transport, etc. How can one man alone possibly supervise efficiently the administration of so vast a spectrum? It is impossible. That is why we say that Parliament does not control its administration. Answers which seemed relevant were given. My colleague, the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Symes) will certainly corroborate this and the young people asked quite intelligent questions. They want to know what Parliament is, what the members and the ministers do. I was glad to spend two hours with those young people. I am sure of one thing, that is they left Ottawa convinced that they had learned something during their short stay. I therefore invite all my colleagues in the House to provide information to our youngsters. The truth should not be concealed even about money matters. They know where the dollar comes from, who creates it, what is its role in the world, how it ends and why it exists.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after all those considerations, of course I do not want to give the impression in Parliament that the fact that I systematically object to the passage of that bill will solve the problem in Canada. Absolutely not. I am not that naive, but I would like to establish quite clearly that I do not believe that even 20 members would considerably alter the system. They would merely divide the profit in 20 shares instead of—

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his allotted time has expired.

● (1720)

Mr. John Rodriguez (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few remarks about this bill. I shall be brief. I am reminded of the comments which were made last Thursday when we were discussing a private members' bill concerning the Bell Telephone company. At that time an interjection was made on a point of order regretting, in effect, that there was no means of providing, in private members' hour, the application of Standing Order 75A or 75B—in other words, closure—on the ground that it was not fair to companies to put them through this process. But here, today, we see the results of what I believe to be one of the finest examinations of a bill to have taken place in private members' hour.

When this bill came before parliament the NDP took serious objection to it, first because it originated in the other place among the corporate retirees and then wound its way into the House through a private member, the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid). We objected, also, to the manner in which interlocking directorships would continue the financial arrangements between the IAC and the Continental Bank. We felt it was certainly an exception to the Bank Act. The government promised revisions to the Bank Act, but that has all been forgotten now, thrown out of the window. We felt it was unfair to deal with corporations such as IAC outside the framework of the Bank Act, that we would shortly see