

*Private Bills*

heard in the committee and in view of this most strange coincidence of these two bills coming in from the same city, dealing with the same business and the same family, there ought not to be any objection to a clause which says that all directors of the companies shall be Canadian citizens.

**Mr. Brunsdon:** On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Vancouver East insists on discussing in connection with this bill another bill which has not yet been introduced in the house and I respectfully suggest that in so doing he is completely out of order.

**Mr. Winch:** I respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that when we have a bill before us, and one which is to follow identical in terms and having to do with the same business and the same family, changing only the names, I am completely in order in saying that in discussing the one bill we are at liberty to consider how it is related to the other.

**The Chairman:** On that point of order, I believe the hon. member for Vancouver East is using Bill No. S-10 only as a basis for comparison for discussing matters which come under the amendment being considered. As long as he does not get into the principle or the details of the other bill I think he would be in order.

**Mr. Pitman:** I should like to say a few words on this amendment. It seems to me that we have spent a great deal of time in the last few days talking about ownership. The whole tenor of the argument used by the Minister of Justice was that we were seeking to secure information and that as a result of obtaining this information we would be able to ascertain the extent of foreign control over the various business enterprises which we have in Canada. Although this is not the kind of company which would come under the disclosure bill which we have passed, and which this group vigorously opposed at some points, the Minister of Justice indicated nevertheless that this kind of information would be sought from companies which came under other types of legislation, banks, transportation companies and so on. The whole intent was to convince this house that this was an important first step toward understanding the nature of our economy in order that no more foreign control would take place.

I was interested in the argument of the hon. member for Winnipeg North when he said that if we voted for this kind of amendment whereby we tried to determine that Canadian directors would be in control of this particular company this would be a very dangerous thing, because possibly the United

[Mr. Winch.]

States would demand that the same thing be done. If we follow this argument logically it completely destroys the proposition which the Minister of Justice was putting before us last week during the discussion of the disclosure bill. He gave us to believe that legislation would follow this bill and that once we had determined the extent of this control we would take measures to try to handle it. If we follow the reasoning put forward in the discussion of this bill it negates every concept which the Minister of Justice was putting before us last week.

We are not trying to be perverse in the discussion of this seemingly small and unimportant piece of legislation, in the eyes of many members of the house. We are trying to adopt the principle which this government has placed before us and which we agree with. Our whole attitude toward the disclosure bill was not that this was undesirable in itself but that the bill would not do what it purported to do—that it was not going far enough. Most of the speeches we made during the discussion of that bill in committee were to the effect that we already had a tremendous amount of information from the dominion bureau of statistics as to the extent of foreign control over our enterprises—92 per cent over the rubber industry, 65 per cent in certain areas of secondary manufacturing, and so on. The whole suggestion was that once we had more information under this bill we would do something about it. We said we already had information over some 30 years and unless the government was going to prove by some piece of action that it was going to do something we were unconvinced.

Last year there was a long and rigorous discussion having to do with Aurora pipe lines before it was finally incorporated, and we tried to encourage Canadian ownership and Canadian directors there. I wonder if the hon. member for Winnipeg North would be willing to accept another kind of amendment, an amendment which stated that the majority of the directors of the Brock Acceptance Company should be Canadian. This, surely, is not one which could possibly be looked upon with disfavour by anyone. We in this corner believe implicitly in what the hon. member said, that this is a respectable and forward-looking group in Winnipeg which is going to do something for the financial stature of that community. We accept this. But surely he would not be unwilling to agree that the majority of the directors of the firm should be Canadians.

**Mr. Morton:** Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that this amendment is brought forward at this date. No matter how valid the general premise may be or how worthy the general