

*Canada Corporations Act*

made by five shareholders or more. I should like to be satisfied with the interpretation to be put on this part. I want combinations. It may be that the minister would find that one or more of the complaining shareholders is a citizen of substance residing in Canada, and from him no security for costs would be required. However, others might be residents of foreign countries or in other provinces and they may not be citizens of substance, so in their case there may be a necessity for obtaining security for costs. The purpose of this amendment is to dot the "i's" and cross the "t's". That is about all there is to it, because we want to make absolutely clear that the choice of the minister would be exercised and that there would not be a case of "any and/or shareholders". The amendment seeks to clear this matter up.

**Mr. Basford:** Mr. Speaker, while I am not entirely sure the amendment is needed, because I think the wording of Bill C-4 probably covers the situation the hon. member refers to, I may say that if there is any doubt I will be quite happy to accept the amendment. That of course, is characteristic of this government. When we receive good ideas from across the floor we are happy to accept them in the spirit of co-operation.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the House ready for the question?

Motion No. 4 (Mr. Lambert) agreed to.

**Mr. Lambert:** Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of privilege that has nothing to do with the minister. It relates to the holding of the debate on the report stage of this bill this afternoon. As the minister knows, there were 19 sittings in committee with regard to this bill. We heard witnesses from 17 organizations as well as individuals, plus the minister, the deputy minister, his assistant, the deputy minister for corporate affairs and the director of corporations. They appeared before the committee on numerous occasions. What I wish to say to Your Honour now will not entail any kind of disparagement of hon. members in the House at the present time. This is a highly technical bill. The House is being asked in some instances to express itself on certain amendments. As debate continues, it will have to express itself on other amendments that are more contentious than the ones which have been put forward up to now. Why has this debate been scheduled for today when there is full knowledge that the finance committee in another place will hold

three sittings today. That is a very grave matter. The members who were present at the committee hearings have studied this matter in great detail. I suggest that very few members of this House have read the proceedings of the committee. They are very extensive.

• (4:10 p.m.)

My point of privilege is that the scheduling of this debate is a discourtesy to this House and also to the witnesses who are appearing before the finance committee. The representatives of national organizations, major corporations, etc., in many cases have to travel a very long distance in order to appear before the committee. The committee today has to limit itself to less than a corporal's guard to receive and question these witnesses. This points out a very serious problem. Your Honour alluded to it yesterday.

There are nine committees holding 19 sittings today. On Tuesday last, ten committees held 25 sittings. One committee had three sittings on that day, yet the legislation called for discussion in this House was legislation dealt with by that committee. I am referring to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. On that day someone counted 26 members in this chamber. I say that is a discourtesy to this House.

I did not see any government members in attendance today at that committee at any time as committee members, although periodically one member present did come in to ask questions. The hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie), the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) and the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) attended that committee. There is not one member on the government side who was present at those committee discussions. That is an odd situation. It seems to be an ill-disguised attempt to get legislation through by default or by steamroller because members are required to be present in two places at the same time.

I am not complaining to the minister because he has no control over this. I am not complaining to the Chair. I wish to point out the difficulty that has arisen which is one that is sundering the efficacy of the committee system in studying legislation.

**Mr. Basford:** There are several things that surprise me, Mr. Speaker. I want to say that the business of the House is arranged through consultation with the government house leader and house leaders of other parties. It