

Mr. STENSON: I am in agreement with the last speaker and with the several speakers who have spoken. Being English-speaking myself I would suggest that maybe we could put a subamendment that two thirds of these people be English-speaking.

Mr. TARDIF: If you do that, it would have the same effect as doing nothing.

Mr. REGAN: What about the Irish?

Mr. MACKASEY: I did not want to speak for the second time, but I have to say this: I think we are all agreed, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Caron and myself and anybody who has spoken, that there should be and there must be representation from French Canada on the board of directors of the new company. However, I think we are approaching it from different aspects. I would hope the motivation for appointing these French Canadians on the board of directors would be one of intelligence on the part of those who are naming them, and a recognition of the dual cultures of this country. We are being called upon to vote on a "when do you beat your wife and when do you stop beating your wife" question. If we vote against the amendment, it can quite easily be interpreted as a vote against French Canadian participation on the board of directors, which is not the intention of those who would vote against it.

I will emphasize once again, in the hope that I am not misunderstood, that I desire and I think it is absolutely necessary that there be French participation on this board of directors, but the motivation for the appointment should be intelligence and enlightenment on the part of those who are picking them and not prejudgment on our part that they do not intend to do so, and therefore that we must do so by legislation which we propose in the amendment.

*(Translation)*

Mr. CANTIN: You did not understand what I said. I meant that I am definitely in favour of French Canadian participation on the board of the company, but I object to the method suggested here and I share the opinion of those who believe we should recommend it and stop at that. After that we should watch the matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Beaulé.

Mr. BEAULÉ: Mr. Chairman, there are several representatives of the two railway companies here today. I think that following today's meeting they should make the recommendation to the two companies concerned, and when we discuss the other sections of the bill later on they could come back here and let us know what the companies intend to do, whether the directors of the company intend to appoint French-speaking Canadians to the board in which case it will not be necessary to amend section 7.

*(Text)*

Mr. ROCK: May I add something? May I suggest that we stand Clause 7 for the time being and let us see what the representatives of the Canadian National Railways and Canadian Pacific Railways do when they enlighten us on the matter in this respect at the next meeting?

The CHAIRMAN: Does the committee wish to stand Clause 7?

Mr. HAHN: No.

Mr. REGAN: Please put the question.

Mr. ROCK: In that case you do not wish to find out whether they have the intention to do so or not?

Mr. HAHN: We are dealing with a matter of principle, and the principle is whether or not we should legislate what we all feel to be desirable. I do not think we should legislate it. I do not think it will make any difference if the