

*Private Bills*

That amendment, which is exactly the same as this, was accepted by the committee. This year a similar bill has been passed with respect to Polaris pipe lines, I believe sponsored by the hon. member for Peace River. The bill with respect to that company contains a provision akin to that which is before the committee at the moment.

I think the amendment would not cause hardship to anyone. I am sure the people named in clause 1 of the bill, who will be the corporation itself, would not object one bit to this amendment. The hon. member for Winnipeg North has said that they are outstanding, fine citizens in the community of Winnipeg. There is no question in my mind that they would say, "Yes, we welcome such an amendment to this bill, because that is what we believe in as Canadian citizens; we believe that the corporate structure in Canada should be that way".

I have heard no real, valid reason why we should not proceed with this particular amendment. If there were valid reasons, surely they would have been put forward and propounded when we moved a similar amendment with respect to the incorporation of Aurora pipe lines, which of course was not a family company in any sense of the word. But there was no objection last year; the committee unanimously said, "Yes, this is a fine principle to have established with respect to Aurora pipe lines". If it is a fine principle, why do we not now adopt with respect to Brock Acceptance Limited and other companies which are incorporated in the future in similar fashion? Why do we not now accept this principle, in the hope that the government itself will come along with legislation of a general nature so that we will have the principle established and will not have to go through this process bill after bill after bill and remind the government that we are attempting to put its promises into effect; promises, incidentally, which coincide with our concepts and ideas.

**Mr. Smith (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to say just one or two words about the remarks of the hon. member for Skeena for whom I have a very high regard. As I pointed out at the beginning of my remarks, I wanted to hear comments from other hon. members of the house, and I thank the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka and the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Macdonnell) for giving very valid reasons as to why this amendment should not be accepted.

I would also like to point out that were we to amend this bill by putting this restriction in it, we could expect that governments in other countries would include the same type of restriction in bills with regard to Canadian companies doing business in those countries.

I would point out to the house that in respect of item No. 4 on today's order paper—which is a bill I am also sponsoring—with regard to another company, that company does the majority of its business in the United States of America. It would be rather difficult for us to pass this bill with the amendment and say all these directors must be Canadians, and then come down to item No. 4 and say, "Well, here we have the reverse; therefore we should put in a provision that all directors should be Americans". I think we would find ourselves in a position that could not at anytime be maintained.

I should also like to say in closing that I should like to see the hon. member bring forward some form of bill with regard to directorships of unions operating in Canada affecting directors who are not Canadian citizens and who do not reside in this country.

**Mr. Winch:** I find it difficult to understand why there should be this opposition to the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Skeena. He is saying that all directors of companies shall at all times be Canadian citizens ordinarily resident in Canada. I cannot understand why there should be any objection to that. I sat through every meeting of the committee on banking and commerce in connection with this matter and as I pointed out at that time, and point out again, I found it most extraordinary that we had before us at one time four private bills, all from Winnipeg. Two of them were completely tied together, the bill which is now before us, Bill No. S-9, and Bill No. S-10. I hope you will allow me to refer to them both for a few moments, Mr. Chairman.

If we take Bill No. S-9 and Bill No. S-10 we shall find that they have identical wording except where they deal with incorporation, and that differs only in the names of the incorporators. In Bill No. S-10 it is Schwartz, Schwartz and Schwartz. In Bill No. S-9 which we are now discussing it is Cohen, Arkin and Arkin. According to the information given to us in the committee this is a combination of family and business completely. Why there should not have been just one bill brought in on a combination of family businesses I do not know. However, this I do know: that on my questioning in the committee on banking and commerce—and the hon. member for Greenwood was there—there was no intention of any outside Canadian control of Canadian investment and there was no collusion on the basis of operation between the two families, one, Schwartz, Schwartz and Schwartz and the other of Arkin. Surely, therefore, I suggest to the hon. member for Greenwood through you, Mr. Chairman, in view of what he