

Bill is, "an Act respecting Crown corporations and matters related and incidental thereto". In French, the version is:

Loi modifiant la Loi sur l'administration financière à l'égard des sociétés d'État et modifiant d'autres lois en conséquence.

We find that the Crown corporation, a notion which has been around for a good many years, has now shifted and is no longer called "corporation de la Couronne", but "société d'État". Is this deliberate? Is this evasion or avoidance of the mere word "Couronne", something of which this Government is ashamed? Why has it decided to rewrite the French language at this particular time? I find this particular instance strange, and I also wonder a little about the expression "société d'État".

[Translation]

Indeed, I have reservations about that French translation. Would it be not more accurate or more correct to say "les sociétés de l'État"? We say "sociétés de la Couronne", so why not say "sociétés de l'État"? If anything is to be changed, it ought to be done correctly. In any case, perhaps it is not too important—

[English]

However, it tells me a great deal about the slipshod manner in which this Bill was drafted so that it could be brought forward to the House at this particular time.

Also, I notice in the definitions section of the Bill that the "Crown" is used in English and "Sa Majesté" is used in French. I wonder why they shifted from the symbol to the person. This does not make good sense. Why are they avoiding the use of the symbol "Crown" in French and using the person in its place? I do not know who did it. I know that the Minister is very articulate in both languages. I am surprised that he should have let this slip through. I think it is necessary—and the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) would probably agree—that there is a distinction to be made between the person and the symbol. Why get them mixed up in a Bill like this? I thought the Minister of Justice provided some of the legal advice on the drafting of Bills. Was it just slipshod workmanship by the Department that allowed the shift from the English symbol to the French person to be slipped in? I find it most extraordinary that the Government by this means should rewrite one or the other of the two official languages of Canada.

• (1610)

The legislation is drafted in a clumsy, even unmanageable manner. I suggest that it be withdrawn. Back at the drafting board, Bill C-27 could be used as a model to assist the drafters. This is not a Crown corporations Bill as it has been touted. It is an amendment to the Financial Administration Act. It is regrettable that in this day and age, with all the Crown corporations in existence, we should have a Bill brought before us in this shoddy manner.

One of the problems of Crown corporations, particularly in Canada, is the subsidiaries created by Crown corporations. The Salmonid Enhancement Program in British Columbia

could take a few lessons from Crown corporations. On the Pacific Coast we are having difficulties in spawning enough fish to make the salmon fishery a thriving industry again. Meanwhile in Ottawa, the Government is busily engaged in producing Crown corporations that spawn subsidiaries at a rate that put our salmon to shame.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, how many subsidiaries Petro-Canada has? I bet you do not. I read some of the literature related to Petro-Canada, if it can be called literature. Sometimes I look in the appendix or the schedule to the Financial Administration Act. Sometimes I look at the report of the Crown corporations. I find that PetroCan, for example, and I use this only as an example, has 33 listed subsidiaries. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you know what Rocair Limited does. I doubt that anyone in this House knows. It is a subsidiary spawned or acquired by Petro-Canada and listed as such. Is GMI Co. (Bahamas) Limited the summer resort to which the PetroCan officials retire when they have had enough of the cold Canadian winter? That is possible. What would it do other than that? These subsidiaries are barely acknowledged in this Bill. They can spawn without let or hindrance.

I am not talking just about PetroCan, which is fairly well known. One of the earlier Crown corporations is CNR. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, how many subsidiaries CNR has spawned in the course of its life? That company which is ours, if we are to believe the advertisements, has 45 subsidiaries.

I placed a question on the Order Paper. I received an answer about two weeks ago. I find that Autoport Limited was spawned in December, 1971 to operate the storage, servicing and distribution area for imported automobiles. That is part of the CNR. Canadian National Steamship Company Limited makes a fair amount of sense. There is Canadian National Hotels (Moncton) Ltd. Canat Limited has its home base in Delaware. It was created for the sole purpose of owning and managing railway equipment purchased with incentive per diem funds in accordance with Interstate Commerce regulations. That is a subsidiary of Canadian National Railways. Some have their operating base in Canada. I do not think there is one in the Bahamas yet.

CN Tower Limited is a subsidiary. Whoa! I had the feeling that we in this House passed legislation creating CN Tower Limited. There is another one related to CN Tower, CN Tower Restaurants (Ltd.). That was created in order to facilitate the separate operation of the restaurants in the CN Tower. That, as you would expect, has its headquarters in Ontario. Another subsidiary is in Minnesota, the Duluth, Winnipeg and Pacific Railway Company. There are several in Delaware. I guess Delaware is a great haven of Crown corporations.

I did not realize my time is about to run out so quickly. I became rather involved in all of these subsidiaries.

A major criticism is the fact that this legislation would put shackles on the House of Commons or the Senate, whichever House receives a motion relating to the creation of a Crown corporation. That is absolutely unacceptable to any respectable parliamentarian. I am ashamed that the President of the