

surfeit of coverage and another part of the country will not have enough.

Because I support the hon. member's motion, not that a third station be established in Toronto but that there be a public hearing to decide whether such a station is necessary, I shall resume my seat, simply indicating that some initiative must be shown by the CRTC beyond the scope of an application.

Mr. James Hugh Faulkner (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately because of the shortage of time, largely occasioned by the very reasonable proposition put forward by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Jerome) that we deal with another item of business prior to this one, I do not have time to deal at length with the motion put forward in the name of the hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Chappell).

Rather than get into the substance of that, I should like to say in the minute that remains that some of the criticisms that have been levelled at the CRTC—and I have no doubt they are levelled in good faith—fail to point out that the CRTC is simply carrying the talks assigned to it by Parliament. When one speaks about hearings, the scope of hearings and Canadian content, the onus has to come back on this chamber because the CRTC is bound by an act of this Parliament known as the Broadcasting Act. When we speak about Canadian content and whether the CRTC is doing its job, I think it is important to do this in the context of our Broadcasting Act. It was we who decided what the broadcasting policy should be, and we are responsible for it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order, please. The hour set aside for the consideration of private members' business has expired. Hon. members will have noticed that the matters presented during this hour were rather airborne: they dealt with weather modification activities and broadcasting. However, they did not attract very great numbers to participate and the flight was not a success. The pilot was not successful and probably should lose his licence.

The House will resume at eight o'clock with item No. 8, an act respecting investment companies.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

INVESTMENT COMPANIES BILL

FILING OF STATEMENTS AND INFORMATION, QUALIFICATIONS AND DUTIES OF AUDITORS, TRANSFER OF SHARES, ETC.

Hon. C. M. Drury (for the Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments

Investment Companies Bill

made by the Senate to Bill C-3, respecting investment companies.

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this bill was considered by the House earlier this session and following third reading on December 14, 1970, was referred to the other place. Having completed their consideration of the measure, their Honours recently gave third reading to the bill, incorporating amendments.

A detailed explanation of the purpose and intention of the bill was given when it was before the House for second reading and I am sure hon. members will join with me in not wishing all that detail to be repeated at this time. I propose to limit my remarks, therefore, to a brief outline of the amendments made to the bill in the Senate. At the outset it can be said that none of the amendments depart from the broad purposes or objectives of the proposed legislation. All are intended simply to clarify the existing provisions or, in some cases, to define more precisely the scope and application of the measure.

In this latter category, three distinct changes might be noted. Firstly, by virtue of an amendment to subclause 4 of clause 2, the concept of excluding from the scope of the legislation companies that are essentially industrial, commercial or manufacturing enterprises has been extended to include such of those companies that for one reason or another have one or more subsidiaries interposed between themselves and their actual operating subsidiaries. As the bill stood before amendment, not all such types of companies would have qualified technically for a statutory exemption and it would have been necessary for them to seek exemption individually from the minister. The government sees no objection to the extension of statutory exemptions contemplated by the amendment.

Secondly, the granting of statutory exemptions to companies that carry on an investment business exclusively on the basis of funds borrowed from Canadian chartered banks, formerly contained in clause 2(3) (d) of the bill, has been deleted although the minister's discretionary power to exempt such types of companies remains. This statutory exemption stemmed from the view that practically every company from time to time has occasion to borrow funds from banks in connection with its day to day operations and it was not considered necessary to bring all such companies under the legislation if, as it was thought, they were likely to be granted discretionary exemptions.

The Senate accepted the view that the automatic exclusion of such companies might possibly create a preferred position for the chartered banks vis-à-vis other financial institutions. The amendment is intended to remove any such possibility, and the government has no objection to what is essentially a change from a statutory to a discretionary form of exemption for all or most such companies.

Thirdly, clause 2(3) (d) has also been changed to specify an additional class of company entitled to a statutory exemption from the legislation. I refer to family invest-