

*Private Bills*

bills and I would like to see the government adopt one of them anyhow; I would like to see them be that courageous.

But to get back to the question that is before us, Mr. Speaker, a few days ago when we were dealing with other bills hon. members of the house were invited to look at the evidence taken before a committee of the other place in order to ascertain what were the circumstances before we began talking about them. We took that advice and that invitation and looked at this particular bill. The sole principle of the amendment is that of taking steps to bring under our own control and direction, as nationals of a country and as the people of a country, our economic and financial welfare; not to have it drift away and be controlled by people in other countries. This is not an anti-foreign speech or anything like that; it is just pro-Canadian, of the type that was made regularly with respect to Aurora pipe lines. We hope that by (1) this amendment, and (2) the discussion which ensues and is taking place, on the public record and in the public press, perhaps, this information and our desires will somehow get to the attention of the proponents of this bill; not the sponsor in the house but the people who are petitioning for the incorporation of this company. So that if and when—and I say “if” because it may not happen this session; it is difficult to say—this particular bill is put before the banking and commerce committee, the people who are petitioning for the bill will expect the type of things that we will require of them, namely steps in the direction of ensuring that we control our own destiny and that we do not export it at every conceivable opportunity.

**Hon. Gordon Churchill (Minister of Veterans Affairs):** I do not intend to say anything about the bill itself. I will only say I find myself in agreement with the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate (Mr. Pickersgill), which causes me some disturbance because it is the first time in years I have found myself in agreement with him. For once, though, the hon. member is right. I think his statement was clearly presented and his advice sound. What disturbs me is this: If the six months hoist proposal were adopted now, the sponsors of the bill would be deprived of the opportunity of having it discussed in committee. They would be deprived of the right which we give to sponsors of other private bills, and a committee of the house would also be prevented from making a useful investigation into the subject matter.

While expressing no opinion one way or another as to the value of the bill I suggest, as the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate pointed out, that this is not the best method to deal with a bill on second reading

when it is a private bill which would, in the normal course, arrive before a committee where it could be examined. In addition, of course, the bill could be dealt with on third reading on its return to this house. As a matter of fact, anyone who does not approve of this bill could vote against it on second reading without having to support a proposal for a six months hoist. There would also be an opportunity to vote against it on third reading.

However, if this comes to a vote—if the mover of the amendment does not accept the advice which has been offered to him—it is not particularly the concern of the government side. This is a private member's bill and any vote which is taken on it can certainly not be considered as reflecting in any way upon the government. I appreciate that the house has given us a vote of confidence on seven occasions already this year, so we are not concerned with this particular matter.

**Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni):** I am not sure whether the Minister of Veterans Affairs was in the house a little earlier when the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate said he knew nothing. I cannot say I altogether agree with the hon. member's own assessment of himself, but in respect to the arguments he used on the subject of the amendment, arguments which have been so volubly supported from the side of the house opposite to that on which the hon. member himself sits, I would like to point this out: some of my colleagues have already made it clear that this amendment was not moved by the hon. member for Danforth without careful consideration. He had given a good deal of thought to the matter.

In the second place, I feel there is a very valid reason why the advice proffered by the hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate and approved by the leader of the house should not be accepted by the mover of the amendment. I believe my hon. friend from Danforth and those who support him in moving the amendment have made it clear that the purpose of doing so is not to discriminate against a particular company but to set forth certain principles and argue for a certain course of action. I suggest that if we were to follow the advice which has been given us, and let this bill go to a committee and then vote against it on third reading we would be voting against a particular company and there may or may not be good ground for doing that. I feel, therefore, that the motion is a sound one and that it deserves the support of the house.