

*Canada Business Corporations Act*

initial clauses which are in both languages. We are not going to make any change. A lot of people are having trouble with Firestone tires. Others have the problem of gas tanks rupturing when they are in accidents.

Many people have bought a Chrysler, as I did, which has a starter that will not turn over the motor. It has been admitted in the United States that those starters were built for a much lighter car. I understand they may have to be changed three or four times during the lifetime of the car. That applies not only to my car but to every Chrysler. I have been told by a Tilden fleet owner that he keeps two standard and two heavy duty starters on his counter all the time, and that he is continually changing them. That is an engineering fault.

● (1522)

There are faults in the ignition system of some of the automobiles on the road; there are faults in the cooling systems; there are faults in some of the transmissions, and these have been obvious for more than one year's production run yet they are still being allowed.

The public asks for the kind of protection which is possible under this bill, but the members are not asking for it, and the department does not want responsibility for supervising the relationship between the warranties and the knowledge which shareholders and directors may have about weaknesses in the products they are selling. They do not wish to become involved because this is, to them, a totally different field. Yet someone has to occupy that field.

It is surprising to me that when this bill went to committee the members there examined it, listened to seven or eight members discussing its deficiencies, and then refused to write in any provisions for the benefit of John Q. Public. When a change of government comes about after the next election I predict there will be a minority government and, if there is, all members had better be prepared—

**An hon. Member:** Dreamer!

**Mr. Peters:** The hon. member says "dreamer", but the Gallup poll indicates that whether it is the high level or the low level, the voting will almost inevitably result in a minority government.

The public knows that minority government is good government. The people know that the only time they got changes beneficial to them—

**Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad if you would ask the hon. member to explain how his prediction of the outcome of the next election fits in with the topic under discussion.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** What are we discussing?

**Mr. Peters:** We are discussing Bill S-5. The hon. member can look it up on the order paper if he likes—it is under Senate bills. If he looks at it he will not be better off than he is now.

The reason I am interested in minority government is this: we have made no changes in this bill which has to do with corporations. It is an act under which corporations are established, but all the government has been interested in doing is seeing that the French version coincides to some extent with the English version which we passed a couple of years ago. I am saying there are more important things to be considered and one of them is the right of individual citizens to demand that, since Canada provides facilities for these large corporations, the public should in turn be assured that where the shareholders or directors realize there is a problem with the product they are selling they would be guilty of an offence if they do not acquaint the public with it and make every effort to eliminate the hazard. Anything less is unacceptable.

The reason I mentioned minority government is this: the bill went to committee and a number of suggestions were made from all quarters. However, when it came back to this chamber no amendments were reported. Indeed, no amendments were moved in the committee, meaning that it was rubber-stamped there; no consideration was given to it at all. I am convinced this is the case, having heard the previous speaker, the hon. member for Edmonton West, who is a stickler for detail. I have heard him give a number of lectures to the House on details of this nature, and if these matters had been discussed in the committee he would have been among those taking part and some amendments would have been made in it, because I am sure it is not perfect. Consideration might even have been given to making some changes affecting the responsibility of companies which have been incorporated so as to ensure that the public would be protected as well as doing what this act does, namely, protecting the shareholders and the board of directors.

I will not say anything further along these lines. I am sure that if a minority government were in power changes would probably have been made to the benefit of the public. We might have saved someone being killed in a little Ford car, a Bobcat or a Pinto; we might have prevented someone being stranded if he were driving a Chrysler whose starter did not work; we might have prevented someone being killed because of the blow-out of a Firestone tire through a defect the company knew about for a year before it became general knowledge. We might have prevented someone being burned to death in a house which had been wired with aluminum wiring.

I am suggesting this is lousy legislation. It is a lousy way to send it to a committee where the committee does not have the courage or the guts to make any decisions other than those the civil servants have made. I think this is lousy government and the sooner we get into a minority situation the better government will be.

**Miss Aileen Nicholson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to reply briefly to the questions raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). The question of the public interest about which the hon. member for Timiskaming has spoken so eloquently was, in fact, raised and discussed