

Mr. PROBE: In connection with 13, Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask Doctor Coleman if he can give any statistics on the number of times that the secretary of state has presented a petition.

The WITNESS: We have not had any.

Mr. PROBE: Then may I ask has the secretary of state investigated any alleged cases where this clause might be applicable?

The WITNESS: Many.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: They have investigated many.

The WITNESS: Investigated many.

*By Mr. Probe:*

Q. I recall during the war there was some reference to the sale, by a very large nickel corporation, of interests in Petsamo, Finland, to an enemy corporation or an enemy government. Now on the surface, a deal of that nature would constitute trading with the enemy. —A. It does not come within the scope of the regulations.

Q. Wherein does it differ?—A. The regulations apply but now you have said there has been a sale to an enemy. I know only what was reported in the House of Commons and to the members at that time. Was it not the Falconbridge nickel company?

Q. I thought it was International Nickel.—A. It was sold to the government of the USSR, which was of course not an enemy. I think what you had in mind is this. It was characterized by the *Times* as a very stupid statement by the president of the company or some officer of the company.

Q. It was in the annual report.—A. Yes, that they had property in Finland at the time, and Finland was at war but had not been interfering with their property and they rather congratulated the shareholders.

Q. I recall it that way.—A. There was no suggestion there was any act on the part of the Canadian company to turn over the plant to the enemy. He simply made what I would call a very foolish statement, that is the term I would use. The statement was to the effect that the enemy, although they had control of it, had not destroyed the assets of the company.

Q. A satisfactory arrangement had been entered into?—A. I do not think it went that far.

Q. You do not think so? As I recall the annual report it raised a big query in my mind, although I was not thinking in terms of this bill at that time. You would say however, that what took place did not contravene section 13.—A. If the Canadian company had entered into a transaction or contract with the enemy that would have been an infringement of the trading with the enemy regulations. I recollect, and again I am subject to correction on examination of the records, that it was foolishness. That was what you might term it.

Q. Indiscretion?—A. I think they went a little further than indiscretion.

Q. I do too.—A. They congratulated the shareholders of the company on the fact that the enemy had maintained their plant intact although they were presumably using it for the productions of materials with which to wage war.

The VICE-CHAIRMAN: I think he wanted to build up the assets of this company.

The WITNESS: After Finland made the treaty with Russia, and Russia occupied that area, Russia made a contract as I recall it with the Canadian company and they acquired the property.

Mr. PROBE: Then, in so far as the secretary of state was concerned, it was a bona fide transaction and did not involve dealing with the enemy.