

*Committee Reports*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest):** Order, please. The Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) may be a little confused, as may be the Hon. Member for York—Scarborough (Mr. McCrossan). I interrupt at this time because the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap is answering a question put by the Hon. Member for York—Scarborough with which the Chair has difficulty. I should like to take this opportunity to remind Hon. Members that we are discussing the first report. The question put by the Hon. Member for York—Scarborough referred to the Bill itself and to what would be the reaction of the Opposition to the Bill. Of course the Chair will be lenient, as it always is in such matters, but I remind Hon. Members that the subject matter is the report, not the Bill itself; that is not what is before the House today.

**Mr. Riis:** Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly certain what was your suggestion. However, in response, we plan to co-operate. We have been calling to get the Bill on the floor of the House as soon as possible. While we have some serious concerns about certain aspects of it, it will not encourage us to stall its consideration or in getting it into committee.

We are very concerned about the limits suggested in the report. We believe very strongly in the 10 per cent rule. We are very strongly on the side of a number of the recommendations before the committee indicating that the 10 per cent ownership rule should remain in place for all financial institutions. Of course that is what we recommended in our dissenting report.

In response to my hon. friend who suggested that we did not speak some time in the past two weeks or three weeks about the Imasco takeover, my friend from Regina and I actually wrote a report which was tabled in the House. It clearly laid out our position on takeovers and of course concurred with that section of the report which wanted to stop the movement on Genstar. I think we are all on the same wavelength.

I should like to respond to his question concerning not only Imasco. Indeed, we are clearly talking about the principle. We are focusing our attention on this particular takeover bid because of its implications in light of the studies which we have done over the last seven months. Whether it were Imasco, x, y or z, we would be making the same case as strongly, if not more strongly than we already have.

In conclusion, the arms length situation is of utmost concern and is critical in this discussion. As a matter of fact, it is one of the ultimate motivations for moving concurrence and for doing whatever is possible to encourage the Minister of State for Finance not to proceed with approving this takeover bid.

● (1600)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre H. Vincent (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to take part in the discussion on the important issue of

financial institutions following presentation of the report of the Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs.

The report tabled in the House represents a very important contribution towards solving a problem which is admittedly complex and which concerns financial institutions in Canada. I think that it should be pointed out right at the start that this report was prepared in an ongoing fashion and with objectivity by the members of the committee for the specific purpose of finding a practical solution to the problem posed by financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, we have spoken about the urgency of the situation, but I think that we could say that everything we do in this House is always urgent. We are here to legislate, to pass legislation, even if we do not always have a lot of help from the Opposition, and it is always urgent.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is somewhat similar to what you certainly found when you practiced law before the courts; there are always appeals for reasons of urgency. In Trois-Rivières, the cases were always urgent and I think that my colleague will confirm it.

However, Mr. Speaker, urgency is no justification for arbitrary decisions. Issues should always be considered with logic and intelligence. The problem before us goes much beyond the simple takeover of a financial institution. It is a problem of national significance. We should not take this problem of national significance and reduce it to the proportions of a simple takeover.

Without making too much reference to Bill C-103, I think that, we are working for the future. We cannot live in the past. Nothing has been done about financial institutions during the last twenty-five years. That is not our fault, but we have to live with it. There is now nothing in the law which could allow us to tell the Chairman of the Committee on Finance and Economic Affairs, another Member of Parliament or the Minister of State for Finance (Mrs. McDougall): "We are working on the Imasco or Genstar deal and we are for or against it". There is nothing in the statutes.

On the other hand, what have we done these last 18 months, Mr. Speaker? Six months only after we took office, yes within six months the Committee of Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, chaired by my colleague for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn), brought forth a green paper along with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) dealing with the situation then prevailing in Canada, namely what we had in terms of legislation, what the problems were and what the solution were that we of the Conservative Party wanted to bring about.

Mr. Speaker, this shows an interest. It shows that when we talk about urgency it is realistic urgency. Within six months of coming to power we tabled a green paper on that issue. Notwithstanding the fact that over the last 25 years almost nothing had been done in connection with financial institutions.