

*Private Bills*

**Mr. André Ouellet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the comments made by previous speakers on this bill and I am happy to note that there is no objection in principle either to the proposal or to its adoption.

I should mention, I think, that on reading the proposed amendments it is clear that the only object of this Senate bill is to amend the act of incorporation of the Royal Victoria Hospital in Montreal so that it be in accord with the Quebec Hospitals Act.

With regard to the department of National Health and Welfare I would like to say that this matter affects only the internal administrative arrangements of a province and, therefore, does not fall directly under the department's jurisdiction.

The constitutional apprehensions raised by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) are not, I think, as serious as he seemed to maintain. In my opinion, this legislation, both from the legal and constitutional point of views, is quite acceptable.

I would also like to reply to a question of the hon. member for Skeena about clause 1.

The enumeration contained in clause 1 refers to certain persons incorporated. Those named there are generally designated as the founders of that renowned hospital. It is still customary to mention people belonging to the corporation. This clause lists people who at the beginning set up the corporation and the sole purpose of the proposed amendment is to remove the hospital's power to establish branches outside the province of Quebec. The Quebec Hospitals Act contemplates the establishment of one hospital only.

Finally, I want to point out that the Quebec Hospitals Act could soon be replaced by Bill 65 that provides for complete re-organization of health institutions and social services in the province of Quebec. When the legislation becomes law, it will probably be necessary to amend our legislation.

Anyway, we cannot see anything in the present bill of national scope to which we would feel it a duty to oppose. I must say also that we do not believe the bill runs counter to any provision of the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act.

Therefore, I recommend the adoption of Bill S-19.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Carried.

Motion agreed to, bill read for the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

[*English*]

## CENTRAL-DEL RIO OILS LIMITED

The House resumed, from Thursday, June 10, consideration of Bill S-12, respecting Central-Del Rio Oils Limited, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, and the amendment of Mr. Skoberg (page 6588).

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, first a point of order in regard to Bill S-21. Did I understand correctly that this bill has been dropped? I did not quite understand the translation.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Boulanger):** Order, please. That bill was stood.

**Mr. Skoberg:** Mr. Speaker, there was debate when Bill S-12 was before us for second reading, and I am very aware of the debate when it went to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. That was a most unfortunate debate, to say the least. I am also aware that we have an amendment which would call for bringing this company, Central-Del Rio Oils Limited within the sphere of Canadian ownership.

Many people have suggested that we in this House should not be hung up on the idea of Canadian ownership, that there has to be a complete change in the area of ownership of companies. I agree with this and ask the government why they have not brought in regulations in light of the report which the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Gray) made to the cabinet last June.

We are all well aware of the problems that exist in various parts of the country in regard to what should be construed as Canadian ownership and what direction should be given to corporations residing within our boundaries. In view of the concern expressed by many eminent people about the type of regulations we have and the direction the government should be giving, we are entitled to ask that safeguards be written into the bill to spell out clearly where ownership will be Canadian and direction as to the destiny of Canadian corporations, which means the destiny of thousands of employees.

Not long ago I read a book on this subject, entitled "Canada can Thrive," by Raymond Spencer Rodgers. It appears that when we talk about nationalization or nationalism we are all tagged with a name which really means retaliation. In 1958 there was a move afoot to try to bring about this type of nationalism and so gain the respect of the younger people of our country.

We have a difficult situation at present with our good neighbours to the south. Some time ago the Carling Company selected Baltimore as the site for a brewery. The legislature in Maryland vetoed the bill on the ground that this Canadian company was not 51 per cent American owned. In that case the executive power stepped in at the last moment and set the legislation aside. In related incidents involving the U.S. Customs, Canadian corporations have suffered. The book gives examples of various areas where exports are affected. At page 26 appears the following:

It cannot be said that Ottawa has been vigorous in its approach to this problem in the past.

We talk about the Canadianization of certain industries, about the type of bills we should enact and whether we should introduce amendments that would bring foreign-owned industry under the control of the Canadian people. The book continues:

During the fourth session of the twenty-fourth Parliament, a private company sought incorporation in Ottawa. Only the most spirited opposition by the old CCF, plus two Conservatives (who were thought to be crossing party lines for having done so—though in fact the matter did not relate to a government bill)