

Mr. Sinclair: I think the committee is indebted to the hon. member for the research he has carried out in this matter. His argument is similar to that which resulted in the inclusion of section 7 in last year's bill, which has been renewed in this year's bill. When the secretary of the treasury board is before the public accounts committee he will be able to outline a little more fully the meaning of section 7.

While I am on my feet I should like to answer the question asked earlier with regard to the wheat board. The wheat board is not included because it is regarded as an agency of the farmer, and not an agency of government.

Mr. Wright: Does that mean that the wheat board is not a charge on the treasury of Canada?

Mr. Sinclair: I am not in a position to answer that question. I shall have it answered for the hon. member on second reading.

Mr. Wright: If it were, it should be included in the bill or at least in the schedule.

Mr. Sinclair: That would not necessarily follow. There are subsidized steamship lines on the west coast which are a charge on the government of Canada, but their operations would not come within the scope of this bill.

Mr. Wright: They would not be set up under an act of this parliament. The wheat board is the result of an act passed by this parliament, enforceable by parliament.

Mr. Sinclair: I shall have a more complete answer when we are on second reading. The revolving fund will require the authority of parliament, and in addition there will be an initial item in the estimates of each department to show that there is a revolving fund. That was provided for in the draft bill which hon. members received last summer, and it will be repeated in the bill to follow.

Mr. Knowles: Will it be one item for all time, or will there be an item each year?

Mr. Sinclair: The revolving fund will be set up and then replenished by the amount authorized by parliament in the first item.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. Martin (for Mr. Abbott) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 25, to provide for the financial administration of the government of Canada, the audit of the public accounts and the financial control of crown corporations.

Canada-United Kingdom Financial Agreement

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CANADA-UNITED KINGDOM FINANCIAL AGREEMENT

APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT RESPECTING INTEREST-FREE PROVISION OF LOAN

The house resumed from Thursday, November 8, consideration of the motion of the Minister of Finance for the second reading of Bill No. 10, to approve the financial agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom, signed on the 29th day of June, 1951.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Dion in the chair.

On section 1—*Short title.*

Mr. Wright: When the minister introduced this bill to the house on November 6 he stated that the post-war investment in Canada by United Kingdom residents was severely limited by the restrictions arising from the shortage of foreign exchange, and went on to state that the government had made available certain moneys under this fund in Great Britain to corporations who wished to locate in Canada, or to British corporations already in Canada who wished to expand their businesses here. I think we all agree that was a good move. Some of the business organizations which have come to Canada as a result of these loans have been for the benefit of Canada, and some of the expansions which have taken place in British plants in Canada are all to the good.

There still remains some \$230 million in the fund, and there is one suggestion I should like to make to the parliamentary assistant in regard to that. It seems to me that if it is good business, and it is, that money should be made available to British firms, then it would be equally good business if money was made available to British immigrants coming to Canada to assist them in establishing themselves on farms or in small businesses. There are many skilled technicians coming from Great Britain who would like to set up a small plant or shop in Canada.

Under the British regulations these people can bring only £1,000 to Canada over a four-year period. I believe that under the amended regulations a man may bring £250 for each dependent member of his family up to four, or a total of £2,000, again over a four-year period. That amount is of little use in establishing a man on a farm or in a small business. It seems to me that it would