

Establishment of Canadian Corporation

and compare them with the conditions of the same band of people when they were settled some 150 miles away from Churchill at a place named Duck Lake. Their only contact with the outside world was through the Hudson's Bay Company. At that time they lived a very different life from the one they are living today. The conditions in which they are living at Churchill are exceedingly discouraging as compared with the conditions in which they lived at the time when they were living on their own land and hunting and trapping off the resources of the land at Duck Lake. At that time they were under the supervision of the Hudson's Bay Company and the records of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development show that they led a very happy, enjoyable and productive life.

Coming back to the complaints which our friends to the left have voiced regarding the exploitative operations of the Hudson's Bay Company, I need only say that I hope they do not compare them with the general attitude of private enterprise because the same complaints have been made about the free traders, not those of the Hudson's Bay Company, who have been dealing with the native peoples in northern Canada. I also hope that our friends who have been criticizing the policies of the Hudson's Bay Company with regard to the Indian people will talk to the present government of Manitoba and find out about the necessity for making changes in the Manitoba government agency called the Manitoba Development Fund. Recently I approached them to try to secure some capital for an Indian person who was interested in opening up a grocery store in one of the northern reserves in competition with the Hudson's Bay Company. I was told by officials of this Manitoba government agency that they had no money to lend for a proposition of that nature. So we must realize that private enterprise did invest money in the Hudson's Bay Company.

Of course the Hudson's Bay Company received a tremendous grant of land called Rupert's Land, which, I am told, extended from Labrador to the Rockies, from the headwaters of the Red River to Chesterfield Inlet of Hudson Bay. This was a tremendous subsidy to give to any one company. However, one other fact that I think has unfortunately been overlooked by many people in Canada is that were it not for the operations of the Hudson's Bay Company, particularly in western Canada and possibly in the province of British Columbia, the territory that is now

[Mr. Simpson.]

part of Canada would undoubtedly belong to the United States.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Had it not been for the Hudson's Bay Company there would have been no "54-40 or fight." It would have been "54-40 for the States and no fight". On behalf of the people of Manitoba, I am pleased that this legislation is being passed by the House today. We Manitobans are pleased to welcome officials and the officers of the Hudson's Bay Company to our province. As one who believes in decentralization, I am only sorry they did not decide to move their head office to one of their older established points in Manitoba, the town of Churchill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

CANADA GRAIN ACT

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION, PROVISIONS RESPECTING GRADING, LICENCES, ELEVATORS, ETC.

On the order:

Report stage of Bill No. C-196, an act respecting grain, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Agriculture—Mr. Olson.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, if I might I would like to rise on a point of order. If you would like to go ahead and present the proceedings on Bill C-196 do so, but I rise on that point.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Would the hon. member for Crowfoot state his point of order?

Mr. Horner: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is to obtain from you a clear ruling and a clear interpretation of Standing Order 75(3) which says:

The report stage of any bill reported by any standing or special committee shall not be taken into consideration prior to forty-eight hours following the presentation of the said report, unless otherwise ordered by the House.

What I would like clarified is the fact that apparently the government is assuming that this bill was reported to the House on the last day the House sat before the summer recess, Friday, June 26, where in *Hansard* of that date at page 8619 there is a brief notation