

Private Bills

the present time are the terms and conditions of Bill S-7 which has been passed by the Senate, has been given second reading by this house, has been considered by the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills and now has been returned to the house for consideration in detail. I have listened very carefully to the arguments advance by the hon. member for Timiskaming and he has not raised any objection to clause 1, the clause we are on. He has objected continually to the procedure in bringing bills of this kind into the whole process of parliament in order to set up this type of corporation. Therefore it would seem to me that the only kind of amendment which would be proper at this time would be an amendment to clause 1.

I take it from the remarks of the hon. member who is trying to move this motion that he does not have any specific objection to clause 1 but is objecting to the procedure. The hon. member for Rosthern said that if it is the procedure he is objecting to surely that should be brought up when the procedures of the House of Commons are under consideration. As you have pointed out on many occasions in the last few minutes, Mr. Chairman, the procedures of the house are not under consideration at the moment. What is under consideration is clause 1 of Bill S-7 and nothing more.

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Timiskaming has moved the following motion: That Bill S-7 be not now read but be referred back to the committee for reconsideration. The motion as it stands affects every clause of this bill when only clause 1 is before us. I suggest the proper time to move such a motion would be during second reading or third reading of the bill. It is out of order at this particular stage.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I have been reading clause 1 and have been following the very well thought out arguments of my colleague, the hon. member for Timiskaming. In my limited understanding of this matter it does seem that we are being asked in effect to buy a pig in a poke. For the benefit of those who may not have followed the refinements of my argument earlier, I was not objecting to the procedures of the house but rather to the fact that there is not a general public law in existence which would permit this group to be incorporated in another way and not by way of statute law.

In the last clause which was read by the hon. member for Timiskaming there is something in its construction which concerns me a bit. It says:

—for the purpose of administering the property, business and other temporal affairs of the Corporation.

These are the objectives and they are spelled out in more detail in subsequent clauses of the bill but particularly they are for the purpose of administering the property, business and other temporal affairs of the corporation. It would seem to me that the word "other" should not be in here because the implication is that the corporation would administer the temporal property, the temporal business and other temporal affairs. It would seem to me we should take out the word "other" to make it clear that we are not interpreting the administering of the property and the administering of the business of the corporation as being temporal affairs, although perhaps in the strict sense of the word it is correct.

When the hon. member for Timiskaming read that I came to the conclusion that the word "other" really was adding a bit of confusion to what the particular propositions of the corporation are. I should like to have some comment from the sponsor of the bill in respect of what the petitioners felt about that aspect, whether they felt anything or whether grammatically it is the correct way to phrase it.

There is another matter which I should like to raise, but in doing so I think I have to make reference to the fact that there is no public law in existence under which such a group can be incorporated. If there were we would have the guide lines or criteria established with regard to what the corporation could or could not do. As it is now parliament has to decide in every individual case what the corporation can or cannot do. Parliament has to decide what is or is not in the public good.

I suggest to the hon. member for Timiskaming that one of the reasons there were not very many questions asked in the committee is that there was not that much interest in the committee and that the members who attended the meeting were not too interested in this particular bill one way or another. I submit that that is an attitude a great number of members take in respect of private bills of this nature. They give lip service to the concept that we have a bounden duty to