

Private Bills

that the hon. member for Timiskaming is actually more interested in the next bill to come before us and that any elaborate discussion of the present one will merely make that much easier the opposition he intends to mount against the next one, which deals with the Interprovincial Pipe Line Company.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should not impute motives.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, because I was in the process of sitting down I was not able to hear Your Honour's observation. I wonder whether you would repeat it.

Mr. Speaker: I was suggesting to the hon. member that he should not impute motives.

Mr. Scott (Danforth): Mr. Speaker, I would never impute motives to any hon. member of the house except for the fact that the particular approach of the hon. member for Timiskaming is so well known in the chamber. However, to come back to the bill, before Your Honour rules me out of order, at the risk of incurring your displeasure I wanted to endorse the views of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard). I realize it is difficult to inject this type of consideration into a discussion of the bill itself. However, having read the bill, and approving of the clauses, I think the hon. member for Skeena has raised a very, very important principle, namely that it is rather silly for the House of Commons to be dealing with this type of bill.

The procedure should be something like that used under the Companies Act, which is of course a statute which lays down the general framework within which particular types of corporations can be set up. It seems to me a gross waste of our time, as well as a gross waste of the public's time and money for us to deal in detail with bills of this type and then send them to committee, have them back in the house and pass them at a later date. In my opinion a general statute ought to be passed empowering the executive to incorporate this kind of enterprise in much the same way as we do with companies and other corporations, rather than going through the long and involved procedure that faces us in this House of Commons in its legislative capacity herein assembled in dealing with this type of matter.

If you look at the bill, Mr. Speaker, you will see it contains no very unusual clauses, in spite of the fears of the hon. member for Timiskaming. You can go through it clause

[Mr. Scott (Danforth).]

by clause, starting with clause 1 which deals with the corporate name and the incorporation—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows very well that he cannot discuss the bill clause by clause when the house is considering its principle. At the moment we are considering second reading of the bill. The hon. member should try to limit his observations to the principle of the bill. I have not interrupted him until now in his dissertation on the procedural aspects of the bill before us. However, if we were to allow this type of discussion every time a bill came before the house, we might spend the whole hour discussing its procedural implications. This is certainly contrary to the rules.

I realize that I placed myself in a difficult position in allowing the hon. member for Skeena to deal with procedural implications in the first place but, as I said, I hoped he would eventually come to the principle of the bill. The hon. member for Danforth did early in his remarks say that what he was doing was against the practice and rules of the house. I would ask him to bear this in mind as he continues with his remarks.

• (6:40 p.m.)

Mr. Scott (Danforth): Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I am only too happy to bow to your directive in this regard. I was trying to keep my discussion of the bill within the ambit of Your Honour's directions. I am sorry I was not able to do that. I will try to do so throughout the balance of my remarks.

In discussing the bill itself what I was really trying to do was not so much to deal with the clauses, which I realize would not be appropriate on second reading, but merely to observe that in looking at the principle behind the bill it did not seem to me that anything unusual was being requested. I come back to my earlier remarks. I could not really see the point of parliament having to deal with this kind of very general bill incorporating a corporation for a legitimate and laudatory purpose. It seemed a gross misuse of the time of this house.

I agree with Your Honour that if we were to continue in that vein we might use up the whole hour discussing the procedural aspects of this matter. I do believe in all seriousness that while we would not want to use this bill, because of its legitimate, laudatory purposes, as a vehicle to try to convince the house that we should not be burdened with this type of bill, there might be an occasion when we would want to use a bill to emphasize the