

Private Bills

Basically the reasons that I and other members of the private bills committee hesitated before to approve the bill were these: The Good News Broadcasting Association of Canada purported to be an association—

Mr. Churchill: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not like to interrupt the hon. member, and the arguments he is advancing may be perfectly sound, but are we not simply considering a motion to recommit this bill to the standing committee, rather than considering the bill itself, which is not before us?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, the hon. member is quite right. We are considering a motion to recommit this bill and the remarks of the hon. member should be limited to that point and not deal with the substance of the bill, which has already been discussed in the house.

Mr. Deachman: With respect, I must be able to discuss the reasons for not approving of the bill in principle at this time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That is not my opinion. I believe the hon. member should limit himself to considerations relating to the advisability of referring the bill to the committee.

Mr. Deachman: I will stay with the question of referring the bill to the committee. Certainly a majority of those who listened to arguments in favour of The Good News Broadcasting Association of Canada at the time the bill was brought before the committee prior to the recess did not approve of the bill as it was presented, on the basis of the facts given at that time. It was for this reason that the bill was returned to the house with the report that the preamble was not proven. It is for this reason I am glad to hear that additional witnesses will be brought before the committee. When my hon. friend is discussing the matter with the witnesses who will be brought before the committee I hope he will suggest to them that they indicate to us what the purposes of The Good News Broadcasting Association of Canada are in regard to a single proprietorship, or whether or not the association is in fact a voluntary one, of some kind, as is usually the case with regard to charitable associations.

The Good News Broadcasting Association comes before the House of Commons for incorporation as an association, not as a proprietorship. However, when the bill was discussed in the private bills committee, this association gave every evidence of being a single proprietorship, and a profitable one indeed.

It is this aspect of the matter to which we objected at that time in the private bills committee and which we would like to see cleared up when the witnesses return to that committee. We should like to know that we are not looking at a single proprietorship, and a profitable one, but looking at a charitable association which has the right to go out and solicit charitable gifts from the public and to account to the public for the way in which it handles the donations made to it.

These were the principal objections made in the committee and these are the reasons the bill was returned to this house. These are the reasons the committee found the preamble of the bill not proven as a charitable association, and I do not propose to agree to the principle of this bill. I hope this matter will be cleared up when the bill is referred to the private bills committee again.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

MADELEINE FRANCOISE HANKOWSKI

The house in committee on Bill No. SD-5, for the relief of Madeleine Francoise Hankowski—Mr. Wahn—Mr. Lamoureux in the chair.

On clause 1.

Mr. Scott: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the sponsor of the bill several questions? This is a bill in which the hon. member for Timiskaming was very much interested when it was before the house on a previous occasion. I believe he drew the attention of the committee to the fact that there seemed to be some irregularities in procedure in connection with this bill. I wonder if those matters were looked into when the bill received consideration in the committee itself.

Mr. Wahn: As has been pointed out, certain alleged regular irregularities were brought to the attention of the committee. They were discussed and the committee decided that it was proper for the bill to be reported back to the house. There were a number of other bills of like nature which would have been held up had we not allowed this particular bill to stand before the summer recess. The committee did consider the irregularities which have been mentioned and the committee was satisfied such irregularities did not exist.

Mr. Scott: I am not going to hold up the bill in any way, but the main irregularity that worried some members was the fact that after the divorce proceeding had been commenced an objection was registered by the husband through a solicitor in Ottawa. At a later date, the objection was withdrawn by