committee to the effect that the preamble was not proven, which is a procedure ordinarily adopted in relation to private bills. To some extent this is significant, and it is to that extent that the argument of the honourable Member for Peace River is valid. But I suggest to him that the precedent is not entirely helpful since our records are not complete.

The same edition of Bourinot's goes on at the following page to refer to a second precedent where a different course was adopted. This other precedent goes back even further, that is to the year 1875 when the then Prime Minister moved for leave to introduce a public bill relating to the Northern Railway of Canada. Eventually a ruling was made that the proposed legislation was both private and public in nature, and subsequently separate bills were passed by the House, one public and one private. This of course is a very interesting precedent. The explanation which I gathered from reading this precedent is that the essential reason why part of the bill was required by the Chair to be introduced as a private bill was that it purported to amend the original Act which itself was considered and passed as a private bill even before Confederation.

The suggestion was made by some honourable Members that there is no precedent at all and that this is an entirely new situation. I agree with the suggestion to some extent, but to a limited extent only. There are a number of precedents where there has been an admixture of private bill and public bill considerations. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) has referred to one of these precedents, which is the Bank of Canada Act of 1934. In that instance, I am informed, the bill was a public bill preceded by a resolution. In that instance the Act provided for public offerings of its shares, and at the same time included provision for the government to participate.

Another precedent which to some extent comes close to the bill which is now before the House is the Trans-Canada Air Lines Act, found in the Statutes of Canada, 1937, chapter 43. The *Journals* indicate that the company was established by a public bill preceded by a resolution, and included even the designation by name of the incorporators, normally a feature of a private bill. Yet in the course of consideration by the House and later until its eventual adoption, the measure was considered and treated by the Canadian Parliament as a public bill.

It has been suggested to me that there may also be an analogy with the Telesat Act of 1968-69. I am not so sure about this precedent and I do not think it should be pressed although this bill was introduced and treated as a public bill. In any event I suggest to honourable Members that in order that a bill be designated as private it should not and cannot include any feature of public policy because such characterization will transcend any private nature it may have.

There appear to be well established principles in determining that a private bill should not be allowed to proceed as such but should be introduced as a public bill. They are described as follows:

"1. Where public policy is affected.

2. Where the bill proposes to amend or repeal public Acts.

3. Because of the magnitude of the area and the multiplicity of the interests involved.

4. The fact that the bill, though partly of a private nature, has as its main object a public matter."

These principles are outlined at page 873 of May's seventeeth edition.

It may be that honourable Members may suggest that none of these criteria apply in this particular case, but to discuss this aspect of the matter I suggest we would have to go into the consideration of the essence of the bill, and to some extent this is what we have been doing in considering the procedural aspects of the matter. But if one applies the principles to which I have referred to Bill C-219, particularly to clause 6 of the bill which sets out the objects of the proposed legislation, I think it is clear that whatever may be said of its private nature respecting incorporation of a company with public participation, this bill would appear to be a declaration of public policy, and would meet some of the other tests provided by the learned author. Again I refer honourable Members to clause 6 of the bill.

I was about to go into other clauses of the bill but perhaps I should stay away from that, because I might give the appearance of delving too closely into the details of the bill, and I think all honourable Members have tried to stay away from discussing the details of the bill or going into its different clauses. I think I will limit my suggestion to this that clause 6, that is the objects clause, would indicate that in view of the principles set down by May, and which have been recognized over the years, the bill should be treated as a public bill. My conclusion therefore must be that procedurally speaking the bill is properly before the House in this form at the present time. I will therefore put the motion.

Mr. Benson, seconded by Mr. MacEachen, moved,—That Bill C-219, An Act to establish the Canada Development Corporation, be now read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

And debate arising thereon;

[*At 5.00 o'clock p.m., Private Members' Business was called pursuant to Standing Order 15(4)*]

(*Notices of Motions*)

By unanimous consent, item numbered nine was allowed to stand and retain its position.

Mr. McCleave, seconded by Mr. Thomas (Moncton), moved,—That, in the opinion of this House, the govern-