

*Private Bills*

same class. Parliament is asked not to concern itself with whether these individuals have the right to become incorporated as Evangelistic Tabernacle Incorporated but parliament must concern itself with whether, if they do become incorporated, their subsequent actions will be for the public good and whether the public good will be best served thereby. I say we are not competent to make this decision because we are in the position of picking and choosing what is for the public good.

The sponsor of the bill may have one concept of what is for the public good so far as this particular group is concerned. Another member may have another concept as to how the public good can best be served by the incorporation of this group. But I do not think parliament can afford to go through the same general debate about whether or not the public good will be served each time a bill such as this comes before us. The public law should be invoked in the first instance, and once we establish the criterion of what is for the public good so far as such groups are concerned we must make it clear to all that the public good will be protected.

I do not intend to say any more about this particular aspect at this stage. I do not look forward to the prospect of having to make these same comments on each and every private bill that comes before us. Even though there are no cabinet ministers in the house at the moment, I hope we will have a declaration on this matter from a member of the government. I am sorry; I did not see the Solicitor General (Mr. Pennell) who is not in his seat. I apologize for my oversight. But I am sure that other members would like, as would I, in the not too distant future a declaration by the government that it intends to draft a public law which will establish criteria as to how the public good would be best served and which would permit of some machinery whereby a group such as Evangelistic Tabernacle Incorporated and others in the same class can be incorporated without going through the present procedure. Now they go to the Senate with their bills, because it happens to be cheaper over there. These bills have to pass through all readings and the committee proceedings there. Then they come over to this house and have to pass through three readings and the committee stage, with all the difficulties attached thereto.

[Mr. Howard.]

• (6:20 p.m.)

I am sure the Solicitor General is not in a position right now to make a declaration of government policy in this regard but I should like him to take this question to the cabinet. I realize the cabinet has many other things to deal with but one of its responsibilities is to promote public law and to introduce into the house bills reflecting this policy. I think that government policy in the general field I have discussed should be the same with respect to companies incorporated for the carrying on of private business.

Some time in the future I hope that cabinet will come to grips with this matter so that we may have a declaration along the lines I have suggested and so that we do not have to go through the same tortuous process every time private members' hour comes on.

**The Chairman:** Order, please. When the hon. member for Skeena began his remarks I had hoped they would be a little shorter than they have been. I would draw to his attention that the house has already accepted the principle of this bill on second reading. I think there is a distinct difference between discussing the method of passing legislation and one particular piece of legislation. The remarks that the hon. member has just made might more properly have been made at another stage of the bill or on some other question having to do with general legislation. I would hope that the hon. member would not continue his remarks in this vein.

**Mr. Howard:** Mr. Chairman, I could not agree with you more. There is no question but that within the strict application of the rules I was out of order. I saw you were not seeking to interrupt me, so I proceeded. Perhaps I took advantage of your kindness, but that was not my intention.

I wanted to get across for the second time what I think is a much better way of dealing with this and similar bills. My transgression of the rules was not designed to embarrass anybody or to flaunt the rules. I think that we could proceed in a much better fashion than we are.

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 1 carry?

**Mr. Peters:** Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to repeat what the hon. member for Skeena has said but I presume it will have to be repeated many times before a change is made in the format of these bills. This bill has been before a committee. Those who were not on the committee would be well advised to take