

*Private Bills*

**Mr. Bert Leboe (Cariboo):** Mr. Speaker, I rise only for a moment to express a great deal of interest in the remarks that have been made by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard). There is a great deal of merit in what the hon. member has proposed in connection with this type of bill. The time has come when parliament needs to be relieved of some of the traditional chores in which we find ourselves involved. In fact, I would go a little further in that connection and say that I think we must again review the situation that has arisen in the House of Commons with respect to public bills. We find a tremendous number of these bills on the order paper. They are being reintroduced—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I hesitate to interfere or intervene at this moment, particularly in view of the fact that the hon. member for Skeena was allowed to make rather lengthy remarks about questions which do not relate specifically to the principle of the bill before us, but this is really what we should be considering. This is what should be the subject matter of our debate. As I say, I did allow the hon. member for Skeena to make these remarks thinking they were introductory and that he would finally come to consider the principle of the bill itself. The hon. member for Cariboo now seems to wish to continue in the same vein and convert this debate into one dealing with procedure rather than one dealing with the principle of the incorporation of this particular association. I do not want to cut off the debate entirely, but I would invite the hon. member for Cariboo and other hon. members who will take part in the debate afterwards to try to limit their contributions to the debate to what they should be, that is, to a discussion of the principle of the bill before the house.

**Mr. Leboe:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those remarks and I agree wholeheartedly that the position you have taken is quite correct. I only say at this moment that we would like to see this bill receive second reading and be referred to the standing committee.

**Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming):** Mr. Speaker, I too should like to say a few words about this bill. I want to have regard for your ruling, but even though I agree with it I think that the house is going to have to give some consideration to the remarks made by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard). I say so because if one looks around the house it will be found from the number of members present that the discussion of this bill does

not seem to be generating a great deal of interest, and I think it should. The title and format of the bill—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Rosthern on a point of order.

**Mr. Nasserden:** Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that as I look about the house I see that there are just as many people here now as there usually are during deliberations in the House of Commons.

• (6:20 p.m.)

**Mr. Peters:** Well, Mr. Speaker, this is no credit to the members of parliament and no credit to the house. We have been discussing estimates of a very serious nature running into millions, yes, billions of dollars. I do not really consider this bill to be in that category. If the hon. member is correct, the degree of disgrace is greater than I had intended. I could go on being out of order by mentioning that I do not like our hours of sitting, which deprive us of an opportunity to have supper. The hon. member was willing to vote for this, but I will not do that.

I feel that we are being asked today to accept a bill about which general remarks should be applicable. This bill appears to have been designed in archaic legalistic terms and does not really mean anything. Perhaps the sponsor is not aware of its legal background, but it seems to have been designed with the sole purpose of putting money into the pockets of lawyers. We do not know whether the Evangelistic Tabernacle Incorporated is a small or large organization, whether it is actually a religious body or a group of individuals associated for other than religious purposes.

On the face of it the bill appears to be the child of some lawyer's mind, particularly in view of the legal hocus-pocus in its format. I am sure that members have not had an opportunity to look at the legalistic rigmaroles contained in this and other similar bills. It is unfortunate that the sponsors did not indicate just what the Evangelistic Tabernacle Incorporated is, or is going to be. It may well be an association to make millions of dollars as a holding organization. It may well be a religious organization having churches in different communities and certain other properties deeded to them. However, in looking at the bill as a member of parliament, because of the way in which it has been drafted I am not aware whether or not it will meet the needs of the corporation. For