

Private Bills

COMMERCE MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY

On the order:

House again in the committee of the whole on Bill No. 198, an act respecting Commerce Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Eudes.

Mr. Knowles: Is the sponsor here?

Mr. Harris: Stand.

Mr. Speaker: The order is "house again in committee of the whole." If the committee of the whole does not wish to proceed with the bill they will have to report progress and ask leave to sit again, but at this moment I must leave the chair.

The house in committee on Bill No. 198, respecting Commerce Mutual Fire Insurance Company—Mr. Eudes—Mr. Robinson (Simcoe East) in the chair.

On clause 1—*Name changed.*

Mr. Green: Mr. Chairman, when the bill was in committee on Friday last the hon. member for Greenwood asked for an explanation from the sponsor. The sponsor not being here, the bill was stood over. I am afraid the sponsor is not here today, and I suggest that it be stood until he is here to explain it.

Mr. Harris: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious if one reads the bill that it deals only with the changing of names and the like, and unless there is any particular objection registered by any hon. member I would hope that we could pass it. The marginal note to clause 1 is "name changed", and certain rights are saved. Clause 2 has to do with the coming into force of the measure. Persons affected by the bill not having made any representations, it seems to me that it is perfectly sensible for us to pass it in the normal course.

Mr. Green: For the sake of the prestige of parliament I suggest that it is not very wise to pass a bill without the sponsor being here. Surely members of the house are entitled to have an explanation of the bill from the sponsor. If he cannot be here today perhaps he can be here on Friday. Just because a bill may appear simple is surely no reason why it should go through the house without hon. members being able to obtain—

Mr. Knowles: That is no reason to make parliament look simple, too.

Mr. Green:—one word of explanation about it at all. Probably there is nothing objectionable in the bill, but it is the principle that worries me, that members can put their names down as sponsors of bills, not bother coming here, and expect the rest of us to pass

[Mr. James.]

them without explanation. I suggest that is going very far and that it is a practice which should not be supported in the house.

Mr. Harris: Under those circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that you rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, but should the same thing occur on Friday I shall undertake to sponsor the bill myself.

Clause stands.

Progress reported.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

AMENDMENT OF CHAPTER 152, REVISED STATUTES OF 1952—VOLUNTARY REVOCABLE CHECK-OFF OF UNION DUES

The house resumed, from Friday, February 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Knowles for the second reading of Bill No. 4, to amend the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act (voluntary revocable check-off).

Mr. Angus MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in support of this bill. It is one that has been before the house and has received consideration on a number of occasions. As was pointed out by the sponsor of the bill, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), when the industrial relations and disputes investigation bill was being considered by the standing committee on industrial relations in 1948 the committee approved a section of this kind in the bill. When the bill came back to the house the action of the committee was rescinded. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has persisted in introducing this measure session after session, and it has received increasing support in the house.

At the last session, after some debate in the house, the bill was referred to the standing committee on industrial relations and that committee approved the principle we are now discussing. Some objection was raised to this measure by one of the speakers who has opposed it on the ground that it has some compulsion in it. May I point out that the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act is in itself an act of compulsion. Section 12 of the act reads as follows:

Where the board has under this act certified a trade union as a bargaining agent of employees in a unit and no collective agreement with their employer binding on or entered into on behalf of employees in the unit, is in force,

(a) the bargaining agent may, on behalf of the employees in the unit, by notice, require their employer to commence collective bargaining; or

(b) the employer or an employers' organization representing the employer may, by notice, require