

be recognized. I understand the hon. member of the official opposition who rushed into the chamber has now recovered his breath and is ready to rise as soon as I have concluded.

● (1950)

**Mr. Blenkarn:** I have been here all the time.

**Mr. Blais:** The hon. member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) is always full of breath and of course is able to receive the recognition Your Honour will grant him at any time. Whether he will advance anything of worth is the question which must be determined.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Waddell:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in reply. Of course the minister does not have to tell the hon. member what he is; he is full of hot air and bafflelegab. If he checks the rules he will find under Citation 210 that a member need not remain in the House after giving notice that there is no quorum.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Waddell:** Hon. members should listen. There is a difference between recognizing myself as a member on a quorum vote and recognizing myself to speak. I submit that I do not lose my right to speak and that I can continue since I was recognized previously.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** Mr. Speaker, when an hon. member calls a quorum in the process of speaking and leaves the House, clearly he has terminated his remarks. This is what happened with the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell). He cannot have it both ways. He could have remained in the House and suggested to Your Honour that there was lack of a quorum, but he would have had to remain in the House in order to retain his turn as a participant in the debate. I have no quarrel with an hon. member who was not speaking rising to call for a quorum. If any hon. member who did not have the floor had stood and called for a quorum, it would have been a different matter; but the hon. member who was in the process of addressing the House called for a quorum and then left the chamber.

When an hon. member sits down in a debate or leaves the chamber in a debate, he has indicated to the House and to Mr. Speaker that he has finished his remarks. I see no conceivable way that the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway could now continue his participation in second reading debate. He has had his opportunity. He relinquished his position in the debate. Of course he will have an opportunity at further stages in the debate.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Kempling:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I think Your Honour should bear in mind in coming to your judgment that when the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) left the chamber, he took his fellow partymen with him. In other words, his manoeuvre was to try

to close down the House. I find that deplorable. In fact the last time this happened was when the then hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre some time ago during private members' hour brought the House to a standstill because there was not a quorum. I do not think the hon. member should be allowed to continue his remarks. Having left the House, he has no right to continue to speak.

**Mr. Skelly:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order.

**Mr. Blenkarn:** You were not in the House.

**Mr. Skelly:** The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) was certainly in the process of addressing the House of Commons on an extremely important issue. The number of participants dropped to nine, two from the official opposition and an equivalent number from the government. This is unwarranted attendance in a debate on an extremely important piece of legislation such as this.

On the other side of the coin, when the hon. member called a quorum I noticed that Your Honour responded by rising and the proceedings were suspended. When they were suspended while the Chair took count of the members so that the House and the hon. member could continue speaking, he resumed his seat. Until the Chair completed the procedural function of taking the count, the hon. member's obligations were terminated for a temporary period.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Skelly:** He left the House, and it strikes me that there should be an opportunity once the procedural function is complete for him to resume. He is now in his seat looking for recognition. It strikes me that the fair thing to do would be to allow him to proceed now that we have a quorum.

**Mr. Waddell:** Surely the principle of a quorum is that we demand attendance and interest in the House. That is why we have a quorum rule.

**Mr. LeBlanc:** But you left.

**Mr. Waddell:** If we drop below a quorum in numbers, in legal terms we lose the jurisdiction of the House. Any hon. member is entitled to call for a count. If the House is able to respond, as it was in this instance when hon. members came running in from the corridor and became involved in the debate, the hon. member is quite justified in doing so. That is the principle of a quorum. I am clearly permitted under the rules to leave the House. That is why the rule is there. The rule on the quorum is there so that the hon. member who is speaking, or any other member of the House, can demand that the House give him the minimal level of attention and jurisdiction he should have. None of the hon. members have raised any substantial rulings indicating that I should not get the floor. They just want to punish me; they do not want to give any real logic.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether leaving the House in the middle of a speech is any worse than finishing a