

complies with the requirements. But in any case, I have anticipated that the apparently rather technical objection might be disputed and I should like to say that, in my view, the argument which the honourable Member has just made is not substantiated by the practice in the past. The rule has been interpreted as though it meant that the sheet containing the prayer must have at least three signatures. Unfortunately, the rule is not drawn as clearly as it might be drawn. The rule in the other place is clear because it indicates that is the practice. But our practice has always been to read the rule as though it meant that where there is more than one signature, at least three of them must be on the page containing the prayer. It is a salutary rule. As all honourable Members who have had experience with petitions will appreciate, it is easy enough to sign a sheet with other names on it and not have much knowledge of what the prayer of the petition is. In support of my view I would cite Bourinot's 4th Edition at pages 233 and 234, and at page 235, where Bourinot states as follows: "And the petition should then close with the formal words: 'And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.' Here follow the signatures of the petitioners which must be in writing and at least three signatures, if there are so many, must be on the same sheet with the prayer of the petition."

On January 31, 1913, Mr. Speaker Sproule ruled a petition out of order because there were not three names on the sheet containing the prayer. That is found in the *Journals of the House of Commons*, 1912-13, at page 210.

Bourinot, at page 263 of the 1st Edition, states as follows with regard to that rule—now Standing Order 70, section (6) to which the honourable Member referred: "But this rule is never interpreted as precluding a single petitioner from approaching the House; it simply refers to petitions signed by a number of individuals."

The matter is not one difficult of correction but I think the better course is to reject the petition at this stage.

Mr. Benidickson, seconded by Mr. Badanai, by leave of the House, introduced Bill C-50, An Act to amend the Industrial Development Bank Act, which was read the first time and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

The House resolved itself again into Committee of Supply.

*(In the Committee)*

The following resolutions were adopted:

FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (1), 1959-60

NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL RESOURCES

619 Acquisition of the pipelines (including the oil therein) and related facilities that are located in Canada and that belong to the United States Government and form part of what is known as the Canol Pipeline System.	\$	670,000	00
---	----	---------	----

NATIONAL PARKS BRANCH

620 National Aviation Museum—Administration, Operation and Maintenance . . . . .	75,000	00
--	--------	----