

Bill No. 297, for the relief of Norah Nichol Meighen Allan.—Mr. Winkler.

Bill No. 298, for the relief of Dora Eleanor Chalmers Grisley.—Mr. Winkler.

Bill No. 299, for the relief of Ruth Desiree Morrisette Chevalier.—Mr. Winkler.

Bill No. 300, for the relief of Richard Martello Johnston.—Mr. Winkler.

Bill No. 304, for the relief of David Allan Ferguson.—Mr. Winkler.

Bill No. 305, for the relief of Ann Louise Fuller Brais.—Mr. Winkler.

Bill No. 306, for the relief of Helen Leola Davidson Hunter.—Mr. Winkler.

The Chairman: Shall I report the bills?

Mr. Knowles: Will the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Winkler), the chairman of the committee that deals with these bills, tell us how many divorces this will make that we have put through at this session?

Mr. Winkler: I cannot tell how many we have put through, but there are sixty-seven tonight.

Mr. Knowles: About three hundred, is it not?

Bills reported, read the third time and passed.

ASSOCIATION OF KINSMEN CLUBS—CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING

Bill No. 312, to incorporate the Association of Kinsmen Clubs.—Mr. Benidickson.

PIPE LINES ACT

PROVISION FOR LOCATION OF MAIN LINE ENTIRELY WITHIN CANADA

On the order:

Resuming debate on the motion of Mr. Sinnott for the second reading of Bill No. 132, an act to amend the Pipe Lines Act, and on the proposed amendment thereto of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. Green: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Bill stands. The sponsor is not here.

Mr. Howard C. Green (Vancouver-Quadra): Mr. Speaker, the debate on second reading was commenced on June 16 and an amendment was moved by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) for a six months' hoist. Several hon. members spoke, and then the debate was adjourned by the hon. member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Mutch). Therefore he would have had the right to speak first this evening, were he here. He is not here, but I submit if some other hon. member wishes to speak on this bill he is at liberty to do so.

Pipe Lines Act

The bill is now before the House of Commons and because someone wishes to shout "stands" is no reason why a member should not be permitted to go on and discuss the bill. I submit there is no such provision in the rules.

Mr. Speaker: It has not been the custom in this house to proceed with a bill introduced by a private member unless that private member is here at the time. The procedure is similar to that followed in respect of bills introduced by the government. If the minister sponsoring the bill is not present, the bill stands, unless the government indicates otherwise. It has always seemed to me that a private member should have the same right in respect of a bill which he has sponsored. I have given the matter consideration and I would be prepared to give a ruling.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Before Your Honour gives a ruling may I say just a word. I realize that it has been the practice, for the most part, not to go ahead with a public bill when the sponsor was not here, but I submit that that is only a matter of courtesy, which in turn depends upon the circumstances involved. When a motion of this kind is in the possession of the house it should be the right of all hon. members who are here to debate it if they wish. I submit for Your Honour's consideration that if the other practice were made firm it would mean that a member could introduce a bill, start the debate with his own speech, and then prevent its being discussed further by the simple expedient of being absent.

I point out that when we have the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne we do not require that the mover and seconder be in the chamber when the debate is resumed; once the debate has been started and the matter is in the possession of the house, it goes on. So it is with bills. They are started with a minister in the house but many times we go on with a bill in the absence of that minister because the matter is in the possession of the house.

I suggest that it would be a dangerous practice to make firm that a bill should not be proceeded with because of that fact or it would make it possible for a member to introduce a bill, for whatever reason or motive he might have, and then prevent the house from going ahead with it. On the other hand, I suggest that after those who want to speak have spoken, if someone wants to move the adjournment of the debate, that would be in order. I do not think the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Green) should be prevented from speaking to this bill which is in the possession of the house, merely because the hon. member for Spring-