

That is the first key thing, because he did in fact then hear the motion. He continued:

I heard the motion and I heard the Hon. Members who expressed their yeas and nays. By the time the Speaker had declared the motion was lost, I was in my seat, as has been indicated.

Then he went on to say:

I was in my seat by that time. I knew what the question was and I was in my seat. When I was in my seat and when it was time to call for a recorded vote, there were five of us here. It is as simple as that.

The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North, on his word as a Member of this House, a respected Member of this House, a senior Member of this House, stated categorically that he was here in time to stand with his colleagues in order that there would be five Members and the recorded division could take place.

It is a practice in this House, long established, that regardless of what allegation may be made against a Member, if he rises and says that he was present or whatever, that is accepted. It is accepted by all sides. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North last night said he was here, and he was. He said he was here in time to stand with his colleagues to cause the vote, and he was. By virtue of his having said so, that should have been the end of it. The vote should then have taken place. What has happened is that the honour of this Hon. Member has been called into question as a result of the conclusion which was arrived at last night, and I object most strenuously to that.

● (1230)

The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North has never uttered a falsehood in this House in his time here. To try to leave the impression that perhaps that occurred last night is disgraceful. I therefore ask you, Sir, taking all of those things into account, to look at the avenues which are now open and to declare that the vote was either carried in the first instance and that *Hansard* be directed to put that into the record of yesterday's events in the House of Commons; or that the matter was not resolved at the adjournment hour last night and the vote has still to take place.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member has argued at some length a matter which was decided last night. Without creating a precedent, the Chair has allowed a discussion to take place with regard to that because of the unique circumstances and the importance of the matter raised. It is, however, I repeat, not to be a precedent concerning a decision which has been made by the Chair.

The Hon. Member has indicated that the Chair in a number of instances uses discretion. The Chair cannot accept a parallel between a choice of who is to pose a question in Question Period and the procedures for the recording of a vote of the House of Commons which, of necessity, must be precise and clear. Reviewing last night's record, the Acting Speaker indicated—and I am quoting as the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) did—at page 1028 of *Hansard*:

THE ACTING SPEAKER (MR. GUILBAULT): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Point of Order—Mr. Deans

Then “Carried?”—with a question mark. That is the usual format of the House. That is the normal way in which the House puts a question. It is quite clear that the word “*adopté*” was in the record, but in an interrogative way, and the format which is normal and usual, time-honoured in this place, when a question is put, is “Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Carried?”—with an intonation indicating a question. It is not essential that “Carried?”—with a question mark—be put into *Hansard*. However, if the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain wishes, the Chair would have no objection to directing that that word, with a question mark, be inserted into *Hansard*.

The procedure is very clear and it was followed by the occupant of the chair. The Chair went through the procedure, put the motion when it was called to his attention, and actually put it very explicitly. I quote from *Hansard* at page 1028:

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

THE ACTING SPEAKER (MR. GUILBAULT): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

THE ACTING SPEAKER (MR. GUILBAULT): All those in favour, please say yea.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yea.

THE ACTING SPEAKER (MR. GUILBAULT): Those against, please say nay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

THE ACTING SPEAKER (MR. GUILBAULT): In my opinion, the nays have it.

That is a very precise formula. If Hon. Members are to object, they object at that point. They objected after:

THE ACTING SPEAKER (MR. GUILBAULT): The motion is defeated, I declare the motion lost.

That was said by the Speaker and then Hon. Members objected, in support of which I quote the words of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) on the following page, page 1029. He said:

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, I was coming into the House when the motion was being put. I heard the motion and I heard the Hon. Members who expressed their yeas and nays. By the time the Speaker had declared the motion was lost, I was in my seat—

It was not after: “In my opinion, the nays have it”. He said: “By the time the Speaker had declared the motion was lost, I was in my seat”. The time at which the Hon. Member had to be in his seat was after the Speaker had said: “In my opinion, the nays have it.”

May I call the attention of Hon. Members to a practice which has given some distress to the Chair. I quote from Standing Order 15(2):

When the Speaker is putting a question, no Member shall enter, walk out of or across the House, or make any noise or disturbance.

The process of Hon. Members entering the House when a vote is being taken—and the issue arose in Committee of the Whole not so long ago—raises all sorts of difficulty. The Chair will have to observe strict decorum and strict adherence to this rule. In the opinion of the Chair, the word “*adopté*” should be added to *Hansard* with a question mark, indicating the time-