

which the house orders it to be sent there. An amendment of such a wide import as the division of the proposed bill into three bills should not be moved with the Speaker in the chair after the house has already ordered consideration by the committee of a resolution recommending only one bill. The main object of the resolution is to approve the expenditure involved in amendment to the Canadian Wheat Board Act. On that, a general debate may take place, and if the resolution is carried, it will be time to consider under proper procedure whether the expenditure should be embodied in three bills.

There are many precedents to justify this opinion. Beauchesne, third edition, reports at page 551 that Mr. Speaker Glen decided on February 19, 1941, that: "On the motion that the Speaker leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee to consider a money resolution, it is out of order to move an amendment to the resolution." He gave a similar ruling on February 23, 1942.

I have come to the conclusion that the amendment is out of order.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that our proposed amendment is a practical matter of modern common sense. I understand that your ruling is not debatable. If that is the case, I must respectfully appeal from it.

Mr. SPEAKER put the question as follows:

The question before the house is an appeal from the Speaker's ruling. We had before the house a resolution proposing to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act. The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Ross) moved an amendment, which I declared out of order. I based my ruling on a ruling given by Mr. Speaker Glen on February 19, 1941, which may be found at page 551 of Beauchesne, third edition, and a similar ruling on February 23, 1942, that on the motion that the Speaker leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee to consider a money resolution it is out of order to move an amendment to the resolution. From my ruling the hon. member appeals.

The house divided on the question: Shall the Speaker's decision be sustained? And the decision of the chair was sustained on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Archibald	Beaudoin
Argue	Beaudry
Arsenault	Belzile
Baker	Benidickson

Bentley	Lafontaine
Bertrand (Laurier)	Langlois
Bertrand (Prescott)	Lapointe
Black (Chateauguay-Huntingdon)	Laurendeau
Blanchette	Leger
Boivin	Lesage
Bourget	Little
Bowerman	McCann
Bradette	McCuaig
Brown	McCulloch (Picton)
Bryce	McCullough (Assiniboia)
Burton	Macdonald (Brantford City)
Campbell	McDonald (Parry Sound)
Castleden	McIlraith
Chevrier	MacInnis
Claxton	McIvor
Cleaver	McKay
Cloutier	MacKinnon
Coté (Matapedia-Matane)	MacLean
Coté (St. Johns-Iberville-Napierville)	MacNaught
Coté (Verdun)	Maloney
Cournoyer	Marier
Croll	Martin
Cruickshank	Matthews (Brandon)
Dechene	Matthews (Kootenay East)
Denis	Maybank
Dickey	Mayhew
Dion (Lake St. John-Roberval)	Michaud
Dionne (Beauce)	Mitchell
Douglas	Moore
Emmerson	Mullins
Eudes	Mutch
Farquhar	Nicholson
Fournier (Hull)	Nixon
Fournier (Maison-neuve-Rosemont)	Parent
Gardiner	Pinard
Gauthier (Nipissing)	Power
Gauthier (Portneuf)	Probe
Gibson (Comox-Alberni)	Raymond (Wright)
Gibson (Hamilton West)	Reid
Gillis	Richard (Gloucester)
Gingues	Rinfret
Gladstone	Robinson (Simcoe East)
Golding	Ross (Hamilton East)
Gour (Russell)	St. Laurent
Gourd (Chapleau)	Sinclair
Grant	Sinnott
Gregg	Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Harris (Grey-Bruce)	Stuart (Charlotte)
Healy	Strum, Mrs.
Herridge	Thatcher
Howe	Townley-Smith
Iisley	Tremblay
Irvine	Tucker
Isnor	Viau
Jaenicke	Warren
Jutras	Weir
King, Mackenzie	Whitman
Knight	Winkler
Knowles	Winters
LaCroix	Wright
	Zaplitny—131.