

*Canadian Flag*

The second example, and this is one of considerable importance, is on July 17, 1905, page 897 in the same reference volume. There was a resolution before the house which the Speaker had been asked to look at. He did look at it and he said:

—the resolution ought to be divided into at least eight, and probably nine, resolutions.

The substance of that was that Mr. Balfour, the proposer of the motion, withdrew it and said he would bring it back again in the form of a bill.

The third example is on November 13, 1912, volume 43 of the fifth series of that year, where you will find a lengthy discussion with regard to a division of a motion before the house, which is worthy of your attention because I think this one rather sets the pattern. The motion before the house at that time dealt with an amendment for the suspension of the standing orders of the house and a recasting of a guillotine resolution, that is allocation of time; and, most important, for the rescinding of an amendment passed by the house a few days earlier.

The Speaker decided that so far as he was concerned the suspension of the standing orders was immaterial, it was the type of thing introduced into many motions. But he said there were two propositions before the house, one being the rescission of an amendment—this is a most unusual practice indeed, to reverse a decision made earlier by the house—and the second proposition was to re-modify the timetable which had been passed by the house two weeks earlier. He said in effect that that motion might be divided, and they would deal separately with the really important question, the rescinding of the amendment. So he cut the question into two parts.

The last reference I would give is in 1920, volume 131, column 2606. There was a motion before the house asking for the suspension of the eleven o'clock rule, and at the same time asking that business other than supply might be taken on a supply day. The Speaker agreed that the motion might very well be taken into two parts. The question affecting the suspension of the eleven o'clock rule might have meant an all-night sitting and was an important question to be decided by the house. The second part of the motion dealt with something entirely different, namely the taking of business other than supply on a day set aside for supply. There was no resemblance between the two propositions put forward in the motion.

This, in addition to the examples quoted by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, represents very largely, if not completely, the examples Your Honour will be able to find in the various reference books. So it is quite clear that in the first instance the division of a motion before the house is not often made. It occurs when two distinct and opposing points of view are presented in one motion, and in such cases the Speaker, for the convenience of the house, makes the division. In some of the examples I have given the motions were withdrawn because of the objections raised and something else was substituted.

Now may I deal with the somewhat dubious method by which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre wants to get around standing order 44. I think Your Honour will have to give most serious consideration to this proposition about reading the orders of the day on some subsequent day and then, at that stage, considering a superseding motion. I would want to examine the record very carefully myself in that regard, but I doubt whether on the basis of the example given to us this morning by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre it would be sound or safe for such a rule to be established here. I think, Mr. Speaker, you must be looking ahead to the business of the house in the future. The adoption of such a suggestion would result in the establishment of a precedent for the future, and all the ramifications which would follow from such a precedent should be carefully examined. Standing order 44, without repeating it in full, certainly says that no motion can be received when a question is before the house except to amend it, postpone it, and so on; and after reading the citation I am not sure that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is giving a correct interpretation of what happened in 1833. However, that is for Your Honour to look at. Even in the motion to which the hon. member drew our attention, two very separate matters were brought to the attention of the house. One involved the setting up of a committee to consider the sale of liquor, and the other asked the house to consider the names of the people who should be appointed to that committee. It is obvious that those two matters could easily be dealt with separately.

I conclude simply by saying that the examples I have been able to draw to Your Honour's attention are so far removed from the motion before us that I doubt very much