

taken. The Speaker decided not to divide the motion on the ground that the business specified under the Standing Order could include two or more Bills, and sometimes it includes some other government business."

This reference will serve to indicate, at least in my opinion, that the Speaker in the British House has a right of discretion in such matters.

In Canada, on the other hand, Bourinot, at page 298 of his 4th edition, states in part as follows: "As respects what are known as 'complicated questions', they may always be divided into distinct parts, with the consent of the House. No individual Member, however, can ask, as a matter of right, that such a question be divided, since the House alone can properly decide whether it is complicated or not and into how many propositions it may be divided. The fact is, the necessity of dividing a complicated question is now obviated by the facilities offered for moving amendments. But, in any case, it is always open to a Member to move formally that a question be divided.

"A motion which contains two or more distinct propositions may be divided so that the sense of the House may be taken on each separately."

The footnote to the foregoing commentary indicates that Bourinot's comments are based on a proceeding which occurred in the British House in 1770 which, however, it should be noted, refers to the ancient practice in the British House.

In the same regard paragraph 4 of citation 200 of Beauchesne's 4th edition reads as follows: "A motion which contains two or more distinct propositions may be divided so that the sense of the House may be taken on each separately."

While this citation is a reiteration, in part, of what has been stated by Bourinot, no indication is given as to the procedure to be followed in making any such division.

May I at this time thank all those honourable Members who have made such a valuable contribution to our discussion this afternoon on what is a very difficult problem. The Chair very much appreciates having the benefit of their experience and knowledge. I have looked into our records and have failed to find any case which establishes a clear and proper procedure on the matter. It is true that there are to be found instructions to committees to divide Bills, or to introduce more than one Bill based on a single resolution adopted in Committee of the Whole; but such instances, in my view, are different from and not applicable to the present situation.

I have considered other cases which might have some bearing on this question, in particular the procedure followed in 1947 and 1948 when a motion was divided in our House, and I might perhaps be permitted to deal more in detail with that instance, which seems to be the nearest to the problem confronting us today.

On Wednesday, December 10, 1947, when a motion to approve the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, together with a complementary agreement with the United Kingdom was being considered, an amendment was proposed thereto as follows:

"That the said resolution be not now proceeded with, but that the same be referred to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to divide the subject-matter thereof into two resolutions, one relating to 'the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, including the protocol of provisional application thereof, annexed to the Final Act of the Second Session of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment held at Geneva from April 10 to October 30, 1947, together with the complementary agreements of October 30, 1947, between Canada and the United States of America,' and the other resolution relating to 'the complementary