

*Canadian Flag*

so prematurely. However, if no one from the other side is willing to speak I should like to deal with the procedure put before us by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

I wondered at this, Mr. Speaker, when everybody here was eager to hear the presentation of the Prime Minister. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has taken 30 minutes to put forward a rather odd suggestion which he has advanced in various devious ways, and is asking Your Honour to reach a conclusion. Before you do that, sir, I certainly think you should hear from others who have also given some consideration to this point. You might want to look back at another reference, Hatsell in 1770, who first dealt with the matter.

I was surprised that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre placed his reliance on our standing order 50 which reads:

Whenever Mr. Speaker is of opinion that a motion offered to the house is contrary to the rules and privileges of parliament, he shall apprise the house thereof immediately, before putting the question thereon—

I fail to see where any of the rights and privileges of parliament are abrogated by the introduction of the resolution that is before us, and I do not see that the Speaker is called upon immediately to examine this and take some action. In fact the hon. member did not give any reference to any incidents when the Speaker had intervened under such circumstances, and certainly he was unable to point out that this offended against any ancient right or privilege of parliament, although he used that expression.

The hon. member is quite right in giving us the references he did, with the one omission I have mentioned, and in the parliament at Westminster there has been in effect a method by which, from time to time, motions may be divided. Although our reference books, Beauchesne and Bourinot, refer to this they do not give satisfactory examples from Canadian practice, and in fact Beauchesne rather skims over the whole thing without any substantial reference whatsoever. So you have to go to May for the references. I wonder why the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre quoted the thirteenth edition of May when we have, and have had for a number of years, the sixteenth edition available. Why does he not get up to date when dealing with a volume as important as May, which has been available in its sixteenth edition for a number of years?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to a number of references which I

[Mr. Churchill.]

am prepared to give where, in the British House of Commons, certain motions are divided; but before doing that may I draw your attention to the fact that there are occasions when motions are not subject to division in the British house, and this should have been drawn to your attention by the hon. member who preceded me. In May's sixteenth edition on page 607 you will find this sentence in the middle of the page:

The practice of the house by which a motion or amendment embodying several propositions is divided by the Chair if objection is taken to it on that account, so that questions may be put on each proposition separately, is not followed in committee of the whole house.

So you have that restriction on this division of motions in British practice, and then you have a further restriction. I give the reference. In 1928, as recorded in the parliamentary debates for the United Kingdom, volume 217, column 678, a member of the house requested the division of a motion which was then before the house dealing with the sittings of the house. The hon. member asked if there would be two votes on this particular motion and Mr. Speaker replied:

No, only one. The business specified under the standing order may include two or more bills and sometimes it includes some other government business.

I draw these two examples to your attention, sir, so you may be clear on the fact that the practice of dividing motions is not carried throughout the business of the house. It only pertains under certain circumstances.

The circumstances under which it may be done can be drawn from a number of references in the British House of Commons running from 1888 to 1928. There are not many references, half a dozen, and in each instance the motions were divided on the request of an hon. member. That is the way they do it there, and the motions that were divided were dealing with matters very distinct one from the other.

The first example I cite, on April 19, 1888, volume 324, page 1828, had to do with a motion which embodied in its first part mention of the earning of grants for cookery, in connection with a bill dealing with education in Scotland, and in the second part it dealt with grants for drawing in reckoning the total of 17s. 6d. per scholar in average attendance. These were two very separate and distinct propositions, and the Speaker said he had no objection to taking them separately. As a matter of fact the motion was not proceeded with; it was withdrawn.