

refer briefly to both. Many members of the House are familiar with the ruling of Mr. Speaker Macnaughton. It is to be found in *Votes and Proceedings* of Monday, June 15, 1964, oddly enough, right after a return to a question asked by Mr. Fisher dealing with the future of the *Bonaventure*.

The future of the "Bonnie" has been decided, but we still have this ruling by Mr. Speaker Macnaughton which I think is a guide to us in respect of this difficult motion. I am sure Your Honour is familiar with this ruling which appears at pages 427 to 431 of the *Votes and Proceedings* of that date. The decision of Mr. Speaker Macnaughton reads:

I must come to the conclusion that the motion before the House contains two propositions—

The problem was relatively simple because there were only two, but I suggest there may be as many as seven involved here. Mr. Speaker Macnaughton went on to say:

—and since strong objections have been made to the effect that these two propositions should not be considered together, it is my duty to divide them as follows:—

Then, he divided the two resolutions.

I was not in the House at that time, but I gather that this method of dividing these important questions was satisfactory to the members who were here. They could at least make up their minds much more easily than we can when we are dealing with this omnibus measure. I hope it will not be argued that we are not dealing with the question of principle but with the question of whether the bill should go to the committee, because many members of this House regard the second reading stage as one involving the principle. We are going to be faced with a problem somewhere along the line as to how one can cast a simple yes or no vote on a bill containing as many as seven different and distinct propositions.

I should like also to refer Your Honour to the British Hansard, for June 6, 1917 when that House was dealing with a bill concerning the "Representation of the People". The Speaker of the British House was dealing with the question of whether or not a motion should be divided. He quoted earlier authorities. One of the latest references to earlier decisions in the British House seems to indicate that members were jealous of their tradition of ensuring that they were not faced with complicated questions. The Speaker in 1917 quoted an earlier ruling of Mr. Speaker Peel of July 26, 1894, who laid down the following principle:

—that an Instruction for the division of a Bill was only possible "when that Bill was divided into parts, or else, comprising more than one subject matter, lends itself to such division into parts."

I am suggesting, Sir, that the measure before us does lend itself to division into several parts. Which ones will be the subject of dispute during the debate that follows, I have no idea, but I suppose some people would like the setting up of the environmental department but might quarrel with the idea that the old Department of Fisheries be swallowed up by it. Some people might think there should be more Parliamentary Secretaries, and I know there are a number of members around with eyes shining

Government Organization Act, 1970

with anticipation, but others may think this question should be thoroughly examined. If I had any very strong objection, I would say that the creation of these ministries for example, is very basic. Only time and the debate will tell which of these seven propositions we face will exercise members who will vote yes or no, and those which will not exercise the members. I could also mention the part in respect of civil servants, which is in my view a basic part. These are the things that bother me.

I gather from reading the ruling of Mr. Speaker Macnaughton, and the history of the rulings that led up to it, that the Speaker would be guided by a sizeable number of people voicing an objection to being presented with a simple yes or no vote on a complicated question. I want to make it clear in asking for your ruling that there be a division, that I am not voicing only my objection. I speak for the members of the Official Opposition. They endorse my position that there should be this division, and they ask you, through me, that when a disposition of this motion is made Your Honour divide the questions. Then, we will not be faced with the problem of going through intellectual gymnastics in trying to decide which parts to vote against because they are objectionable and which parts to support. I think the precedents I have pointed to are sufficient, so I rest my case. I would ask that Your Honour give it respectful consideration.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make two comments on the argument which has been so ably made by the hon. member who has just taken his seat. It is true that he raises some issues which are relevant as we begin consideration of this bill. It may be of some assistance to the House to realize that the over-all theme of the bill is to improve and make more efficient the organization of government. All the propositions which are, in the words of my hon. friend, contained in the bill, are directed, at least in the mind of the government, to improving and making more efficient the organization of government. All the items the House is asked to deal with in the bill are relevant to the over-all theme.

• (3:10 p.m.)

I would argue that during this session we have dealt with bills which contained several propositions. We have dealt with bills in this session which have amended several other acts. One which comes to mind immediately is the omnibus loans bill which included loan guarantees for fishermen, farmers and others. Those three were dealt with at the same time. Yesterday, we dealt with the second reading of the textile legislation and I believe one could find quite a number of propositions in that particular bill. Mr. Speaker, I would also mention that on previous occasions we have had before us similar government organization bills in which new departments have been created, so at such times essentially the same kind of legislation has been considered. There is, therefore, ample precedent. I do not see any difficulty from that point of view, but I now come to the crux of the argument made by the hon. member, namely, that there are several principles in this bill.