

be deferred to a later date. The initial suggestion was that they be deferred until Tuesday, but Tuesday being an opposition day we thought possibly it would have to be Wednesday. Unfortunately our House leader is not here, but I would recommend that you at least consider this suggestion.

An hon. Member: You have already voted.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): I think that the House finds itself in this difficulty because the opportunity to defer the vote, which was the understanding mentioned by the hon. member for York-Simcoe, was missed because the required number of members did not rise in their places, which would have allowed the Chair to postpone the vote according to Standing Order 75(11).

One way in which we can resolve the difficulty is, by unanimous consent, calling the question again on motion No. 2 and have members rise, and then we can defer the vote until the required time. If that were agreed then there still would be an opportunity for the Chair to take into consideration the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there is confusion and, with respect, I think it is in your mind as well, between taking a vote and having a recorded vote. If you put the question and call for the yeas and nays—

An hon. Member: He did.

● (2050)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): All right, when Your Honour puts the question and calls for the yeas and nays and you declare the motion carried, that is the vote. To say that it is being put off until Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday is merely deferring the formality of the recorded division. My complaint is that the taking of the vote on motion No. 2, by virtue of the announcement made earlier today from the Chair by His Honour, Mr. Speaker, wipes out any possibility of voting on motion No. 3. In my view what should have been deferred was the taking of the vote the way we took it. When you say that the recorded division is being put off, that does not put off the vote. The vote has already been taken on motion No. 2 and has been carried, and when you couple that with Mr. Speaker's announcement, the vote on motion No. 2 takes care of No. 3, and No. 3 has had it.

I think the whole procedure should be reviewed by Your Honour at your next morning prayer meeting to see if you cannot sort it out again.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have some indication from the acting house leader as to whether it is the intention to defer whatever the vote is until Wednesday, on the understanding that the debate will be completed as quickly as possible either tonight or tomorrow.

Mr. Gillespie: Mr. Speaker, I would like to get some clarification with regard to the proposal respecting a deferred vote. It is not clear to me how that deferred vote would be taken. What is the proposal of the opposition, or of the Chair, in regard to the order in which the votes

Federal Business Development Bank Act

would be taken and, if so, when, and what does the phrase "deferred vote" mean? I would appreciate, as I am sure other members of the House would, a clarification of some of these terms.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, pardon me for getting up so often, but what I asked for when I raised the point some time ago was not the mere deferment of the mechanics of a recorded vote until some other day but that the vote on motion No. 3 be called before the vote on No. 2. I gave my reasons, and the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) repeated them. Motion No. 3 is broader, and it seems to me that we should decide whether we go that far first. If, instead, we decide on the narrower proposition in motion No. 2, that ends the story. It seems to me that what is called for is a review of Mr. Speaker's announcement this afternoon that the vote would come first on motion No. 2 and an affirmative vote on it would settle motion No. 3. I think that the order should be reversed, that the vote on motion No. 3 should be taken first.

An hon. Member: Why?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Because I believe in doing things logically. An affirmative vote on motion No. 3 would adopt the wider proposition. If it were defeated, it would be still open to us to slip back to motion No. 2. But if motion No. 2 is carried, there is no opportunity to go on to motion No. 3. I suggest that the House agree to let the whole matter stand until Mr. Speaker, and the rest of those in the chair and at the table, can review the matter at one of their morning sessions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Penner): I thank hon. members for their contribution to the present dilemma in which we find ourselves. The Chair will make a suggestion to the House in order that we may proceed with the business before us this evening, and that is that, by unanimous consent, the vote on motion No. 2 be deemed not to have been put, and that we proceed with the debate immediately on motion No. 3. If the House would agree to that, then we would be able to proceed with our business this evening in a straightforward way.

Mr. Gillespie: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I should like to clarify this matter of the debate on motion No. 3, because it was my impression that the House has been debating both motions Nos. 2 and 3 since we met this afternoon.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is the order of voting that is at stake.

Mr. Gillespie: We have come now to the point where we are ready to proceed to other motions, and of course I would seek your guidance as to whether it would be motion No. 1 or No. 4. But so far as the debate is concerned, I understand that we have completed the debate on both earlier motions. The confusion, as I understand it, revolves around whether or not there was to be a deferred vote, or whether in fact a vote has occurred which has been an affirmative vote in favour of motion No. 2. I am anxious to co-operate with the House and to proceed with this bill as, I am sure, are members of the House. I hope it