

*The Address—Mr. Low*

so far as what has happened tonight is concerned, as this is the first recorded vote in this new parliament. However, it seems to me that it should be made clear, both to old and to new members, what the rule is with regard to voting. Citation 67 of Beauchesne's second edition reads:

If a member was not present in the house when the question was put by the Speaker, he cannot have his vote recorded.

This point of order was raised, as it has been raised on other occasions, on October 27, 1949. On that occasion Mr. Speaker Macdonald made a definite ruling, as recorded on pages 1210 and 1211 of *Hansard*. The following sentence is the important one:

But I would point out this citation to all members and ask them to note that a member should be in the house and should hear the question read from the beginning.

I would ask that Your Honour consider this point and perhaps give a direction to the house for future occasions.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps I could comment on the point of order at this time. The hon. member has referred to a ruling made by Mr. Speaker Macdonald in which he said that an hon. member must be in his seat and have heard the question.

**Mr. Knowles:** From the beginning.

**Mr. Speaker:** That particular point is not quite clear. If the hon. member looks further in *Hansard* he will find I think that there were rulings made by Mr. Speaker Macdonald that if a member had heard the question he might vote. I have not that ruling before me at the moment. I noticed that two hon. members walked into the chamber—I could not identify them—at the moment that I was reading the amendment to the amendment.

I would agree with the hon. member that in future hon. members should be in their seats at the beginning of the division. I do not find in the records any instance where a vote has been denied even when it was found that an hon. member was not in his seat at the beginning of the reading of the question. I would imagine that at some time in the future if the rules are not adhered to they will have to be applied. I am glad to have this opportunity to warn hon. members about the course I may perhaps have to take on future occasions.

Once the Clerk has announced that the result of a vote is so many nays and so many yeas, and if a point of order is raised after the division is over, I may have to declare that the vote be reduced by a certain number if some hon. members were not seated at the beginning of the vote and therefore should not have voted. (See Bourinot's fourth edition, page 381.)

**Mr. Solon E. Low (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, my reason for rising to speak at this time in this debate is to take advantage of the opportunity to move an amendment. I could not move an amendment on behalf of the Social Credit group when I first spoke in this debate because the rules of the house limit the number of amendments at any one time to two. The Social Credit group, therefore, if it is to be able to move an amendment at all, must do so after the subamendment is disposed of or after the votes have been recorded on both the amendment and the subamendment. Although we do not wish unnecessarily to prolong the present debate we feel justified, for various good reasons, in presenting our amendment for consideration by the members of the house.

We were not satisfied that either the amendment moved by the Conservative party or the subamendment moved by the C.C.F. expressed the Social Credit views at all closely. Both of them, it seemed to me, left some things which we felt should be definitely put forward as practical proposals for the solution of at least one of Canada's greatest problems, that of securing suitable markets for our abundant production. In addition, both amendments contained some expressions that need clarification. I say that because the meanings of those expressions have been distorted by a good deal of political straining over the years until they are now misunderstood throughout this country and, perhaps, throughout a large part of the world.

My colleague the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Shaw) this afternoon made our position clear relative to a national health program and to that part of the C.C.F. subamendment. Consequently I shall have nothing whatever to say about that matter tonight. I will confine my remarks to the Conservative amendment and some closely related matters.

The amendment now under consideration expresses the belief of the Progressive Conservative party that the welfare of Canada is dependent upon free competition. That term "free competition" has already been bandied about in this debate and has been interpreted by some hon. members, including the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. MacInnis), to mean monopoly enterprise. I do not think I am competent to say exactly what the Conservative party meant by their declaration, although I think I know.

This whole world suffers from those who, for their pride's sake or for political party advantage, try to destroy what they do not understand. So I would rather not interpret