

put. I remember the feat accomplished by a very eloquent representative of Nova Scotia, Hon. Mr. Miller who was at one time Speaker of the Senate. I cannot say whether the incident took place before he occupied the Speaker's Chair or afterwards. He had expressed dissent from a Bill, but it passed the three readings. I do not remember exactly the career of the Bill—whether it had been disputed in Committee or in the House, but he made up his mind only at the very moment when, after the third reading had passed the final supplementary question was put, "Shall that Bill pass?" He rose from his seat and made such an onslaught on the Bill that a vote was taken, and the decision was that the Bill should not pass. That is the only precedent that I remember. That precedent was afterwards cited in the House; and it would bear on the present stage of procedure.

My honourable friend can divide the House on the question put by the honourable the Speaker.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: I can do better than that. I am strictly within the rule mentioned by Bourinot at page 532:

Motion, that the Bill do pass.—The next question put by the Speaker is: "That this Bill do pass, and that the title be", etc.

This motion generally passes nem. con. immediately after the third reading, though it is quite regular to defer the final passage until a future day, or to move that the further consideration of the Bill be postponed; or to propose other amendments against the principle of the measure with the view of preventing its passage.

The rule seems to be quite clear.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: That supports the procedure of Senator Miller. He stopped the Bill as it was about to leave the hand of the Speaker, and defeated it on a vote. My honourable friend says, "I can move that it do not pass, but be further amended, or be referred back to Committee."

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: Yes. The rule is clear, it seems to me.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: That is not a ruling; that is a statement from Bourinot. It is a question of practice.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Carried.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Does the honourable member insist on his amendment?

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: Yes. My amendment is to insert the following words as subsection 2 of section 1:

(2) Any contributor who, at the time of his election to become a contributor under the provisions of sections sixteen, seventeen, twenty and twenty-two of this Act, did not elect to

pay contributions in respect of past periods of service, may, at his option, on or before the thirty-first day of December one thousand nine hundred and twenty-seven, amend the terms of his election by electing to pay contributions in respect of such service.

I beg to move that as an amendment.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Honourable gentlemen, the question before the House is that this Bill do now pass; to which Hon. Senator Belcourt moves in amendment that the Bill do not now pass, but that it be further amended by inserting in section 1, as subsection 2, the amendment which he has read. The question is on the amendment.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: Honourable gentlemen, I am not disposed to accept the principle that an amendment may be introduced at this stage, though that may have been a procedure accepted and practised in a distant past. I have now been 29 years in the Senate and I take it for granted that our tradition, at all events, is that all such propositions or amendments must be made on the motion for the third reading, the last stage, notwithstanding that precedent of the final question—"Shall this Bill pass?"—having been once answered by a negative vote. I make that reservation so that we may not—at all events, speaking for myself, I would not—be bound by the motion that is now made by my honourable friend.

On the merits I intend to vote against that amendment, considering the argument made in the memorandum which I have read as to the necessity of closing as early as we can the period of election. We have already granted delays, and it seems to me that the interval from the present time to July next will be sufficient to allow the parties to think the matter over. They are not losing anything by joining in, but are gaining something.

Right Hon. Sir GEORGE E. FOSTER: Honourable gentlemen, I would like to understand just the position. If I heard aright what was read by my honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Belcourt) and colleague as to the practice in the Senate, an amendment can be moved at this stage only if its purpose is to defeat the principle of the Bill. I do not think my ears deceived me in that. Is my honourable friend willing to take the position that he is now moving an amendment for the purpose of defeating the principle of the Bill? If so, I can hardly join with him in voting for his amendment.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: Though I have not had occasion to see it applied in practice, I think the wording of the passage I have quoted from this authority does not justify the con-