

Division

I am the last one to lecture them about what is obvious in this amendment. The amendment now before the house is not that the bill go back to the committee of the whole for the purpose of incorporating the amendment of the hon. member for Greenwood but that it go back to the committee of the whole for the purpose of reconsidering clause 21, which would open the door for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Carleton to be moved again.

Mr. Bell (Carleton): Of course it would not. It having been already disposed of in committee of the whole I could not move the same amendment again.

Mr. Lewis: With great respect and without the knowledge of the rules that I am sure my hon. friend has, my logic tells me that he is obviously wrong. If the house sends the bill back to the committee of the whole then it will be asking the committee of the whole to reconsider the clause. In such a case any amendment could be moved, that of the hon. member for Carleton which we supported in committee and would support again, that of the hon. member for Greenwood, or any other suggestion that might emerge and which might be wiser than either of those that were put before the committee of the whole. Neither the hon. member for Greenwood nor any one of us is wedded to the particular proposal which was made. What we are anxious to see is an amendment to clause 21 which would open the door to the kind of possibility about which the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) spoke and which was repeated several times by the hon. member for Carleton during second reading and in committee of the whole.

I do not think the hon. member for Carleton or any other hon. member can get away with voting against this amendment on the ground that it is a particular kind of amendment to be considered by the committee of the whole, because it is just not so. If the hon. members for Carleton and Edmonton West, or any other hon. members, are dissatisfied with clause 21 as it stands, as they claim they are, then they have no logical alternative other than to vote for the amendment now before the house and leave it to the committee of the whole to decide what to do.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Brewin) which was negatived on the following division:

[Mr. Lewis.]

• (5:50 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Barnett	Lewis
Brewin	Martin (Timmins)
Cameron (Nanaimo- Cowichan-The Islands)	Mather
Douglas	Orlikow
Fawcett	Peters
Gilbert	Prittie
Howard	Saltsman
Knowles	Schreyer
	Winch—17.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken	Honey
Alkenbrack	Hopkins
Allard	Horner (Acadia)
Andras	Hymmen
Asselin (Charlevoix)	Isabelle
Asselin (Richmond-Wolfe)	Johnston
Badanai	Jorgenson
Ballard	Korchinski
Batten	Lachance
Béchar	Laflamme
Bell (Carleton)	Laing
Berger	Lambert
Brand	Lamontagne
Byrne	Langlois (Chicoutimi)
Cadieux (Terrebonne)	Langlois (Mégantic)
Cameron (High Park)	Laprise
Cantelon	Latulippe
Cantin	Laverdière
Cashin	LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Chatterton	Legault
Chatwood	Lessard
Choquette	Lind
Chrétien	Loiselle
Churchill	Macdonald (Rosedale)
Clancy	MacEachen
Clermont	MacEwan
Coates	MacInnis
Comtois	(Cape Breton South)
Côté (Nicolet-Yamaska)	Mackasey
Crossman	MacLean (Queens)
Crouse	MacRae
Davis	McCleave
Deachman	McCutcheon
Dinsdale	McIlraith
Drury	McIntosh
Énard	McKinley
Éthier	McNulty
Fane	McQuaid
Forbes	McWilliam
Forrestall	Madill
Foy	Marchand
Fulton	Matte
Gauthier	Mongrain
Gendron	Moore
Godin	Muir (Lisgar)
Goyer	Nasserden
Greene	Nesbitt
Grégoire	Neveu
Guay	Nicholson
Gundlock	Noble
Habel	Nugent
Hales	Olson
Harkness	Ormiston
Harley	Otto
Hees	Pascoe
Hellyer	Pearson
	Pilon