

on this point I do understand the practice. I wish to protest very distinctly against the proposition suggested by the hon. the Minister of Finance. I believe we are entitled, after what occurred last night, and it was the understanding of the House generally at that time, that the votes of members should be recorded as reversed from the former division. It is the right of every hon. member to have his vote so recorded. It would be unfair and a dangerous practice to depart from that position to-day. I know it to be perfectly clear, so far as the last four or five years are concerned, that upon an occasion of this kind the practice has been such as is asked for by my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Ingram). The hon. Minister of Finance says, forsooth, that because of the inconvenience it might occasion to the minority of one, the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. McIntyre), to have the vote recorded in that way we should depart from what has been the practice of parliament. The practice of parliament must be well understood by the older members of this House. I think it is well understood on this point by almost every member of this House, and I think it is the right of the House to have the vote recorded in the way my hon. friend from Elgin has proposed.

Mr. FIELDING. I only speak again, Mr. Speaker, with your permission. I am afraid the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has entirely misunderstood my point. I rather agree as a matter of intelligence and convenience with the suggestion made by hon. gentlemen opposite as to recording the names the second time. I think it would be the better way, whether that changes the practice of the House or not. But when my hon. friend declares that we must have the practice of the House and not what the Minister of Finance suggests, he is wrong and I am right because Mr. Speaker has told us this is the practice of the House. The particular point that I was drawing attention to was that if we recorded the names in the way suggested you would place my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. McIntyre) in a position which would be unfair. That was the only point of my observation.

Mr. LENNOX. If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, a word in reply to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), I wish to make it very distinct that, with all deference to what Mr. Speaker may have suggested, having regard to the practice which has been followed for the last five years, what was suggested by my hon. friend from Elgin has been the practice in matters of this kind.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as has been remarked, this is rather an important matter, and no doubt all of us on both sides of the House are desirous that our votes

should be correctly recorded. I draw attention to the 'Votes and Proceedings' of yesterday and also to the 'Hansard.' In the 'Votes and Proceedings' we find that:

The question being put on the main motion, it was agreed to on the same division reversed.

That certainly expresses the intention clearly and without equivocation, but when I turn to 'Hansard'—and I am not reflecting upon 'Hansard' at all, because, it is not recording words spoken by an hon. member—I find that 'Hansard' reports it thus:

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

In the country that might be quoted against me. I may be told that because I did not vote against the Bill I voted for it and I think, Mr. Speaker, that you should direct, that, in the Revised 'Hansard' the wording should be changed so that it will convey the intention, at least of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is perfectly clear that a change will have to be made in the 'Hansard' report. I did not observe that before, but obviously it conveys an entirely wrong impression, and it is the document which is more likely to be used in connection with this vote than the formal record of the proceedings of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I agree with the suggestion that 'Hansard' ought to be revised and can be revised, and it will convey exactly what took place, but I do not think we can change the 'Votes and Proceedings.'

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST—SUBSIDY TO ALBERTA.

House in committee to consider the following proposed resolutions providing for the payment of an annual subsidy to the province of Alberta.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

1. Resolved, That the following amounts shall be allowed as an annual subsidy to the province of Alberta, and shall be paid by the government of Canada, by half-yearly instalments in advance, to the said province, that is to say:—
(a) for the support of the government and legislature, fifty thousand dollars;

(b) on an estimated population of two hundred and fifty thousand, at eighty cents per head, two hundred thousand dollars, subject to be increased as hereinafter mentioned, that is to say:—a census of the said province shall be taken in every fifth year reckoning from the general census of one thousand nine hundred and one, and an approximate estimate of the population shall be made at equal intervals of time between each quinquennial and decennial census; and whenever the population, by any such census or estimate, exceeds two hundred and fifty thousand, which shall be the minimum on which the said allowance shall be calculated, the amount of the said allowance shall be increased accordingly, and so on until the popu-