

place—and this chamber is not an easy one to hear in—I thought that the decision was that the main motion was carried on division. It is well known in that House that I expressed myself in opposition to the main motion. There was no call for the yeas and nays, nor did I feel especially called on, or desirous indeed of opposing the government though I did call 'lost' when the second reading was put. But, if as a matter of fact, the form in which the question was decided was that the main motion was agreed to on the same division reversed, it unfortunately places me in the position of apparently speaking one way and voting the other, which was not my intention nor did I do so in fact. It may be that, some time before I get through with my political life, I will be guilty of doing that. If I have apparently done so at this time, it was inadvertently.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman succeeded admirably in doing it this time.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM. In the case of the vote taken last night, when the main motion was put to the House, according to the 'Hansard' to-day it says, 'Carried,' without saying whether it was carried unanimously. It leaves it to be understood that it was carried unanimously. Every one knows that the division took place on the amendment, and the main motion was carried on the same division reversed exactly. Now the Votes and Proceedings show the names of the first division, and according to the practice usually adopted in this House the names should have been recorded on the second division, because every hon. gentleman in this House should be placed on record exactly as he has voted. It is a well known fact that according to the custom of this House the hon. member for South Perth voted for the Bill, as every hon. gentleman did who voted against the amendment. Therefore I say that the Votes and Proceedings ought to be amended so as to show the names twice instead of only once, as they are now shown.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I remember, the suggestion was made to declare the motion carried on division, and then I think the leader of the opposition said, 'Carried on division reversed if there is no objection,' and no objection was made. But with regard to my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. McIntyre), it is well known that he had stated that he intended to vote against the Bill, and his position is quite correct and well understood.

Mr. SPROULE. I always understood it was the right of any member of this House to have a vote if four other gentlemen stand up with him, then a division must take place. It is assumed that when no person stands up to vote no one desires a division, and therefore the question goes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would think that the case is even stronger than my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has put it. As a matter of fact, the method which was adopted last night is often adopted purely for convenience. We have adopted it in this House on many occasions, particularly in the numerous divisions which took place in connection with the government Bill relating to the Transcontinental Railway. It was declared 'Carried by division reversed' or 'Carried on the same division.' However, the system has been adopted purely for convenience. As last night we were here until about a quarter to two o'clock in the morning, I suggested that the main motion should be carried on the same division reversed, purely as a matter of convenience, not having in mind my hon. friend from South Perth, and that was done. It did not need five gentlemen to rise and call for the yeas and nays, all that was necessary for my hon. friend from South Perth to have done was to stand up and call for the yeas and nays, because the division had already been granted by the Speaker. Therefore it was a matter for himself to determine whether we should have another division or not. There may be some excuse for him as a new member, but he could, simply by raising his voice, have had a vote taken in the way in which he says now he would like to have had it taken.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is hardly correct. The hon. member for South Perth could not have exacted the yeas and nays, because he was alone, though he could have objected to the motion being declared carried on the same division reversed, and he could have insisted on having it carried by division. But at all events, I think the hon. gentleman has made his position clear, and we all understand it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I thought was that when a division had once been assented to by the Speaker any hon. member could call for the yeas and nays on that division.

Mr. INGRAM. What I would like to know particularly is if the Votes and Proceedings of yesterday can be amended in order that the names of hon. gentlemen may be recorded as having voted on two different occasions, because it is a subject that will be referred to very frequently in the future, it was one of the most important votes ever cast in this House, and every member of this House should be placed on record so that there will be no dispute as to how he voted? I think the Votes and Proceedings need to be amended.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I doubt if we can do that now.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not see how the Votes and Proceedings, which are now correct as a matter of record, can be amended.