

They state exactly what occurred, and any one reading them can ascertain exactly how the division came about. As a matter of record, the Votes and Proceedings are correct.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand you to say that it would not be correct to have the names appear twice on the Votes and Proceedings?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. The record is correct as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough, because it only shows the names in one division, whereas there were two divisions.

Mr. MCINTYRE. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker is entirely correct in what he says; I have made inquiry and find it is so. I only regret that I did not hear the motion distinctly put, and being somewhat ignorant of the proceedings with regard to divisions—we have had so few of them this session—I was not aware that I had such privileges as the leader of the opposition says I had.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may be permitted to make a suggestion to his honour the Speaker. The question came up once before on, I think, a precisely similar matter, and the decision was—I am speaking from memory—that as the method adopted in the House was one purely of convenience, a record of the Votes and Proceedings should be made precisely in the same way as if the division had taken place. It was only a method of saving the time of hon. gentlemen in this House. But when it comes to recording the names, they should appear as if the division had taken place; that is to say, that you should have a record as if the House had actually voted, because every one in the House is supposed to consent to the course adopted.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not quite disposed to agree with the leader of the opposition. If you were to record the names, you would place the hon. member for South Perth in a false position. Probably the best way we can do is to let the matter go as it stands, because if the names were again recorded and his name was recorded as voting for the Bill when in reality he wanted to vote against it, it would only make the matter more difficult. I think that as a matter of record the other form would be more convenient.

Mr. INGRAM. What about the other ninety-eight members in this House? Have they no rights at all?

Mr. FIELDING. They have not expressed any dissent.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose that if any member of this House desires another vote he has to show that desire by standing up and asking for a division, and when he does

Mr. SPEAKER.

not do that, and no other member has done it, we assume that he is satisfied.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE. It seems to me that if we are to declare this record correct, we must hereafter always have the two divisions, because I am quite certain that the gentlemen on this side of the House would have insisted on another vote if they thought they were not to be recorded again. Of course the Speaker must decide that. If the practice is that we must have a new division under these circumstances in order to get a record of the names, then we must always put the House to that trouble. I had always understood, though I have not bothered my head much about these rules, that when it was a division such as was agreed to last night, the names were recorded the second time, and that when we consent to the division in that way the names are always to be recorded, because the object of the division is to have a record of the names. But if that is not the case, then my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) is right, and the minutes ought to be amended, if we have power to amend them. I do not know myself what proceeding we ought to take.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, you surely ought to be informed as to what the practice of the House has been. This has occurred a hundred times in the House and in my opinion such votes have always been recorded as if the vote had been given at the time. You can very well find out what the practice has been and if the practice has been as I state then it is your duty to see that the Minutes of the House are revised and printed in accordance with the practice.

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to inform the hon. member (Mr. Haggart) that I have asked the clerk what the practice has been and he states that the practice has been to record the vote as it has been recorded and not as the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. U. WILSON. I would have asked for a division last night on the main motion had I not understood that these names would be recorded again, only reversed, because I want it distinctly understood that I am opposed to the Bill from beginning to end.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think we understand it.

Mr. U. WILSON. And I want the people to understand it.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, I think it is pretty evident to the House that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) proposes to dispose of this matter altogether too lightly. It is an important matter and an important question of practice. Although I have not been a great many years in this House, I feel that