667 NATIONAL LIBRARY
PUBLIC ARCHIVES BUILDING
OTTAWA 2

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
ÉDIFICE DES ARCHIVES PUBLIQUES
OTTAWA 2

NAME OF AUTHOR... *J. R. O. Donnell*
TITLE OF THESIS... *The Twenty-sixth Canadian*
 House of Commons: A Roll
 Call Study
UNIVERSITY... *Carleton*
DEGREE... *M.A. (Pub. Admin.)* YEAR GRANTED ... *1966* ..

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL
LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to
lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights,
and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from
it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without
the author's written permission.

(Signed) *J. R. O. Donnell*
PERMANENT ADDRESS:

... *75 Blackburn Ave*
... *Ottawa 2, Ont.*
.....

DATED... *Sept. 26* 1966

THE TWENTY-SIXTH CANADIAN HOUSE OF COMMONS: A ROLL
CALL STUDY

by J.R. O'Donnell

A thesis submitted to Carleton University in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Public Administration.

School of Public Administration
Carleton University
Ottawa, Canada

September, 1966

ABSTRACT

In this work a systematic study is made of the voting behaviour of Members of the Twenty-sixth Canadian House of Commons, on recorded divisions. Particular attention is given to internal party cohesion, minor party affinity, and attendance of members. Also examined are the "parliamentary weekend", and the voting pattern of regional groups (including French-Canadian members).

The first chapter provides a history of the Parliament and the second gives information on the background of members and composition of the parties.

In the third chapter, which is the central core of the study, the detailed examination of the 129 votes is made. The results are placed in context by relating them to the information contained in the first two chapters.

The final chapter presents some personal observations of the author on the value of the study and a discussion of some conclusions he has drawn from the data.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I	
The Setting	5
First Session, 1963	6
Second Session, 1964-65	26
Third Session, 1965	43
CHAPTER II	
The Composition of the House	51
Method	51
The Members	56
CHAPTER III	
The House Divided	70
Who Makes the Motions?	92
Cohesion and Affinity	96
Attendance	125
The Parliamentary Weekend	150
CHAPTER IV	
Conclusion	154
BIBLIOGRAPHY	
APPENDICES	
1 Members of the House of Commons	
2.1 Code for Recording Background of Members	
2.2 Background of Members of Parliament	
2.3 Voting Record of Members	
3 Recorded Division Calls	
TABLES	
1 Party Representation in the House by Provinces	57
2 Experience in the House of Commons	61
3 Place of Birth	63
4 Age of Members	65
5 Education Level	67
6 Marital Status	69
7 Number of Times Parties Voted Same Way	98
8 Dissenting Members	107
9 Total Dissenting Votes	109
10 Defections by Party	110

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
 TABLES (cont'd)	
11 Attendance by Party - First Session	128
- Second Session	129
- Second & Third Session	130
12 Attendance Related to Marital Status	135
13 Attendance- Married Members under 45	136
14 Liberal Attendance by Experience	139
Progressive Conservative Attendance	
Related to Experience in the House	140
NDP Attendance Related to Experience	
in the House	141
R.Cr. & Soc.Cr. Attendance Related to	
Experience in the House	142
15 Regional Attendance - Liberals and	
Progressive Cons.	143
- NDP and Soc. Cr.	144
16 Attendance - French-Canadians	146
17 Attendance by Occupational Groups	148
18 Average Attendance by Day	151
 CHARTS	
Fig.1 Margin on Division	103
Fig.2 Division Call Attendance	
(all parties combined)	133

INTRODUCTION

Roll call analysis has been used extensively, particularly in the United States,¹ for the examination of behaviour and voting patterns in legislative bodies. The techniques developed, however, have been almost completely confined to the study of legislative bodies in which party discipline is either weak or non-existent. As far as this author can ascertain no attempt has been made recently to apply them to systems where most votes are cast on strict party lines such as happens in the "British Parliamentary form" of Government found in Canada.

This paucity of roll call analysis is not surprising. Scope for the application of such techniques by the student of the parliamentary type of Government is very limited when compared with the fertile fields open to his counterpart studying the Congress or state legislatures in the United States. Interest and applicability increases, however, when a minority Government situation, such as has been found in the last three Canadian Parliaments,² exists.

1. See among others; William H. Riker and Donald Niemi, "Stability of Coalitions on Roll Calls in the House of Representatives", American Political Science Review, LVI, (March 1962), 58-65, and David Derge, "The Lawyer in the Indiana General Assembly", Midwest Journal of Politics, VI, (Feb. 1962), 19-53. A more detailed list of United States studies will be found in the bibliography for this thesis.
2. Twenty-fifth Parliament (1962-63); Twenty-sixth (1963-65); and Twenty-seventh (1965 to time of writing).

The fact that the Government must rely on members outside its own party for support in its legislative programme means that it must draft legislation acceptable to other groups in Parliament. The degree of success of these efforts is reflected in the voting pattern of the members of the non-government parties. The constant possibility of defeat also affects attendance by members. The study of these two areas alone would probably be sufficient justification for this work. R. MacGregor Dawson has pointed out, however, in a preface to the first edition of The Government of Canada¹ that there was, at the time of writing, in 1947, a "dearth of specialized studies on various phases of the subject." Since then the situation has improved and Professor Norman Ward was able to observe in the fourth edition of the same work in 1964 that "a number of valuable studies have appeared...and indeed it can now be said that although there are still gaps...a small but respectable literature now exists."²

1. R. MacGregor Dawson, The Government of Canada, rev.-Norman Ward (4th ed; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963), p. vii.
2. Ibid. p. vii.

One area in which there is still such a gap in specialized knowledge is in the study of the dynamics of the House of Commons. It should have the greatest attraction and interest for Canadian students of politics since it is the focal point of our Federal Government. Yet, outside of references in the two basic texts on Canadian¹ and democratic² government by R. MacGregor Dawson and J. A. Corry respectively, a study on representation³ by Norman Ward and procedure⁴ by W. F. Dawson, the Canadian House of Commons has been largely neglected as an area of study by the Canadian political scientist. No examination using an analytical approach has been attempted although we have borrowed freely from other countries in examining voting patterns and behaviour of the general public at the time of an election.⁵ We have not, however, examined what those elected do when they go to Ottawa.

1. Ibid, pp.331-417.
2. J. A. Corry, Democratic Government and Politics, (2nd ed; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957).
3. Norman Ward, The Canadian House of Commons - Representation, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950).
4. W. F. Dawson, Procedure in the Canadian House of Commons, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965).
5. See John Meisel, The 1957 General Election, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962), and Brian Land, Eglinton, (Toronto: Peter Martin, 1965). A more complete list will be found in the bibliography for this thesis.

This thesis will study the House of Commons throughout the life of the 26th Parliament. An examination will be made of the events inside and outside the House which effected this Parliament and particular attention will be given to attendance on division, and to the behaviour of the two, and later, three, minority parties. Hypothesis with regard to regional, ethnic, and occupational differences in attendance patterns, minority party cohesion, and affinity will also be investigated.

It is hoped that this study will throw some light upon the recent behaviour of our parliamentarians, provide general information concerning the activities of the House of Commons during a minority government situation and, in a small way, help to fill in one of the gaps which exists in the literature on Canadian Government.

CHAPTER I

THE SETTING

Each Parliament is unique. The interplay of personalities, the events with which it must cope and the relative strengths of the parties all combine to give each its own character. The deliberations that take place and the decisions that are made reflect not only the issues and the events of that period but also the circumstances under which the House was chosen and the expectations its members entertain concerning the future. The voting of the members cannot stand alone - it must be augmented by an understanding of the events which influence the motions which are introduced, and the votes upon them. David Truman in The Congressional Party¹ refers to this in his study of the 81st Congress and says,

Such an account is important not only to understand what was taking place but also to estimate the extent to which inferences drawn from the material are indeed matters of general tendency or are primarily reflections of a unique set of circumstances...one must, therefore, be particularly careful to keep in mind the events and circumstances of the case in order to judge how far one may have confidence in the general tendencies indicated from it.²

One also must keep in mind that this study is not a history, but an examination of a particular institution and

1. David B. Truman, The Congressional Party, (New York: John Wiley, 1959).
2. Ibid., p.16.

the pressures and influences upon it. The background material provided in this chapter will, therefore, be restricted to those subjects which gave rise to a recorded division in the House of Commons. An attempt will be made to relate these to the circumstances and events which lead to the demand for a recorded vote but there is no intention to try to cover in their entirety all the events during the period 1963 to 1965¹ which may have had an influence on this Parliament.

The First Session, 1963

The Speech from the Throne opening the 26th Parliament was read by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court on May 16th.² It was a Speech prepared by the Government of Hon. Lester B. Pearson and marked the return of the Liberal party to power after almost six years in opposition. The foremost question in the minds of everyone was not the content of the Speech from the Throne but rather whether the Pearson Government could retain the confidence of the

1. A detailed study of the events of these years can be found in Canadian Annual Review, ed. John T. Saywell (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964, 1965).
2. Governor-General Vanier had suffered a heart attack in April and had cancelled most of his public duties.

House of Commons, for this was a minority government with the Liberals holding only 129 seats in the 265 seat House - four seats less than required for an absolute majority. It was a question which was to haunt the House throughout its life; the 26th Parliament was to labour under the shadow of the last days of the 25th.

The story of the 26th Parliament really begins on February 6, 1963 with the defeat of the Progressive Conservative Government of John G. Diefenbaker. At 8:41 p.m. that evening a vote of non-confidence in the Government initiated by the Social Credit party was accepted on a vote of 142 to 111.¹ The Prime Minister immediately announced that he would ask for dissolution and the following day the proclamation was signed by the Governor-General.²

1. Only once before in the history of Canada, in 1925, had a Government lost a vote of confidence in the House.
2. See Charles Lynch, "Who Won? Who Lost?", Ottawa Citizen, (Jan. 26, 1966), p. 7, for a summary of the part Robert Thompson played in the defeat of the Government.

The days before the campaign started were filled with rumours of attempted coup d'etats in the Conservative party; the resignation of Ministers, arguments on nuclear arms and finally votes of confidence in caucus on John Diefenbaker's leadership.¹

The campaign itself was pale and insipid when compared with the heady days of intrigue which had preceded it. The main issues became nuclear arms, better social security measures, and the party best-suited to be placed in charge of the government. From the start the Social Credit and the NDP concentrated on the Liberal party as their main opposition rather than the Conservatives and it appeared at times during the campaign as if the Liberals rather than the Conservatives had formed the previous Government.²

1. A report of events and an interpretation of the situation can be found in Peter Newman, Renegade in Power, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1963) and a somewhat contradictory interpretation in Pierre Sevigny, This Game of Politics, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1965).
2. Standing in the House at dissolution had been Progressive Conservative 113, Liberal 99, Social Credit 30 and NDP 19.

When the votes were counted on April 8th, the party standings were: Liberals 128, Conservatives 96, Social Credit 24, and New Democratic Party 17.¹ It was rumoured that in view of the fact that no party had a clear majority Prime Minister Diefenbaker would follow the example set by Mackenzie King in 1925 and would retain his position.² However, faced with little press support, the public declaration by six Social Credit members of the House of Commons that they would support a Liberal Government, and an increase to 129 seats for the Liberals at the expense of the Conservatives after the service vote had been counted, Mr. Diefenbaker decided to resign. On April 15 he discussed the transfer of the Government with Mr. Pearson and two days later presented his resignation to the Governor-General. The transfer of power took place on April 22nd.³

1. Globe and Mail, "Standing by Province", (April 10, 1963) p.9.
2. In 1925 the Liberal party under William Lyon Mackenzie King had elected 101 members, the Conservatives 116 and the Progressives 28. With the support of the Progressives King continued in office despite the fact that his party was not the largest party in the House. A more complete history may be found in Donald G. Creighton, Dominion of the North, (Toronto: MacMillan, 1962), and H. Blair Neatby, William Lyon Mackenzie King, 1924-1932, The Lonely Heights (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963).
3. Globe and Mail, "Pearson Shuffles Ministerial Duties", (April 22, 1963), p.1.

The next few weeks were taken up with the transfer of the reins of Government and preparations to meet the new House in May.

Usually the first vote of confidence¹ that any Government faces at the beginning of a new session is on an amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.² The original motion on which the Debate is based is usually so broad as to be meaningless. The amendments moved are usually more specific but they allow great latitude in the Debate. At the beginning of the 26th Parliament the

1. An opposition party may force a vote on the election of the Speaker. This can happen when the opposition does not agree with the choice or is not consulted. (This may happen where the government party has a strong majority). The Address in Reply vote is then the second faced.
2. Amendments to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the Budget Speech and the motion to go into Committee of Supply are considered as votes of confidence. On the Address in Reply debate continues for 10 days and an amendment and a subamendment may be before the House at one time. A vote on the subamendment (if there is one) is called on the sixth day - a second subamendment may then be made. On the ninth day all amendments and subamendments are voted on, and on the tenth day the vote on the main motion is called. Similar procedures (S.O.58) exist for the Budget Speech. Under Standing Order 56, which relates to supply motions, debates are limited to two days and the motion is only debatable on six occasions during the session. For a complete outline of procedure on these votes see W.F. Dawson, Procedure in the Canadian House of Commons, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962), pp 109, 110, 180.

Conservatives moved,

While recognizing that Canada's economic growth during the year 1962 exceeded that of any country in the western world, this House regrets that many of the pledges made by the Prime Minister and his colleagues have not been incorporated in the Government's declaration of intention as outlined in the Speech from the Throne and further regrets that policies announced failed to provide full opportunity for the people of Canada to continue the social advance and large economic growth of the past year.¹

The New Democratic Party, however, was more specific when it moved a subamendment. The motion made by Mr. Douglas was,

We regret that your Excellency's advisers have indicated their intention of acquiring nuclear arms for Canadian forces, thereby lessening the chances for nuclear disarmament and increasing the dangers of nuclear war.²

The nuclear arms question was very contentious in May of 1963. It had first become highly controversial in the early days of the year and had been precipitated by a visit to Ottawa of General Lauris Norstad, the retiring NATO Supreme Commander who, in a press interview, had contradicted the stand that had been taken by the Prime Minister, John Diefenbaker, concerning a Canadian

1. Journals of the House of Commons of Canada, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1964), p.33. Hereafter referred to as Journals.

2. Ibid, p.33.

commitment to acquire nuclear arms for its squadrons in Germany and Bomarc-B bases in Canada.

The debate in the House which had resulted when the press interview was reported culminated in the resignation of Douglas Harkness, the Minister of Defence, and a motion of non-confidence in the Conservative Government by the Liberals.¹

Of the three parties in the House only the Liberals were in favour of the acquisition of nuclear weapons. The other three parties were against such a move with the New Democratic Party being the strongest anti-nuclear group. Yet, on the night of February 5th, 1963, the three opposition parties combined to defeat the Government.

During the election the Liberals shifted their position slightly to a "accept nuclear arms now, but negotiate to have them removed afterwards" position.

It was plainly evident then that Mr. Pearson and Mr. Douglas held radically different views on the role that

1. For a complete account of the events leading up to the vote see Canadian Annual Review for 1963, ed. John T. Saywell (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), p.284. Also Globe and Mail, (Jan.28, 1963 to Feb.4, 1963) and House of Commons Debates, Official Report, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1963), III, 3136. Hereafter referred to as Debates.

nuclear weapons should play in Canada's NATO commitment. The subamendment that Mr. Douglas proposed on May 21, therefore, was not the usual type of broad generalization and the question in Ottawa was, "Can the Government survive the vote?" When the division bells rang the galleries were packed and many expected to see a repeat of the February 6th situation. The Government, however, survived with the subamendment being defeated 124 to 113. On May 23rd the Conservative main amendment was also defeated, this time with a greater majority. Then, in an attempt to clarify the situation on nuclear weapons Mr. Knowles of the NDP moved that all correspondence, documents, etc., up to June 10, 1957, containing commitments by the Government to accept nuclear arms be tabled. The Liberals supported this motion and it was carried. The Government had weathered its first storm.

On the night of June 3rd Walter Gordon presented his first budget to the House of Commons. The next day Mr. Douglas Fisher asked the Minister an apparently innocent question: "Can the Minister assure us that he and his government officials alone prepared the budget speech without the assistance of outside consultants or ghost writers from Toronto?"¹ Mr. Gordon's reply was,

1. Debates, (1963), I, 1169.

"Mr. Speaker, as Minister of Finance I take full and sole responsibility for everything which was contained in the Budget."¹ Later in the day, however, Mr. Gordon made a further statement, "I had the assistance of three special consultants who joined the department of finance on a temporary basis shortly after the Government took office."² Mr. Diefenbaker attempted to have the House discuss the Minister's indiscretion as a matter of urgent public importance. The Speaker ruled that it was not an important issue and was sustained in his ruling. When debate on the motion to resolve into Committee of Ways and Means (Budget) resumed on June 19th an opening for debate was presented and Mr. Nowlan, the Minister of Finance in the former Conservative Government, moved in part,

That this House regrets that the Minister of Finance by failing to maintain the constitutional practice of the essential secrecy of the Budget has seriously weakened public confidence;...³

1. Ibid. p.1169.

2. Ibid. p.1198.

3. Ibid. p.1356.

It was suggested in the newspapers on June 20th that Mr. Gordon had that day submitted his resignation to the Prime Minister and that it had been refused. Mr. Gordon's Budget problems, however, were not yet over. He became embroiled in further difficulties when it appeared that he had purposely withheld from the House the fact that he had consulted with other than the Cabinet on a decision concerning a tax matter in his Budget. On June 24th Mr. Nowlan's amendment came to vote and was defeated 113 to 73. Even though it had won this vote the Liberal control on the House was still precarious. On June 26th a ruling by the Speaker that a motion to discuss the provision of federal assistance to municipalities contained in the Budget was not a matter of public importance was sustained by only one vote on a recorded division of 108 to 107.

The June 26th attempt at debate had been prompted by statements by Premier Lesage in the Quebec Legislature on the previous day.

Mr. Gordon's Budget had included a provision of \$4,000,000.00 which would be available to municipalities and which was intended

"to promote increased employment in Canada by the provision of financial assistance by ways of loans to municipalities...to augment or accelerate the capital works program subject to the approval of the provinces concerned."¹

1. Canadian Annual Review for 1963, p.65.

Although the use of the money had to be approved by the provinces the Minister of Finance had not consulted with them before including it in his Budget. Premier Lesage had cautioned Ottawa and had gone as far as to suggest on June 7th that this measure be delayed until after an intended August Inter-Provincial Conference. It is likely that the Premier would have waited until this conference and attempted to work out a compromise had not the Union Nationale introduced a motion of non-confidence in his Government by calling for the establishment of a provincial loan fund. The Premier's hand having been called he lashed into an attack on the Municipal Loan Fund and succeeded in having the opposition withdraw its motion and in place had a motion stating that the municipal loan and development proposals were "a serious infringement upon the executive jurisdiction and the autonomy of the Province of Quebec," ¹ introduced.

1. Ibid. p.65.

Parliament limped on into July and the Liberals maintained control of the House despite the necessity of presenting a new budget on July 8th and a strongly partisan debate on pensions introduced by the Minister of National Health and Welfare on July 8th. A bill to increase the sessional allowance for members and to provide for greater payments to the Leader of the Opposition was carried on division with only the second reading being recorded; the result was 200 to 10 in favour of what was in effect a free vote.¹ Bills setting up an Economic Council of Canada (despite a Conservative attempt to have the Productivity Council which they had set up while in office assume these new duties) and changes in the excise tax were passed. On August 2nd the House adjourned for a summer vacation.

The first two recorded divisions of the House after it re-assembled on September 30th were on appeals to rulings made by the Chairman while the House was a Committee of the Whole. Both amendments dealt with the proposed increase of \$10.00 in the Old Age Security Pension. All

1. John Diefenbaker and Real Caouette were among those who voted against it and the press reported that Mr. Diefenbaker refused to cash his cheques after the increase came into effect.

parties were in favour of the increase but there was some disagreement on the effective date of the increase and the age limit. Mr. Diefenbaker had proposed that the effective date be April 8th, 1963 instead of the proposed date of October 1st and Mr. Caouette proposed the lowering of the eligible age to 65, and to 60 with a means test; both appeals were defeated. An attempt by Mr. Diefenbaker to revive the nuclear arms problem by requesting copies of agreements on nuclear arms between Canada and the United States be laid before the House was also defeated on October 2nd.

On October 3rd an internal controversy among members of the Social Credit party was brought into the House.

A split within the party which had been evident as early as April when six members had bolted the ranks of the party to declare that they would support the Liberal government was publicly announced following a party conference at Grandby on August 31st - September 1st. Le Ralliement des Creditiste under Real Caouette became a separate party; the members of the Social Credit being divided between Real Caouette and his new party and Robert Thompson. When the Commons met on September 30th Mr. Caouette had claimed twelve followers and had so informed the Speaker and demanded recognition as an official

party in the House. This placed the Speaker in a difficult position since the situation of recognition of a break in a party after an election had never before occurred. The problem became that of deciding whether to recognize the split or wait until the next election and allow the electorate to decide whether a new party had been created by the split. He recommended that the question be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections; Mr. Stanley Knowles introduced the suggestion as a motion, the House agreed and the referral was made.

Le Ralliement was not satisfied with the speed with which the Committee investigated the question,¹ however, and on October 3rd Mr. Gregoire announced that his party did not intend "to end the Debate on Interim Supply...as long as the Privileges and Elections Committee had not remedied the ridiculous and illogical situation which prevails in this corner of the House." ² To meet the

1. Mr. Diefenbaker uncharitably suggested that the insistence on recognition might be prompted by the fact that a leader of a group with more than 12 members is entitled to an additional allowance. As long as the split in the party was not recognized Mr. Thompson, although only leader of the 10 members still loyal to him, received the allowance as if he were leader of the whole group while Mr. Caouette received nothing. (See Debates, IV, p.3340).
2. Debates, (1963), IV, 3347.

filibuster Mr. Pickersgill, the House Leader, moved that until supply was granted the House hold around-the-clock sittings. A compromise was worked out, when the committee was given permission to sit while the House was in session. Mr. Pickersgill's motion did not come to a division although an appeal on a ruling that a proposed amendment on this motion, put forward by Mr. Churchill, was out of order was voted on and sustained. Two appeals on rulings of the Speaker that Mr. Caouette could not be recognized while the question of Le Ralliement's position in the House was before the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections and a motion for adjournment until all members were recognized were also sustained.

The committee reached a decision which recognized the Creditistes as a group with Real Caouette having the right to speak as a leader, but in precedence following Mr. Thompson. When the report came before the House the N.D.P. found it unacceptable and Mr. Stanley Knowles moved that it be referred back to committee in order that it be amended to allow groups other than the official Opposition be seated in the House according to numerical strength of their respective groups.¹ This amendment was defeated as

1. This would place the Creditistes ahead of the numerically inferior Thompson Social Credit group.

was an amendment to the amendment proposed by Mr. Diefenbaker. On October 21st an amendment suggested by Mr. Plourde that the Social Credit members themselves be allowed to decide which section constituted the Social Credit party suffered the same fate.

Interspersed with the controversy on the seating arrangement for the Social Credit/Creditiste was another controversy of far greater significance. On October 9th Parliament was asked to consider a bill to place Maritime Transport Unions under government trusteeship.

The dispute had begun in 1961 when the Canadian Maritimes Union had attempted to replace the Seafarers' International Union in Canadian ports. During 1962 the dispute had become so violent that the Diefenbaker Government had found it necessary to appoint Mr. Justice T.G. Norris as a one-man enquiry commission. During hearings in 1962 and 1963 attempts had been made to prove that Harold Banks, the Canadian S.I.U. President, had misappropriated the union money.

The opening of the 1963 navigational season saw a resumption of hostilities between the two unions. In May when Mr. Pearson had visited with Mr. Kennedy at Hyannis Port the shipping dispute had been one of the major topics of conversation. No solution however was forthcoming and

in July and the Norris Report was tabled in the House of Commons and made public.

The report was a ringing condemnation of Hal Banks and of the Canadian Steamship Lines which was accused of co-operating with Banks to the detriment of the shipping industry and the seamen.¹

The central recommendation of Judge Norris' report was that the S.I.U. be placed under governmental trusteeship so that corrupt officials could be removed.

Although there was wide public support for the imposition of the trusteeship endeavours were continued to bring about a private settlement without the necessity of such an imposition. These discussions were not fruitful and as a result action was taken to place all Maritime unions in Canada under governmental trusteeship. This was the basis of the Bill introduced on October 9th and proclaimed on October 27th.

Most of November was taken up with examination of estimates and the implementing of changes in the Income Tax Act made necessary by the changes announced in the budget.

1. Arthur Kruger, "The Great Lakes Shipping Dispute", Canadian Annual Review for 1963, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), p.262.

Perhaps the most unusual vote of the 26th Parliament took place on November 12, 1963. The Conservatives had introduced an amendment on the sixth (and last) supply motion condemning the Government for failing "to carry out the spirit of co-operative federalism" and for neglecting "to consult with the provinces before announcing or undertaking programmes which fall wholly or partly within provincial jurisdiction". The amendment had been prompted in part by the Government's handling of the Municipal Loan Fund proposals and partly as a grandstand play before the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Conference slated for November 26 to 29. Douglas Fisher of the NDP amended the Conservative amendment to read,

this House urges the Government to carry out more fully the spirit of co-operative federalism and to consult with the provinces before announcing or undertaking programmes which fall to any extent within provincial jurisdiction.¹

The Liberals astonished the House by accepting this amendment and voting in favour of it. Thus they in effect voted against themselves on what appeared to be a motion of confidence. Conservative members on the other hand voted against the subamendment and, therefore, in

1. Journals, (1963), p. 546.

favour of the Government. The subamendment carried 128 to 60. The Conservative amendment as amended then passed 187 to 0.

When the Liberals had first announced that they would vote for the subamendment Mr. Diefenbaker had argued that the Liberals were voting themselves out of power. Despite his insistence, however, the Liberals voted as indicated above and still remained in office.

An attempt by Stanley Knowles on November 29th to have a Speaker's ruling that his request to have the report of R. Dixon-Spears and Associate on the moving of maintenance facilities of TCA from Winnipeg tabled was not a question of privilege was defeated 92 to 73¹

The Speaker, however, almost was defeated on another ruling. On December 4th Gilles Gregoire appealed a ruling on a question of privilege in an attempt to bring about a debate on off-shore rights.

1. A TCA announcement in 1962 that they planned to close down the Winnipeg facilities had prompted a public outcry in that city. The Conservative Government of the day had ordered an investigation into the situation but the report was not ready until after the Conservative Government had lost office. The Liberals decided against tabling the report. Stanley Knowles was the member for Winnipeg North Centre and thus had a political interest in having the report released.

This was a touchy problem in the field of federal-provincial relations. Oil companies had intensified exploration off the coast of British Columbia and had started to search for oil off the coast of Nova Scotia. There was also a possibility that exploration would begin in Hudson Bay. Under the provisions of the B.N.A. Act licensing and taxation within the provinces¹ was given to the provinces while control over sea coasts was to be a federal responsibility². Since the licensing of oil companies and the funds from the control and taxing of oil produced, if found, would be important sources of revenue, both levels of government claimed control. The vote in the House reflected the situation. It was a tie vote of 106 to 106. Because neither side won the Speaker ruled his ruling had been sustained.

Only one other question was brought to a vote before the end of the session. On December 12 Mr. Nowlan proposed to send back a bill amending the Old Age Assistance Act, Blind Persons Act and Disabled Persons Act in order to have the effective date changed. His amendment was defeated 117 to 100 and 9 days later on December 21, 1963 the first session ended.

1. Sec.92(9)
2. Sec.91(12)

Second Session, 1964-65

The Speech from the Throne on February 13th indicated a businesslike, if not inspired, second session. It enumerated a number of pieces of legislation, including the Columbia River Treaty, Railway Legislation, a Federal Labour Code, the Canada Pension Plan, Loans to University Students, a Ministry of Rural Development, and a Twelve-Mile Fishing Limit, which had been left over from the last session.¹ But it was co-operation, rather than legislation, which was to be the keynote of the new session. As the Speech expressed it this was "a time when it is possible, despite our many problems, to deliberate our Canadian world affairs in a spirit of reasoned hopefulness."²

The first votes of confidence indicated that the "reasoned hopefulness" was more of a will-o'-the-wisp than a reality. Mr. Diefenbaker's amendment on the Address in Reply chided the Government for not removing the eleven per cent sales tax on farm machinery and the subamendments of the New Democratic Party followed the traditional partisanship of these amendments and challenged the Government on the question of Medicare.³ On February 21st

1. Globe and Mail, "Throne Speech Deals With Leftover Plans", (Feb. 19, 1964) p. 1.
2. Debates, (1965), 1, 8.
3. Journals, (1964), mss. p. 33 to 41.

the NDP subamendment was lost in the House and four days later, amid reports that the Leader of the Opposition had prohibited pairing, and that the Liberal party Whips had forced members from their sick beds, the Conservative amendment went down to defeat as well. A Creditiste amendment and a further subamendment both dealing with Family Allowances were voted down on February 27th.

With the Throne Debate out of the way the House turned to other subjects. On March 3rd Mr. Martin introduced a motion

That the treaty between Canada and the United States of America related to co-operative development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin signed at Washington January 17th, 1961, together with the protocol, containing modifications and clarification of the treaty, annexed to an exchange of notes between the Governments of Canada and the United States be referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs.¹

The Columbia River Project had had a long history extending back to 1944. In that year the decision was first made to investigate the joint development by Canada and the United States of storage and dam facilities on the Canadian section of the river. By 1961 an agreement had been hammered out and Mr. Diefenbaker and General Eisenhower signed a treaty on January 17th. Premier Bennett, of British Columbia, however, had ideas of his own and opposed

1. Debates, (1965), I, 467.

the ratification of the treaty. He wanted joint development of the Columbia and Peace rivers. During these embarrassing days of negotiations the Liberals did little to help the Government by opposing Conservative attitudes to the export of power and the loss of controls. However the treaty which Mr. Martin introduced on March 3rd was little changed from that negotiated by the Conservatives and they enjoyed the opportunity to rake the Liberals over the coals of inconsistency. It was the NDP critics, however, who were the severest on the Government terming it "a thoroughly bad treaty conceived in avarice and born in apathy."¹ Finally on March 9th the motion was passed.

In Committee Mr. Martin asked for approval without any change. If the Committee voted against ratification, the Minister was reported to have said, "it would signify a lack of confidence" and "this Government will no longer be in office."² After examination the bill was returned to the House for a three-day debate and was finally ratified overwhelmingly on June 5th.

1. Debates, (1965), I, 487.
2. Canadian Annual Review for 1964, ed, John T. Saywell (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), p.18.

While the Committee had been examining the Columbia River Treaty the House had not been idle. Mr. Gordon, remembering perhaps too vividly, his embarrassment in the early days of the first session, presented his second full budget on March 13th. This budget appeared to be carefully calculated to be as non-controversial as possible. Opposition motions of want of confidence were also non-controversial. Mr. Nowlan, criticized the failure to decrease expenditures while an N.D.P. subamendment extended this by suggesting that money saved in the cuts and lower expenditures should go to help Canadian economic development and to aid the United Nations in its aid to developing countries.

Support for this N.D.P. subamendment, Mr. Diefenbaker announced before the vote, would mean his party was in effect voting against its own amendment. The N.D.P. motion was defeated on March 20th and the House voted against the Conservative amendment four days later.

Easter fell on March 29th in 1964 and it was the intention of the government to have a recess from March 26th to April 6th provided that Interim Supply, and Supplementary Estimates had been passed. On March 26th over \$200,000,000.00 in supplementary estimates still remained before the House. Mr. Favreau attempted to get the Commons

to sit during the evening but the Conservatives would not agree. This issue was further complicated by the refusal of Mr. Terrance Nugent to give unanimous consent to the waiving of the rules to sit on Good Friday unless the Liberals agreed to recess. The House therefore was compelled to meet on Friday for a short time, and to sit all of the following week. Saywell in summing up the events of that week says,

The Supplementary Estimates were debated all the next week and were finally approved late on Friday, April 3rd. Included were the estimates which would permit the Finance Department to loan money to the bankrupt Unemployment Insurance Fund to enable the latter to meet \$2,000,000.00 - much of it paid in cash - on the Monday. With the Governor-General waiting to give assent, the bill reached the Senate shortly before 6 o'clock p.m., only to meet with Senator Grattan O'Leary's refusal of the unanimous consent necessary for three readings. No pleas, appeals or charges that he was unmindful of the plight of the unemployed would move him.¹

Finally a solution was found when the Post Office agreed to pay funds received from the sale of Unemployment Insurance Stamps one day early.²

1. Ibid. p.20,21.

2. The Post Office acts as agent for the Unemployment Insurance Commission in selling Unemployment Insurance Stamps. Usually these funds are transferred at the beginning of each week.

With their recess denied them, and the events in the Senate at the end of the previous week still fresh in their minds, it was a quarrelsome House which met on April 6th. Any spirit of co-operation which might have existed appeared to have evaporated. Stanley Knowles asked "leave to introduce a bill to amend the B.N.A. Act to abolish the Senate."¹ On recorded division a motion to place this bill on the top of the list was approved 104 to 54. The Conservatives appeared to have lost any support they might have had from other opposition groups.

The Budget Debate finally ended on April 14th and for the next four days the House dealt with the Redistribution Bill. At the beginning of the debate Mr. Martineau proposed that all maps used in the redistribution discussions in Committee be laid before the House. This was defeated and no additional recorded divisions were called during that debate.

For the next two months Parliament, as Saywell describes it, "seemed to be marking time waiting until the real issue officially reached the Commons."²

1. Journals, (1964), mss.p.167-8.
2. Canadian Annual Review for 1964, p.22.

Three non-confidence motions, transfer of Veterans' Hospitals; the need for a co-ordinated water policy; and eastern agriculture were voted on and defeated by margins of 29, 63 and 18 respectively.

The most controversial, and certainly the longest, debate in the House of Commons began on June 15th. It was the debate on the motion for a new distinctive Canadian flag.

This debate was really a "play in three acts".

The first scene of Act 1 took place at the 20th Biennial Convention of the Royal Canadian Legion in Winnipeg on the eve of the Victoria Day holiday. Prime Minister Pearson, although he had been advised not to discuss the flag, had decided that the time had come to bring the question into the open. A highly partisan crowd loudly jeered and heckled Mr. Pearson when he suggested that a flag "designed around the Maple Leaf will symbolize - will be a true reflection - of the new Canada."¹ At one point noise in the gathering prevented Mr. Pearson from speaking and the Chairman had to remind the members that he was their guest and that they should extend to him the courtesy of

1. Globe and Mail, "P.M. Calling on Legion to Approve Leaf Flag" (May 18, 1964) p.1.

allowing him to present his views. The scene shifted to the House of Commons on May 27th when two twin resolutions were placed on the order paper. The first provided for a national flag design of three maple leaves on a white field with two blue bars on either end and was coupled with the retention of the Union Jack as a symbol of Commonwealth membership. The second provided for O Canada as the National Anthem and God Save the Queen as the Royal Anthem.

Opposition to the flag motion, despite the twinning, was immediately announced by the Conservatives. Press reports suggested Mr. Pearson would call an election if a prolonged filibuster was mounted when the motion was introduced into the House. Mr. Pearson was also adamant about the necessity of twinning the two bills. He was stolid in his stand that he would neither split the resolution or consider Conservative demands for a referendum.

By June 15th when the motion for the flag was brought into the House the stand of all the parties was known and the speeches by the party leaders and the subsequent debate cast little new light upon their positions.

Although the Members discussed other topics during the next few weeks the flag matter was never very far from their minds and the House was in a baulky mood.¹

On June 19th Mr. Alvin Hamilton questioned the Prime Minister about a film "Mr. Pearson" which the CBC had decided not to show on the TV network, allegedly under pressure from the Prime Minister's office. Mr. Hamilton suggested that Mr. Pearson was misleading the House.² The Prime Minister challenged the statement on a question of privilege and asked that the statement be withdrawn. Mr. Hamilton refused and was "named" by the Speaker. He withdrew from the House but returned shortly after and then was barred from the House for the remainder of the day on a recorded division.

The question of the defecting Social Credit members flared up when Mr. Nugent took issue with an editorial in the Ottawa Citizen in which the words, "Mr. Gerrard Girouard accused the director of the Liberal party of providing a bribe", were contained. Mr. Nugent, who sat on the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, felt

1. Globe and Mail, "House Speaker Orders Flag Resolution Divided", (June 16, 1964), p.1.
2. Debates, (1964), IV, p.4489.

that this was a contempt of the findings of that Committee. His motion to have the Committee examine the editorial however was lost.

In the next few days the Government was successful in piloting the Student Loan Bill through the House although it received strong opposition from Quebec members who considered it an infringement on provincial rights.

After July 27th, however, work in the House came to a virtual standstill when the Conservatives mounted a filibuster in an attempt to delay the flag debate. By August 6th the patience of most members had worn thin as had that of the general public and Mr. Caouette seemed to express the general sentiment of the country when he said, "In the eyes of the people right across Canada, we are considered as school kids."¹ Saywell reports, "People were getting tired of this game and the press was wavering uneasily between the desire for the imposition of closure and the possible consequences of such a motion in view of the 1956 Pipeline Debate."²

1. Debates, (1964), V, 6460.

2. Canadian Annual Review for 1964, p.26.

Finally the intermission was over and the flag was back in the House. Where it stayed almost continuously until September 10th.¹ Very little new was said but members managed to fill more than 550 pages of Hansard with their comments.² During the debate an appeal on the Speaker's ruling that a Conservative amendment and the motion for adjournment were defeated. Eventually behind the scenes negotiations among party leaders bore fruit and on September 10th Mr. Pearson announced that it had been agreed that debate would be suspended and the question referred to a fifteen-man committee which would report in six weeks. "When the Committee report was ready there would be another meeting of the party leaders to determine the length of time that should be devoted in the House to the discussion of that report."³

1. The debate was broken only for the weekly debate on estimates.
2. Debates, (1964), VII, 6753-7941.
3. Ibid. p.7817.

Mr. Diefenbaker, however, indicated that the committee's task would not be a simple one. "While no limitations will be placed on the committee in advance we in this party are unchanged in our view that unless 80 per cent to 90 per cent of the committee are in agreement we could not,... agree to accept a recommendation from the committee without a full and untrammelled debate in this House."¹ he warned. Thus the curtain rang down on Act II.

With the flag debate temporarily out of the way the House passed a bill extending credit to farm machinery syndicates, defeating a Progressive Conservative motion to have it referred back to committee on September 29th.

Most of October and early November was taken up with a Committee of the Whole examination of the proposed redistribution legislation and procedures to improve the business of the House. On November 16th members gave unanimous assent on second reading to the Canada Pension Plan on a recorded vote. The same day it was announced that all parties had agreed to postpone the resuming of debate on the flag in order to pass the remaining estimates.²

1. Ibid.p.7819.

2. It seems likely that the Conservatives were aware of the Lucien Rivard affair and wanted an opportunity to have the estimates for the Department of Justice come up for consideration so they could discuss it.

Agreement was also reached on the use of the guillotine rule to cut off further debate on estimates on November 27th.¹

Discussion on the flag resumed on December 3rd and until December 17th was the exclusive topic of debate with even the question periods being eliminated. After the first few days of debate the floor was virtually abandoned to the Conservatives who had again mounted a filibuster.

On the 9th of December Mr. Balcer, himself a Conservative, sharing the opinion of members of all other parties and many of the members of his own party, broke rank and rising on a point of privilege complained that, "The House of Commons has been witnessing an unparalleled debate which is completely paralyzing the business of this House and transforming it into a debating society where it is impossible to reach any decision." He then stunned the House by inviting "The Prime Minister or one of his members to give notice that he will make use of Standing Order 33 to have this question settled without further delay by applying the Closure Rule."²

1. Debates, (1964), IX,10675.

2. Debates, (1964), IX,10967.

The Conservatives had been caught off guard; a special caucus was called for the next day but was not successful in breaching the differences and when the Conservative plebiscite amendment came up for a vote seven Quebec Conservatives voted against it and the amendment was lost. It was hoped that debate would then begin on the main motion but these hopes were ill-founded. On December 11th the Conservatives indicated they would prolong the filibuster when they moved a new amendment that the Red Ensign be recognized as the Canadian flag.¹ That afternoon Mr. McIlraith announced that closure would be introduced and on December 14th the closure motion was voted in 152 to 85.

Finally at 2:13 a.m. the flag motion came to a vote and was passed 163 to 78. The first hurdle had been passed. Three days later the Union Jack was accepted as the Commonwealth flag. The debate which had ground on for so long was over.

1. Despite Mr. Pearson's earlier statements about splitting the motion on the flag the Committee had brought in separate reports on the new Canadian flag and the Commonwealth flag.

While the House had been debating the flag, however, public attention had not been centered entirely on that Chamber. The Dorion enquiries into charges of bribery and interference on the part of Executive Assistants of the Justice and Immigration Ministers, and a Cabinet Minister, in the extradition proceedings of Lucien Rivard, a suspected narcotics smuggler, had received prominence in the press. The Prime Minister when asked in the House on November 24th about a Royal Canadian Mounted Police report on the affair had denied any knowledge of such a report. He later forwarded a letter to Judge Dorion, on December 8th, explaining that although he could not now speak in the House because of the flag debate he felt that he should clarify his earlier statement. He explained that he had been told of the report in a passing reference on a trip to Charlottetown early in September but it had been only a passing reference and had slipped his mind.

When the letter was read at the enquiry on December 18th and reported in the press Mr. Douglas moved on a question of privilege that the entire situation be discussed in the House but the Speaker ruled against his motion and was upheld. The House recessed late on the night of December 21, 1964.

Members returned to the House on February 16th to find the new Maple Leaf flag which they had taken so long to approve flying on the Peace Tower. It had been officially raised at a ceremony the previous day.

While members had been away the attention had focused on the Dorion Commission sessions which had been held in Ottawa and which were still going on. The reopening of Parliament was not likely to shift the spotlight. Reports from these enquiries read like a serialized version of a suspense novel while all the House could offer was a detailed study of the report of the Joint Committee on the Canada Pension Plan.

This report, an opting our formula for shared Federal-Provincial programs, and the new Labour Code together with legislation left over from the Speech from the Throne and the estimates were the principal diet of the Commons.

Mr. Douglas broke the monotony, however, on February 24th when he tried to have alleged election irregularities in his own constituency of Burnaby-Quoquitlam examined but he lost his appeal on a Speaker's ruling and the members returned to their study of the Pension Plan.

Conservative and NDP attempts to have the bill amended to include payments to those between the age of 65 and 70 were overruled by the Speaker and upheld on a recorded division. Finally on March 29th it was given third

and final reading on a vote of 159 to 12 and this Bill which was hailed as the most far-reaching social legislation in Canadian history passed on to the Senate for ratification.

Discussions returned to the topic of the opting out formula for shared Federal-Provincial programs. Quebec, in particular, wanted this formula so that it could share in federal monies available for such programs while still zealously guarding its provincial rights. Tax abatements were to be provided to provinces in lieu of grants for provincial programs which were similar in operation to those of Federal-Provincial programs of the same nature in other provinces. The abatements would be equal in value to the grants that would have been received had the province participated in the Federal-Provincial scheme. Opposition parties criticized the government for not waiting until a report of the committee examining Federal-Provincial tax structures had been completed, and forthcoming provincial taxation meetings were held. The Conservative amendment, however, on second reading, was defeated on March 30th and the bill was passed on third reading later the same day on

a voice vote. Estimates occupied the attention of the House during the next two days and then on April 2nd, 1965, the longest session in the history of the Canadian House of Commons came to an end.¹

The Third Session, 1965

It had been a short respite; two days after they had completed the second session members of the House of Commons were gathered at the Bar of the Senate to hear the Speech from the Throne opening the Third Session.

It, like the Speech opening the Second Session, was not likely to spark lively controversy. Canada was continuing to support the United Nations; the authorization of O Canada as the National Anthem and God Save The Queen as the Royal Anthem were included as was a plan to incorporate a company of young Canadians; the procedural wrangles and the flag filibuster of the previous session were recognized and the Speech indicated that measures were to be introduced to reform the procedures of the House. The question of repatriation of the Constitution along lines indicated in the Fulton-Favreau formula was also to be studied.

1. It had lasted for 408 days with sittings on 247 of these.

It was a war on poverty, however, with an attempt to increase farm income, to raise standards of living, and to provide for allowances for relocation from centres of depressed labour requirements that presented the principal challenges of the Speech and lifted it from the mundane.

The opposition was quick to label it "too little" and uninspired. The amendments introduced on non-confidence, however, showed little more inspiration and originality.¹ The New Democratic Party subamendment on Medicare was similar to motions that had been introduced in the past and it was defeated on April 7th; a Creditiste amendment on Family Allowance was also lost. The Conservative amendment was the most challenging and likely to cause the most discomfort to the Liberal Government. It challenged "the failure to eradicate wrongdoing at high and low places" and was prompted by disclosures of the Dorion enquiry and side issues of the "Furniture Deal"²

1. Journals, Manuscript, Third Session, p.1-3.
2. It was suggested that Mr. Lamontagne and Mr. Tremblay had used their cabinet posts to advantage in having large bills for furniture deferred by a Montreal firm which later went into bankruptcy.

and the "Stonehill Incident".¹ The vote on the Conservative amendment was 106 to 93 and although close was not enough to imperil the Liberal control in the House.

With the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne approved the Commons took an Easter recess until April 26th.

During the recess Mr. Diefenbaker announced that Mr. Michael Starr would be the new Conservative House leader.² It was evident, however, that Mr. Diefenbaker himself intended to remain party leader despite the blow the Quebec wing had suffered when Leon Balcer had announced on April 7th that he would sit as an Independent because of his opposition to Mr. Diefenbaker's leadership.³

1. Representation had been made to the Department of Citizenship and Immigration during the term of the Diefenbaker Government to prevent the deportation of Harry Stonehill, who lived in B.C. but had been exiled from the Phillipines because of suspected shady dealings. One of the persons representing Stonehill had been Hon. Paul Martin who had severed his connection when he learned of Mr. Stonehill's past. A letter allegedly written by Premier Bennett of B.C. to Hal Dornan, an assistant to Mr. Pearson asking that Stonehill be allowed to remain in Canada was also brought to light. This letter was later found to be a forgery and a Vancouver public relations man was sentenced to jail because of it.
2. Globe and Mail, "New PC House Leader ", (April 17, 1965) p.7.
3. Debates, (1965), Daily Report p.57.

The question of Dominion and Provincial rights broke out again when the Province of Quebec announced that it was negotiating a treaty on culture and education with the French government. When the story broke on April 24th Mr. Martin, the Minister of External Affairs, maintained that only the federal government had treaty-making powers and he reiterated this in an answer to a question in the House. Quebec was quick to clarify the situation explaining that everyone knew that only the federal government could negotiate treaties. What Quebec was negotiating, it was explained, was an agreement and this, as Mr. Lesage said, was quite within the ambit of provincial responsibility. It appeared that the compromise was reached on the basis of semantics but a new truce between the federal government and Quebec had been achieved.

No doubt Mr. Gordon wished that some sort of truce could be negotiated with the Opposition in the House when on April 24th he again entered the lion's den to present his third budget. It had all the earmarks of an election appeal. A ten per cent income tax reduction was to go into effect July 1st; a Canadian Development Fund to allow Canadians to have a greater part in investment in their own

economy was to be established; advertising in foreign-owned newspapers and magazines was to be disallowed as a tax deduction for business expenses and circumspectly Time and Reader's Digest were given Canadian citizenship.¹

Characteristically the opposition parties called the budget a boon to the large businesses and high-salary earner while offering little to the heads of large families and those earning small incomes. Mr. Diefenbaker denounced the government as "the two-bit boys". The government was also criticized for its decision not to impose the magazine advertising limitations on Time and Reader's Digest.

On April 29th another procedural controversy broke out over the order of recognition of members. An attempt by the New Democratic Party to have greater recognition of the minor parties was lost, however, on a vote of 157 to 31. Later that same day an N.D.P. subamendment on the budget speech was also defeated on a recorded vote.

The defeat on the order of speaking, however, did not finally settle the question, nor had the discussions among

1. These two magazines published "Canadian" editions in Montreal and both had been exempted under the new income tax provisions on advertising.

party whips had any greater success, and on Monday, May 3rd, the N.D.P. again attempted to be heard out of order not giving up until they were defeated on a challenge to the Speaker's ruling on a vote of 148 to 22. Later that day a Conservative want of confidence motion calling for the elimination of the tax on farm machinery was also defeated.

A motion for the retirement of Senators at age 75 was introduced on April 26th and debated for two days. Second reading was called on May 7th. The N.D.P. which had long maintained that the Senate should be abolished tried to introduce such a motion as an amendment to the retirement bill but was overruled by the Speaker. His ruling was upheld. Debate was interrupted the next day in order to discuss estimates but resumed on May 14th.

It was not until May 17th, however, that a second attempt by the N.D.P. to delay the passage was overcome and second reading approved. On third reading Mr. Diefenbaker attempted to have the bill amended to have the date of effectiveness changed until after a new election had been called but this was defeated 117 to 75, and the bill was forwarded to the Senate on May 18th.

The remaining days of May were concerned with the estimates and Supply although a policy discussion on Canada's part in the War in Vietnam did take place.

Mr. Favreau, Minister of Justice, became the target for Conservative members on June 1st when they criticized him for a proposal he had made that the press be restricted from reporting on court cases until after the decision of the court had been given. It was suggested that in this way those who were acquitted would be spared the humiliation that accompanied press reports of such trials. The Opposition criticized the suggestion as an attempt to place a muzzle on the freedom of the press. No vote was forced on the suggestion however.

Members moved to consider procedure in the latter part of May and early June and on June 11th the Chamber accepted a report of the Committee on Procedure.

The remaining days of the session were equally uneventful although on June 21st a suggested news leak on the report of Judge Dorion which he was preparing on the Rivard case enlivened the House.¹ But this had settled down by the next day and the House returned to routine business, defeating an attempt to prevent passage of a bill setting up an Indian Claims Commission. The same day the bill providing for the changes in the Federal-Provincial fiscal

1. Ottawa Citizen, "Dorion Preview", George Brimmell, (Fri. June 18, 1965) p.1.

arrangements was given second and third reading. Most of what was left of the month was taken up with Supply. On June 30th the House adjourned without an opportunity to discuss the Dorion Report which had been submitted on June 29th.

The Report which Judge Dorion¹ had prepared accused Ministers of indiscretion but absolved them of all blame and after a brief flurry in the press, over the exchange of letters between the Prime Minister and Judge Dorion about the November 24th lapse of memory on the part of the Prime Minister, it also was laid to rest.

On September 7th with Gallup polls showing the Liberals leading with 47 per cent of the popular vote and the Commons still on holidays Prime Minister Pearson succumbed to the pressure of his advisers and dissolved the 26th Parliament.

1. For an outline of the events which brought about the enquiry and its results see Richard J. Gwyn, The Shape of Scandal, (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Co., 1965).

CHAPTER II

THE COMPOSITION OF THE HOUSE

Method

In this chapter and the one which follows analysis has been facilitated by the use of punched IBM cards.

Each member of the House was assigned an identification number which was used throughout the study. This identification number, together with the name of the member, was punched, one to a card, and became Deck I for the study (Appendix I). Professor R. R. March of Carleton University already had on hand a series of cards with background information on all members of the House of Commons from 1867 to 1963, which had been prepared for a study undertaken at the University of Indiana.¹ I adopted the same identification numbers for the members in this study and thus was able to make use of his cards and eliminate duplicating the research already carried out. Information on members who entered the House after the election of 1963 were added to bring the data up to date. These cards became Deck 2.(Appendices 2.I and 2.2).

1. Most of this material had been collected from The Parliamentary Guide augmented whenever possible with newspaper and other biographies.

Decks 3 and 4 consist of a series of cards, one in each deck for each member, on which are contained the recorded divisions in the House of Commons for the three sessions of the 26th Parliament.

Under the procedures of the House at least five members, rising together in their places, after a voice vote may demand a recorded division.¹ When this happens the bells ring and the members assemble in their places in the House. The length of time for which the bells may ring is not limited and is decided by the Opposition and Government Whips. After the Whips are satisfied all members who are available to answer the call are in their places, they enter the House, bow to the Speaker, and take their places. As they enter the bells are stopped and the doors to the Chamber are closed. No member is allowed to take his place after this. The Speaker then reads the motion and the members rise in order beginning with the Leader of the party. The yeas are recorded first and they are followed by the nays. The clerk records the name of each member and these are included in the Reports of the House.

1. W.F. Dawson, Procedures in the Canadian House of Commons.p.181.

It is these recorded votes which are coded and placed on cards in decks 3 and 4. Each vote has been allotted one column. Votes yea are recorded 1; nay 2; and absent as 0. There were 124 recorded votes during the 26th Parliament; 45 in the first session; 58 in the second; and 21 in the third. For the sake of facility in handling the cards one half the votes were recorded on deck 3 and the remaining half on deck 4. They cover columns 1 to 62 inclusive in each deck.(Appendix 2.3). Members were considered to be available unless their seat had been declared vacant. No attempt was made to trace the reason for absences. In the case of members who died while in office, or members who resigned their seat, the record was kept up to and including the last division for which they would have been eligible to vote immediately prior to the declaration by the Chief Returning Officer of the vacancy of their seat.

Members entering the House following by-elections were recorded from the date on which their name first appears on the roll.¹

In compiling the tables which follow, the Speaker of the House, Honourable Allan McNaughton, was not included unless it is expressly indicated. It was felt that although the Speaker is a member of the House he holds a special position and his inclusion in some tables would lead to a distortion of them. In the tables which refer to divisions the Deputy Speaker was always considered as

1. There were 6 by-elections. February 10, 1964 in St. Denis and Laurier brought about by the resignations of Azellus Denis on entering the Senate on December 27 and Honourable Lionel Chevrier who left the House on December 27 to become High Commissioner in Great Britain. They were replaced by Messrs. Prud'homme and Leblanc respectively. The seat in Saskatoon became vacant on March 4 with the death of the incumbent Mr. Henry Jones. This seat was won on June 22 by his wife, Mrs. Eloise May Jones. The seat for the riding of Nipissing became vacant on March 14, 1964 with the death of the Minister of National Revenue, the Honourable J.R. Garland; on June 22 this seat was retained for the Liberals by Mr. Carl Legault. In by-elections on November 9, 1964 in the ridings of Waterloo South and Westmoreland the former was captured from the Conservatives by Mr. Max Saltsman who replaced Mr. Gordon Chaplin who had died on March 4th; the latter riding was retained for the Liberals by Mrs. Margaret Rideout who replaced her husband, Sherwood Rideout, who had died on May 29th, 1964. (Material supplied by the Chief Electoral Officer from his official records).

if he were an ordinary member even when he was in the Chair. On these occasions he was recorded as absent. This decision was made since a Deputy Speaker assumes the Chair only in the absence of the Speaker. This means in effect that one of the Liberal members is absent and it was decided that by using this method of report the actual attendance record of the Liberal party would be maintained.

In only one case was it deemed feasible to drop the voting record of a member. This was done in relationship to the voting record of Mr. Gordon Chaplin. Since this member died while in office it was decided that his high absentee rate (90 per cent) was a reflection of his inability to attend at votes during the period immediately preceding his death and that inclusion would give a distorted view of the Progressive Conservative party's attendance record.

An examination of the material in relationship to the Creditiste group showed that although they did not break with the Social Credit Party until September 30, 1963, there was sufficient difference throughout the Parliament to treat them independently from the beginning of the first session. Therefore, throughout the charts they are treated as a separate and distinct party.

With these qualifications behind us we are now ready to

examine the material.

The Members

When the unofficial tabulation of votes was completed on April 9, 1963 the standing in the House was reported as Liberals 128; Progressive Conservatives 96; Social Credit 24; NDP 17.² A week later when the service vote was counted Liberal standing increased to 130 at the expense of the Progressive Conservatives. The official count confirmed the results in all ridings but Pontiac-Tamiscamingue.³ There, the seat was declared won by the Conservative member, Paul Martineau. The standing in the House, at the beginning of the 26th Parliament, therefore, was Liberals 129; Progressive Conservatives 95, with the other parties remaining as they were reported earlier. A summary of party strength and areas of representation is contained in Table 1.

It will be noted immediately that Liberal support came primarily from Ontario and Quebec with these provinces

1. Globe and Mail, "Victory For Liberals", (April 9, 1963), p.1.
2. Globe and Mail, "Liberals Gain Two", (April 15), p.1.
3. In this riding the incumbent, the Honourable Paul Martineau, was declared the winner. The returning officer reportedly flipped a coin to determine how he would vote in casting the ballot which would break the tie vote that existed after a judicial recount. The judge's certificate confirming the decision was issued on April 25, 1963.

TABLE 1

Party Representation in the House - By Provinces¹ (May 1963)

Party	Total	Nfld.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alba.	B.C.	Y/NWT
Liberal	129	7	2	5	6	47	52	2	0	1	7	0
P.C.	952	0	2	7	4	82	27	10	17	14	4	2
N.D.P.	17	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	9	0
Soc Cred	24	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	2	2	0
	265	7	4	12	10	75	85	14	17	17	22	2

1. Globe and Mail April 10, 1963 (with correction for service vote, April 17, 1963)

2. Includes Pontiac-Temiscamingue

supplying more than 76 per cent (99 seats) of all Liberal members. This party had also made a clean sweep of all the seats in Newfoundland (7) while it divided evenly with the Progressive Conservatives in the other Maritime provinces winning half of the 26 seats available.

The difference in support for the two major parties was most noticeable in the representation from the west. While the Progressive Conservatives still had a large group from Ontario (27 seats or 28.4 per cent) they held 41 of the 48 seats in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan against only 3 held by the Liberals. In the far west (British Columbia), on the other hand, the Conservatives held only 4 seats, while the Liberal party had 7. Thus, Liberal strength was concentrated in eastern and central Canada with a small group of supporters from British Columbia. The vast area between the Great Lakes and the Rockies was almost completely the domaine of the Conservatives.

With the two major parties capturing almost 85 per cent of the seats minor party representation was unevenly distributed across the country. Over 50 per cent (9 seats) of the NDP's 17 seats in the House came from British Columbia alone, while Ontario (6 seats) and Manitoba (2 seats) provided the remainder of their representatives. For the Social Credit the personal magnetism of Real Caouette, which

had won many supporters for the party in 1962, worked again during the 1963 election. As a result Robert Thompson, a westerner, found himself the leader of a party with more than 80 per cent (20 seats) of its members from the Province of Quebec. A split in the party, along regional lines, seemed inevitable and no one was surprised when twelve Social Credit members banded behind Real Caouette to form a new party composed entirely of French-speaking members.

Not all the French-speaking members broke¹ with the Social Credit. Those who remained, however, appear to have had second thoughts, for on April 23, 1964 Messrs. Girouard and Ouellet announced that they had resigned from that party and now wished to be considered as members of the Progressive Conservative party.

The change was reported to have been brought about by negotiations conducted by the Hon. Leon Balcer, the Progressive Conservative Quebec Lieutenant. Ironically almost one year to the day later (April 7, 1965) Mr. Balcer himself announced in the House that he could no longer support the leadership of the Progressive Conservative party and would sit as an Independent.² He was accompanied in this move by Remi Paul.

1. Seven remained with Robert Thompson. A description of events surrounding the break will be found on p.18.
2. Debates, (1965), 1, p.59.

These changes and the Social Credit split were, perhaps, an indication that internal stresses developed within the parties caused by the problem of assimilating a large number of new members with varying opinions.

Fifty-three, or some 20 per cent of the members who entered the House were doing so for the first time. Table 2 contains a breakdown of the experience of members by party. The large percentage for new Liberal members (31.0) is in sharp contrast to the high percentage of Conservative members with six to seven year's experience (62.1) and is a reflection of the elections of 1957 and 1958 which saw defeat of a large number of the then sitting members of the Liberal party.

For another approximately 30 per cent (80) of the members this was the second term. But since these were first elected to the 25th Parliament in 1962 they had had only a year's experience in the House. Again in this group the Liberals had by far the greatest number - 47 or 36.4 per cent of all Liberal members compared with 8.4 per cent (8) for the Conservatives. Thus more than 65 per cent of new Liberal members had two year's experience or less. The percentage of new members in the three minor parties was similarly high - only the Conservatives could claim to have experience in the House.

TABLE 2
Experience in the House of Commons

Party	New Members %	2 years or less %	3-5 years %	6 years %	7 years %	8-10 years %	11 years %	More than 11 years %	N	Total
Liberal	31.0	36.4	2.3	4.6	1.5	—	11.6	12.4	128	100%
P.C.	10.5	8.4	4.2	34.7	27.4	1.0	4.2	9.5	95	99%
NDP	5.9	41.2	—	—	23.5	—	17.6	11.8	17	100%
R.Cr.	—	92.3	—	7.7	—	—	—	—	13	100%
Soc.Cr.	18.2	54.4	9.1	—	18.2	—	—	—	11	100%

1. At start of 1st session (May 1963).
2. Includes Members first elected in the 1962 general election.
3. Includes Members first elected in the 1958 general election and Members elected before 1958 whose total experience is 6 years.
4. Includes Members first elected in the 1957 general election and Members elected before 1957 whose total experience is 7 years.
5. Includes Members first elected in the 1953 general election and Members elected before 1953 whose total experience is 11 years.
6. Only Real Caouette had been elected previous to 1962.

It may, therefore, be assumed that the troubles which came to the surface were only reflections of the inner turmoil in the parties.

Although members were inexperienced in Parliament they could not be regarded as lacking experience in the areas they represented. The electorate showed a general preference for native sons. All but 54 of the members were born in the province which they represented. A breakdown of place of birth by party is shown in Table 3.

Of the group who were not born in the province that they represented, 22 were born in the neighbouring provinces; five members who had been born in Ontario were representing the Province of Saskatchewan but all of these had had their education in that province or had moved to the province several years before being elected; a further three members had moved from a western province to Ontario. Mr. Pickersgill of the Liberals who was born in Ontario represented the riding of Bonavista Twillingate, and John Nicholson who was born in New Brunswick represented the riding of Vancouver. These two members were in the cabinet and in the case of Mr. Pickersgill this had been a chosen riding for a safe cabinet seat. Mr. Nicholson, however, was a well-known British Columbia financier and consequently took advantage of this in running for a British Columbia seat. In one other case there was a movement westward of a

TABLE 3

PLACE OF BIRTH

Party	Total	Nfld.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	Que.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	United States	Eng.	Scot.	Other	Unknown
Lib.	132	6	2	3	4	46	41	6	3	3	2	4	1	—	11	10
P.C.	96	—	2	6	3	9	33	3	18	8	2	2	—	2	12	4
NDP	18	—	—	—	—	1	3	1	—	2	3	1	4	1	—	2
R.Gr.	13	—	—	—	—	11	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Soc.Cr.	11	—	—	—	—	7	—	—	1	2	—	1	—	—	—	—
Total	269	6	4	9	7	74	78	10	23	15	7	8	5	3	5	16

1. - Born in Italy.

2. - One Member born in each of: South Africa, New Zealand, Russia, Ukraine.

member from Manitoba to British Columbia.

Of the 21 members who had been born outside of Canada only six had been educated in other countries and all had received their secondary or post secondary school education in a Canadian institution, or, if they had had foreign secondary education, had lived in their community for upward to 20 years before being elected.

The immaturity which resulted from inexperience in Parliament was further emphasized by the "lack of years" in those sent to Parliament. The voters showed a preference for youth, making the 26th a young Parliament with more than half the members (148) under the age of 50 (Table 4).

The rejuvenation of the Liberal party ranks and the prospect of new opportunities available to younger members within the party was reflected in the age of freshmen Liberal members. In that party 15 (11.3 per cent) had not yet reached the age of 35; 30 of the 40 Liberal members entering the House for the first time in 1963 were under 50. This compares with only two of the 10 new members for the Progressive Conservatives and the lone new member of the NDP who were in the 36-50 age bracket. When the parties are taken as a whole the gap between Liberals and Conservatives under 50 practically disappears with 53.7 per cent of the Liberals and 50.7 per cent of the Conservatives falling into this group. Fifty per cent of the NDP were also

TABLE 4

AGE OF MEMBERS 1

Party Total	30 and under	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	66-70	71 and over	Unknown
Liberal 132	4	11	24	22	10	23	10	9	3	2	14
P.C. 95	-	5	7	19	19	15	9	12	7	-	2
NDP 18	-	-	2	5	2	3	3	1	2	-	-
R. Gr. 13	2	2	3	1	3	1	1	-	-	-	-
S. Cred. 11	1	-	3	1	2	2	-	-	-	-	2
Total 269 ²	7	18	39	48	36	44	24	22	12	2	18

1. As of May 1963 or on entry if elected after 1963.

2. Includes members elected at by-elections.

under 50. The Creditiste was the youngest party in Parliament - 84.7 per cent (11) of the 13 members were under the age of 50 and 4 of these were under the age of 35. The Social Credit was slightly older with half its members (6) between 35 and 50. Neither of the members over 50, however, had reached the age of 55.

Although many members could not claim sagacity through advanced years, they could claim that they had had the opportunity to gain wisdom through a formal education. (Table 5). Sixty of the 113 Liberals (53 per cent) for whom we have information, were university graduates, as were 46 of 79 Progressive Conservatives (58.4 per cent), 6 NDP (50 per cent) and 5 Social Credit members (55.8 per cent. Only in the Creditiste group did the percentage of university graduates drop below 50 per cent. Three of their 9 members for whom information was available reported university graduation. Even in this party, however, education is significant when it is noted that only 3.1 per cent of the Canadian population have graduated from a university.¹

The educational qualifications for membership in the House become even more noticeable when post university education is considered. Of the 225 members for whom information is available, 36 per cent (81) had attended university beyond the first degree level.

1. Canada Year Book, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1965), p.359.

TABLE 5

EDUCATION LEVEL

Party	Total	Elementary and/ or High School	Some College	University Degree	Graduate Degree	Law Studies	Healing Arts	Unknown
Liberal	132	19	24	30	10	25	5	19
P.C.	95	22	13	10	8	20	6	16
NDP	18	3	3	2	3	-	1	6
R. Cr.	13	5	4	2	-	-	1	1
S. Cred.	11	3	1	3	-	1	1	2
Total	269 ²	52	43	43	21	46	14	44

1. Includes Pharmacists and Dentists as well as Medical Doctors.

2. Includes members elected at by-elections.

One other factor appeared to be significant when data on members' background was examined.

Married men were over represented in Parliament (Table 6). Only 4 of the 269 members were unmarried compared to 15 per cent in the 35 to 50 age group in the general population. There was also no indication that any members had been divorced. Within the group the electorate showed a preference for members who had large families. Sixty-five of the members (28 per cent) had families with 4 or more children in them. Although some of these will be a reflection of larger families in French-Canadian representation, it also appears to reflect a belief (either conscious or unconscious) that men with family responsibilities will act more responsibly when in Ottawa.

This, then, was the background of the members of Parliament whose behaviour we will examine in the next chapter. Typically, the member was a man¹ between 35 and 50, married with 4 children, university educated and represented a riding in the province in which he had been born.

1. Only five women were elected to the Twenty-Sixth Parliament.

TABLE 6

MARITAL STATUS

Party Total	Single	Married with										No Children Child.	No Info.
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Children or more	Children	Children		
Lib.	132	2	9	15	30	23	16	4	4	5	24		
P.C.	96	2	2	8	21	23	19	6	3	5	7		
NDP	18	-	-	2	6	4	4	1	-	-	1		
R. Cr.	13	-	-	1	1	2	-	2	1	4	2		
S. Cr.	11	-	-	-	-	2	2	1	2	2	2		
Total	269	4	11	26	58	54	41	14	10	16	36		

CHAPTER III

THE HOUSE DIVIDED

When a form of Government based upon a "constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom"¹ was established in Canada the division procedure in practice in the British House of Commons in 1867 was also adopted (with modifications).

This was a relatively new practice, having been introduced in Britain as recently as 30 years previous, in 1836, with the hope that the electorate would take into account the voting record of its members when they presented themselves for re-election.

"The people," wrote Burke, in his 'Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents', "ought to be excited to a more detailed attention to the conduct of their representatives...Frequent and correct lists of the voters in all important questions ought to be procured."² This ideal of free expression and an informed electorate was not to last for long.

The jelling of the party system, in the latter half of

1. British North America Acts, 1867-1951, (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1952), p.13.
2. S. E. Finer, H. B. Berrington and D. J. Bartholomew, Backbench Opinion in the House of Commons, 1955-59, (London: Pergamon Press, 1961), p.1.

the 19th century, greatly reduced the number of opportunities for the individual member to vote along lines dictated by his conscience. The necessity of securing party endorsement made him susceptible to party discipline and forced him to follow the party line when voting. The division system, however, persisted, and even though emasculated, has value for the student of Parliament. Michael Foot, as late as 1959, when speaking of the British situation was still able to say, "those who elect MPs to represent them can judge their conduct if they know how their representatives vote on issues of real importance."¹

The Canadian situation has tended to parallel that in Britain. Party discipline has increased since the turn of the century but considerable flexibility still exists. Discipline in the Liberal party, particularly in a minority situation has been strong, but among the opposition parties it has by no means been as successful.

In 55 of the 124 recorded division calls during the 26th Parliament one or more members of a party voted contrary to the majority of his party.² Albeit some of these deviations from the party line are a reflection of the internal problem of the Social Credit party. But it should be

1. Ibid, p.2.

2. For a discussion on dissenting members see p.105.

remembered that throughout the study the Creditiste and Social Credit groups are treated as distinct parties. We have, therefore, considerable data available for the study of deviant votes. We also have material available for the study of the voting patterns of opposition parties.

In working with this data the necessity for a reference framework around which the analysis could be developed became immediately apparent. An attempt was made to use the system of relative significance developed by William Riker in "A Method for Determining the Significance of Roll Calls in Voting Bodies".¹ The figures produced, although mathematically significant, varied so little that their political significance was suspect. An examination of the votes, however, showed that they more or less naturally divided themselves into groups which reflected their content. As a result the votes were divided as follows: 1) Votes of Want of Confidence, 2) Ruling Challenges, 3) Amendments to Legislation, 4) Specific Problems, and 5) Miscellaneous.

The category Votes of Want of Confidence was defined

1. William H. Riker, "A Method for Determining the Significance of Roll Calls in Voting Bodies", Legislative Behaviour, (Glencoe: Free Press, 1959), p. 377.

narrowly. As mentioned earlier¹ votes taken on amendments to the Address in Reply, the Budget, and on Supply are usually considered to be in this group. There are, undoubtedly, other votes such as those on the flag and specific pieces of legislation which the Government considered as crucial to its remaining in power. Since we have no "inside" information available as to which votes the Government considered as such, a decision to accept other than those ordinarily included in this category would require a subjective analysis. It was decided, therefore, to avoid the temptation and to include only the votes, which, by tradition, are considered to be votes of want of confidence.

Under the restrictive rule allowing amendments to the Address in Reply nine amendments and subamendments were possible; eight were actually proposed. The main amendment in each of the three sessions was made by the Conservative party; the NDP proposed a subamendment in each case; and in the second and third sessions the Creditiste proposed a further subamendment after the vote had been taken on the NDP subamendment. Three of these votes on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne could be considered serious threats to the Government.

1. Footnote page 10.

The first of these challenges was on the subject of nuclear arms and the Government was sustained by only 11 votes (113-124). Douglas Harkness joined with John McIntosh and four Social Credit members to provide the margin. The next came during the second session when the Conservatives disputed the need for the sales tax on building materials and farm machinery. The Government survived with a margin of nine (119-128) provided by a Creditiste, two NDP and four Social Credit members. The final close vote was on the main amendment in the third session. On this occasion the Liberals defeated the amendment on a vote of 106 to 93 with the help of six members of the NDP and eight Creditists.

Thus on all three occasions that the Liberals came close to losing an amendment on the Address in Reply they were kept in power by dissident members of the opposition.

Almost identical subamendments to the Address, on Medicare, were proposed by the NDP at the beginning of the second and third sessions. The first was defeated 134 to 87 and the second 129 to 84 with the support of the Social Credit on both occasions. A Conservative amendment during the first session suffered a similar fate losing by 71 votes.

While the Conservative and NDP amendments to the Address sometimes presented a serious challenge to

to the Government those of the Creditiste never did. A second session subamendment on Family Allowance was defeated 222 to 25 (the NDP supporting the motion) and a third session subamendment on Income Taxes was defeated 126 to 32 with scattered Conservative support.

Proposed amendments to the Address in Reply may range far afield, and usually do. Amendments in the other two confidence areas, however, are more restricted in that they must have financial implications. Andrew Hill in the book, What's Wrong with Parliament?¹ says of the British House,

In the exercise of its financial function, the House of Commons spends nearly one third of its historical role of protector of the people's money, this high proportion of time should not surprise us.

Since the Canadian Parliament "takes very much after the Mother" a good deal of time is also spent talking about money here as well.

There were seven recorded divisions associated with the Budget motions during the 26th Parliament; two were votes on the main motion to go into Committee; three were for Conservative amendments, and two were on subamendments proposed by the NDP.²

1. Andrew Hill, What's Wrong With Parliament? (Harmsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1964), p.18.
2. On the first two votes of the first session on amendments to the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means the NDP, although present in the House abstained from voting. Mr. Douglas explained their decision this way, "By abstaining from voting we are saying to the Government that we are prepared to see you stay in office in the hope that you will do something to implement the promises you made to the people of Canada. But by abstaining we are also saying we have no confidence in this budget."

The only serious challenge to the Government came on NDP and Conservative proposals in the third session. The first of these which asked for an increase in the Old Age Security Pension was lost by 16 votes on a recorded division of 90-106. Although all opposition parties voted against the Government, there were sufficient absences in their ranks to provide the Liberals with a sufficient margin to defeat the amendment. The other attempt, an effort to force the Government into eliminating the sales tax on building materials and farm machinery, was defeated by 11 votes (100 to 111). Again the absence of opposition members provided the Government with a margin of safety.

It is interesting to note that whenever the sales tax became the subject of a vote the margin for the Government was always small. It appears that while the opposition felt that it was a good issue on which to win support among particular groups, it did not have sufficient weight with the general public to make it the base for a new election. Rather than force the downfall of the Government the opposition preferred to humiliate it by bringing about close votes while arranging for sufficient members to be absent so that the Liberal Government was kept in office.

Rules adopted in 1955 also cut down on the number of times that the Government must submit to a debate on the

The only serious challenge to the Government came on NDP and Conservative proposals in the third session. The first of these which asked for an increase in the Old Age Security Pension was lost by 16 votes on a recorded division of 90-106. Although all opposition parties voted against the Government, there were sufficient absences in their ranks to provide the Liberals with a sufficient margin to defeat the amendment. The other attempt, an effort to force the Government into eliminating the sales tax on building materials and farm machinery, was defeated by 11 votes (100 to 111). Again the absence of opposition members provided the Government with a margin of safety.

It is interesting to note that whenever the sales tax became the subject of a vote the margin for the Government was always small. It appears that while the opposition felt that it was a good issue on which to win support among particular groups, it did not have sufficient weight with the general public to make it the base for a new election. Rather than force the downfall of the Government the opposition preferred to humiliate it by bringing about close votes while arranging for sufficient members to be absent so that the Liberal Government was kept in office.

Rules adopted in 1955 also cut down on the number of times that the Government must submit to a debate on the

motion to go into supply. They have been reduced to six.¹ As will be seen from the discussion which follows the opposition does not necessarily force a recorded division on each of these occasions. Of the fifteen votes on which a division was recorded ten took place during the first session, four during the second and only one in the third.

The decision on the subject on which the Government will be challenged is left to the opposition, the only restriction being that it have some pertinency to the estimates of the department being introduced. During the 26th Parliament four supply motion amendments dealt with economic policies or unemployment, three with agricultural problems, and two with problems of defence. Other topics ranged wide and far afield - from Great Lakes shipping to the abandonment of Veteran's hospitals. It would be expected from the nature of the challenge (a vote of want of confidence) that the Government would be hard pressed on many occasions to sustain itself in office during a minority situation. This hypothesis is not borne out. Margins of safety for the Government ranged from fifteen on an NDP amendment criticizing the lack of protection under the terms of the auto pact between Canada and the United States, to 198 on a Creditiste amendment asking for the

1. Supra and W.F. Dawson, op.cit., p.141. Under these rules at least twelve amendments and subamendments would be possible each session.

acceleration of ARDA policies. Other votes ranged within these two extremes with the average vote providing a margin between 40 and 60.

The wording of the motion seems to have had a bearing upon the support which it would receive. Of all the parties in the Commons the Social Credit and Creditiste appeared to be the least adroit in formulating their amendments. A Social Credit motion in the first session chastising the Government for "continuing inadequate policies of the previous Government" was not likely to gain the support of the Conservatives. It was, in fact, defeated 208 to 22. A Creditiste amendment, also in the first session, abhorring the storing of nuclear arms on the grounds of the "State of Quebec" was also worded in a manner to discourage any support from other opposition parties. It went down to defeat 210 to 27.

The New Democratic Party had the greatest success in phrasing a subamendment which was acceptable to other parties in the House. In fact it was so successful that the Liberal party decided to support it. - The subamendment in question was the one proposed by Douglas Fisher on co-operative federalism.¹

1. Supra, p.23.

The subamendment was passed, with the Conservative opposition voting against it and the Liberal Government in favour, 128 to 60. On the main amendment all parties combined and the vote was unanimous (187 to 0).

Challenges to Speaker's rulings do not have the drama of the votes of confidence since defeat does not bring about the fall of a Government. They are, nevertheless, most important for they create precedent. Usually the Government can gain enough support to sustain the Speaker (who is their man, although endorsed by the opposition).

There are two types of rulings¹ which may be challenged and a vote asked of the House:- those made by the Speaker or Deputy Speaker while the House is in session and rulings of the Chairman while the House is in the Committee of the Whole. Of the 26 challenges to the Speaker almost half (11) came from the Creditiste, while nine were moved by the Conservatives, five by the NDP, and one by the Social Credit.

1. Under new procedural rules adopted in 1965 questions of privilege must now be submitted to the Speaker in advance of their introduction and his rulings on these, and other decisions cannot be challenged. Globe and Mail Magazine, "Mr. Speaker Rules Firmly, Strikes Softly", (Mar.12,1966), p.2.

The result of the votes on nine of the Creditiste's appeals shows that other opposition members in the House usually considered them to have little substance. Votes with such lopsided results as 205 to 13 (an appeal on the sitting of the Creditiste group during the first session), and 160 to 7 on the Canada Pension Plan were typical.

One of these challenges by the Creditistes although defeated, was considered as very serious. It was in the form of a "want of confidence" motion in the Speaker. Such a motion was a reflection on the Speaker's traditional impartiality and had it been upheld would have resulted in his resignation. Only once before¹ had the Speaker been challenged in this way. The Creditiste proposal was nothing more than an act of futility based upon their frustration in having been defeated on their appeals so

1. During the heat of the Pipeline Debate in 1956 the Conservative party moved a motion of non-confidence in the Speaker, Mr. Beaudoin. This censure was brought about by the fact that the Speaker had ruled one way and then the following day had reversed his decision. Since the Speaker is, in effect, the appointee of the Government in power, a vote of censure suggests that he had used the power which he has as Speaker to ingratiate himself to the Government in order to receive a reward upon his relinquishing of the Chair. W.F. Dawson, op.cit, p.74.

often. None of the other opposition members voted with the Creditistes and their motion was lost 206 to 10.

Appeals by the Creditistes seemed to sit at both ends of the swing of the pendulum. On the opposite side to the overwhelming defeats are two votes which the Creditistes won or came close to winning. The first of these was a defeat for the Speaker on an appeal from his ruling that a subamendment, on a supply motion, (concerning the placing of arms on the territory of "the State of Quebec") was out of order, by a recorded vote of 85 to 83. The vote on the subamendment which followed showed that although the opposition was in sympathy with the Creditiste's right to propose the subamendment they were far from being in favour of the subamendment itself which was overwhelmingly defeated as mentioned above. The other vote, a challenge to the Speaker on the relevancy of an amendment on territorial waters, was introduced by the Creditiste in the last days of the first session. The resulting vote was 106 to 106 and the Speaker was called upon to vote in order to sustain his own ruling.

The five NDP appeals suffered a better fate than those of the Creditistes. A ruling that Mr. Gordon's admitted violation of secrecy on the first budget was not a matter of urgent business was sustained by only 28 votes (97 to 69). Mr. Knowles' attempt to have the R. Dixon-Spears

Report tabled went down to defeat by only sixteen votes (92 to 73), and an attempt to have the Commons debate the Prime Minister's statement to the Dorion Commission was defeated by only 43 votes (122 to 105). The NDP was not as successful, however, on the vote on the Speaker's ruling that an amendment (to the Bill requiring retirement of Senators at 75) abolishing the Senate was out of order. The Speaker was upheld 99 to 18. A challenge to the Deputy Speaker's ruling that a proposed amendment on going into supply during the first session was irrelevant was even more overwhelmingly defeated on a recorded vote of 158 to 14.

The larger group of Progressive Conservative members in the House with their greater experience and more orthodox views were likely to gain more support on their challenges to the Speaker's ruling. Such an expectation is borne out by an examination of the voting on Conservative appeals. An attempt by Mr. Balcer to have the municipal loan question debated as a matter or urgent business received support of all opposition members and the Liberals were able to avoid being defeated by only one vote (108 to 107) with the aid of Dr. Marcoux.

During the Creditiste attempt to have their group recognized in the House, Gordon Churchill attempted to have the House sit day and night until the question was

solved. The Speaker ruled that this motion was out of order and an appeal on the ruling was defeated 101 to 88. A Conservative attempt to introduce the Rivard case during the first session met with a similar fate on a vote of 116 to 110. During the second session an attempt to censure the Government in the person of the Minister of Transport for the revealing of air policy outside the House was ruled as not being a question of urgent business and the Speaker was sustained 111 to 63. In the midst of the flag debate a Speaker's ruling that a proposed subamendment by Mr. Diefenbaker was not relevant was upheld by 35 votes (94 to 59). Attempts to have the Speaker overruled on decisions concerning the relevancy of amendments to the Canada Pension Plan and Old Age Security Pension were defeated 99 to 45, 111 to 78, and 76 to 96, and an attempt to have papers concerning the Prairie Farm Assistance Administration tabled suffered defeat in the third session when the Speaker was upheld 122 to 52.

The single Social Credit appeal (on a ruling that a private member's bill asking for the establishing of the office of Parliamentary Commissioner (Ombudsman), introduced by Robert Thompson, was a money bill and could not be introduced by a private member) perhaps is the most interesting of the appeals on the Speaker's rulings.

Members of the Social Credit were joined by members from all of the other opposition parties and yet the vote was still defeated 115 to 75.¹

Appeals from the ruling of the Chairman while in Committee of the Whole are not as common as appeals on the Speaker's ruling probably because they do not establish as strong a precedent as do those of the Speaker. There were only six such decisions demanded of the House during the 26th Parliament. Four of these occurred in the first session and one in the second.

Three of the first session appeals were by the Creditistes and, as occurred with challenges to the Speaker, were overwhelmingly defeated. Indicative of these votes was an appeal concerning bilingualism in the Pharmacy Act which was lost by 176 votes (188 to 12).

NDP and Conservative appeals to the House on rulings fared better. Appeals during clause by clause discussion of the Excise Tax Bill losing only 100 to 70 and 113 to 66 for the respective parties and a challenge by the Conservatives which came during the flag debate being overruled by 59 votes (118 to 59).

The restraint which governed the parties in challenging the rulings of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole

1. The question of defectors on this vote is discussed later on p. 105.

was also evident in the lack of votes forced on second and third reading of legislation. Although the rules of the House allow amendments on both second and third reading¹, only eleven votes on second reading (six on amendments; five allowing the Bill to go on to the next stage) and ten votes on third reading were forced (seven of these on amendments). Four pieces of legislation were challenged on both second and third readings. Of these latter, two were Income Tax Bills (one in the first session and one in the third). In both cases attempts were made to refer the legislation back to committee. (These were defeated 126 to 78 and 112 to 66). Although amendments were not proposed on the Student Loan Bill, it was forced to a vote. Second reading was approved 144 to 11 and third reading 137 to 14.

1. The procedure used for the passage of bills in the Canadian House consists of three readings. First reading is a mere formality. On second reading a debate on the principles is allowed but the clauses cannot be debated or even referred to in passing. Amendments are possible but must be couched in general terms. The common approach to second reading is to move a simple hoist or refer the subject matter of the bill to a committee before giving approval to it in principle. A committee then examines the details clause by clause and on third reading the House gives further consideration to the bills in their final form. The motion for third reading is debatable and members may move amendments. Usually such amendments take the form of referring the bill back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend it in certain specific ways. It is also possible to move a hoist at this stage.

The Canada Pension Plan, perhaps the most disputed legislation next to the flag, was forced to a vote only on second reading and was carried by the surprising vote of 184 to 0.¹ In the third session amendments on clauses 120 and 122 of the Pension Plan² were attempted by the NDP but these were defeated 76 to 96 and 76 to 94.

The Bill for retirement of Senators at 75 also had a stormy passage. The NDP attempted a hoist on the second reading but it was defeated 15 to 112. A third reading attempt by the Conservatives to have the date of effectiveness delayed was also defeated (117 to 75).

Other pieces of legislation on which attempts were made to delay passage on second reading were the "Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act", the act extending credit to agricultural syndicates, and the "Indian Claims Act". None of these were successful. Third reading amendments

1. Although no record exists as to who called for the vote it appears that the Liberals manoeuvred the opposition into a position that forced them to vote for a measure which they did not entirely agree with because voting against it would be political suicide.
2. These clauses brought about changes in the Old Age Security Act.

to bills setting up the Economic Council and increasing payments of the Old Age Security Act were proposed by the Conservatives but were defeated. On second reading the Senate and House of Commons Act was passed 200 to 10, the Student Loans Act 144 to 11 and, as mentioned earlier, the Canada Pension Plan 184 to 0. On the third reading the main motions on the ratification of the Columbia Treaty (108 to 16), students loans (137 to 14) and the Canada Pension Plan (159 to 12) were carried.

The Student Loan Program also passed with difficulty - the Creditiste group challenging on three occasions in the third session. They proposed an amendment on second reading and also forced votes on both second and third reading. These attempts were overwhelmingly defeated with majorities of more than 120. A forced vote on the Income Tax amendments in the third session on second reading also was defeated (102 to 58) and an NDP proposal to return the bill to Committee of the Whole on third reading failed to carry by a margin of 74 (78 to 102).

The Senate and House of Commons Bill which barely had enough supporters to demand a recorded vote found two party leaders, Mr. Caouette and Mr. Diefenbaker, together with a handful of followers voting against an overwhelmingly majority of members in the House. Their vote appears to

indicate a genuine difference of opinion on the necessity of an increase in salaries and allowances for both members of the House and of the Senate. That so many would be in favour of such a vote is easily understood when it is related to the fact that most of the members were married with families and consequently experienced difficulty in trying to maintain a family on the lower (\$8,000.00 per year) stipend in effect at the beginning of the 26th Parliament.

On the placing of Maritime Transport Unions under the management and control of trustees only four members voted against the bill on second reading. (One cannot help but wonder where the fifth person to force the vote was found).¹

Up to this point the discussion has been oriented towards legislation and legislative process. Let us now turn our attention towards two issues during this Parliament, which, because of the number of votes they generated, deserve closer scrutiny.

1. W.F. Dawson, in Procedure in the Canadian House of Commons, op.cit., p.184, discusses the question of forcing members who ask for a vote to vote against the motion.

These were the flag debate and the seating of the Creditiste group. Overlapping will occur because votes on these issues were included in the preceding three sections. A complete picture of voting behaviour is not possible, however, unless voting on these issues is considered separately.

The flag debate provided the most contentious and the most controversial of the topics under discussion during the 26th Parliament. As indicated in Chapter I tempers were frayed, heated words were exchanged and deep-seated prejudices were challenged. There were a total of fifteen votes on questions relating to the flag. These fall into two groups, the first consisting of four votes in the period September 17th to October 8th, 1964, and the remainder in the period December 3rd to December 17th, 1964.

The first consists of an appeal by the Conservatives on the ruling of the Speaker, an attempt to have a plebiscite held on the flag question, and two motions for adjournment.¹ None of these were successful, the appeal

1. Motions for adjournment are not debatable and thus may be used to cut off a debate. They may also be used, however, as a means of wasting time since they must always be voted on. A completed discussion of the use of adjournment can be found on pages 172-6 in W.F. Dawson, op.cit.

being lost 94 to 59 and the attempt at a plebiscite 69 to 118. The two adjournment motions were lost 69 to 84 and 64 to 85. During this period interest in debate in the House and in attendance lagged. Only on the plebiscite vote could attendance be considered as adequate (71.4 per cent). On the other three votes attendance was less than 60 per cent. (This will be discussed later when the question of attendance is raised).

The remaining flag division calls may also be subdivided into two groups. Eight concerned with the acceptance of the sixth report of the flag committee (this was the adoption of a distinctive Canadian flag with the red Maple Leaf and two red bars) and the seventh report (the acceptance of the Union Jack as the Commonwealth flag). Of the eight votes dealing with the Canadian flag five were forced by the Conservatives; two in an attempt to have debate adjourned (lost 129 to 55 and 139 to 68); one to force a plebiscite (lost 153 to 82); and a final futile attempt to have Mr. Diefenbaker recognized in place of the Prime Minister after the imposition of closure (lost 155 to 72). The NDP added to the confusion on December 9, by attempting to have debate adjourned by moving that the House proceed to the Orders of the Day. This was defeated 132 to 99. The other two votes were the imposition of closure which was passed on a vote of 152 to 85 and the

passage of the motion itself which finally received approval on a vote of 163 to 78.

The Conservatives tried to have the seventh report returned to the committee in order that it could be amended to provide that the Red Ensign be adopted instead of the Union Jack as the Commonwealth flag, but they were unsuccessful (87 to 130). In an attempt to have the decision delayed the Creditistes suffered a similar defeat (194 to 22). The motion itself then passed 185 to 25.

The next largest group of votes on one subject was that concerned with the seating of the Creditiste group after the breakup with the Social Credit. There were six votes in all on this topic. Three of these were proposed by the Creditistes themselves and only the last, the suggestion of Mr. Plourde, on letting the Social Credit decide on which group should be seated where, came close to receiving the support of the rest of the House. The Conservative and NDP amendments to the committee reports suggesting the recognition of the group were both defeated by the Liberals. The Liberals, however, were successful in having debate adjourned in order to allow for behind-the-scenes discussions.

Although the questions of nuclear arms, federal-provincial relations, and the Canada Pension Plan might have been included under this heading, it was felt they had

been discussed in considerable detail above and that further comment at this point would be redundant.

As is often the case when an attempt is made to group items together, it was found that there were a number of subjects for which there were not sufficient divisions to require a separate category, yet which were sufficiently different that they could not be included in categories already established. For this reason the category miscellaneous was created. In it all the votes that were not covered in the preceding discussions were included. Among these were the problem of the defection of the six Social Credit members at the beginning of the first session; requests for the tabling of correspondence; questions on Trans Canada Airlines, redistribution, the Columbia River Treaty, election irregularities; and the suspension of Mr. Hamilton from the House. None of these appear to have had great import as far as the policy of any party was concerned and no connecting link which would tie them together for meaningful discussion could be found. Since they are discussed in Chapter I in the context of events surrounding them, they will be mentioned here, in passing, but no further comment will be made on them.

Who Makes the Motions?

A grant of money or tax bill, in Canada, can be introduced only on the recommendation of the Governor-

General. Because we have a responsible cabinet it is understood that the members of the cabinet are the only individuals capable of obtaining this recommendation and that they are responsible to the House for the amounts involved and the uses to which the money is put.¹ For this reason all money bills are introduced by the minister responsible for the legislation under which the money will be spent. The tradition has also grown up that ministers will introduce all legislation which has a bearing on their own department. Of the seventeen votes forced on motions introduced by the Liberals, fifteen of these were presented by ministers. Mr. Gordon led the list with four, followed by Mr. Pickersgill with three, Miss LaMarsh and Mr. McIlraith with two each, and Messrs. MacEachen, Martin, Favreau and MacNaught with one each. The remaining two motions introduced by the Liberals were on the flag. These were introduced by Herman Batten, Chairman of the Flag Committee.

Motions by leaders of the parties accounted for 1/5 (25) of the motions presented during the 26th Parliament. Mr. Diefenbaker introduced eleven, Mr. Douglas nine, Real Caouette three, and Robert Thompson two. It is interesting to note that none of the motions presented by the Prime

1. W.F. Dawson,op.cit.,p.7.

Minister (Mr. Pearson) were forced to a recorded division during this Parliament.

Since the Conservative party had sufficient members in the House to form a shadow cabinet and had not been out of office sufficiently long for members to have lost contact with the department for which they were responsible, 22 of the votes which were initiated by motions from the Conservative party were introduced by former members of the cabinet. Gordon Churchill, who was also House leader for the Progressive Conservatives, led the list with six, followed by George Nowlan who, as Finance Minister in the shadow cabinet, matched Mr. Gordon's four motions, J. Waldo Monteith (3), Alvin Hamilton (3), Leon Balcer, Water Dinsdale, Michael Starr, Hugh John Flemming, J. H. Ricard and Marcel Lambert with one each. Of the remaining seventeen motions seven were on the flag introduced by Messrs. Moore, McIntosh, Smallwood, Woolliams, J. H. Horner and Thomas; four were appeals to Speaker's or Chairman's rulings introduced by Messrs. McIntosh, Nielsen (2) and Baldwin. Other motions introduced were by Terrence Nugent (2 on the sales tax on building materials and farm machinery), Alfred Hales (tabling of Department of Industry papers), Gordon Aiken (procedure), Eric Winkler (the recognition of Mr. Balcer in place of Douglas Harkness), and Paul Martineau (request for the tabling of redistribution maps).

Thus, of the 95 members in the Progressive Conservative party only 22 made motions which were considered important enough to force a recorded division and out of these more than half were appeals or motions on the flag.

In the minority parties a larger proportion of members were allowed to introduce motions which were forced to a vote. In the NDP besides the motions of Mr. Douglas, seven were introduced by Stanley Knowles (the House leader) and Douglas Fisher (the party whip) introduced three. Others making motions were Messrs. Cameron, Barnett and Prittie two each, and Messrs. Scott, Brewin, Orlikow, Peters and Howard one each.

Gilles Gregoire of the Creditistes led all members of the Parliament in introducing motions which were forced to a vote. With fourteen such votes to his credit he exceeded Mr. Diefenbaker's motions by three. Other members of the party to introduce motions which were forced to a vote were Messrs. Plourde (2), Langlois (2), Beaulé (2), Rondeau and Gauthier. Mr. Thompson of the Social Credit was responsible for both of the contested motions of his party.

An examination of the seconders to motions shows a pattern very similar to that for the proposer of the motions. Government legislation was usually seconded by another minister, and party leaders when introducing a motion were

seconded by the House leader. Since many of the motions made by backbenchers were appeals on the ruling of the Speaker which require no seconder, the number of opportunities for backbenchers to second motions were limited, but in each case that a motion was made by a backbencher it was seconded by a backbencher.

Cohesion and Affinity

Dr. Eugene Forsey in an article in the Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science says,

During the election of April, 1963, Liberal speeches and editorials tended to depict minority Government as a nameless, faceless horror, the political fate that is worse than death. The authors of these productions are now hard at work trying to prove themselves wrong.¹

He then goes on to show that historically, in Canada, and contemporarily, in Australia and Britain, minority Government defeats in the House do not necessarily result in a new appeal to the electorate.

Whether we believe the statements of the politicians or share the enlightenment of Dr. Forsey we should share a common interest in the cohesion and affinity² of

1. Eugene Forsey, "The Problem of 'Minority' Government in Canada", Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXX (Feb. 1964), p.1.
2. For the purposes of this study cohesion is defined as the tendency for members of the same political party to vote the same way on a particular vote; affinity as the tendency of one political party to unite with another on any vote.

political parties in the 26th Canadian House of Commons. For, should the trend towards minority Governments continue, as the results of the elections of 1962, 1963 and 1965 suggest may happen, an examination of the behaviour in this Parliament will provide us with an insight as to what to expect in future minority situations.

Table 7 shows the number of times that each party voted with one of the other parties. No attempt has been made to separate data according to all of the combinations of parties possible. The number in the square where a column and row intersect is an indication of the number of times these two parties voted together out of a possible 124 votes.¹ Only the top part of the table is shown since the bottom section is a mirror image.

The values outlined in red show the number of times that parties stood alone. An examination of these values shows that on 54 or 43.5 per cent of all votes taken during the 26th Parliament one of the parties stood alone against the combined weight of all the other parties. The eleven

1. There were two abstentions by the NDP (votes 5 and 7 of the first session), and two abstentions (votes 38 and 53 of the second session) by the Creditistes for a total of only 122 votes for each of these parties.

TABLE 7
Number of Times Parties Voted the Same Way

	Liberal	Liberal	Prog. Cons.	NDP	R. Cr.	Soc. Cr.
Liberal	11	35	59	55	86	
Prog. Cons.		23	63	43	52	
NDP			4	73	62	
R. Cr.				16	55	
Soc. Cr.					0	

times of the 54 that the Liberals stood alone are of particular interest because in this minority situation without support from mavericks in the other parties, or sufficient absentees within the other parties, the Liberals could have been defeated. This did not happen although on a vote of confidence on federal assistance to municipalities the margin was only one and a tie vote occurred on a challenge to the Speaker's ruling concerning off-shore oil rights. In all other cases the Government was sustained with a margin of from eight to twenty.¹

The Social Credit party shows a definite trend towards support of the Liberals. Their decision to support the Liberals on 86 out of a possible 124 votes is by far the highest for all parties. The Ralliement de Creditiste, on the other hand, which broke away from the Social Credit group, shows a greater affinity toward the NDP (voting with them 73 out of 120 times) than towards any other party in the Parliament. This is despite the fact that the Creditistes showed a definite preference for the Liberals

1. The votes and the margin are as follows (the margin to be found in parenthesis): vote, 30(16); 42(16) and 45(17) of the first session; vote, 4(8), 32(21), 54(20) and 55(18) of the second session; vote, 2(13) and 13(15) of the third session.

(55 out of 122) over the Conservatives (43 votes out of 122), while the NDP preferred the Conservatives (voting with them 63 out of 122 times) slightly over the Liberal party (59 out of 122).

An examination of the votes cast by the Social Credit party and the Creditistes shows that every time the Creditistes (55 times) voted with the Liberals the Social Credit also voted the same way. The reverse, however, is not true. There are several occasions on which the Creditistes voted with the Conservatives, while the Social Credit supported the Liberals.

The NDP is perhaps the least predictable party as it favoured all parties almost equally.

Although it would take an analysis in greater depth and over a longer period of time than was possible here it appears that this lack of support for any one point of view reflects the lack of differences in the two major parties.¹ The NDP is not a radical socialist party and is prepared to support any measures which tend to move in the direction of

1. Peter Newman, "The Lack of Conservative-Liberal Differences in Canadian Politics", Order and Good Government, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), p.91.

its objectives. It thus votes against measures which are considered to slow down this movement and in favour of those which promote it.

Between the two major parties, the Ralliement de Creditiste and the Social Credit party tend to favour the Liberals over the Conservatives. The decided preference of the Social Credit makes them more predictable than the group which broke off, but both show the same preference for the Liberal attitude, although still maintaining independence and a flexible view. The NDP maintained a vigorous independence showing little inclination to be bound to the policies of either major party. The data seems to indicate that the minor parties do follow independent courses of action as their own principles and policies indicate, with the Social Credit showing a tendency to come to the aid of the Liberals whenever necessary.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the phrasing of motions and amendments has an effect on the chance for success of any recorded division. The minor parties must receive the support of one of the two major parties if they are not to see the division overwhelmingly defeated. The reverse, of course, is also true. But a defeat by a small majority is less likely to have as great an impact on the public. This gives the Conservatives a considerable edge

over the three minor groups. The Liberals, in this minority situation, had to gain the support of all of their own members as well as a minimum of four opposition members, in the optimum situation, if they were to win divisions. It is, however, a much easier task to persuade four members than it is to persuade one hundred.

Figure 1 is an attempt to show graphically the relationship between the success or failure of votes introduced by each of the parties.

The large number of votes in the zero to nineteen category for the Progressive Conservatives is a reflection of the votes on which they were called to stand alone without any help from other parties. The very tall column in the 45 to 59 range is the result of the combination of the Progressive Conservative vote with that of one of the minority parties, as are the nine votes in the 60 to 79 range. The single vote 180 to 199 column is vote number 40 of the first session, the unanimous acceptance of the supply amendment on co-operative federalism.

The tendency for all of the votes brought about by Conservative initiative to be concentrated in the zero to 79 range reflects the strength of the Progressive Conservative party in the House. Even when all other parties voted against it the margin seldom exceeded 80.

Figure 1

Party is the one
that proposed motion
or amendment.

The two high columns in the 160 to 200 or over range and the two short columns in the 140 to 159 range on the left of the Creditiste graph reflects the sixteen occasions on which the Creditiste stood alone. This represents 64 per cent of the votes forced by the Creditiste, and is an indication that they received very little support for their motions from the other parties.

Of the four votes in the extreme right, one is the appeal on the Speaker's ruling during the first session which was won by the Creditiste, while the others are the vote on seating of members, an adjournment motion during the flag debate and the off-shore oil rights controversy.

The NDP was successful in gathering the support of other parties for two-thirds (20) of its amendments, motions, etc., on which votes were recorded. The four votes on which the party was forced to stand alone are found in the 120 to 179 range with three of these being over 143.

Votes on Liberal motions divide themselves into two distinctive groups of ten votes and seven votes. The first group with majorities between zero and 99 include the first and third session motions to move into Committee of Ways and Means and the motion to adopt the reports of the Flag Committee and the imposition of closure. The second group includes votes on the Student Loan Act, the Canada Pension

Plan and the ratification of the Columbia River Treaty.

Only two proposals of the Social Credit party were voted on during the 26th Parliament. On one of these, Mr. Thompson's appeal on the Speaker's ruling concerning the establishment of a Parliamentary Commissioner the margin was 106 with the Social Credits being joined by a scattering of members from the other party. The other vote (23 of the third session) on an amendment on resolving into Committee of Supply was defeated by 185 votes.

Equal in importance with the question of how the parties vote is the question of how the individual member votes. A member's behaviour on a division reflects not only the degree of importance that he attaches to the division, but also the degree of importance that his party attaches to it, for party displeasure with dissenters is directly proportional to the importance of the vote. A member who disagrees with his party really has only two approaches open to him in indicating this disagreement. He may either abstain from voting, in which case only the members of his party and not the public will be aware of his displeasure with their stand, or he may record a vote in the House opposite to that of the majority of his party - a step which contemporary writers¹ suggest is

1. Peter G. Richards, Honourable Members, (London: Faber, 1964), p.263.

not taken lightly in an era where the carrying of the party's label often means success or failure at the polls.

During the 26th Parliament members bolted party ranks on 51 out of a possible 124 occasions, seventeen or thirty per cent of these defections being on the flag issue.

Table 8 lists all the dissenting members from each party in rank order according to the number of votes cast contrary to the majority in the party. Tables 9 and 10 are consolidations of Table 8. Subdivisions have been made in order to identify any similarities or trends which may have developed.

The Flag, as mentioned above, accounted for 47 per cent of the defections (94 out of 199) and, therefore, all votes on this issue were listed in that column; Social Welfare includes all votes on student loans, family allowances, and the Canada Pension Plan; the Financial division includes the vote on the increase in stipend and budget, or monetary changes and amendments. The final category Others includes the remaining votes.

Welfare and financial votes each provided approximately 1/8 of the defections. Welfare was a much more significant cause of defections in the NDP, providing for 20 per cent of the dissenting votes compared to 14 per cent for the Conservatives. Such a high percentage of defections on

TABLE 8
Dissenting Members

Name	and Party	Nature of Division				Total
		Flag	Financial	Social Welfare	Other	
Cowan	Liberal	9	-	-	-	9
Choquette		1	-	-	1	2
Regan		-	-	-	1	1
Paul	Prog.	10	-	4	1	15
	Cons.					
Pigeon		8	-	2	-	10
Balcer		7	-	1	1	9
Martineau		6	-	-	1	7
Fairweather		2	1	-	3	6
Grafftey		5	-	-	-	5
Ricard		3	-	-	1	4
Clancy		-	1 (s)	1	1	3
McIntosh		-	-	1	2	3
Pascoe		-	1	-	2	3
Harkness		-	-	-	2	2
MacInnis		-	-	-	2	2
Vincent		-	-	2	-	2
Cantelon		-	1	-	-	1
Cooper		-	-	-	1	1
Diefenbaker		-	1 (s)	-	-	1
Enns		-	-	-	1	1
Fane		-	-	-	1	1
Gundlock		-	1 (s)	-	-	1
Horner (Albert)		-	1 (s)	-	-	1
Jones (Mrs.)		-	-	-	1	1
Macquarrie		-	-	-	1	1
Muir (George)		1	-	-	-	1
Nasserdon		-	1 (s)	-	-	1
Nielsen		-	-	-	1	1
Rapp		-	1 (s)	-	-	1
Smallwood		-	-	-	1	1
Valade		1	-	-	-	1
Watson		-	-	1	-	1
Webb		-	-	-	1	1
Howard	NDP	2	1	6	3	12
Herridge		4	-	-	4	8
Peters		2	-	-	4	6
Winch		2	-	1	2	5
Barnett		2	1	-	1	4

TABLE 8 (cont'd)

Name	and Party	Nature of Division				Total
		Flag	Financial	Social Welfare	Other	
Fisher	NDP	1	1	-	1	1
Saltsman		1	-	2	-	3
Brewin		1	1	-	-	2
Douglas		1	-	1	-	2
Knowles		-	1	1	-	2
Mather		2	-	-	-	2
Webster		1	-	-	1	2
Howe		-	-	-	1	1
Prittie		1	-	-	-	1
Scott		-	-	-	1	1
Olson	Soc. Cred.	3	2	-	3	8
Leboe		7	-	-	-	7
Marcoux		1	4	-	1	6
Patterson		5	-	-	1	6
Cote		3	-	-	2	5
Lessard		-	2	-	2	4
Frennett		2	-	-	1	3
Thompson		-	1	-	1	2
Chapdelaine		-	-	-	1	1
Ouellet		-	-	-	1	1
Beaule	Creditiste		1			
Caouette			1 (s)			
Dionne			1 (s)			
Gregoire			1 (s)			
Langlois			1 (s)			
Plourde			1			

(s) indicates votes against the increase in Parliamentary stipends.

TABLE 9

Total Dissenting Votes¹

Party	Flag	Financial	Welfare	Other	Total
Liberal	10	-	-	2	12
Prog. Cons.	43	9	12	23	87
NDP	20	5	11	18	54
R. Cr.	-	5	-	-	5
Soc. Cr.	21	9	-	12	42
Total	94	28	23	55	199

1. The absolute maximum defection possible would have been 16,368 votes.

TABLE 10
Defections -- by Party

Party	No. of Members Defecting				
	Once	Twice	Three	Four	More than Four
Liberal	1	1	-	-	1
Prog. Cons.	17	3	3	1	6
NDP	3	5	2	1	4
Soc. Cr.	3	5	2	1	4
R. Cr.	5	-	-	-	-
Total	29	14	7	3	15

this issue is surprising in a socialist party. Some comments are made on this later in discussing the attitude of Frank Howard but it does appear that more study of the internal differences in the socialist orientation of the NDP is warranted.

More study through interviews and examination should also be made on the relatively high (when the general belief in straight party votes is considered) number of members (25 or almost 10 per cent) who voted three or more times contrary to the majority of the party.

It will be noted at once that the highest number of defections in the Progressive Conservative party were among the French-speaking Canadians. Among these were Leon Balcer and Remi Paul who later became Independents. It is not amiss to suspect that as the number of contrary votes increased there was an accompanying increase in the pressure to conform or leave the party - the result being the break.

Also of note is the fact that 1/3 (11) of the contrary votes in the NDP which have a no relationship to the flag, (34) were on social welfare measures. More than one half of these were by Frank Howard who had been a member for that party since 1957. It would appear that the NDP can continue to contain within it a member who holds contrary views even on such basic issues as the degree of social

benefit required for citizens.

If members of the Liberal party disagreed with their party's stand only three had the temerity to vote against the majority. Auguste Choquette voted against the Speaker's ruling and in favour of Mr. Caouette on his attempt to be recognized as leader of a group in Parliament and voted against the motion for accepting the Union Jack as the Commonwealth flag. Gerald Regan broke rank with the party once in order to vote with the Social Credit party in their attempt to have a bill setting up the office of Parliamentary Commissioner introduced.

Only Ralph Cowan of the Liberal party, however, could be ranked as a true rebel.¹ He voted contrary to the rest of his party on nine occasions, all of them during the flag debate. Five of these votes were on motions for adjournment, including Mr. Knowles' attempt to have Orders of the Day debated and one was on the motion to introduce closure. Mr.

1. This tendency towards rebellion got him into trouble on March 29, 1966, when he again showed his independence by refusing to give unanimous consent to a further debate on capital punishment. On that occasion severe pressure was applied and Mr. Cowan capitulated and allowed debate as desired by his party.

Cowan also refused to accept the report of the Flag Committee proposing the Maple Leaf flag for Canada and voted in favour of both Conservative amendments attempting to return the question to the Flag Committee for adoption of the Red Ensign. He did admit defeat gracefully, however, and voted in favour of the adoption of the Union Jack as the Commonwealth standard.

In the Progressive Conservative party the two members who later became Independents (Leon Balcer and Remi Paul) showed the greatest inclination to vote contrary to the party. Mr. Balcer voted against the party nine times compared with Mr. Paul's fifteen contrary votes.¹ Mr. Balcer voted in favour of having TCA indicate how it arrived at its new aircraft selection² and against the Progressive

1. These take into consideration only the votes up to the time of the break with the Progressive Conservative party at the beginning of the third session on April 7, 1965. After that time Mr. Balcer registered eight other votes which were contrary to the Progressive Conservative party's attitude and Mr. Paul registered nine such votes.
2. TCA chose to equip its fleet with planes manufactured by Douglas aircraft, an American firm, rather than accept the French built Caravelle which was approximately the same size and price. French-speaking members suggested this was an intended affront against Quebec.

Conservative suggestion that the Canada Pension Plan Bill be referred back to committee for reconsideration of the rates being paid Old Age Security Pension beneficiaries. The remaining votes were on questions relating to the flag. On the votes asking for a plebiscite, on imposition of closure, and the acceptance of the report making the Union Jack the Commonwealth flag Mr. Balcer voted against the proposals; on the NDP motion to adjourn the debate and the attempt by Mr. Douglas to have the Orders of the Day debated Mr. Balcer voted in favour of the motion (and delay). He, however, did favour the new flag proposed in the sixth report of the Flag Committee and supported it when the vote was taken. Nine of Mr. Paul's contrary votes were also on the flag. He voted against the Progressive Conservative party on their three motions attempting to have a plebiscite taken, as well as the attempt to have the sixth report referred back to committee for adoption of the Red Ensign as the Canadian flag. He voted in favour of three of the attempts to have the debate adjourned and in favour of closure. His vote was split on the votes for the flag itself in favour of the new Maple Leaf flag and against the implementation of the recommendation that the Union Jack become the Commonwealth symbol. He also voted against first and second reading of the Student Loan Bills, the Federal-Provincial Fiscal

Programme proposal of the third session and the referring of the Canada Pension Bill back for examination of the Old Age Security Pension benefits.

A group of seven western Progressive Conservative members consisting of Messrs. Clancy, Diefenbaker, Gundlock, Albert Horner, Nasserden, Pascoe and Rapp could hardly be called rebels, although they did oppose the majority of the party on a vote, particularly since one of them is the leader of the party. They, together with three other members from other parties, opposed second reading of the Senate and House of Commons Act and Members of Parliament Retiring and Allowances Act.

With the exception of Deane Gundlock all of the Progressive Conservative members who voted against the motion came from Saskatchewan and amount to approximately 1/3 of the members from that Province (17). This undoubtedly is a reflection of the belief by these members that members of the Saskatchewan electorate would likely consider the gap between their own income and that of the members as unwarranted. This also would explain the votes against the measure by Messrs. Caouette, Dionne and Langlois of the Creditiste who represent relatively poor Quebec ridings. One of these Conservative members, Mr. Pascoe, voted with Messrs. Fairweather, Fane and Webster in favour

of Mr. Thompson's "ombudsman" appeal.

James Pascoe and Gordon Clancy also joined with Remi Paul and Leon Balcer in attempting to have papers concerning the TCA aircraft decision tabled. On the question of Maritime Unions Erik Nielsen stood alone among the Progressive Conservatives in opposing it, the only time that he voted contrary to the rest of the party.

As was to be suspected from his stand on nuclear weapons, Douglas Harkness voted in favour of their acquisition and for the tabling of papers concerning their acquisition. He abstained on the vote on which his right to speak was challenged.¹ John McIntosh voted with Mr. Harkness on the acquisition of nuclear arms and with Mr. Thompson on the ombudsman appeal, and against the implementation of the Canada Pension Plan. On the vote for recognizing Mr. Diefenbaker in place of Mr. Harkness, Reginald Cantelon and

1. Although the procedure of the House required only that a member stand uncovered in his place in order to be recognized by the Speaker, a convention has been developed whereby the Speaker is provided with a list of members from each party which he "will be able to see better than others". This convenience has been adopted in order to avoid wrangles in the House and to give each of the parties an opportunity to speak on a cycle agreed to by the party whips. See Procedure in the Canadian House of Commons, op.cit., pp.103-4, 169, 176.

John Enns supported Douglas Harkness' right to speak.

Clarence Cooper bolted the party ranks once in voting in favour of the Territorial Seas Act.

Mrs. Jones, Gordon Fairweather and Paul Martineau voted in favour of the adoption of the report on procedure even though other members of the party voted against it. Terrence Nugent and Clifford Smallwood registered displeasure with the Canada Pension Plan Bill on third reading. Gordon Fairweather also registered a contrary vote on the appeal against the Speaker's motion that an attempt to have security procedures investigated was out of order. Clement Vincent and Louis-Joseph Pigeon voted against second and third reading of the Student Loans Act.

The remainder of the votes on which a dissention was registered by members of the Progressive Conservative party were on questions relating to the flag. Gordon Fairweather voted in favour of the adjournment of the flag debate and against the recognition of Mr. Diefenbaker in place of the Prime Minister; William Grafftey voted against the two plebiscite motions, the adoption of the Red Ensign and concurred in the new flag; Paul Martineau also voted in favour of the new flag, two adjournment motions, and closure, while voting against the proposal to implement the Red Ensign. Terrence Nugent voted against the adoption of

the Union Jack as the Commonwealth flag as did J. H. Ricard who also voted against the Red Ensign and in favour of the new flag. Louis-Joseph Pigeon voted in favour of adjournment of the flag debate on three occasions. He also voted in favour of closure, the new flag and the Beaulieu amendment to have the Prime Minister propose that the Commonwealth adopt the Union Jack as its flag at the next Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference instead of Canada adopting it as such unilaterally. George Muir indicated only one vote contrary to the party; this was on one of the motions for adjournment.

Although there were a number of members of the Progressive Conservative party (19) who voted "out of step" with the majority on one occasion, they cannot really be considered as defectors, nor could Douglas Harkness or Terrence Nugent who registered only two votes contrary to that of the rest of the party.

John McIntosh, and James Pascoe with three defections, Gordon Fairweather and William Graffrey with five defections, Paul Martineau with seven, Leon Balcer with nine, Louis-Joseph Pigeon with ten and Remi Paul with fifteen defections could be considered as having registered sufficient protest to show that they have genuine difference with the policy of the party.

Frank Howard of the New Democratic Party has shown greater independence than any other member in Parliament while still remaining within a party. On twelve occasions he voted contrary to the majority in his group and on two of these occasions, votes on Medicare and Unemployment, contrary to the published policy of the party. He supported Mr. Thompson in his subamendment criticizing the Government for following the policies of the previous Government, favoured Mr. Caouette's amendment on nuclear arms on the territory of the "State of Quebec". On other votes he was against the Conservative amendment for removal of the sales tax on building and farm machinery, in favour of raising Family Allowances in keeping with the cost of living and of providing them until age 18, in favour of the Beaulieu amendment on the flag, and against the Union Jack. He also voted in favour of the forwarding of the Citizen editorial to the Committee on Privileges and Elections and voted against his own party amendment on the reduction of defence and the use of the funds for foreign aid. Such an independent attitude, as witnessed by the decision of Mr. Balcer and Mr. Paul would in other parties have brought about pressure to toe the party line or declare oneself independent. Mr. Howard, however, has remained as an NDP member despite his basic policy

differences with the party.

It is impossible from Frank Howard's votes to classify whether he stands to the left or right in his party but it appears that he has his own particular brand of socialism which is more conservative than that of the rest of the party.

Bert Herridge, with eight contrary motions, was next to Mr. Howard in registering dissatisfaction with the party. He voted with Mr. Thompson on the ombudsman appeal, in favour of forwarding the Citizen editorial to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, against Maritime Unions, in favour of closure and against the Red Ensign. He also broke ranks with the party and voted in favour of sustaining the Speaker on Mr. Caouette's third session appeal against a ruling on the introduction of a Family Allowance amendment. He appears to be for less direct Government interference and in favour of more money in the form of benefits than is the rest of the party.

Arnold Peters followed Mr. Herridge with votes against the Maritime Union, in favour of the Caouette nuclear arms motion, the Ottawa Citizen editorial referral to committee, the Beaulieu amendment and against the Union Jack and the new procedures. Next was Thomas Barnett who voted in favour of the ombudsman appeal, the tabling of federal spending in the

provinces, the recognition of Mr. Diefenbaker in place of Mr. Harkness, and Mr. Diefenbaker's appeal on the relevancy of his discussion during a proposed flag amendment. He also voted in favour of the imposition of closure. Harold Winch with votes in favour of eastern agriculture, the reference of the Ottawa Citizen editorial, closure, the Caouette Family Allowance motion and the referral of the sixth committee report to committee for implementation of the Red Ensign recommendation could also be considered among the renegades. Douglas Fisher found himself in the minority on three occasions (the Hamilton suspension, closure, and federal-provincial fiscal arrangements) as did Max Saltzman (closure, federal-provincial fiscal arrangements both second and third readings). Mr. Douglas (closure, and the Caouette appeal on Family Allowances), Stanley Knowles (federal spending in the provinces and the Caouette appeal on Family Allowances), Barry Mather (two plebiscite proposals on the flag), and Arnold Webster (closure and the Caouette third session appeal) found themselves in the minority on two occasions as did Andrew Brewin (closure and federal-provincial fiscal arrangements). Reid Scott (the Caouette nuclear arms on the "State of Quebec" appeal). Robert Prittie (closure) and Dr. William Howe (Caouette nuclear arms) disagreed with the majority once. Thus only

Colin Cameron, Murdo Martin, and David Orlikow of NDP members, never split with the majority of the party.

A similar situation existed in the Social Credit party where every member of the party at some time found himself in a minority. On ten occasions the minority voted with the Creditiste group.¹ Four of these were on questions related to the flag.

Bert Leboe with eight dissenting votes (against the first vote of the Parliament on the amendment on the criticising of the Government for the acquisition of nuclear arms, in favour of adjournment and debate on Orders of the Day, in favour of closure, in favour of the two amendments to have the Red Ensign adopted, and against the new flag), and Horace Olson also with eight votes in the minority, (first session vote on nuclear arms, against the sustaining of the Speaker's ruling while debating the Excise Tax Bill while in committee, and against an amendment to send the Excise Tax Act back to the committee, and against the new flag while in favour of Mr. Gregoire's appeal on the Speaker's ruling concerning Mr. Caouette's recognition, the introduction of papers concerning security, and two votes trying to have the Red Ensign recognized) had the highest number of defections. They were followed by Dr. Guy Marcoux with six votes (in favour of the appeal for

1. Votes 18 and 42 in the first session; 4,12,31,37,49 and 50 of the second session; and 4 and 21 of the third session.

discussion on municipal loans, against the first budget proposal, against the Union Jack, in favour of the nuclear arms papers tabling, and for the Conservative amendment on doubts and uncertainty) and Alexander Patterson with six votes (first session nuclear arms, against the plebiscite vote on the three Maple Leaf flag, in favour of closure, in favour of the return of the Red Ensign to committee for amendment of the sixth report, and in favour of the Red Ensign being adopted in place of the Union Jack, against the new flag) who had the next highest number of votes in the minority. Maurice Cote with five contrary votes, (in favour of the Diefenbaker request for nuclear papers to be tabled, in favour of off-shore rights being debated, in favour of adjournment of the debate on the flag on two occasions, and against the Union Jack), Marcel Lessard with four (nuclear arms papers, in favour of the Gregoire appeal against the recognition of Mr. Caouette, in favour of the tabling of papers showing spending in the provinces, and in favour of raising income tax exemptions), and Jean Frenette with three contrary votes (against the Speaker's ruling on off-shore rights, in favour of the Beaulieu amendment, and against the adoption of the Union Jack) also tended towards an independent rather than a party view. Robert Thompson provided bookends for his vote by being in a minority on the

first vote of the first session concerning nuclear arms (against the amendment) and on the last vote of the third session (in favour of the amendment on federal-provincial fiscal arrangements). Gerrard Chaptelaine had the best record voting in the minority only once (against the tabling of the R. Spears-Dixon Report).

The Ralliement de Creditiste showed the greatest internal cohesion and party discipline after the Liberals. Only on two votes did party members break rank. These occurred when Messrs. Beaulé and Plourde voted in favour of sustaining the Chairman's ruling while discussing the Excise Tax in committee during the first session, and when Messrs. Caouette, Gregoire, Dionne and Langlois voted against the Senate and House of Commons Act and Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act. On both these occasions the party had not yet broken away from the Social Credit.

The Liberal party, as expected, maintained strict discipline over its members to assure the minimum defection and the smallest possible chance for a vote going against it. The NDP, on the other hand, contains a number of defectors. This appears to bear out Duverger's hypothesis¹ that obedience in a party implies homogeneity. The NDP is probably the least homogenous party drawing together from diverse background and with widely diverse

1. Maurice Duverger, Political Parties, (London: Methuen, 1964), p.174

educational qualifications. The small number of members accentuates this and makes differences more noticeable making discipline more difficult and increasing the likelihood of dissent. This same hypothesis explains the very strong discipline in the Creditiste. All are French members with similar backgrounds and from ridings which are close together. They also owe their seats in large part to the popularity of Real Caouette which gives him a great deal of authority in the party.

Attendance

Douglas Fisher in an article in Maclean's Magazine¹ on February 5, 1966, cautions..."Checking on a man's presence at voting time is not a reliable way to spot a good MP!" Since Mr. Fisher was a sitting member in the House during the 26th Parliament, his words may be given some credence. It is interesting to note, however, that of the six members

1. Douglas Fisher, "How Good Or Bad Is Your MP?", Maclean's, (Toronto, February 5, 1966), p.17.

he selects as effective MPs, four - Stanley Knowles (96.8 per cent), Donald MacDonald (90.3 per cent), John Matheson (84.5 per cent), and H. A. Olson (86.3 per cent) had excellent¹ records of attendance on votes; one (Clement Vincent, 65.4 per cent) was average, and one (Gerald Baldwin, 59.9 per cent) was just slightly below average. Among the members labelled "drones", on the other hand, not one had an excellent record. The two members in this group who had the highest attendance (C. F. Kennedy, 76.6 per cent and Viateur Ethier, 75.8 per cent) voted on 20 per cent fewer divisions than the "effective" members with the best attendance records. The other four "drones" (John Morison, 67.7 per cent; Rodger Mitchell, 64.5 per cent; Albert Horner, 64.5 per cent; John Addison, 63.0 per cent) had average attendance records on division calls.

Although a good attendance record does not guarantee an effective MP, it does appear that the effective MPs are most

1. When constituency responsibilities, and the claims made on time by committee and party duties are taken into consideration any member with an attendance record higher than 80 per cent should be considered as having an excellent record. Most members are present for between 65 and 70 per cent of divisions. A record less than 50 per cent, on the other hand, is poor.

likely to be found among those with good attendance records.

Attitudes towards the attendance on roll calls vary among the five parties. This is shown in Table 11 where the attendance record in percentage is shown for each of the parties for each of the roll calls throughout the 26th Parliament.

The Liberal party, because it was in power and had a minority situation, placed the greatest emphasis on attendance in the House. Only on nineteen occasions out of 124 was attendance lower for the Liberals than for the Progressive Conservatives. In each of these cases the vote was on a motion for which the Government was sure of sufficient opposition support to carry the decision without difficulty. In only one case, the Gregoire appeal on the nuclear question in relationship to the "State of Quebec", did the Liberals miscalculate and lose a vote. However this could not have been considered a vote of want of confidence. Although attendance slipped to 60 per cent on that particular vote, it was far from being the lowest attendance recorded by the Liberals. This record was set during the third session¹, when Liberal attendance slipped to 40 per cent, on an appeal to a Speaker's ruling concerning a Creditiste subamendment on the Address.

1. Third vote.

TABLE 11 - ATTENDANCE BY PARTY

FIRST SESSION

%

PARTY	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Liberal	92	89	80	66	80	84	81	66	75	72	72	87	75	70	70
Prog.Cons.	85	80	67	67	76	75	77	62	64	47	56	75	57	50	50
NDP	94	88	88	70	0	94	0	82	82	47	73	76	64	71	76
R. Cr.	92	85	85	38	23	84	54	46	77	54	38	61	77	69	69
Soc. Cr.	90	54	100	63	63	90	82	72	81	63	64	73	64	55	27
All	90	84	72	63	70	81	69	65	72	61	64	79	65	62	62

PARTY	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
Liberal	79	78	79	73	79	79	69	86	86	77	68	69	68	82	84
Prog.Cons.	85	80	67	67	77	75	77	62	64	47	56	75	67	50	50
NDP	59	59	65	76	82	82	82	82	82	71	65	76	71	76	82
R. Cr.	92	92	92	69	92	100	69	100	100	100	87	69	77	69	77
Soc. Cr.	82	36	64	73	100	91	73	82	91	82	82	64	64	64	82
All	76	70	74	72	83	83	70	87	87	75	67	64	66	78	82

PARTY	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45
Liberal	60	80	93	93	76	86	86	63	77	77	70	65	77	82	84
Prog.Cons.	68	76	90	89	83	78	77	64	61	62	67	54	75	72	58
NDP	71	82	71	88	47	76	6	53	71	76	53	59	76	94	88
R. Cr.	69	92	100	100	77	38	38	69	77	77	69	61	92	92	85
Soc. Cr.	82	45	91	54	73	73	73	64	27	73	64	54	36	45	64
All	64	80	90	91	77	79	75	62	71	71	67	62	76	80	82

TABLE 11 - ATTENDANCE BY PARTY

SECOND SESSION

%

PARTY	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Liberal	84	67	89	98	85	90	87	84	79	89	61	78	83	78	87
Prog.Cons.	75	72	85	86	93	93	87	84	74	85	57	71	87	64	83
NDP	100	82	76	100	94	94	65	71	76	100	71	71	71	59	71
R. Cr.	92	54	85	100	85	85	85	77	61	100	61	77	77	54	92
Soc. Cr.	45	64	91	64	100	100	36	73	64	82	54	54	64	56	78
All	84	70	86	94	94	93	84	82	76	88	60	74	83	66	85

PARTY	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
Liberal	86	66	94	69	63	45	79	72	47	48	63	50	66	66	72
Prog.Cons.	81	53	93	59	57	48	72	67	52	53	54	58	55	53	75
NDP	71	65	82	76	76	88	71	65	41	53	71	47	65	47	76
R. Cr.	92	69	85	54	61	38	100	85	38	100	54	61	61	54	46
Soc. Cr.	89	67	89	44	44	11	89	89	44	44	44	33	33	33	44
All	84	61	92	64	61	47	81	71	48	56	59	58	59	58	71

PARTY	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45
Liberal	61	67	61	62	75	71	53	76	80	85	87	94	83	94	94
Prog.Cons.	56	47	48	47	63	61	44	72	61	73	88	82	81	85	75
NDP	71	65	65	53	59	65	29	71	53	67	89	78	94	94	78
R. Cr.	54	38	54	38	69	92	46	0	61	61	85	92	92	92	92
Soc. Cr.	33	33	44	67	67	56	33	67	67	89	100	100	100	100	100
All	58	57	55	55	69	68	46	70	70	78	81	89	90	92	86

TABLE 11 - ATTENDANCE BY PARTY

SECOND SESSION

%

PARTY	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Liberal	84	67	89	98	85	90	87	84	79	89	61	78	83	78	87
Prog.Cons.	75	72	85	86	93	93	87	84	74	85	57	71	87	64	83
NDP	100	82	76	100	94	94	65	71	76	100	71	71	71	59	71
R. Cr.	92	54	85	100	85	85	85	77	61	100	61	77	77	54	92
Soc. Cr.	45	64	91	64	100	100	36	73	64	82	54	54	64	56	78
All	84	70	86	94	94	93	84	82	76	88	60	74	83	66	85

PARTY	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
Liberal	86	66	94	69	63	45	79	72	47	48	63	60	66	66	72
Prog.Cons.	81	53	93	59	57	48	72	67	52	53	54	58	55	53	75
NDP	71	65	82	76	76	88	71	65	41	53	71	47	65	47	76
R. Cr.	92	69	85	54	61	38	100	85	38	100	54	61	61	54	46
Soc. Cr.	89	67	89	44	44	11	89	89	44	44	44	33	33	33	44
All	84	61	92	64	61	47	81	71	48	56	59	58	59	58	71

PARTY	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45
Liberal	61	67	61	62	75	71	53	76	80	85	87	94	83	94	94
Prog.Cons.	56	47	48	47	63	61	44	72	61	73	88	82	81	85	75
NDP	71	65	65	53	59	65	29	71	53	67	89	78	94	94	78
R. Cr.	54	38	54	38	69	92	46	0	61	61	85	92	92	92	92
Soc. Cr.	33	33	44	67	67	56	33	67	67	89	100	100	100	100	100
All	58	57	55	55	69	68	46	70	70	78	81	89	90	92	86

TABLE 11 - ATTENDANCE BY PARTY

SECOND SESSION

%

PARTY	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59
Liberal	96	90	88	87	98 ^a	84	74	56	75	73	74	70	66	
Prog.Cons.	86	81	72	70	65	83	71	38	54	55	53	54	73	
NDP	94	83	78	89	78	89	55	61	83	78	72	72	50	
R. Cr.	92	92	92	92	92	92	85	85	54	54	46	54	85	
Soc. Cr.	100	78	89	100	100	78	56	11	22	22	22	22	44	
All	91	86	82	82	79	84	72	46	65	64	63	65	67	

THIRD SESSION

%

PARTY	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Liberal	83	81	40	48	73	71	80	65	71	91	77	48	86	45	77
Prog.Cons.	73	70	53	55	55	68	67	69	85	74	80	35	73	48	65
NDP	78	56	61	67	67	83	83	50	61	72	78	78	83	72	78
R. Cr.	100	85	61	85	61	77	77	69	69	92	85	54	85	38	69
Soc.Cr.	100	67	33	44	89	67	44	44	78	56	78	44	55	44	100
All	77	75	47	60	66	71	74	64	80	80	56	44	78	48	73

PARTY	16	17	18	19	20	21
Liberal	73	66	57	69	65	77
Prog.Cons.	72	50	37	55	55	61
NDP	72	56	72	72	83	72
R. Cr.	69	46	77	46	23	46
Soc.Cr.	89	56	56	56	56	44
All	72	58	51	63	61	68

Despite the low Liberal attendance the division was still lost by 96 votes.

The highest attendance rate for the Conservatives was recorded on the fourth vote of the second session when 98 per cent of the Liberal members were present in the House. This vote was on a Progressive Conservative amendment to the Address in Reply and was won by the Liberals by only a margin of eight.

The lowest attendance record for the Progressive Conservatives was 35 per cent¹ on an appeal concerning an amendment to abolish the Senate proposed by the NDP. The highest attendance by the Progressive Conservatives was 93 per cent and occurred on three occasions in the second session.²

The NDP recorded 100 per cent attendance on two occasions early in the second session.³ This is compared

1. Twelfth vote, third session.
2. Vote five, the Creditiste subamendment on the Address in Reply; vote six, a Conservative amendment to the Address in Reply criticising failure to extend Family Allowances to age 18; and vote eighteen, a Conservative amendment on a supply motion criticising failure to take action on eastern agriculture.
3. Vote four which was the same vote as the Liberals recorded their highest attendance, and vote ten, the Conservative budget amendment.

with ten occasions of perfect attendance for the Ralliement de Creditiste and thirteen times on which all members of the Social Credit party were on hand. These latter two parties, however, also recorded the lowest attendance votes with 23 per cent for the Creditiste and eleven per cent for the Social Credit.

The wider span of percentage of members present from the minority parties is distorted, however, since the presence of each member shows a much greater increase in percentage attendance than occurs in the two larger parties. It is interesting to note the wide divergence in the attendance pattern of the minority parties, however, in view of their arguments against "sheep" in the other parties.

Figure 2 is a graphic presentation of the combined percentage attendance (all parties) during this Parliament. It will be noticed immediately that there was a general slump in attendance during the mid-point of the second session. This coincides with the July-August flag filibuster of the Conservatives. It also reflects the decrease in interest on the part of members brought about by the better summer weather.

It is evident that although the floor was abandoned to the Conservatives, all parties did participate in pairing. An examination of Table 11 shows that there was a

Figure 2:
Division call attendance
(All parties combined)

proportional drop in party attendance in the opposition (including the Conservatives) to that in Liberal attendance. Clearly the Liberals had arranged to protect themselves against the embarrassment of a defeat through the absence of members. With the high percentage of married men with children it is not surprising that members took advantage of an uninteresting debate to enjoy a holiday and rest. Tables 12 and 13 show the attendance of members based on marital status and age. There is evidence in these tables to support the hypothesis that married men or those with large families neglected their parliamentary duties to devote time to their families.¹

The attendance record of those members under 45 was chosen since it was assumed that parents with children in the pre and early teens would be found in this group. It is these children who would have the greatest claim on the parents' time.

Except for the parents in the group with 4 or 5 children the attendance record of members under 45 in the two major parties was higher than that for the same groups

1. Douglas Fisher gave this lack of time for his family as the major reason for his decision not to run for his Port Arthur seat in the 1965 election for the 27th Parliament.

TABLE 12

Attendance related to Marital Status

<u>Liberal</u>	91=100%	81=90%	71=80%	61=70%	Less than 60%	N	Av. Attend. %
Single	-	-	-	2	-	2	66.4
Married -no children	4	2	2	1	-	9	83.8
1 to 3 children	7	18	16	16	11	68	73.8
4 or 5 children	2	8	5	3	2	20	77.7
6 or more children	-	3	3	2	1	9	73.1
<u>Prog. Cons.</u>							
Single	-	1	-	1	-	2	75.9
Married -no children	-	-	-	1	-	1	66.5
1 to 3 children	5	10	13	9	14	51	68.4
4 or 5 children	-	3	6	9	7	25	66.1
6 or more children	-	4	1	3	-	8	69.9
<u>Other</u>							
Married							
1 to 3 children	1	3	5	4	4	18	68.2
4 or 5 children	-	2	6	2	2	12	70.7
6 or more children	-	1	1	3	1	6	69.3

TABLE 13

Attendance - Married Members under 45

<u>Liberal</u>	91-100%	81-90%	71-80%	61-70%	Less than 60%	N	Av. Attend. %
1 to 3 children	5	12	7	7	2	33	74.5
4 or 5 children	-	3	3	3	2	11	73.1
6 or more children	-	3	-	3	-	6	75.6
<u>Prog. Cons.</u>							
1 to 3 children	-	4	4	5	4	17	70.4
4 or 5 children	-	-	-	5	3	8	55.7
6 or more children	-	-	1	1	-	2	72.2
<u>Other</u>							
1 to 3 children	-	1	-	2	-	3	63.5
4 or 5 children	-	2	1	1	-	4	65.2
6 or more children	-	-	1	1	-	2	64.3

in the party as a whole. In the 4 or 5 children group Liberal attendance was down by 4.6 per cent over the same group in the whole party, and in the Progressive Conservative party the gap was 10.4 per cent. In all cases the attendance record was lower in the under 45 selection than for the whole group. No explanation could be found for this discrepancy. Interviews with members and the use of a questionnaire might have revealed factors not easily identified in the material available for this study. The time involved in such an examination, however, was not available, and, although interesting, the topic had to be dropped.

Another hypothesis which was considered was an expected grouping of attendance records for freshmen and sophomore members on the high and low ends of the scale, with a considerable gap in the centre. It was expected that attendance would reflect an attempt by new members either to keep constant contact with their constituencies, or to completely disregard their constituencies for concentration on Parliament. Gerrard Peltier writing in the Ottawa Citizen¹ indicates that seasoned members of Parliament give new members contradictory advice on this sort of problem.

1. Gerrard Peltier, "Which Way To Go", Ottawa Citizen, (January 11, 1966), p.7.

One group will insist that the member's return to the House is dependent upon keeping his constituents happy, while the other group will contend that constituents expect their members to be in Ottawa paying attention to the governing of the country. The evidence from Table 14 tends to substantiate this hypothesis for the NDP and Conservative parties but the Liberals appear to have compromised since freshmen and sophomore attendance appears to be grouped around the party average of 76.3 per cent. This is not surprising in view of the fact that the life of the Government was dependent upon having members available to defeat an unexpected attack launched by any of the opposition parties. Opposition parties, on the other hand, could choose the grounds for attack and therefore could allow greater freedom to their members.

An attempt to relate attendance to the proximity of the member to Ottawa and/or representation of a large city is shown in Table 15. In the two major parties it does appear that Ottawa members have a better attendance than the average. There does not, however, appear to be any general statement which can be made about the other regions. In the NDP and Social Credit parties the highest attendance is by western members, while this is the lowest attending group in the Liberal party and the next to lowest group in

TABLE 14
LIBERALS - ATTENDANCE BY EXPERIENCE

Present % Calls	New	2 years	3-5 years	6 years	7 years	8-10 years	11 years	More than 11 years	Total	% of Members
96-100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	0.8
91-95	5	4	-	1	-	-	1	2	13	10.1
86-90	5	5	1	-	1	-	3	2	17	13.3
81-85	7	10	-	1	1	-	1	0	20	15.6
76-80	7	5	-	-	-	-	4	3	19	14.8
71-75	5	5	1	2	-	-	1	2	16	12.5
66-70	6	5	-	2	-	-	-	2	15	11.7
61-65	2	4	1	-	-	-	2	1	10	7.8
56-60	5	3	-	-	-	-	1	1	10	7.8
51-55	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	0.8
46-50	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	2.3
41-45	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1.6
36-40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31-35	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
26-30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	0.8
21-25										
16-20										
11-15										
6-10										
0-5										
Total	40	47	3	6	2	0	14	16	128	99.9% ¹
Average Attend. %	76.7	73.6	74.5	77.5	84.6		74.9	73.2	76.3	

1. Error due to rounding.

TABLE 11.

PROG. CONS. - ATTENDANCE RELATIVE TO EXPERIENCE IN HOUSE

Present % of Calls	New	2 years	3-5 years	6 years	7 years	8-10 years	11 years	More than 11 years	Total	% of Members
96-100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
91-95	-	-	-	4	2	-	-	-	7	7.5
86-90	-	1	-	2	1	-	-	1	5	5.3
81-85	3	2	-	3	3	-	1	-	12	12.8
76-80	1	-	1	2	4	-	1	1	10	10.7
71-75	2	-	-	2	4	1	1	1	11	11.7
66-70	1	1	-	3	2	-	1	1	9	9.7
61-65	1	1	-	5	7	-	-	-	14	14.9
56-60	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	2	6	6.4
51-55	1	-	1	4	-	-	-	1	7	7.5
46-50	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	6	6.4
41-45	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	4	4.3
36-40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1.2
31-35	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1.2
26-30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21-25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16-20	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1.2
11-15										
6-10										
0-5										
Total	10	7 ¹	4	33	26	1	4	9	94 ¹	99.8 ²
Average Attend. %	77.2	66.8	73.9	67.8	69.4	71.8	75.1	67.3	71.1	

1. Gordon Chaplin is not included. See p.

2. Error due to rounding.

TABLE 14

PROG. CONS. - ATTENDANCE RELATIVE TO EXPERIENCE IN HOUSE

Present % of Calls	New	2 years	3-5 years	6 years	7 years	8-10 years	11 years	More than 11 years	Total	% of Members
96-100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
91-95	-	-	-	4	2	-	-	-	7	7.5
86-90	-	1	-	2	1	-	-	1	5	5.3
81-85	3	2	-	3	3	-	1	-	12	12.8
76-80	1	-	1	2	4	-	1	1	10	10.7
71-75	2	-	-	2	4	1	1	1	11	11.7
66-70	1	1	-	3	2	-	1	1	9	9.7
61-65	1	1	-	5	7	-	-	-	14	14.9
56-60	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	2	6	6.4
51-55	1	-	1	4	-	-	-	1	7	7.5
46-50	-	2	-	2	1	-	-	1	6	6.4
41-45	1	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	4	4.3
36-40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1.2
31-35	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1.2
26-30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
21-25	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16-20	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1.2
11-15										
6-10										
0-5										
Total	10	7 ¹	4	33	26	1	4	9	94 ¹	99.8 ²
Average Attend. %	77.2	66.8	73.9	67.8	69.4	71.8	75.1	67.3	71.1	

1. Gordon Chaplin is not included. See p.

2. Error due to rounding.

TABLE 14

NDP - ATTENDANCE RELATIVE TO EXPERIENCE IN HOUSE

Present % of Calls	New	2 years	3-5 years	6 years	7 years	8-10 years	11 years	More than 11 years	Total	% of Members
96-100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	5.9
91-95	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
86-90	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
81-85	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	11.8
76-80	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	11.8
71-75	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	4	23.5
66-70	-	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	3	17.7
61-65	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5.9
56-60	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	17.7
51-55	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5.9
46-50										
41-45										
36-40										
31-35										
26-30										
21-25										
16-20										
11-15										
6-10										
0-5										
Total	1	7	-	-	4	-	3	2	17	100.2 ¹
Average Attend. %	52.4	69.3	-	-	68.6	-	74.0	89.5		

1. Error due to rounding.

TABLE 14

R. Gr.		
Present % of Calls	2 years	6 years
96-100	-	
90-95	-	
86-90	1	
81-85	2	
76-80	3	
71-75	1	
66-70	2	
61-65	1	1
56-60	2	
51-55		
46-50		
Total	12	1
Average Attend. %	72.0	65.4

Soc. Grad.						
Present % of Calls	New	2 years	3-5 years	7 years	Total	%
		-				
		-				
		-	1		1	
		1			1	
		1		1	2	
		2			2	
	1			1	2	
	1	1			2	
		1			1	
Total	2	6	1	2	11	
Average Attend. %	54.5	62.1	86.3	64.2	66.8	

TABLE 15

REGIONAL ATTENDANCE *

Liberals

AREA	96-100 %	91-95 %	86-90 %	81-85 %	76-80 %	71-75 %	66-70 %	61-65 %	56-60 %	51-55 %	50% or less	N	Average Attend. %
Ontario ¹	2	-	7	3	4	3	7	3	4	1	2	36	76.1
Toronto ²	-	1	5	-	2	4	-	-	2	-	-	14	76.7
Ottawa ³	1	1	1	1	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	7	82.9
Quebec ⁴	-	3	3	4	5	3	6	-	-	-	1	25	77.8
Montreal ⁵	-	1	1	5	4	4	2	2	-	-	1	20	74.8
East	-	4	4	3	3	1	2	1	1	-	1	20	78.4
West	-	1	-	3	-	-	2	3	1	-	-	10	68.9

Conservatives

Ontario ¹	-	2	2	4	3	4	2	2	-	3	3	25	70.6
Toronto	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ottawa ³	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	77.2
Quebec	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	1	1	1	7	65.5
Montreal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
East	-	-	1	2	2	2	1	2	-	1	2	13	69.0
West	-	4	2	6	5	6	4	7	5	3	5	47	68.2

TABLE 15 (Cont'd)

NDP

AREA	96-100 %	91-95 %	86-90 %	81-85 %	76-80 %	71-75 %	66-70 %	61-65 %	56-60 %	51-55 %	50% or less	N	Average Attend. %
Ontario	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	5	69.1
Toronto	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	2	64.4
West	1	-	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	-	-	11	74.5
Social Credit													
Quebec	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	1	1	1	6	58.9
Ottawa 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	52.4
West	-	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	1	-	-	4	71.4

1. Ontario excluding ridings in Toronto, and Ottawa Area.

2. Ridings: - York Centre, York Scarborough, York West, York Humber, York South, High Park, Parkdale, Davenport, Trinity, Spadina, St. Paul's, Eglinton, Rosedale, Broadview, Greenwood, York East, Danforth.

3. Ridings: - Gatineau, Hull, Ottawa East, Ottawa West, Carleton, Russell, Renfrew South, Lanark, Pontiac-Témiscamingue, Labelle.

4. Quebec Province excluding Montreal, and Ottawa Area ridings.

5. Ridings: - Laval, Jacques-Cartier, Mercier, Dollard, Mount Royal, Notre-Dame-de-Grace, St. Henri, Verdun, St. Antoine-Westmont, Ste Anne, St-Laurent-St. George, Cartier, Laurier, St. Denis, Maisonneuve, Hoshelaga, Pontiac, Outremount, St. Jacques, Ste. Marie.

* For R. Cr. see Table 16 All are members from Quebec.

the Conservative party.

The suggestion is often made that French-Canadian members have a voting attendance record much lower than that for other members due to a dislike for Parliament and a belief in personal representation with the political chiefs. In the Progressive Conservative party and the Social Credit party this does appear to be borne out (Table 16). The French-Canadians in the Conservative party attended only 65.8 per cent of the votes compared with 74.6 per cent for all other Conservatives and Social Credit attendance dropped to 58.0 per cent compared with 71.4 per cent for the western members of that party. In the Liberal party French-Canadian attendance was 76.8 per cent, slightly higher than the average attendance of 75.2 per cent for the party as a whole. This would appear to be a reflection of two things - one, Pauline Jewitt's suggestion¹, that "what has happened in the last few years is that French-speaking Canadians are no longer willing to accept the minority role. They feel like equals and they want to be treated as equals, not as a privileged minority."

Secondly, we must take into consideration the political

1. Pauline Jewitt, "Can MPs Do A Better Job?" Order and Good Government, p.58.

TABLE 16

ATTENDANCE -- FRENCH CANADIANS

Party	96-100 %	91-95 %	86-90 %	81-85 %	76-80 %	71-75 %	66-70 %	61-65 %	56-60 %	51-55 %	50 % or less	N	Average Attend. %
Liberal	3	2	5	9	12	6	11	2	1	-	1	53	76.8
P. C.	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	4	-	-	1	9	65.8
R. Gr.	-	-	1	2	3	1	2	2	2	-	-	13	71.3
S. Gr.	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	1	1	2	7	58.0
All	3	2	8	11	15	8	16	10	4	1	4	82	67.9

sphere in which French-speaking members from Quebec find themselves. By moving into federal politics they indicate that they have "tied their star" to the federal Liberal party. The influential chiefs, therefore, that they must impress are found in the cabinet and the top echelons of the federal Liberal party. Consequently it is unlikely that French-speaking members would not be in the House when their chiefs are.¹ It is also possible that with such a large contingent from Quebec that attendance on voting may be used as a lever in petitioning for favours. This, however, is mere speculation and would require detailed research before any conclusive answer could be found.

Doctors and businessmen leave their business or profession behind them if they are elected as Liberals, as appears from Table 17. This is not true, however, in the Conservative and minor parties. The decision seems to have been left to the individual to decide in his own interest.

The low attendance record of some of the doctors and lawyers in the opposition parties may stem from the fact that they have private practices while those in the Liberal party are in clinics and larger firms. On the other hand,

1. The average attendance for the cabinet is 74.7 per cent.

TABLE 17 - ATTENDANCE BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS

Liberals

Present % of Calls	96-100	91-95	86-90	81-85	76-80	71-75	66-70	61-65	56-60	51-55	50 or less	N	Average Attend. %
Law	1	1	7	5	6	9	7	2	4	1	-	43	74.6
Doctor	-	-	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	82.5
Business	2	2	-	4	5	3	-	1	-	-	1	18	81.0
Exec.	-	2	1	1	1	-	2	1	1	-	-	9	76.9
Manuf.	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	3	55.4

Prog. Cons.

Law	-	-	-	2	3	3	3	6	2	1	3	23	65.1
Doctor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	3	44.2
Business	-	1	1	-	-	2	1	-	2	1	-	8	74.2
Exec.	-	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	6	74.2
Manuf.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-
Farmer	-	3	4	4	1	2	1	2	1	-	1	19	78.2

Other Parties

Law	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	3	57.8
Doctor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	56.5
Business	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	2	72.1
Exec.	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	85.0
Manuf.	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	74.4
Farmer	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	74.3

All Parties %

Law	7.9	7.9	10.2	10.2	13.1	17.4	16.0	11.6	10.2	11.6	5.8	69	65.8
Doctor	-	-	12.5	-	25.0	-	-	12.5	12.5	12.5	25.0	8	61.1
Business	7.1	10.7	3.6	14.3	21.4	17.9	10.7	3.6	7.1	3.6	3.6	28	75.8
Exec.	-	18.8	6.2	18.8	12.5	6.2	12.5	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	16	78.7
Manuf.	-	-	-	-	25.0	25.0	-	-	-	-	50.0	4	64.9
Farmer	-	13.6	18.2	25.0	4.5	9.1	4.5	9.1	4.5	-	4.5	22	73.7

the lack of attention by farmers in the Progressive Conservative party to the running of their farms appears to reflect an ability to hire others to run their enterprises.

Individual attendance records show a much greater variation. Among the Liberals, John Garland (99.2 per cent) before his death in March, 1963, Charles Legault (96.3 per cent) who replaced him as the representative for the riding of Nipissing, and George McIlraith (96.0 per cent) had the highest attendance records. For the Conservatives Reynold Rapp with an attendance of 93.5 per cent had the best record, while Stanley Knowles (96.8 per cent) carried the banner for the NDP. Charles Gauthier (75.5 per cent) and Marcel Lessard (71.8 per cent) had the best attendance record for the Creditiste and Social Credit parties respectively.

On the other end of the scale the record holders for absenteeism were: Allen MacLean (41.9 per cent) for the Liberals, Hugh Horner (18.5 per cent)¹ for the Conservatives,

1. Douglas Fisher in the Maclean's article, op.cit., chooses Albert Horner who had an attendance record of 64.5 per cent as one of the drones in the 26th Parliament. The lower attendance record of Hugh Horner suggests that Mr. Fisher, with three Horners to choose from, may have selected the wrong drone.

Louis Belanger (56.5 per cent) for the Creditiste, Maurice Cote (47.6 per cent) for the Social Credit and Dr. William Howe (57.4 per cent) for the NDP.

The Parliamentary Weekend

The statement that members of Parliament believed in the "three-day week", Tuesday through Thursday, has been heard so many times and repeated in the press so often that it has become entrenched as an axiom of our comments on Government. It would seem remiss, with the information available, for us not to check into this aspect of the attendance pattern. Table 18 shows the average attendance for each day of the week by session. The decision to treat each session independantly was made to try to eliminate any built-in bias that might result in a particular session due to the choice of a particular day to introduce motions.

The data does suggest that members are inclined to consider the weekend as beginning on Thursday night and ending on Tuesday morning. Attendance on Monday never exceeded 70 per cent, and averaged only 66.7 per cent for the 26 votes case on that day.

For the first two sessions attendance was almost identical (77.9 and 77.3) on Tuesday. In the third session it dropped to 67.9 but this was still 6.7 per cent higher

TABLE 18
AVERAGE ATTENDANCE BY DAY OF WEEK

Session	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
First	69.0 (6)	77.9 (16)	76.5 (11)	70.9 (8)	62.7 (4)
Second	69.9 (14)	77.3 (13)	82.0 (5)	78.3 (18)	62.0 (8)
Third	61.2 (6)	67.9 (5)	79.8 (3)	72.6 (3)	57.3 (4)
Average	66.7 (26)	74.4 (34)	79.4 (19)	77.9 (29)	61.7 (16)

attendance than that for Monday for the third session.

For the sixteen votes held on Friday, average attendance dropped from 62.0 per cent in the second session to a low of 57.3 per cent for the four votes of the third session. The difference between attendance on Thursday and Friday during the first session was 8.2 per cent rising to a difference of 16.3 per cent for the second session and remaining high at 14.3 per cent for the third session.

The highest attendance values and the highest average were recorded for Wednesdays, a fact which seems to be consistent with the suggestion of the long weekend. It is interesting to note that despite the high attendance on Wednesday, it ranks behind Tuesday, Thursday, and Monday, as a day on which votes are called. This may be due in part to the fact that the House does not sit on Wednesday nights, whereas it does sit on Tuesday and Thursday nights.

Although the data tends to support the hypothesis, a note of caution should be injected at this point.

An examination of differences in attendance on the vote on a Friday and the following Monday¹ shows attendance can vary as much as 28 per cent. Even votes called on the same day can vary in attendance by as much as 15.5 per cent. There were not, however, sufficient cases during this Parliament to make any general statements which can be substantiated by statistical data. Much further research over many Parliaments will be required if this is to be properly investigated.

1. There were four groups of Friday-Monday votes: Friday, October 18, 1963 (64.4), Monday, October 21, 1963 (66.3), difference 1.9; Friday, February 21, 1964 (83.7), Monday, February 24, 1964 (70.4), difference 13.3; Friday, March 26, 1965 (45.8), Monday, March 29, 1963 (65.2), difference 19.4; Friday, April 9, 1965 (74.4), Monday, April 12, 1964 (47.0), difference 28.4. On five occasions more than one vote was called on the same day; August 17, 1964 (59.5 and 58.4), difference 1.1; Monday, December 14, 1964 (89.7, 91.6, 86.0, 91.3), maximum difference 5.6; March 29, 1965 (65.2, 64.4, 63.2, 64.8), maximum difference 2.0; Monday, April 12, 1965 (47.0, 59.8), difference 12.8; and Monday, April 5, 1965 (64.4, 79.9), difference 15.5

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

So far our discussions have been concerned with what happened during the Parliament being examined. In doing so a conscientious effort has been made to present the facts without introducing personal comments on their import. It seems advisable, at this juncture, to stray from the strict confines imposed by the method adopted earlier. This is done for two reasons. First, because this is a single case and to try to draw universal conclusions from it would be presumptuous. But, also, because the author of this work does not believe that either the empirical or the traditional schools of political science must be by necessity mutually exclusive. Having borrowed from the first school in collecting the data he would like to have the flexibility of the more traditional approach in interpreting it.

Although this is not intended as an apologia for the method used in the study, it is perhaps well to start this chapter by examining the usefulness of the roll call study as a method of understanding Parliament better. What has been studied here is the behaviour of members of Parliament during a particular period of time. It is an attempt to see how the members act when carrying out the duties for which they have been elected. They are in as close to

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

So far our discussions have been concerned with what happened during the Parliament being examined. In doing so a conscientious effort has been made to present the facts without introducing personal comments on their import. It seems advisable, at this juncture, to stray from the strict confines imposed by the method adopted earlier. This is done for two reasons. First, because this is a single case and to try to draw universal conclusions from it would be presumptuous. But, also, because the author of this work does not believe that either the empirical or the traditional schools of political science must be by necessity mutually exclusive. Having borrowed from the first school in collecting the data he would like to have the flexibility of the more traditional approach in interpreting it.

Although this is not intended as an apologia for the method used in the study, it is perhaps well to start this chapter by examining the usefulness of the roll call study as a method of understanding Parliament better. What has been studied here is the behaviour of members of Parliament during a particular period of time. It is an attempt to see how the members act when carrying out the duties for which they have been elected. They are in as close to

"laboratory conditions" as it likely to be found in political science. Each member is faced with making some choice; he may either vote for the measure, against it, or he may abstain. There is no way that he can avoid making some decision. Not only must he decide but he must decide for the official record. We have, therefore, a complete account of an individual member's choices over a period of time. Although the actual issues on which votes are counted may vary from Parliament to Parliament, the method of recording and the type of issue on which a recorded division might be called have changed very little since 1867. A comparison of the roll call votes for several Parliaments, therefore, can provide us with much information about the institution. We can find out whether the number of dissidents has increased or decreased since Confederation; the relative rightness or leftness of a party over a period of time; identify issues which divide loyalties and those on which party discipline is always strong and those on which it is weak. These are only a few of the areas which might be explored. In short, we can put to the test many of the hypothesis we have about the Canadian Parliament.

Recorded Divisions are, of course, only one facet of the activities of Parliament. Caucus meetings, committee responsibilities, constituency pressures, and statements

from the floor of the House are important too. They also are a reflection of the attitudes of members and influence the course of the Parliament. The roll call, however, has one great advantage over these in that it has a set of rules and regulations surrounding it which give us a common base for further study.

I would hope, however, that this work would provide something more than a vindication for further study of Parliament. There have been a number of statements made about Parliament and in this, the concluding chapter, I would like to look at some of these and see whether they hold up in the light of the data which has been collected about the 26th Parliament.

Walter Harris, in 1957, in the Queen's Quarterly, special edition entitled Focus On Parliament, says,

Almost every member quotes at one time or another his approval of Burke's speech to the electors of Bristol, to the effect that a member is not a delegate of his constituents required to speak and vote as they direct, but rather a full agent with responsibility to speak and vote as he thinks with respect to the national issues.¹

He then goes on to suggest that despite their pronouncements members do little more than pay lip service to this high ideal.

The information gathered appears to belie Mr.

1. Walter Harris, "A More Business-Like Parliament", Queen's Quarterly, (Winter, 1957), p. 507.

Harris' statement. There are divisions on questions of national interest on which party attitudes are ignored and a member votes as he personally desires. In this Parliament the increase in stipend and the Canada Pension Plan were issues which brought about some votes which were contrary to the party line. There is nothing to indicate that dissenting members followed anything but their consciences in casting their votes.

Mr. Harris, however, was a Liberal and he may have considered the belief in the necessity of cohesion held by that party as being the norm for all of the groups in Parliament. J. W. Pickersgill in his book on the Liberal party, leaves no doubt of that party's attitude towards internal cohesion when he writes,

One of the chief purposes in any political party is to enlist sufficient support for its candidates in a general election to enable it to form a Government which can translate its policies into action.¹

The Liberals were the Government party and each member was expected to help in the "translation", by voting with the party. What was surprising was the large number of members in the Progressive Conservative and NDP ranks who ignored party ties.

1. J. W. Pickersgill, The Liberal Party, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1962), p. 137.

Frank Howard and Bert Herridge of the NDP were particularly noticeable for their ability to act independently and remain within an organized party. Their efforts were not "one shot affairs". They were quite consistent in their independent votes on issues which it appears they felt justified such action.

Sometimes, however, dissenters are forced to face the consequences of their decisions. Leon Epstein in a study of British Parliamentary parties observes,

The power of a Parliamentary party to remove a rebellious member from its ranks is real enough...but whether the possession of this power is the crucial element in maintaining cohesion is most doubtful. Obviously expulsion can be effective only insofar as a party values its solidarity enough to countenance such drastic discipline. Therefore even if expulsion (or the threat of expulsion) were regarded as the decisive weapon the explanation for its effectiveness would lie in the nature of the party loyalty which supported issues rather than the nature of the weapon.¹

The Progressive Conservative members obviously valued party loyalty far more than the NDP. Leon Balcer and Remi Paul did not find it possible to remain in the Progressive Conservative party when they persisted in voting against it.

1. Leon D. Epstein, "Cohesion In The British Parliamentary Parties", Legislative Behaviour, John C. Wahlke, ed., (Glencoe: Free Press, 1962), p.137.

The request by Mr. Balcer to have closure imposed during the flag debate was, of course, the major cause for the break. But the rift could possibly have been mended had the groundwork not already been laid by the dissenting votes which he had on record.

Speaking at the 33rd Couchiching Conference, in 1964, Bernard Crick stated,

The electorate may grumble that members of Parliament have become rubber stamps, but they punish independents and persistently refuse to return them, indeed they punish men who are notoriously irregular in their relationship with their party.¹

The operative word here appears to be notorious. The results of the election for the 27th Parliament seemed to uphold Mr. Crick's statement. It is interesting to note that when the members of the 27th Parliament took their seats in November, 1966, the four members who could be considered as most irregular in their relationship with their parties in that they changed allegiance, (Leon Balcer, Remi Paul, Gerrard Girouard, and Gerald Ouellet) were not among them.

It would appear, however, that the general electorate takes much the same attitude towards dissenting members as does the party. Of the members who were in the ranks

1. Bernard Crick, Order and Good Government, op.cit., p.27.

of the dissenters, 29 per cent did not return to Parliament. This compares with a turnover of 16 per cent for the Parliament as a whole. The roll call appears, for the general public, to have become a device for control of the MP - not as originally envisaged, but as a measure of party solidarity. Indirectly it has also become a control on the executive. A high degree of dissent within the ranks of the Government party would reflect a backbench disapproval of cabinet's policies, particularly if this party were the Liberals. This would doubtlessly be a factor to be taken into consideration by the electorate when voting. This perhaps justifies, if somewhat negatively, the retention of the publishing of the roll call.

The electorate does not appear to react to affinity of minor parties. Perhaps this is because informal coalitions are well hidden. Few people will take the time necessary to examine the data concerning roll calls as closely as we have here.

It appears from the information gathered that the Social Credit did make some agreement with the Liberals to keep that party in power. On the other hand, it is difficult to find any consistency in the support of the Creditistes and the NDP for either of the major parties.

Dr. Eugene Forsey refers to this minor party shift from side to side on particular votes as "leose shoals of fish".¹ These minor party groups, he suggests, have taken over the function of "keeping the Government on its toes" which was formerly carried out by individual members before party discipline became so strong. The minor party support becomes the barometer of the electorate and although the party in power does not always tailor its legislation to the attitudes of the minor parties, it can test the degree of support for a measure by having it voted on in the House on first reading. If the bill appears likely to be defeated after it has been introduced into the House it is withdrawn, amended and then resubmitted. Thus, the Government party receives the best of both sides; their party solidarity and a sounding board for the testing of opinion.

The Liberal party, at least, seems prepared to endorse such a situation. This is indicated in their acceptance of Mr. Fisher's "co-operative federalism" subamendment.

The above discussion is by no means exhaustive of the material collected. There are many more areas which might

1. Eugene Forsey, "The Problem of 'Minority' Government in Canada", Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, (February 1964), p.5.

be speculated upon. That, however, was not the aim of this work. It pretends to be nothing more than a close examination of a particular Parliament. What has been discussed in this chapter is only some of the ideas which came to the mind of the author during his collection and collating of the material. It is hoped that others may read the work and find it a stepping stone to further studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Source Material

British North America Acts, 1867-1951. Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1952.

Canada, House of Commons, Debates. May 16, 1963 to April 2, 1965.
Ottawa, Queen's Printer.

Canada, House of Commons, Journals. Vol. CX, CXI, CXII. Ottawa,
Queen's Printer, 1964 and 1965.

Normandin, Pierre G. ed. The Canadian Parliamentary Guide.
n.p. 1964 and 1965.

Saywell, John T. ed. Canadian Annual Review, Toronto, University of
Toronto Press, 1964, 1965.

Methodology

Belknap, George M. "A Method for Analyzing Legislative Behavior,"
Midwest Journal of Political Science, II (Nov. 1958) 377-402.

Crane, Wilder. "A Caveat on Roll Call Studies of Party Voting,"
Midwest Journal of Political Science, IV (Aug. 1960) 237-249.

Greenstein, Fred and Elton Jackson. "A Second Look at the Validity
of Roll-Call Analysis," Midwest Journal of Political Science,
VII (May 1962) 156-166.

Humanities Research Council of Canada. Scholarly Reporting in the
Humanities. (by R. M. Wiles) Ottawa, The Council, 1951.

Janda, Kenneth. Data Processing -- Application to Political Research.
Evanston, Northwestern University Press, 1965.

MacRae, D. Jr. "Some Underlying Variables in Legislative Roll Call
Votes," Public Opinion Quarterly, 18 (Summer 1954) 191-196.

Rice, Stuart A. "Measuring Cohesion in Legislative Groups,"
Legislative Behavior, John C. Wahlke ed. Glencoe, Free Press, 1959.

Riker, William H. "A Method of Determining the Significance of
Roll Call in Voting Bodies," Legislative Behavior, John C. Wahlke ed.
Glencoe, Free Press, 1959.

--- "The Stability of Coalitions on Roll Calls in the House of Representatives," American Political Science Review, LVI (March 1962) 58-65.

--- "Voting and the Summation of Preferences," American Political Science Review, LIII (Dec. 1959) 483-485.

Selltiz, Claire, and others. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

Canada

Beck, J. M. "The Election of 1963 and National Unity," Dalhousie Review (Summer 1963) 143-154.

Blishen, Bernard R. and others. Canadian Society. Toronto, Macmillan, 1961.

Brady, Alexander. "Quebec and Canadian Federalism," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXV (Aug. 1958) 259-269.

Creighton, Donald G. Dominion of the North. Toronto, Macmillan, 1962.

Corry, J. A. "Adaptation of Parliamentary Processes to the Modern State," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science XX (Feb. 1954) 1-9.

Dawson, R. MacGregor. The Government of Canada. 4th ed. edited by Norman Ward. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1963.

Dawson, W. F. Procedure in the Canadian House of Commons. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1965.

Engelmann, Frederick. "Membership Participation in Policy Making in the CCF," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXII (May 1956) 161-173.

Forsey, Eugene. "Government Defeats in the Canadian House of Commons, 1867-73," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXIX (Aug. 1963) 364-367.

--- "The Problem of 'Minority' Government in Canada," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXX (Feb. 1964) 1-11.

- Fox, Paul ed. Politics: Canada. Toronto, McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Hawkins, Gordon ed. Order and Good Government. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1965.
- Knowles, Stanley. The New Party. Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, 1961.
- Land, Brian. Eglinton The Election Study of a Federal Constituency. Toronto, Peter Martin, 1965.
- Maquarrie, Heath. The Conservative Party. Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, 1965.
- Meisel, John. "Stalled Omnibus: Canadian Politics in the 1960's," Social Research, 30 (Autumn 1963).
- "The June 1962 Election," Queen's Quarterly, LXIX (Autumn 1962) 329-345.
- Neatby, H. Blair. William Lyon MacKenzie King, 1924-1932, The Lonely Heights. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1963.
- Newman, Peter G. Renegade in Power: The Diefenbaker Years. Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, 1963.
- Pickersgill, J. W. The Liberal Party. Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, 1962.
- Powers, C. G. and others. "Focus on Parliament," Queen's Quarterly, XLIII (Winter 1956) 478-565.
- Quarterly Committee of Queens University. "Focus on Parliament," Queens Quarterly. (Winter 1957).
- Regenstreif, S. Peter. "Some Aspects of National Party Support in Canada," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXIX (Feb. 1963) 59-74.
- Sevigny, Pierre. This Game of Politics. Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, 1965.
- Thorburn, H. G. "Parliament and Policy-Making," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXIII (Nov. 1957) 516-531.
- Party Politics in Canada. Toronto, Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Ward, Norman. The Canadian House of Commons: Representation. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1950.

United States

Derge, David R. "Lawyer as Decision Maker," Journal of Politics 21 (Aug. 1959) 408-433.

--- "The Lawyer in the Indiana General Assembly," Midwest Journal of Political Science, VI (Feb. 1962) 19-53.

Froman, Lewis A. Jr. "Inter-Party Constituency Differences and Congressional Voting Behavior," Journal of Politics, 24 (Feb. 1962) 72-91.

Stokes, Donald E. and Warren E. Miller. "Party Government and the Saliency of Congress," Public Opinion Quarterly, XXVI (Winter 1962) 531-546.

Truman, David B. The Congressional Party. New York, Wiley, 1959.

Great Britain

Butler, D. E. "Some Notes on the Nature of British Political Parties," Occidente, X (Mar.-April 1954) 137-153.

Finer, S. E., H. B. Berrington and D. J. Bartholomew. Backbench Opinion in the House of Commons, 1955-59. London, Pergamon Press, 1961.

Foot, Michael. Parliament in Danger. Pall Mall Pamphlet #4, 1959.

Hanson, A. H., and H. V. Wiseman. Parliament at Work. London, Stevens and Son, 1962.

Hill, Andrew. What's Wrong With Parliament? Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1964.

Hollis, Christopher. Can Parliament Survive? London, Hollis and Carter, 1949.

Jennings, Sir Ivor. Parliament. Cambridge University Press, 1957.

Keeton, George Williams. The Passing of Parliament. London, Benn, 1952.

Lambeth, Lord Morrison of. Government and Parliament A Survey from the Inside. 3rd ed. London, Oxford, 1964.

Livingston, William S. "British Elections and the Two-Party System," Midwest Journal of Political Science, III (May 1959) 168-187.

Mathiot, Andre. The British Political System. London, Hogarth Press, 1958.

McKenzie, R. T. British Political Parties. Heinemann, 1955.

Richards, Peter G. Honourable Members: A Study of the British Back Benchers. 2nd ed. London, Faber, 1964.

General

Brogan, D. W., and Douglas V. Verney. Political Patterns in Today's World. New York, Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., 1963.

Duverger, Maurice. Political Parties. University Paperback ed. London, Methuen, 1964.

Leiserson, Avery. Parties and Politics an Institutional and Behavioral Approach. New York, Alfred Knopf, 1958.

Miller, Warren E. "The Socio-Economic Analysis of Political Behavior," Midwest Journal of Political Science, II (August 1958) 239-255.

Overacker, Louise. The Australian Party System. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1952.

Ostrogorski, M. Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties. Frederick Clarke trans. London, Macmillan, 1902.

Ranney, Austin ed. Essays on the Behavioral Study of Politics. Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1962.

Rieselbach, L. N. "Quantitative Techniques for Studying Voting Behavior in the U.N. General Assembly," International Organization, 14 (1960) 291-306.

Smiley, Donald V. "Two-Party System and One Party Dominance in the Liberal Democratic State," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXIV (Aug. 1958) 312-322.

Storing, Herbert J. ed. Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

Wahlke, John and Heinz ed. Legislative Behavior. Glencoe, Free Press, 1959.

--- The Legislative System. New York, Wiley, 1962.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

ROLL CALL CANADIAN HOUSE OF COMMONS 26TH PARLIAMENT DECK 1

CODE NO.	NAME		ATT.
CMP 0007 ADDISON	JOHN	HOLLINGS	63.0
CMP 0010 AIKEN	GORDON	HARVEY	65.3
CMP 0015 ALKENBRACK	ALMONTE	DOUGLAS	77.4
CMP 0050 ARMSTRONG	FREDERICK	THOMAS	78.2
CMP 0060 ASSELIN	EDMUND	TOBIN	62.1
CMP 0061 ASSELIN	JOSEPH	PATRICK	69.7
CMP 0073 BADANAI	HUBERT		90.3
CMP 0082 BALCER	LEON		60.1
CMP 0084 BALDWIN	GERALD	WILLIAM	59.9
CMP 0098 BARNETT	THOMAS	SPEAKMAN	68.8
CMP 0106 BASFORD	STANLEY	RONALD	80.6
CMP 0109 BATTEN	HERMAN	MAXWELL	91.1
CMP 0124 BEAULE	JEAN	ROBERT	75.8
CMP 0127 BECHARD	ALBERT		87.9
CMP 0130 BEER	BRUCE	SILAS	70.2
CMP 0134 BELANGER	LOUIS	PHILLIPE	56.5
CMP 0143 BELL	THOMAS	MILLER	67.7
CMP 0150 BENEDICKSON	WILLIAM	MOORE	71.8
CMP 0157 BENSON	EDGAR	JOHN	85.5
CMP 0162 BERGER	JEAN	CHARLES	85.5
CMP 0183 BIGG	FREDERICK	JOHNSTONE	71.8
CMP 0219 BLOUIN	GUSTAVE	P	78.2
CMP 0248 BOULANGER	PROSPER		79.8
CMP 0264 BOUTIN	PIERRE	ANDRE	81.5
CMP 0297 BREWIN	ANDREW		69.7
CMP 0317 BROWN	JAMES	E.	55.6
CMP 0359 BYRNE	JAMES	A.	83.9
CMP 0360 CADIEU	ALBERT	C.	58.8
CMP 0361 CADIEUX	LEO		72.6
CMP 0370 CAMERON	ALAN	JOHN	71.0
CMP 0372 CAMERON	COLIN		73.4
CMP 0396 CANTELON	REGINALD	W	76.6
CMP 0397 CANTIN	JEAN	CHARLES	83.9
CMP 0399 CAQUETTE	REAL		65.4
CMP 0400 CARDIFF	LEWIS	ELSTON	63.0
CMP 0401 CARDIN	LUCIEN		78.2
CMP 0409 CARON	ALEXIS		86.3
CMP 0422 CARTER	CHESLEY	WILLIAM	93.6
CMP 0434 CASHIN	RICHARD	J	66.1
CMP 0438 CASSELMAN WADDS	JEAN		53.2
CMP 0459 CHAPDELAINE	GARRARD		47.6
CMP 0462 CHAPLIN	GORDON		10.0
CMP 0469 CHATTERTON	GEORGE	LOUIS	66.2
CMP 0474 CHEVRIER	LIONEL		77.8
CMP 0483 CHOQUETTE	AUGUSTE		68.6
CMP 0487 CHRETIN	JOSEPH	JACQUES	71.0
CMP 0494 CHURCHILL	GORDON		43.6
CMP 0498 CLANCY	GORDON	DRUMMOND	82.3
CMP 0521 COATES	ROBERT	CARMAN	72.2

CMP 0546 COOPER	CLARENCE	OWEN	50.0
CMP 0558 COTE	JEAN-PIERRE		82.3
CMP 0559 COTE	MAURICE		62.9
CMP 0572 COWAN	RALPH	BRONSON	75.8
CMP 0591 CROSSMAN	GUY		83.9
CMP 0593 CROUSE	LLOYD	ROSEVILLE	80.6
CMP 0610 CYR	ALEXANDRE		81.5
CMP 0616 DANFORTH	HAROLD	WARREN	86.3
CMP 0634 DAVIS	JACK		65.4
CMP 0641 DEACHMAN	GRANT		92.8
CMP 0655 DENIS	AZELLUS		95.3
CMP 0670 DESCHATELETS	JEAN	PAUL	77.4
CMP 0693 DIEFENBAKER	JOHN	GEORGE	72.6
CMP 0695 DINSDALE	WALTER		78.2
CMP 0697 DIONNE	CHARLES	EUGENE	78.2
CMP 0718 DOUCETT	GEORGE	HENRY	90.5
CMP 0723 DOUGLAS	THOMAS	CLEMENT	75.0
CMP 0731 DROUIN	VINCENT		67.7
CMP 0733 DRURY	CHARLES	MILLS	73.4
CMP 0735 DUBE	JEAN	EUDES	75.8
CMP 0765 DUPUIS	YVON		73.6
CMP 0793 EMARD	RENE		79.8
CMP 0799 ENNS	JOHN		47.8
CMP 0804 ETHIER	VIATEUR		75.8
CMP 0805 EUDES	RAYMOND		67.8
CMP 0819 FAIRWEATHER	GORDON		47.6
CMP 0820 FANE	FRANK	JOHN	91.9
CMP 0829 FAVREAU	GUY		75.8
CMP 0852 FISHER	DOUGLAS	MASON	68.6
CMP 0860 FLEMMING	HUGH	JOHN	53.2
CMP 0863 FLEMING	STUART	A.	61.2
CMP 0874 FORBES	RICHARD	ELMER	83.1
CMP 0875 FOREST	YVES		71.0
CMP 0877 FORGIE	JAMES	MOFFAT	50.8
CMP 0898 FOY	WALTER	FRANK	48.8
CMP 0899 FRANCIS	CYRIL	LLOYD	76.6
CMP 0916 FRENETTE	JEAN	LOUIS	54.0
CMP 0938 GARLAND	JOHN	RICHARD	99.2
CMP 0946 GAUTHIER	CHARLES	ARTHUR	84.5
CMP 0956 GELBER	MARVIN		91.1
CMP 0959 GENDRON	ROSAIRE		66.2
CMP 0989 GIROUARD	GERALD		52.4
CMP 1002 GODIN	OSIAS	J.	69.4
CMP 1013 GORDON	WALTER	LOCKHART	71.0
CMP 1026 GRAFFTEY	WILLIAM	HEWARD	62.9
CMP 1031 GRANGER	CHARLES	RONALD	73.3
CMP 1035 GRAY	HERB		90.3
CMP 1042 GREENE	JOHN	J	80.6
CMP 1045 GREGOIRE	GILLES		80.6
CMP 1052 GROOS	DAVID	W	62.1
CMP 1055 GUAY	RAYNALD		75.8
CMP 1061 GUNDLOCK	DEANE	ROSCOE	88.7
CMP 1066 HABEL	JOSEPH	A.	89.7
CMP 1073 HAHN	DAVID	G	75.8
CMP 1075 HAIDASZ	STANLEY		89.7
CMP 1078 HALES	ALFRED	DRYDEN	78.2
CMP 1091 HAMILTON	FRANCIS	ALVIN	75.6
CMP 1108 HARKNESS	DOUGLAS	SCOTT	52.4

CMP 1110 HARLEY	HARRY	C	79.8
CMP 1134 HAYS	HARRY	WILLIAM	59.7
CMP 1143 HELLYER	PAUL	THEODORE	71.8
CMP 1156 HERRIDGE	HERBERT	WILFRED	82.2
CMP 1186 HONEY	RUSSEL	CLAYTON	73.3
CMP 1189 HORNER	ALBERT	RALPH	64.5
CMP 1190 HORNER	JOHN	HENRY	54.0
CMP 1191 HORNER	HUGH	MACARTHUR	18.5
CMP 1199 HOWARD	FRANK		66.2
CMP 1203 HOWE	WILLIAM	DEAN	52.4
CMP 1204 HOWE	WILLIAM	MARVIN	75.0
CMP 1233 IRVINE	JOHN	ALFRED	73.4
CMP 1257 JEWETT	PAULINE		83.9
CMP 1273 JONES	ELOISE	MAY	64.8
CMP 1276 JONES	HENRY	FRANK	62.0
CMP 1279 JORGENSON	WARNER	HERBERT	74.2
CMP 1291 KELLY	LEONARD	PATRICK	59.7
CMP 1296 KENNEDY	CYRIL	FROST	76.6
CMP 1314 KINDT	LAWRENCE	E.	56.5
CMP 1326 KLEIN	MILTON	L	82.2
CMP 1331 KNOWLES	STANLEY	HOWARD	96.8
CMP 1334 KONANTZ	MARGARET	MCTAVISH	66.1
CMP 1335 KORCHINSKI	STANLEY	JAMES	66.1
CMP 1344 LACHANCE	GEORGE-C		65.4
CMP 1359 LAING	ARTHUR		65.4
CMP 1366 LAMARSH	JUDY		69.4
CMP 1367 LAMB	CHARLES		41.9
CMP 1370 LAMONTAGNE	MAURICE		62.9
CMP 1368 LAMBERT	MARCEL	JOSEPH	82.2
CMP 1371 LAMOUREUX	LUCIEN		57.2
CMP 1392 LANGLOIS	RAYMOND		55.6
CMP 1394 LANIEL	GERALD		81.5
CMP 1402 LAPRISE	GERARD		41.2
CMP 1411 LATULIPPE	HENRY		66.9
CMP 1421 LAVERDIERE	HERMAN	E	85.5
CMP 1432 LEBLANC	FERNAND		70.9
CMP 1434 LEBOE	BERT	RAYMOND	59.7
CMP 1439 LEDUC	RODOLPHE		69.7
CMP 1443 LEGAULT	CARL		96.3
CMP 1460 LESSARD	H	PITT	72.6
CMP 1461 LESSARD	MARCEL		71.8
CMP 1479 LLOYD	JOHN	EDWARD	59.7
CMP 1484 LOISELLE	GERARD		80.6
CMP 1485 LONEY	JOHN		82.2
CMP 1502 MACALUSO	JOSEPH	ANGELO	71.8
CMP 1514 MACDONALD	DONALD	STOVEL	90.3
CMP 1540 MACEACHEN	ALLAN	JOSEPH	75.8
CMP 1541 MACEWAN	HOWARD	RUSSELL	84.7
CMP 1545 MACINNIS	DONALD		48.4
CMP 1548 MACKASEY	BRYCE	STUART	46.0
CMP 1570 MACLEAN	J.	ANGUS	90.3
CMP 1582 MACNAUGHT	JOHN	WATSON	85.5
CMP 1591 MACQUARRIE	HEATH	NELSON	62.1
CMP 1592 MACRAE	JOHN	CHESTER	74.2
CMP 1596 MADILL	JOHN	ELWOOD	84.7
CMP 1614 MANDZIUK	NICHOLAS		62.9
CMP 1623 MARCOUX	GUY		60.7
CMP 1637 MARTIN	MURDO	WILLIAM	60.7

CMP 1638 MARTIN	PAUL	JOSEPH	50.6
CMP 1643 MARTINEAU	PAUL		63.6
CMP 1652 MATHER	BARRY		62.9
CMP 1653 MATHESON	JOHN	ROSS	85.5
CMP 1657 MATTE	JEAN-PAUL		91.1
CMP 1671 MCBAIN	JAMES	ALEXANDER	71.8
CMP 1705 MCCUTCHEON	MACLYN	THOMAS	50.8
CMP 1749 MCILRAITH	GEORGE	JAMES	96.0
CMP 1755 MCINTOSH	JOHN		71.8
CMP 1778 MCLEAN	ALLAN	MARCUS	41.9
CMP 1811 MCMILLAN	WILLIAM	HECTOR	79.0
CMP 1819 MCNULTY	JAMES	CARROL	68.6
CMP 1829 MCWILLIAM	GEORGE	ROY	90.3
CMP 1854 MILLAR	CAMPBELL	EWING	69.7
CMP 1865 MITCHELL	DAVID	RODGER	64.5
CMP 1883 MONTEITH	JAY	WALDO	83.1
CMP 1887 MOORE	HARRY	ANDREW	75.8
CMP 1892 MORE	KENNETH	HAMILL	56.6
CMP 1893 MOREAU	MAURICE	JOHN	90.5
CMP 1898 MORISON	JOHN	B	67.7
CMP 1917 MUIR	GEORGE	ROBSON	82.2
CMP 1918 MUIR	ROBERT		72.6
CMP 1919 MULLALALLY	JOHN	COONEY	92.8
CMP 1926 MUNRO	JOHN	CARR	82.2
CMP 1947 NASSERDEN	EDWARD		79.0
CMP 1954 NESBITT	WALLACE	BICKFORD	75.8
CMP 1959 NICHOLSON	JOHN	ROBERT	83.9
CMP 1963 NIELSEN	ERICK		66.9
CMP 1964 NIXON	GEORGE	EWART	44.3
CMP 1965 NOBLE	PERCY	V.	66.9
CMP 1969 NOWLAN	GEORGE	CLYDE	60.7
CMP 1970 NUGENT	TERENCE	JAMES	80.6
CMP 1980 O'KEEFE	JOSEPH	PHILLIP	91.9
CMP 1985 OLSON	HORACE	ANDREW	86.3
CMP 1989 ORLIKOW	DAVID		58.8
CMP 1990 ORMISTON	JAMES		62.9
CMP 1993 OTTO	STEVEN		71.0
CMP 1995 OUELLET	GERARD		56.5
CMP 2013 PASCOE	JAMES	ERNEST	91.9
CMP 2016 PATTERSON	ALEXANDER	BELL	69.7
CMP 2020 PAUL	REMI		66.9
CMP 2025 PEARSON	LESTER	BOWLES	63.6
CMP 2034 PENNELL	LAWRENCE	T	71.1
CMP 2036 PEPIN	JEAN-LUC		67.7
CMP 2043 PERRON	GERARD		70.1
CMP 2047 PETERS	WILLIAM	ARNOLD	79.0
CMP 2057 PICKERSGILL	JOHN	W.	86.3
CMP 2059 PIGEON	LOUIS-JOSEPH		68.6
CMP 2060 PILON	J E	BERNARD	91.1
CMP 2068 PLOURDE	LUCIEN		78.2
CMP 2108 PRITTIE	ROBERT	WILLIAM	75.0
CMP 2115 PRUD'HOMME	MARCEL		87.3
CMP 2117 PUGH	DAVID	VAUGHAN	77.4
CMP 2132 RAPP	REYNOLD		93.5
CMP 2146 REGAN	GERALD	A	71.7
CMP 2158 RHEAUME	GENE		70.2
CMP 2162 RICARD	J.	H.	90.3
CMP 2166 RICHARD	JEAN	THOMAS	76.6

CMP22175	RIDEOUT	MARGARET	ISABEL	87.8
CMP 2176	RIDEOUT	SHERWOOD	HAYES	81.1
CMP 2184	RINFRET	MAURICE		83.8
CMP 2198	ROBICHAUD	HEDARD	J.	75.8
CMP 2219	ROCHON	JEAN	L	81.5
CMP 2220	ROCK	RAYMOND		81.5
CMP 2229	RONDEAU	GILBERT		74.2
CMP 2260	ROULEAU	GUY		62.9
CMP 2268	ROXBURGH	JOHN	MAXWELL	60.6
CMP 2286	RYAN	SYLVESTER	PERRY	85.5
CMP 2292	RYNARD	PHILIP	BERNARD	49.3
CMP22298	SALTSMAN	MAX		85.0
CMP 2303	SAUVE	MAURICE		49.5
CMP 2318	SCOTT	REID		58.1
CMP 2335	SHARP	MITCHELL	WILLIAM	50.1
CMP 2357	SIMPSON	ROBERT		65.4
CMP 2373	SKOREYKO	WILLIAM		44.4
CMP 2376	SLOGAN	JOSEPH		41.1
CMP 2379	SMALLWOOD	CLIFFORD	S	57.2
CMP 2390	SMITH	HEBER	EDGAR	37.0
CMP 2412	SOUTHAM	RICHARD	RUSSELL	91.1
CMP 2438	STARR	MICHAEL		84.7
CMP 2442	STEFANSON	ERIC		87.9
CMP 2445	STENSON	FRED	FRISE	85.5
CMP 2460	STEWART	JOHN	BENJAMIN	62.6
CMP 2494	TARDIFF	PAUL		95.2
CMP 2505	TEILLET	ROGER-JOSEPH		65.4
CMP 2509	TEMPLE	ANTHONY	ROBERT	85.5
CMP 2520	THOMAS	WILLIAM	HOWELL	71.8
CMP 2532	THOMPSON	ROBERT	NORMAN	69.7
CMP 2564	TREMBLAY	RENE		69.7
CMP 2568	TUCKER	JAMES	ROY	84.7
CMP 2582	TURNER	JOHN	NAPIER	69.7
CMP 2590	VALADE	GEORGES		44.4
CMP 2606	VINCENT	CLEMENT		65.4
CMP 2611	WAHN	IAN	GRANT	56.5
CMP 2615	WALKER	JAMES	EDGAR	88.7
CMP 2632	WATSON	IAN		87.9
CMP 2633	WATSON	LAURENCE	E	84.7
CMP 2638	WEBB	RODERICK	ARTHUR	95.2
CMP 2641	WEBSTER	ARNOLD	ALEXANDER	85.6
CMP 2644	WEICHEL	OSCAR	WILLIAM	50.8
CMP 2656	WHELAN	EUGENE	FRANCIS	81.5
CMP 2682	WILLOUGHBY	CHARLES	JAMES	72.6
CMP 2694	WINCH	HAROLD	EDWARD	79.8
CMP 2695	WINKLER	ERIC	ALFRED	91.9
CMP 2709	WOOLLIAMS	EIDON	MATTISON	54.0

APPENDIX 2.1

CODE USED FOR RECORDING MEMBERS BACKGROUND

ROLL CALL CANADIAN HOUSE OF COMMONS 26TH PARLIAMENT DECK 2A

COLUMN
NUMBER

CONTENTS OF COLUMNS

1-3 CMP

4-8 IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

9-11 YEAR OF BIRTH, E.G. 1898 PUNCH 898

12-13 PLACE OF BIRTH

CODE INFORMATION

- 1 ONTARIO
- 2 QUEBEC
- 3 NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
- 4 PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND
- 5 NOVA SCOTIA
- 6 NEW BRUNSWICK
- 7 MANITOBA
- 8 SASKATCHEWAN
- 9 ALBERTA
- 10 BRITISH COLUMBIA
- 11 UNORGANIZED TERRITORY OF CANADA SUCH AS YUKON OR NORTHWEST TERRITORY, MACKENZIE DISTRICT
- 12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
- 13 ENGLAND
- 14 SCOTLAND
- 15 WALES
- 16 IRELAND
- 17 FRANCE
- 18 ITALY
- 19 NEW ZEALAND
- 20 ICELAND
- 21 POLAND
- 22 BELGIUM
- 23 HOLLAND (DUTCH)
- 24 NORWAY
- 25 SWEDEN
- 26 CHINA
- 27 UKRAINE
- 28 LEBANON
- 29 DENMARK
- 30 RUSSIA
- 31 GERMANY
- 32 AUSTRIA
- 33 CZECHOSLOVAKIA
- 34 HEBREW
- 35 RUMANIA
- 36 YUGOSLAVIA
- 37 HUNGARIAN
- 38 SWITZERLAND

39 AUSTRALIA
 40 CHILE
 41 BRITISH COLONY OTHER THAN SENIOR DOMINIONS EG GIBRALTER
 42 ITALY THIS IS THE SAME AS COL 18
 43 SOUTH AFRICA
 44 PORTUGAL

14-15 FATHER'S NATIONALITY--IF CANADIAN USE 01, FOR FRENCH CANADIAN
 USE 02, THEN BEGIN WITH PUNCH CODE 12 OF COLS 12-13

16-17 MOTHER'S NATIONALITY TREAT IN SAME WAY AS FATHER'S NATIONALITY

18-19 PLACE OF PRIMARY, BUT IF HAD SECONDARY, THEN SECONDARY EDUCATION.
 USE SAME CODE AS COLS 12-13

20-21 TYPE OF EDUCATION. THIS IS FOR THE HIGHEST CERTIFICATE OR
 DEGREE.

CODE INFORMATION

UPPER CANADA COLLEGE TORONTO ONTARIO
 1 LOWER SCHOOL, IE ELEMENTARY, PRIMARY
 2 SOME JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
 3 COMPLETE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
 4 SOME SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL
 5 COMPLETE SENIOR MATRICULATION
 6 SOME COLLEGE, IE ATTENDED, BUT NO DEGREE INDICATED
 7 BACHELOR OF ARTS
 8 BACHELOR OF SCIENCE
 9 BACHELOR OF LAW, -LL.B
 10 EARNED DEGREE IN NATURAL SCIENCES
 11 EARNED DOCTORATE IN SOCIAL SCIENCES
 12 MEDICAL DEGREE
 13 HONOURARY DOCTORATE
 14 BARRISTER OF LAW
 15 BCL (BARRISTER/BACHELOR OF CIVIL LAW)
 16 LLL
 17 MA
 18 BSA
 19 PENG
 21 DVM
 22 CHARTERED ACCOUNTANT
 23 PHM B
 24 DDS
 25 LLM
 26 ED
 27 PHM C
 28 C A
 29 B ARCH
 30 B COMM
 31 DIVINITY
 32 B PAEDAGOGY
 33 B DIVINITY
 35 D CIVIL LAW
 36 CIVIL ENGINEER
 37 S J D
 38 MECH ENGINEER

39 VETERINARY SURGEON
40 LACP P G
41 BACH AGRIC SCIENCE
42 LLD
43 MB
44 MBA
45 MED

22-24 NAME OF SPECIFIC INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING FOR FIRST EARNED
DEGREE, SEE CODE FOR COLS 25-27

25-27 NAME OF SPECIFIC INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING FOR HIGHEST
EARNED DEGREE

CODE INFORMATION

1 UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
2 OSGOOD HALL, LAW SCHOOL
3 MCGILL UNIVERSITY
4 UNIVERSITY OF MONTREAL
5 MCMASTER UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON, ONTARIO
6 UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
7 UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN
8 UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
9 UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
10 DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
11 LAVAL
12 MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY, NEWFOUNDLAND

14 BISHOP'S COLLEGE LENNOXVILLE, QUEBEC
15 RIDLEY COLLEGE, ST CATHERINES
16 ALBERT COLLEGE, ONTARIO
17 UNIV OF NEW BRUNSWICK
18 BOURGET COLL, QUEBEC
19 MONTREAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL
20 ST BONAVENTURE, ST JOHN'S NEWFOUNDLAND
21 GRADUATE SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE, OLDS ALBERTA
22 SIR GEORGE WILLIAM
23 MOUNT ALLISON
24 LOYOLA COLLEGE, MONTREAL
25 OTTAWA UNIV
26 KING'S UNIV, ST JOHNS
27 ONTARIO COLL. OF AGRICULTURE
28 QUEEN'S UNIV, KINGSTON
29 ST FRANCIS XAVIER
30 ST MARY'S COLL, MONTREAL
31 UNIV OF SUDBURY
32 UNIV OF WESTERN ONTARIO
33 ST JOSEPH'S UNIV, NEW BRUNSWICK
34 ST DUNSTAN'S, PEI
35 ST ANN'S COLLEGE, NOVA SCOTIA
36 ACADIA UNIV
37 PRINCE OF WALES
38 ST BONIFACE, UNIV OF MANITOBA
39 STE ANNE'S CLASSICAL, QUEBEC
40 CHICOUTIMI SEMINARY
41 NICOLET COLL
42 QUEBEC SEMINARY

39 VETERINARY SURGEON
40 LACP P G
41 BACH AGRIC SCIENCE
42 LLD
43 MB
44 MBA
45 MED

22-24 NAME OF SPECIFIC INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING FOR FIRST EARNED DEGREE, SEE CODE FOR COLS 25-27

25-27 NAME OF SPECIFIC INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING FOR HIGHEST EARNED DEGREE

CODE INFORMATION

1 UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
2 OSGOOD HALL, LAW SCHOOL
3 MCGILL UNIVERSITY
4 UNIVERSITY OF MONTREAL
5 MCMASTER UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON, ONTARIO
6 UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
7 UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN
8 UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
9 UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
10 DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
11 LAVAL
12 MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY, NEWFOUNDLAND

14 BISHOP'S COLLEGE LENNOXVILLE, QUEBEC
15 RIDLEY COLLEGE, ST CATHERINES
16 ALBERT COLLEGE, ONTARIO
17 UNIV OF NEW BRUNSWICK
18 BOURGET COLL, QUEBEC
19 MONTREAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL
20 ST BONAVENTURE, ST JOHN'S NEWFOUNDLAND
21 GRADUATE SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE, OLDS ALBERTA
22 SIR GEORGE WILLIAM
23 MOUNT ALLISON
24 LOYOLA COLLEGE, MONTREAL
25 OTTAWA UNIV
26 KING'S UNIV, ST JOHNS
27 ONTARIO COLL. OF AGRICULTURE
28 QUEEN'S UNIV, KINGSTON
29 ST FRANCIS XAVIER
30 ST MARY'S COLL, MONTREAL
31 UNIV OF SUDBURY
32 UNIV OF WESTERN ONTARIO
33 ST JOSEPH'S UNIV, NEW BRUNSWICK
34 ST DUNSTAN'S, PEI
35 ST ANN'S COLLEGE, NOVA SCOTIA
36 ACADIA UNIV
37 PRINCE OF WALES
38 ST BONIFACE, UNIV OF MANITOBA
39 STE ANNE'S CLASSICAL, QUEBEC
40 CHICOUTIMI SEMINARY
41 NICOLET COLL
42 QUEBEC SEMINARY

49 ST THOMAS NEW BRUNSWICK
 50 JOLIETTE SEMINARY
 51 STE THERESE COLLE, CLASSICAL
 52 STE HYACINTHE
 53 VICTORIA UNIV, COBOURG
 54 KING'S COLL, WINDSOR
 55 VICTORIA COLL COBOURG
 56 SHERBROOKE UNIV
 57 VALLEYFIELD SEMINARY
 58 ST VICTOR SEMINARY
 59 ST ARSENE COLLEGE
 60 REGINA COLL
 61 WESTERN
 62 MEMORIAL
 62 BOURGET COLL
 63 ST ANSELE COLL
 67 OR 064 ST SULPICE, MONTREAL
 68 L'ASSOMPTION
 69 ONTARIO COLLEGE OF PHARMACY
 70 RIMOUSKI
 71 LEVIS
 72 MASSON COLL. , TERREBONNE

301 OXFORD
 302 CAMBRIDGE
 303 UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
 304 LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS
 305 UNIV. COLLEGE , EXETER
 306 EDINBURGH
 307 BRISTOL UNIV
 308 UNIV. COL. SCHOOL, LONDON
 309 TRINITY COLL DUBLIN
 311 UNIV OF GLASGOW
 312 ROYAL NAVAL ACADEMY
 313 KING'S COLL LONDON, INNS OF COURT
 314 TRINITY COLL DUBLIN
 315 LIVERPOOL COLL.
 316 QUEEN'S COLL CORK
 317 TRINITY COLL SCOTLAND
 318 ST ANDREWS SCOTLAND
 319 MARISCHAL COLL ABERDEEN
 320 KING'S COLL ABERDEEN
 321 SANDHURST
 400 RHODES SCHOLAR
 401 LOUVAIN
 402 SORBONNE
 403 ROUEN, FRANCE
 404 ST JEROME COLL LIEGE BELGIUM
 405 PRETORIA UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

28 MARITAL STATUS

CODE INFORMATION

DIVORCED
 1 SINGLE
 2 MARRIED WITH NO CHILDREN INDICATED

- 3 MARRIED WITH ONE CHILD
- 4 MARRIED WITH TWO CHILDREN
- 9 MARRIED WITH 7 CHILDREN OR MORE

29-31 OCCUPATION

CODE INFORMATION

- 1 BARRISTER
- 2 LAWYER/ADVOCATE
- 3 FARMER
- 4 MERCHANT, BUSINESS MAN
- 5 MANAGER, EXECUTIVE
- 6 MANUFACTURER
- 7 DOCTOR-MEDICAL
- 8 DENTIST
- 9 PROFESSOR, OR ANYONE WHO TEACHES FULL TIME AT A UNIVERSITY
- 10 TEACHER, NON-COLLEGE
- 11 CHARTERED ACCOUNTANT
- 12 ECONOMIST
- 13 PUBLIC SERVANT
- 14 INSURANCE AGENT
- 15 REPRESENTATIVE OR SALESMAN
- 16 HOUSEWIFE
- 17 DRUGGIST
- 18 MINISTER OF A CHURCH, THEOLOGIAN, GRAD OF A DIVINITY SCHOOL
- 19 ENGINEER (CONSULTING ENGINEER)
- 20 SCIENTIFIC WORKER, UNIVERSITY TRAINED
- 21 CLERK
- 22 PROFESSIONAL ATHLETE
- 23 HOTEL KEEPER (OWNER)
- 24 NOTARY
- 25 NEWSMAN, EDITORS, ADVERT FOR NEWSPAPER
- 26 LUMBERMAN
- 27 TRADESMAN
- 28 UNSKILLED WORKER
- 29 JOURNALIST AND AUTHOR
- 30 GENERAL CONTRACTOR
- 31 PLANNING SUPERINTENDENT
- 32 SCHOOL PRINCIPAL
- 33 MORTICIAN -OWNER OF OWN ESTABLISHMENT
- 34 PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONIST (EG SUPERINTENDENT)
- 35 SOCIAL SERVICE
- 36 LAND SURVEYER
- 37 GARAGE OWNER/OPERATOR
- 38 WIDOW RUN FOR HUSBAND'S CONSTITUENCY
- 39 MINE WORKER
- 40 BUSINESS TEACHER - RUNS OWN SCHOOL AND OWNS CHAIN OF SCHOOLS
- 41 FIRE FIGHTER
- 42 TIMEKEEPER
- 43 LUMBER COMPANY OWNER
- 44 RADIO COMMENTATOR
- 49 SENIOR CIVIL SERVANT
- 50 DIPLOMAT AND TRADE OFFICER

51 TRADE UNION ORGANIZER/OFFICIAL
 52 AGRICULTURIST
 59 PLUMBING AND HEATING OWNER
 60 BUILDING CONTRACTOR
 61 THEATRE OWNER
 63 RETIRED FARMER
 64 RETIRED CONTRACTOR/MERCHANT/MANUFACTURER
 65 AGRONOMIST
 66 REAL ESTATE
 67 ARCHITECT
 68 GENTLEMAN
 69 UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT
 70 FISHERMAN(LATTERLY A FISHERIES INSPECTOR)
 71 ACCOUNTANT, NON-CHARTERED
 72 CARTAGE CONTRACTOR
 73 PUBLIC RELATIONS
 74 CHIROPRACTOR
 75 A RETIRED SUPREME COURT JUSTICE
 76 RAILWAY LOCOMOTIVE ENGINEER/DESPATCHER
 77 FORESTRY TECHNICIAN
 78 A FARMER AND MERCHANT(BUSINESSMAN)
 79 INVESTMENT MANAGER
 80 AIR PILOT
 81 OPTICIAN
 82 CHEMIST NON-UNIVERSITY TRAINED
 83 AGRICULTURE SPECIALIST
 84 LAND SURVEYOR
 85 RETIRED SOLDIER
 86 BANK DIRECTOR
 87 PROSPECTOR
 88 FINANCIER
 89 SEGNIEUR
 90 AUCTIONEER
 91 INSPECTOR/FOREMAN
 92 OPTOMETRIST
 93 RETIRED
 94 TECHNICIAN-DENTAL
 95 UNIVERSITY STUDENT
 96 TECHNICIAN
 97 CHIROPRACTER
 98 NURSE, GRADUATE

32-33 NUMBER OF CLUBS MENTIONED, OF WHICH IS A MEMBER--INCLUDES
 ASSOCIATIONS, SPORTS AND COUNTRY CLUBS

CODE INFORMATION

1 ONE CLUB
 2 TWO CLUBS

34 WHEN FIRST ELECTED

CODE INFORMATION

IF FIRST ELECTED IN A GENERAL ELECTION LEAVE BLANK

1 FIRST ELECTED TO HOUSE OF COMMONS IN A BY-ELECTION
 2 FIRST ELECTED IN A BY BY ACCLAMATION
 3 FIRST ELECTED IN A GENERAL ELECTION BY ACCLAMATION

35 NUMBER OF TIMES ELECTED BY ACCLAMATION ONLY TO HOUSE OF COMMONS

36-38 YEAR FIRST ELECTED TO PARL. IF 1898 PUNCH 898

39-40 TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS EXPERIENCE IN POLITICS PRIOR TO BECOMING
AN MP THIS INCLUDES ALDERMANIC, MAYORALITY, BUT NOT SCHOOL BDS
NON-ELECTED-, JUDGESHIPS OR COMMISSIONS

41-43 YEAR LAST ELECTED TO PARLIAMENT

44 1 ALDERMAN OR CITY COUNCILMAN

PREVIOUS PUBLIC EXPERIENCE

45 1 COUNTY COUNCILMAN

46 1 MAYOR
2 DEPUTY MAYOR ONLY

47 1 REEVE OF A RURAL MUNICIPALITY
2 DEPUTY REEVE ONLY
3 WARDEN ONLY

48 1 MEMBER OF A PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE
2 SPEAKER OF A PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE
3 MEMBER OF A UNITED STATES OF AMERICA STATE LEGISLATURE

49 1 MINISTER IN A CABINET OF A PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE

50 1 PREMIER OF A PROVINCE

51 1 CIVIL SERVANT-- AT ONE TIME THIS INCLUDED PATRONAGE JOBS
AND APPOINTED POSITIONS IN MUNICIPAL BODIES

COLUMN CODES FOR THIS COLUMN HAVE A LOT OF OVERLAP
PRIORITY OF PUNCH IS TO JUSTICE OF THE PEACE. NEXT PRIORITY
IS TO MEMBERS OF A SCHOOL BOARD. NOTE THAT SHERIFF IS AN
IMPORTANT POSITION BUT IT IS UNCERTAIN AS TO HOW POLITICAL
IT IS.

2 JUSTICE OF THE PEACE AND MAGISTRATES OF LOCAL COURTS UNDER
PROVINCIAL JURISDICTION
3 MEMBER OF SCHOOL BOARD
4 MEMBER OF A TRADE BOARD
5 PRESIDENT OF A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION
6 CONTROLLER
7 UNION OFFICIAL LABOUR
8 UNION OFFICIAL FARMER
9 SHERIFF

52-53 RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

CODE INFORMATION

1 ROMAN CATHOLIC
2 ANGLICAN

- 3 CHURCH OF ENGLAND
- 4 UNITED CHURCH OF CANADA
- 5 METHODIST
- 6 WESLYAN
- 7 BAPTIST
- 8 PRESBYTERIAN
- 9 GREEK ORTHODOX
- 10 PROTESTANT
- 11 HEBREW
- 12 SALVATION ARMY
- 13 UNITARIAN
- 14 CHRISTIAN
- 15 LUTHERAN
- 16 MENNONITE
- 17 UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC
- 18 UKRAINIAN ORTHODOX
- 19 MORMON
- 20 CHRISTIAN CHURCH
- 21 AGNOSTIC
- 22 CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE
- 23 EPISCOPALIAN
- 24 CONGREGATIONALIST
- 25 MORAVIAN BRETHREN
- 29 GREEK CATHOLIC
- 30 QUAKER
- 31 UNIVERSALIST
- 32 CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH
- 33 DISCIPLE OF CHRIST
- 34 INDEPENDENT

54-55 POLITICAL PARTY

CODE INFORMATION

- 1 LIBERAL
- 2 PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE, OR CONSERVATIVE
- 3 CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH FEDERATION/ NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY
- 4 LIBERAL-LABOUR
- 5 INDEPENDENT LIBERAL
- 6 INDEPENDENT CONSERVATIVE
- 7 SOCIAL CREDIT
- 8 PROGRESSIVE
- 9 LABOUR PROGRESSIVE OR COMMUNIST
- 10 INDEPENDENT
- 11 INDEPENDENT CCF
- 12 UNIONIST
- 13 LABOUR
- 14 UNITED FARMERS OF ALBERTA
- 15 LIBERAL-PROGRESSIVE
- 16 INDEPENDENT LABOUR
- 17 RECONSTRUCTION
- 18 UNITED FARMERS OF ONTARIO
- 19 NEW DEMOCRACY (SOCIAL CREDIT)
- 20 UNITY-SASKATCHEWAN
- 21 UNITY-REFORM
- 22 BLOC POPULAIRE CANADIENNE
- 23 LIBERAL LABOUR
- 27 CONSERVATIVE - UNIONIST

28	LIBERAL- UNIONIST
29	INDEPENDENT UNIONIST
30	RADICAL
31	INDEPENDENT CONSERVATIVE UNIONIST
32	REFORMER
33	NATIONAL CONSERVATIVE
34	INDEPENDENT LIBERAL CONSERVATIVE
35	PATRONS OF INDUSTRY
36	LIBERAL NATIONALIST
40	UNITED PROGRESSIVE
41	NATIONAL PROGRESSIVE
42	LIBERAL CONSERVATIVE
43	INDEPENDENT PROGRESSIVE
44	UNITED FARMERS SASKATCHEWAN
45	RADICAL
46	INDEPENDENT CONSERVATIVE UNIONIST
47	NATIONALIST
48	LIBERAL REFORMER
49	NATIONALIST LIBERAL CONSERVATIVE
50	SOCIALIST LABOUR
51	INDEPENDENT SOCIAL CREDIT
52	INDEPENDENT LABOUR
53	LIB. DE ELECTURES

62-63 MINISTRY FIRST APPOINTMENT

CODE INFORMATION

1	FINANCE
2	SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
3	MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE
4	TRANSPORT, SOMETIMES CALLED RAILWAYS
5	NATIONAL REVENUE SOMETIMES RECEIVER GENERAL
6	JUSTICE AND ATTORNEY GENERAL
7	NATIONAL DEFENCE (MILITIA)
8	CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION
9	FISHERIES
10	LABOUR
11	POSTMASTER GENERAL
12	SOLICITOR GENERAL
13	PUBLIC WORKS
14	AGRICULTURE
15	HEALTH AND WELFARE
16	NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND NATURAL RESOURCES
17	FORESTRY
18	SECRETARY OF STATE
19	ASSOCIATE MINISTER (NOT SPECIFIED)
20	MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO
21	VETERAN'S AFFAIRS
22	MUNITIONS AND SUPPLY
23	MINES
24	PRIME MINISTER
25	RECONSTRUCTION AND SUPPLY
26	DEFENCE PRODUCTION
27	RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT
28	MIN OF MARINE
29	MIN OF SOLDIER'S REHABILITATION
30	INTERIOR

- 31 CUSTOMS AND EXCISE
- 32 INLAND REVENUE
- 33 INDUSTRY AND DEFENCE PRODUCTION
- 34 PRESIDENT OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL
- 35 NATIONAL WAR SERVICES
- 36 NATIONAL DEFENCE FOR NAVAL SERVICES

64 OTHER POSITIONS TO WHICH FIRST APPOINTED

CODE INFORMATION

- 1 PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY
- 2 SPEAKER OF HOUSE OF COMMONS
- 5 DEPUTY SPEAKER
- 6 MAJOR PARTY WHIP

65-66 MINISTRY TO WHICH APPOINTED A PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY
SEE COLS 62-63 FOR CODE

- 67 SEX
- 1 MALE
 - 2 FEMALE

68-69 PREVIOUS PROVINCIAL EXPERIENCE

IF HAD BEEN A MEMBER OF A PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE PUNCH TOTAL
NUMBER OF YEARS HAD BEEN IN LEGISLATURE

70 CHANGE IN PARTY ALLEGIANCE
HAS MADE A CHANGE IN PARTY DESIGNATION OF SOME KIND

71-72 FINAL CAUSE OF RETIREMENT FROM THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

CODE INFORMATION

RESIGNED HOUSE OF COMMONS WHILE STILL A MEMBER-
REASON UNKNOWN

- 1 STILL A MEMBER OF H OF C AS OF 1964
- 2 DEFEATED IN A GENERAL ELECTION DID NOT RUN AGAIN
- 3 NOT STAND FOR NOMINATION IN THE NEXT ELECTION
- 4 DIED WHILE A MEMBER
- 5 APPOINTED TO SENATE WHILE STILL A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS
- 6 RESIGNED SEAT IN HOUSE FOR A JUDGESHIP
- 7 NOT RUN IN NEXT ELECTION
- 8 RESIGNED FOR PROVINCIAL POLITICS
- 9 RESIGNED FOR PATRONAGE (EXCLUDES JUDGESHIPS)

APPENDIX 2.2

BACKGROUND OF MEMBERS

ROLL CALL CANADIAN HOUSE OF COMMONS 26TH PARLIAMENT DECK 2

CMP 00079290113010007001001400409	962 963	0201	1	011
CMP 00109180113010114002002600103	95700963	20402	1	011
CMP 0015912010101010104	404303 962069631 11	0402	1	011
CMP 0050 13	004 963 963	01	1	051
CMP 00609200202 16	004802306 962129631	0101	1	021
CMP 0061930020202 06	5005 863 863	0101	1	021
CMP 00738951818181804	600504 958169631 1	0101	1	011
CMP 008291702020102090110114002	949 963	3010295796012	1	7021
CMP 00849071913 0914	800104 958 963	0202	1	091
CMP 00989090912130906009	4026 953 963	0203	1	101
CMP 01068320713161009009009 001	963 963	0201	1	101
CMP 0109909031313 080230012032	953 963	0201	1	031
CMP 01249270102020204	701402 962 963	0107	1	021
CMP 01279220202020216011011502402	962 963	10101	1	021
CMP 01309100113140118027027500304	962 963	10401	1	011
CMP 01349070202020204	903602 962009631 1	0107	1	021
CMP 01439230613010615017017300101	953 963	0202	1031	061
CMP 0150911072001070900600650015	945 963	0404963	231011	011
CMP 0157923011301 30028028600902	962 963	1001	1011	011
CMP 01629240202020206042	904403 963 963	0101	1	021
CMP 01839120813011009007002500203	958 963	0302	1	091
CMP 02199120202020206003	400603 963029631	0101	1	021
CMP 02489180202020204	600409 962009631	0101	1	021
CMP 0264934020202 07011	009 962 963	0107	1	021
CMP 029790713131313 002	700106 962 963	0203	1	011
CMP 03179130114120107001002500203	953019631	40401	1	011
CMP 03599111216161000	6039 949 957	0101	1101	101
CMP 03609030817160804	503003 958 963	0202	1	081
CMP 03619080202020207051	2025 96201963 1	10101	1	021
CMP 037089507141401 002002300103	949 963	0801	1	011
CMP 03728961314141000	6028 95308963 1	03	08	101
CMP 03969020816130807007006403204	963 963	0402	1	081
CMP 03979180202020209011011400202	96212963 1	0101	1041	021
CMP 03999170202020206	5037041 94603963 1	0107	103	021
CMP 04008890116160104	500304 9401296311 1	0402	1141	011
CMP 040191912020202090240045001031	953 963	0101964	07	1 021
CMP 04098990202020206025025601402	95310963 1 1	0101	113	021
CMP 04229020313130308026026503406	1949 963	0201	1	031
CMP 043493703010103090290104001	963 963	0101	1	031
CMP 043892001140101	4038021 958 963	0402	2	011
CMP 04599350202020216056	5002 962 963	0107	1	5021
CMP 04629070114010104	400604 96203963 1	0802	103	011
CMP 046991641414141184051576	081 96104963 1	11002	1	101
CMP 04749030102020113025002800105	935 963	0101945954041221		020
CMP 0483 02	002 963 963	0101	1	021
CMP 04879340202020216	011300204 963 963	0101	1	021
CMP 049489801130107090060063001031	95103963 1	040295796103	103	071
CMP 0498912081601 080070079017	958059631	30402	1	081
CMP 05219280513160509023010400104	957 963	0702	1	051
CMP 05468990113130102	6003 95817963	0702	1	081
CMP 0558 020202	094 963 963	0101	1	021
CMP 05599170202120206	807905 962 963	0107	1	021

CMP 0572	14	005	962	963	01	1	01
CMP 0591	14	030	962	963	01	1	06
CMP 05939180513010505		400503	957029631		41502		051
CMP 06109220202140206034		407104	963	963	30101	1	021
CMP 06169160113010120027027500307			958029631		0402	1	011
CMP 06349161013131011009301501905			962	963	1001	1	101
CMP 0641925091401 025014 2073			963	963	01	1	10
CMP 06559070202020209		200103	935	963	0101	1	025
CMP 0670912020202020209030004500102			953	963	10101963	13	021
CMP 06938950131010113007007200103			940	963	0702957962244241		081
CMP 069591607130107170050016035061			951	963	1202960963161211		071
CMP 06979080202020202		802015	962	963	0107	1	021
CMP 07188970113130103		10140611	95718963		1 0202	118	011
CMP 07239041414140717006005301802			93517963		111 0703	117	088
CMP 0731932020202020209011003300102			962	963	40101	1	021
CMP 07339120213010215048003600408			962	963	1 1 01963	33	021
CMP 0735926020202 09033017300106			962049631		10101	1	061
CMP 07659260202160203		400408	95804963		1 0101964	20	104 021
CMP 0793 0202 02		051	963	963	0101	1	021
CMP 0799924 31310707006006601302			962	963	31602	1	071
CMP 08049150202020102		200404	962	963	0101	1	011
CMP 08059120202160211033004500102			940	963	0101	1	021
CMP 08199230613010609002017500203			96210963		11 0202	110	061
CMP 082089709131409260080084003			958009631		30202	1	091
CMP 0829 0202 06		002	963	963	010196396408	1	021
CMP 08529190113010117028001501001			957	963	1303	1	011
CMP 08608990614140605		4004031	96028963	1	111 040296096217	114	061
CMP 08639201014011000		100407	958	963	0402	1	101
CMP 08748940114140700		9003	958159631		30402	1	071
CMP 0875921020202020209003003700203			963	963	0101	1	021
CMP 08778890116010107028002400206			95304963		1 0801	104	011
CMP 08989080116010102		501404	962	963	1001	1	011
CMP 08999200113010111001160500403			963049631		11301	1	011
CMP 09169200202020204		706702	96202963	1	0107	1	021
CMP 09389180113 0102		2004	94900963		0196396405		014
CMP 09469130202020206		900402	962109631	1	30107	6	021
CMP 0959920020202020207029003901103			96307963	1	0101	1	02
CMP 0989 020202 06		009	963	963	07	1	5021
CMP 1002911010202 07031002400103			958009631		0101	1	011
CMP 10139060114010006048		501101	962	963	40201963	01	011
CMP 10269280216010115023003 00404			958	963	0202	1	021
CMP 10319120313130302		602905	95800963		11 0201	1	031
CMP 10359310113 0106003002 00206			962	963	1101	1	011
CMP 10429200113010106001002700204			963	963	0201	1	011
CMP 104592602020202160110113073			962	963	0107	1	021
CMP 105291812131310		600501	963	963	0201	1	101
CMP 1055 02020202		002	963	963	0101	1	021
CMP 10619140913120904		700301	9581296311	1	31002	1	091
CMP 10668950202021204		4021	95312963	1	0101	6	112 011
CMP 10739250101010043001155500403			963	963	0201	1	011
CMP 10759230121210112025001400703			957	963	0101	1	011
CMP 107890901130101180270276004	1		957029631		0402	1	011
CMP 10919120114010107007007401003			95708963		100295796016	1	081
CMP 11089030114140907008008301004			945	963	080295795716	1	091
CMP 11109260114140112001		500702	962	963	0801	1	011
CMP 11349090913010904		307803	963	963	0101963	14	091
CMP 11439230113140107153001500402			949	963	40401963	071071	011
CMP 115689513131301 027027600303			94504963		1 0203		1046101

CMP 11869210813010806002	400104	962	963	40401	1	011
CMP 11899130216160806007007700303		958	963	40402	1	081
CMP 1190927081614 060080085		958	963	0402	1	091
CMP 11919250816140812007032600704		958	963	0402	1	091
CMP 11999251013 1004 302602		957	963	72103	103	101
CMP 12039160113010112001 00702		963	963	1303	1	011
CMP 12049060113010106 600401		953	963	30402	1	011
CMP 12339120113010106028 306406		963	963	0202	1	011
CMP 1257922011301 11028155 00903		963	963	01	2	011
CMP 1127391701010101120010016007 12		964	964	0302	2	0801
CMP 12769200813130809007007600110		957	963	0302	1211	081
CMP 12799180824250704 500301		957	963	80402	1141	071
CMP 12919270116010104 4022		962	963	0101	1	011
CMP 12969150516010526 400402		957	963	0402	1	051
CMP 131490112121209110081543012		958	963	10402	1	091
CMP 13269100234340209004 400203		963	963	1101	1	021
CMP 133190812160112330060064018021		942	963	0403	1	071
CMP 13348990701010705 501604		963	963	0201	2	071
CMP 13359290821270806007 00301		958	963	0102	1	081
CMP 13449260202020209004025300204		962	963	10101	1	021
CMP 13599041013141018009009300503		949	963	30401963	16	103 101
CMP 136692401130101090010021001021		960	963	0801963	15	2 011
CMP 1367905 13 04		963	963	0402	1	011
CMP 13689190902220917008400500105		957	963	0102963963212071		091
CMP 13708200202020206 012		963	963	0101964	18	1 021
CMP 13719200102020117025002600101		962	963	0101	5	1 011
CMP 13929360802020808025004400903		962	963	0107	1	021
CMP 13949240202020206057 701406		962	963	0101	1	021
CMP 140292502020202 9027		962	963	0107	1	021
CMP 14119130202020206058 900401		962	963	0107	1	021
CMP 14219270202020108 004 00904		963	963	0101	1	021
CMP 1432 02020202 1		964	964	0101	1	02
CMP 14349090924241005 904302		953	963	1407	1	5101
CMP 143990201020202240250042008021		936	963	0101	1	021
CMP 144392301020201060250255004041		964	964	30101	1	0101
CMP 14609130202020202 303704		958	963	0101	1	021
CMP 14619260202020204 802701		962	963	0107	1	5021
CMP 1479 13 011		963	963	01	1	051
CMP 14849210202020206059 700402		957	963	0101	1	021
CMP 1485 13 003		963	963	02	1	011
CMP 15029310142420107005002300104		963	963	0101	1	011
CMP 15149320114010125002155400103		962	963	0701	1061	011
CMP 15409210514140517029001 009		953	963	0101963	10	1 051
CMP 15419250514140509023010500103		957	963	0402	1	051
CMP 15459180514140506 703902		957	963	0402	1	051
CMP 15489210214010206003022500601		962	963	0101	1	021
CMP 157091404141404130090236003051		951	963	080295796309	1	041
CMP 15829040414130409010010401302		945	953	1 01964	121091	042
CMP 15919190414010417 003500909		957	963	40802	1	041
CMP 15929120214140626 504007		957	963	40402	1	061
CMP 15969150101010106 401404		963	963	0402	1	011
CMP 16149022727270709006006500101		957	963	30902	1	071
CMP 16239240202020212011004500707		962	963	10107	1	5021
CMP 16379170214140200 504102		957	963	70803	1	011
CMP 163890301020201130011554001		935	963	010194694718	1	011
CMP 16439210202020216025004400104		958	963	0102962963231241		021
CMP 16529090913141002 402903		962	963	03	102	101
CMP 1653917021414 250280028001151		961	963	0401	1	011

CMP 16579140202020207	025200403	962 963	40101	1	021
CMP 16719100116010104	7003071	9541796311 1	30802	1	011
CMP 17059120113160104	307803	963 963	0202963	20 1	011
CMP 1749908011414	600103	940 963	0801963	341251	011
CMP 17559091414140800	500401	958049631 1	0402		081
CMP 17788910614010613	500603	962 963	30401	1	061
CMP 181189201140101120280284007021	95003963	1	0801	1	011
CMP 18199180116010107001005801003	9620596311 2		0101	1	011
CMP 18299050614010626	502502	949 963	0101	1	061
CMP 18549111014160104	609102	962 963	0202	1	011
CMP 18658980113130127001001401710	953 963		0401	1	011
CMP 18839030113010128001001501106	953069631 1		020295796215	1	011
CMP 18879140916140906008	500301	962 963	0402	1	091
CMP 18929070813140806060	400507	958 963	0402	1	081
CMP 18939270801010806007	401903	963 963	0401	1	011
CMP 18989230113010004	6014	963 963	0301	1	011
CMP 19179030714140704	400301	95702963	1002	1	071
CMP 19189191413130501	500504	957109631	70802	1	051
CMP 19199300416160407034	501002	963 963	0101	1	041
CMP 1926931011401 07061002300102	962079631		0201	1	011
CMP 19479190828 0800	800505	95800963	30402	1	081
CMP 19549180114140109032002 00105	953 963		0302	1241	011
CMP 1959901061301 06010 300503	962 963		1040196396417	1	101
CMP 1963924082913 090101105001031	957 963		40202		111
CMP 19648980116140106	4004	940029631	30401	1	011
CMP 19659020113160100	9 03	9570096311	30402	1	011
CMP 196989805160205090360107001021	94906963	1	070295796205	106	051
CMP 19709200916160909008008300102	958 963		02	1	091
CMP 19809090313130306062	400403	963 963	0101	1	031
CMP 198592509010109	607802	957 963	1507	1	5091
CMP 19899180734340706006	3 02	962119631 1	31103	104	071
CMP 19909150814141400	307803	958 963	0802	1	081
CMP 1993 01	002	962 963	01	1	011
CMP 1995 0202	003	963 963	0107	1	0111
CMP 20139000813140807007007200303	958 963		0402	1	081
CMP 20169110816140704	601801	953 963	2207	1	5101
CMP 20209210202020216033011500101	958 963		0102	1	7021
CMP 20258970113 01130014004050 1	948 963		10401948958024	1	011
CMP 2034 13	002	962 963	01	1	011
CMP 203692402020202160254063009	963 963		0101	1	021
CMP 20439200202020206042	502302	962 963	0107	1	021
CMP 20479220113010100	5051	95700963	1403	1	011
CMP 205790501130107 0063016049	953 963		1040195395418	1	031
CMP 20599220202020218156004305203	958 963		10102	1	021
CMP 20609180202020206062	301404	962 963	0101	1	021
CMP 20689300202020204	004	962 963	0107	1	021
CMP 21089191014141007009003601002	962 9631		11303	1	101
CMP 2115 0202	1	964 964	0101	1	02
CMP 21179070915160130009002900102	958 963		0202	1	101
CMP 21329013031313005	500306	95807963 1	1502	1	081
CMP 2146 13 06	002	963 963	01	1	051
CMP 2158 02	014	963 963	0102	1	111
CMP 21629090202020204	700501	95700963	30102963963201241		021
CMP 21669070102 09025002900109	945 963		0101	1	011
CMP 221759230501010504	5038 41	964 965	30701	152	0601
CMP 21769170602010604	507604	96212963111	30701	1	061
CMP 2184915020202 07 004200403	962 963		0101	1	021
CMP 219891102020206070330339049	953 963		10101963 09	1	061

CMP 22199040202020244003	209202	96200963	1	0101	1	021
CMP 22209220221210206022	400406	962119631		0401	1	021
CMP 22299280202020204	700604	962 963		0107	1	021
CMP 22609230202020214004003100108	953 963		40101	1241	021	
CMP 22689011213130118027	400305	96200963111		0401	1	011
CMP 22869180116130107001002300108	962 963		0101	1	011	
CMP 22928970116140112028028300702	957 963		0402	1	011	
CMP222989210101010106	4005041	96404 1	31103	1	01	
CMP 230392302020202110044063012	962 963		0101964	17	1	021
CMP 23189260114160107001002600202	96203963	1	0403	103	011	
CMP 23359110714140707006304300502	963 963		10401963	03	1	011
CMP 23579100814140700	500501	957 963	0402	1	071	
CMP 23739220927270806	603703	958 963	0902	1	091	
CMP 237693101272707120010062008091	959 963		1702	1	071	
CMP 23799150914160900	600303	958 963	40402	1	091	
CMP 23909150113010114002002400105	95705963111		0202	1	011	
CMP 24129070813160804	406105	95804963 1	0402	1	081	
CMP 24389100127270100	4021021	95203963 1	180295796310	1	011	
CMP 24429130720200704	601407	958079631 2	31302	1	071	
CMP 24459140113010104	500302	96205963 1	30402	1	011	
CMP 2460924051414 036190 00902	962 963		0701	1021	051	
CMP 24949100102020100	6005021	959229631 2	30101	1	011	
CMP 250591207020107 038 4 04	96206963	1	0101963	21	106	071
CMP 250992601130101070010024001	963109631 2		0101	1	011	
CMP 25208950113010900	406302	957029631	0402	1	011	
CMP 25329141213010908009009901002	962 963		1007	1	091	
CMP 256492202020202060113026012	963 963		010196396320	1	021	
CMP 25689090313130306012012500414	958099631		0401	1	031	
CMP 25829291313010107009406 002	962 963		0101	1	021	
CMP 2590922120202 23004003 01704	958 963		0102	1	021	
CMP 26069310202020206041063800304	96203963 1		0102	1	021	
CMP 26119160813010817002400400208	962 963		0401	1	011	
CMP 26159110913010904	5014	962059631	0801	1	011	
CMP 26329340214140215014003 002	963 963		0801	1	021	
CMP 26339170814010804	500303	963109631 1	30402	1	081	
CMP 26389100113010100	3004051	9591396311 1	0802	1	011	
CMP 264189910130101 0090014010	96203963 1	1 03		103	101	
CMP 26449000101010104	402903	958 963	1502	1	011	
CMP 26569240116020104	407802	96200963 1	30101	1	011	
CMP 26828940113010112001001600104	963 963		30402	1	101	
CMP 26949071313131004	5027	95319963 1	03	1198	101	
CMP 26959200131010100	500403	9570696311	1502	1	011	
CMP 27099160813130809007007400103	958 963		40202	1	091	

APPENDIX 2.3
DIVISION CALLS

ROLL CALL CANADIAN HOUSE OF COMMONS 26TH PARLIAMENT DECK 3

2211211000011001121110222210210222221112010020122220220121002	0007 3
01221000012101121121112111000021211111211210110112122200112211	0010 3
11001001112121121101112110001221211111211012110112122212112211	0015 3
221 101100101022110000022221221122222211211122112222220101220	0050 3
22110001211002200200002202022102220221000111220122220221100000	0060 3
221 101112111100112111122000221122202211211122012222220020220	0061 3
221001112111100112111122221221122222211211122112222221121222	0073 3
10001221100100021101100000201200210111210212100002112012112210	0082 3
11221221100120000021112110001221211111211202111112122212112211	0084 3
121202021121221000221121120000000000000012112111102120000002	0098 3
221121112111122112111222212210222200000000002112222220121220	0106 3
221 121112011122102111122221221122222211211122112222202 1121222	0109 3
12100210001012022102212111212202122122112022020211111121220121	0124 3
221 12111211112211211122221221022222200001102112222222 1120222	0127 3
22112110001112211211102222022112222000110000220000022221121222	0130 3
101 12001220112122102212110012202122002110222100210010020221121	0134 3
10201221100101121121110000011221211111211000011012122212112211	0143 3
221 121112000022112011122221221122222211211102112222222 1121220	0150 3
221121112100000112111122221221122222211211122112222221121222	0157 3
221 12111211112211211122221221122222211211122112222222 1120222	0162 3
11220220100120000101112100001221211111211012111112102212112210	0183 3
220100002110122112111022201221022222211201122112222222 1120002	0219 3
22102110201112211211112222122102220221110111020122222200121222	0248 3
121002102200121221222021112100021220021122221222111112 1220121	0264 3
12120002122120021122101211202222120100000212112111100021210002	0297 3
22100000011110000000000022102102220000000000000122222020120222	0317 3
0011211001111001121111222210211222022111211122112222221121222	0359 3
11021220000000021121100000011200000000211000111112122200002210	0360 3
2211211121111220000000000000000022000000000002112222221121220	0361 3
2010211000111221120110222000210222222111211122002222220120222	0370 3
1212020212212212012211120102222222101112012112111122121201222	0372 3
11021221112000021121112111211221211111001212111112122212110210	0396 3
02112111201112211211110020022102222221112011221122222021120220	0397 3
1200000120021002212021211101222012012011222212021111112 1201120	0399 3
00200001000120100001112000000000201000000212111012122212112001	0400 3
221 1211121010221121111220202211222222000011022112222220 1121222	0401 3
22112111211112211211122221221122222211211102002222221121222	0409 3
221 121112111122112000022221221122222211211122112222222 1121222	0422 3
22002111200102000000002222122112222221002100221122220000000000	0434 3
10221201100100000120012111211220211001001212010012102210000210	0438 3
02100210021010010011111222002102022220112202200102202020020000	0459 3
00000000002000	0462 3
10201221102121121121112100010001211110000012000012122210012210	0469 3
200021112001022112111022221021102222211101112	0474 3
02000000001012211202012222102112222221112001220122200001121222	0483 3
22002110011110011201102202100102222220112011200122222200021002	0487 3
11221221112121121121112111211221211110000212111112122212110211	0494 3
11221220012221022021102101211221211111001212111112112212112211	0498 3
10221221110120021021112110211021211111211012111112122212112210	0521 3
11201221102100021121112111011221211000210000111112122210012210	0546 3
22110111211112211201112222122112222221112101221122220220100220	0558 3

10110211220110010101111222122112122000112112201112200001201220	0559 3
22112110011012211211112222122102222000112100220122222221121222	0572 3
2211211001111001121110222212210222222112011221122222221120222	0591 3
11221220012101100021112111211221210000000212111112120012112211	0593 3
2211011001111221121110222212211222222112101221122202220001002	0610 3
1102000111212112112110211121122121111211210111112120012112211	0616 3
22112110011110011211112200022102222220000011220122222021120222	0634 3
2211211121111221121111222212211222222000011221122222221121222	0641 3
22102111211112211211112220122012222221120012	0655 3
2211011121111221121111222212211022222112111220122222221021222	0670 3
11221220100201120121112111211221211111211200111012122212102211	0693 3
11221220010000021121112111211201211111001012111012122210110211	0695 3
10100211022200122122212110002222122002112222122011110020200121	0697 3
11221221112121121121112111211221210000211212111112122212112211	0718 3
1212020210200212112211001022222122101112212112010002021211222	0723 3
0210211100001221121001220000200022222112111220122200000021220	0731 3
22012111210102210011112202120112220220112111221120022221101222	0733 3
22100110001112200011112222122102220000112111221122222220021222	0735 3
2211211101111000021110222212211222222112111221122222221120220	0765 3
221101112111120012111122200221122222211211122112222221121222	0793 3
11020020010000020101102100000001211111000012110012100210110000	0799 3
220121112111122102111122021221122222211211122112220000000000	0804 3
0000000000111221120110222200211222222112111200000002000001222	0805 3
11221220022101001021100000000000000000000210010112120010100200	0819 3
11221221022121121121102111211221211111212111112122212112211	0820 3
2211211121111221121000222202211022222100211122112222221121222	0829 3
1212020000210212112211001122222022100110012110011122120210000	0852 3
1120000010210000000000000000000000000000110211010101112122212110210	0860 3
11021221102121100021112101211221211000211212010112122210110210	0863 3
11021221110021121121102111211200211111211012101112122210112211	0874 3
2210211120011001120110222000210222222112111220122222220120220	0875 3
22102110211110011210012222122112222220112001201122222201020222	0877 3
20000111201102211000112200022002222000112000221020002200120000	0898 3
221121112011000112111122221000000000000000111221122222221021222	0899 3
12112201200112100001101200002102122222112012200112202220001222	0916 3
221121112111122112111122221221122222211211120112222	0938 3
1210020122011212212221211101222212212211222212221111121221121	0946 3
2211211121111221120111222210211222222112111220122222221121222	0956 3
22100111211010011201112222102102220000110111220122222220121220	0959 3
10112211200102010011101222122112120000100002201102200200002211	0989 3
221021112011122112111100000000000000000000111221122222221121222	1002 3
22012111200100000011110000120110222221000101220122222221101222	1013 3
11201221000020021101112111001220211111211212010112122012110210	1026 3
22102111210112211001002220122112222220000011220122202220020000	1031 3
22112111211112211211112222102102220000112111221122222221121222	1035 3
2211211021101220121111222010211222222112101221122222021120222	1042 3
1210020122011212212221211121002212212211202212221111021021120	1045 3
20102111201112211200002222122102220000112111221122222220020002	1052 3
2210011121111220001001222212211222222112111221122222221120222	1055 3
11201221110221121120112111211221211110211200011112122210112211	1061 3
2211200121111221121111222212210222222112111221122222221121222	1066 3
22102110011012211211112222102112222220000111220002202220121220	1073 3
2211211121111221121001222212211222222112111221122222221121222	1075 3
11021220012120021121102111011221211111211012101112122012110211	1078 3
112210200001011211211112100000021211111211212111112120000002211	1091 3
20021221100101100021112101211210211000210202001100002212110210	1108 3
2211200120111221121111222202211222222112011221122222221121222	1110 3
2201210121011000121111002210210022222112111201122220021101002	1134 3
22112101210112211201102222022112222220112111021122222021121222	1143 3

1212020211202210112212121122222212210111221211211122120011222	1156 3
2211200021111221121110222212211222222112011021122220000000000	1186 3
00221220000221100001112111200000211000211200111112122210002210	1189 3
11021220002000020121100011211201211110000012111112122200100210	1190 3
0002000000000000000000002110000000211000211012000000000000000000	1191 3
0010020022000000000221122002222222222201122121220222222221001220	1199 3
121002021000000000000001200022202222101112002112111120021010220	1203 3
11221221102120021101112111011221211111211010101112122012112210	1204 3
11220221112120021121112100011221211111211012101112120012002000	1233 3
221021112111122112111222212211222222112011021122202221121000	1257 3
00000000000000002012111210000000000000000000000000000000000000	1276 3
11021221100121121121112111001221211111211212000000022202110211	1279 3
22112000201100211200012222102102220220110000220122200200001222	1291 3
11001220002120021100012111001221211110001012111112122212112210	1296 3
11220000010000021100002111211221211110211212001112120000112210	1314 3
221121112011122112111222212200022222112111220122222220120222	1326 3
12120202122122121122111211222222122101112212112111122121211222	1331 3
221121112101122000000000000000000000000000002000021122222221121220	1334 3
1120122110012110000112110000021211111211212111112122210012210	1335 3
22102110201110211200002222100102220000110111020122220221021222	1344 3
22112111201110011011112222120012222220112111220002220221120220	1359 3
2211200121010001121001222210210222222112100220122222020120000	1366 3
10221221100101121121112111001221211111001010111112122010010210	1367 3
11221021100100000121102110211021211000000000111112122212110211	1368 3
2211211101111221120110002212211222222112111221122222220121222	1370 3
22112110210100000211112222122002222220110101220022220221121220	1371 3
12102200200200000002202111202222122000112022120211110020200120	1392 3
2211211021111220101111222210211222222000011221102220220021222	1394 3
1211021122200002212221211121222212200000020012221111121220121	1402 3
12010210220112122102202111212202122002112022120020001020221121	1411 3
0011211121111221121111220212211222222111211122112222221121222	1421 3
21122222021100222	1432 3
20102211200002001211101222100000000000000000220002222021121220	1434 3
2210000121010221021111222010211222222112011221122222221120222	1439 3
2201211121110220000000000000000000220220110001221122222221121222	1460 3
10112211221112110111011202122112122220000002201102202220220002	1461 3
220121100001000000111122000000000000220000011221122222021121222	1479 3
2210211120110221120111222210200222222112100221122222221121220	1484 3
11221221102120021101112111211021211111211212111112122212112210	1485 3
2211211121111001121001222000010222222112000021022222220021222	1502 3
2211211121111001121111222212211222222112111221122222221121220	1514 3
2211211021011221021111222210211222222000211221122202021100222	1540 3
1120022011212110000112101001221211111001212111112122212112211	1541 3
11001221110000021100022111211201211110000012111112122012112001	1545 3
2201000001110000000000000000000000220220000000000122202020120220	1548 3
112012211121211211121112111211221211110000212111112122212112211	1570 3
2211211121111221121111222012010222222112001201122222220021222	1582 3
01221200012000020121112101201221211111210012111112122212112211	1591 3
11000220000121101021112111211221211110000212011112102212112210	1592 3
11221221112120021121112111211221211111000212111112122012112210	1596 3
0122000000200002012111210021122121111100021200112122212112210	1614 3
10100120101000010101112221220021200001100002112202221020222	1623 3
1210020200210212102211121000000212000011220212111120020011000	1637 3
2211211021010000001000220002211222020112110220022222201101220	1638 3
1120122110210112002111211101122021111000202111112122212112211	1643 3
121202021221221000000000000000000000101112212012111122120210002	1652 3
22012111211112211211112220022112222220000111200122222221121222	1653 3
2211211121111221121111222002211222222111211122112222221121220	1657 3
1122100110012112012111211121120121111001212110112122212112210	1671 3

00110000201110000000000000002211222222112111221122222220121222	2268	3
221121112101122012011122212211222200011211122112222221121220	2286	3
11200000000020000001102011001201210001000010000112122010110211	2292	3
2210200121010021101110220000210222220000000221120022000001220	2303	3
1210020000210012010001121122222022000000020211012222121210222	2318	3
02112111211012200211110000022110000220110111221000022221101000	2335	3
11220000000100021121112111011221211111000012100000022212110000	2357	3
1100122110000100000000211011200211111001000100112122210002000	2373	3
010012200020000000011211121120000011211212000112122210010001	2376	3
110212211000000000211211000000121111211212100112122210012210	2379	3
10201021100020121000002100001201211110000000100110022010010210	2390	3
11221220002121121121112111211221211111211212111012122210012211	2412	3
1120000112121121121102111011200211111211012011112122212112210	2438	3
1120122111012112112110211121120121111211212111112122210112211	2442	3
11001221112121121121112111211221211111211010011112122212112211	2445	3
22112110011110000000000000000000000000000000010002112222220121222	2460	3
221120112111022112111122212211222000011211122112222221121222	2494	3
2001001001011001121111220000210222222100011221122222221120222	2505	3
2211211121111221121111222002211222222000011221122222220121222	2509	3
11221001112001100100002110001221210111210012101112122212110211	2520	3
22110211221110011211111222122112022220112012200122220021121222	2532	3
2211211121110000001110002212211222222110111221122222020021220	2564	3
22002112111122112111122212210222222112111221122222220021222	2568	3
22110000000000001101111222122100220220110101021122222220121222	2582	3
0120122000012012000110211120020121111211012110112100010010211	2590	3
11200221112120000101112111201201210000210212111112120210012211	2606	3
221021100101122110111122212001022222112111220122222220021222	2611	3
2211211001111221121111222122112222221000000021122222220121222	2615	3
220021112110122112111122212211222222112111221122222220121222	2632	3
11221200012121121121112111011201211111211212111112122210012210	2633	3
11221221122121121021112111211221211111211202111112122212112211	2638	3
12120202122122121122111210222202122101112212112111122121211220	2641	3
11020221112120021121112100001221211110211012111112100000002210	2644	3
221121112111122112111122212211222222110111221122202220021222	2656	3
11221220000121100021112110211221211111211212111112120012112211	2682	3
12100202102120021102111211222222022100000202012111102121211222	2694	3
11221221112121121121112111211221211111211212111102122212112211	2695	3
11020000012100001001010000000001211111211012010012120000010211	2709	3

ROLL CALL CANADIAN HOUSE OF COMMONS 26TH PARLIAMENT DECK 4

22000000100020000200002221221122111000002220012222111202000210	0007	4
12011122110010000120100112100210022000000110002121220101100001	0010	4
12101102012211022022011112112212100200000110022121020121122001	0015	4
22102110100022021210122221221122111122110221212222110002210002	0050	4
200000000000022220210122221221122111122110220012222110202210000	0060	4
20002100010120021000020221221122110022112220002202110202001002	0061	4
22102110102122201202122021221122111122110201212222111222211212	0073	4
1000010200202012212002022120120220002110221202122000012110212	0082	4
12101120010000102022100000000000022000001010000000200121110001	0084	4
11222112102121010002122121221212121011112100001100112111211111	0098	4
22112102112100000210122221221122111122112221212222111222201000	0106	4
22112102112120221202122221221122111122112221210000111222201212	0109	4
11111211001100021200022221221221202011222210110011220102201201	0124	4
22112102102122221210022221221122111022112220212222110202211212	0127	4
22110002110020001210122221221100010122110220012202111202210002	0130	4
11001201020002020011000221221221220000000200010000000102200000	0134	4
1001112000001002012011112112212122000001110000021220101120220	0143	4

22012000000022001210122021221122100100000221210002111222000000
20002102112120220002122221221122111122112220200222111220211202
22112112012122220212100001221120011022110220002200111202011212
10100002112001120102001112112212102011110111122121221001120001
22112112100120220200120221221122111100002220212200111222211212
22102002010122220212122221221122101022112220012222110022000212
1110121122000202121022221221221222011222210111111222102211200
11222100102220011200122121221212120100002112211100012110000121
2011211211202200000120221221122111122110220010022110202200000
22102102112100201212122221221122111122112200002222111222211000
1200112001220000000001011211221212221111111122121220000100220
22102102112122201210122221221122111122112221212222111022211212
22102002100022000010122221221122111122112200012200110202000212
0022000000002011121010012122100002111112110001100112111001111
00110122110010022100111112112211020211111110000021221100002221
22102102112122021210122221221122111122112220012222111200201212
00001001021100100011002221221221200011022212001111220122001000
1211012011221002212011111211220002201111111202121220021122220
20002112102122000012122221221122111100000221210022111222210202
22012110002122220212102221221000011122112220212200111222211210
22112112112102201212122221221122111122112221212222110022211212
22102110000002221212002221221122111122112021200022110222211012
10010000000210000100111112112212102011000000000000201121002201
20001100002000020000120221221022101000000200010002010202200000
0000000
11011100002000102120111112112212120200011111022001221021122000
22102110000022001212122221221122200122110220002222111200210002
22100100100020221210122021221122101022112220212222110222210212
1211112211221112212211111211221212221111111220021221121122221
1011012001220112200211111211221012221012111102121221100122020
1011000001221102210211011211221212201111111200000221100120221
10121122110010002102101100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2211001200002222121210000122100122112220212222110222211202
2210210011012022121212222122111022110220012202110222201010
12001002010010010100020112112211102000110001202020000021101221
1211012211221102212011111211221212201111111222121220121100220
2200211200210022120012002122111022112200000202110202200002
1122202211000110120000210122121210111110100011101110111201021

0150 4
0157 4
0162 4
0183 4
0219 4
0248 4
0264 4
0297 4
0317 4
0359 4
0360 4
0361 4
0370 4
0372 4
0396 4
0397 4
0399 4
0400 4
0401 4
0409 4
0422 4
0434 4
0438 4
0459 4
0462 4
0469 4
0483 4
0487 4
0494 4
0498 4
0521 4
0546 4
0558 4
0559 4
0572 4
0591 4
0593 4
0610 4
0616 4
0634 4
0641 4
0670 4
0693 4
0695 4
0697 4
0718 4
0723 4
0731 4
0733 4
0735 4
0765 4
0793 4
0799 4
0804 4
0805 4
0819 4
0820 4
0829 4
0852 4

10101000110211022120001112112212122000001101222120000121000221
1211000000220002210011100000000002021111000002121221100100000
121111201100111000200011121122121220111111122121221121120021
20002112000020020012102221221122111022110220012202110202001212
2000000001200002121210200210210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212211000000000012111000022012112211111011220111110111210100
10200000002021100000020122221202121010002110201101000110010001
12101100100011120102111112112000022211111100222101220101100001
12001002010001102102110110112000022000001100020021001101120221
20102012112100201212122221221122111022110220002222110202211212
110011120100110112112212022000001110022121220100121001
12001100000011120120111112112212020011101111220121221101120201
22000002010022000012002021221120001100000220002222110222211212
12011102102211022120111112112212122000001111222121220121120221
1000100201000002202011111211221212220000001120021000001000001
22002100012120001202122221221122110122112221212222110002211002
1122211211222111121212221222121211111011121111112111211111
2201211011012002121202221221122111122110221212222111222001002
00111102112210000000101112112000022200001111122121020100100000
22110100000002021212122221221122111122112220202222111202211202
00110002110002001012102201221120010122110220000022111000000200
20002100112122200012122221221122111122112220010000000222211010
121011000
10000002112210120102101112102212002210011111202021020000002021
00002110112122200212022221221122110022112021210222111000201212
20000000000022000000002221221120110020000220010002110202010002
10101201200002120010002221221221222000002210100011220000010000
22102002002122221210022221221122110122112220212222110202211212

0860 4
0863 4
0874 4
0875 4
0877 4
0898 4
0899 4
0916 4
0946 4
0956 4
0959 4
0989 4
1002 4
1013 4
1026 4
1031 4
1035 4
1042 4
1045 4
1052 4
1055 4
1061 4
1066 4
1073 4
1075 4
1078 4
1091 4
1108 4
1110 4
1134 4
1143 4
1156 4
1186 4
1189 4
1190 4
1191 4
1199 4
1203 4
1204 4
1233 4
1257 4
11273 4
1279 4
1291 4
1296 4
1314 4
1326 4
1331 4
1334 4
1335 4
1344 4
1359 4
1366 4
1367 4
1368 4
1370 4
1371 4
1392 4
1394 4

11101001221120100010000000000000022000002210101111220100001021
11101201020022020211020021221221222000002212101100222102001000
02002110002122220010122221221122111022112221212222110022200210
20102000112002201210022221221122111100002220012202110202211202
22111112110000001212101112122112101000000211211212010022210002
00000000002120220010102221221122110000000020012222111202211012
2110022221212122221221122111122112221212222111222211212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1402 4
1411 4
1421 4
1432 4
1434 4
1439 4
11443 4
1460 4
1461 4
1479 4
1484 4
1485 4
1502 4
1514 4
1540 4
1541 4
1545 4
1548 4
1570 4
1582 4
1591 4
1592 4
1596 4
1614 4
1623 4
1637 4
1638 4
1643 4
1652 4
1653 4
1657 4
1671 4
1705 4
1749 4
1755 4
1778 4
1811 4
1819 4
1829 4
1854 4
1865 4
1883 4
1887 4
1892 4
1893 4
1898 4
1917 4
1918 4
1919 4
1926 4
1947 4
1954 4
1959 4
1963 4
1964 4
1965 4
1969 4
1970 4
1980 4

22101110100021111212122221122112121111112201211202111222201212	1985	4
112200021000211110101000000000000000011000100000000112111201010	1989	4
12111122012211000002111112112212120200001110222101220000100001	1990	4
20000112102122021212122221221122011022112220212200111200210212	1993	4
02100000022001020002001022211200022000110000002000001000000000	1995	4
1211112211001102210211111211221212221111111222121220100122221	2013	4
20000002112100001200022212122112121000002211211212111222211210	2016	4
12101102220020100120122221201202201021112220002122111010010212	2020	4
00002100012102200210102221201022110022110220010202110002210000	2025	4
22002002112100200212122221221122111000002201202202110200200202	2034	4
2210110002120220200102221221122110000002220212222111020211212	2036	4
0011121120002200021002022122122122201122221211100222000201020	2043	4
1102110011222111121110012222121122011112010011111002100202111	2047	4
20112112102122220012102221221122111000002201212202111202211002	2057	4
121011022200100000221220202112012000000011000000361220101000200	2059	4
22102112112122221212122221221122111122112221210022111222211212	2060	4
10011201201100121210022221221221222000002212111111222100211001	2068	4
0102211201000011021010212122121212011111200221111112101211110	2108	4
20112110002120221210122221221122111122112220012222110222211212	2115	4
1200112211221100210011111211221212201111111222121220101100220	2117	4
1200112211221112212210111211221212221111111222121221121122220	2132	4
22002110012100220000022021221122111122110021212202001200200200	2146	4
00001120010001000120110112112211220200001001120000000121120220	2158	4
121001222221012212211111221120222201111110000021221121120221	2162	4
20112100110020221000022221221122111000000221012222111220200002	2166	4
22221221122111002112221212222110222210210	22175	4
20	2176	4
22102100112122201012122221221122110122112221212222111202210212	2184	4
22012112000100220200122221221122111022112201212200000202000212	2198	4
22112102010022020210122221221122111122112220212222110202211212	2219	4
22102112112000021212022221221122111100002220212222111222211212	2220	4
11011211001120000210020221221221222011222212101111220122211200	2229	4
22112102002102221212122221221122100000000000002222110200201002	2260	4
20002000012122221210100221221122111022112221012200110022210212	2268	4
22102002110120221212122221221122111022112200212222111202001212	2286	4
10111122000011120000010112112210022000001110020021221100100000	2292	4
2121221212121111111100011111110001211121	22298	4
00002100002122001210022221221122110000000000002022000202000002	2303	4
00222100102221110011100122201212120011110012210000000000000001	2318	4
20110000012100200210102221221000001100012200202200000222210212	2335	4
12001122002211000100101112112212122011011111122121220121002000	2357	4
12000002000001020020101110000000020011111110002101220000000000	2373	4
00011122000000000020001110000000000000001000002100000100100001	2376	4
1200110200220100002001111000000002201121110002121220000100001	2379	4
00001000100010002000100110102000020000001000000021200101000001	2390	4
12111120112211122100001112112212122211111111122121221121122221	2412	4
10101102102211102022111112112212122011111111122121220121122221	2438	4
12111120112210100020111112112212122211111111222121220101100221	2442	4
12101120112211020122111112112210022211101010022121001121120221	2445	4
20012112112122221200122221221122111122112201212222111222211212	2460	4
22112112112122221212122221221122111122112221212222111222211212	2494	4
2000000011002222121212222122112211100000000000002111200211212	2505	4
22112112100122001200022221221122111022112220212222111222001212	2509	4
12111102010011100022011112112212020211001110222121220101102220	2520	4
20001112100021100010002221221002120000002210011202110202201001	2532	4
22112112110022220010122221221122110000000200000000000222210212	2564	4
22112112010002221002120221221122111000002221212222111200211212	2568	4
20112102112022220202122221221122101122110220010200110000000212	2582	4
1010000000002000002000000000000002220000110000101001101000000	2590	4

12100002220210102122000000000000020011111110122121021121002221
22112102100020200012122201221000011122112220012200010202210200
22112112112122220200022221221122111122112221212222111222211212
22110102112120221212122221221122111022110220010202111202210212
10111122110001022102111112112212122011121111222121220100120221
1210112211221112010211111211221210221111111122121221121122221
10222112112221001210122121221212121000000111201111112111211011
1200112210001100000010000011221212200000000000000000000000000000
20110002012122200000122221221122101022112020210222110200210212
10110000102211100020100112112212122000000110002121021121120021
2122111211222111001010212112121212110000210121111112111211111
1211112211200002212211111211221212221110111222121220100122220
12001122112000000022001112112212120000000011122021221100122000

2606 4
2611 4
2615 4
2632 4
2633 4
2638 4
2641 4
2644 4
2656 4
2682 4
2694 4
2695 4
2709 4

APPENDIX 3

Divisions

RECORDED DIVISION CALLS

First Session, 26th Parliament

Call	Col. No.	Motion	Decision
1 Tues. 21/5/63 (Douglas)	Deck 3 1	Amendment to amendment on Address, regretting decision of acquiring nuclear arms, thereby lessening chances for nuclear disarmament and increasing the danger of war.	Nay - 124 Yea - 113
2 Thurs. 23/5/63 (Diefen- baker)	Deck 3 2	Amendment to Address; add regret that pledges of Prime Minister and colleagues have not been included in Speech from Throne and "regret that policies announced fail to provide full opportunity for people of Canada to continue the social advance and large economic growth of the past year".	Nay - 147 Yea - 76
3 Wed. 3/6/63 (Douglas)	Deck 3 3	Request to have all communications etc. since June 10, 1957, on commitments to accept or acquire nuclear weapons for Canadian forces be laid before House	Yea - 140 Nay - 64
4 Mon. 17/6/63 (Douglas)	Deck 3 4	Request by Diefenbaker that House adjourn to discuss admissions of Minister of Finance concerning preparation of Budget. -speaker decides not urgent -appeal; shall Chair be sustained?	Yea - 97 Nay - 69

5 Mon. 24/6/63 (Nowlan)	Deck 3 5	Amendment on motion to resolve into Comm. of Ways and Means (Budget);- failure of Min. of Finance to keep secrecy of Budget weakened public confidence; proposals will endanger and curtail expansion of economy; sales tax on building materials and manf. mach. retrograde and inexcusable; proposals to bring Can. control over economy will fail to achieve obj. and will result in deterioration of Can's international relations	Nay - 113 Yea - 73
6 Wed. 26/6/63 (Balcer)	Deck 3 6	Adjournment under S.O.26 - discuss denunciation of fed. ass. to municp. as infringement of prov. autonomy, made by Premier of Quebec 25/6 - Speaker ruled not urgent - Appealed - Speaker ruled could be no appeal - Appealed ruling could be no appeal - Should ruling be sustained?	Yea - 108 Nay - 107
7 Wed. 26/6/63 (Gordon)	Deck 3 7	House resolve into Committee of Ways and Means (Budget)	Yea - 119 Nay - 74
8 Tues. 2/7/63 (Douglas)	Deck 3 8	Chair (Deputy Spkr.) challenged on ruling amendment irrelevant - Should ruling be sustained?	Yea - 158 Nay - 14

5 Mon. 24/6/63 (Nowlan)	Deck 3 5	Amendment on motion to resolve into Comm. of Ways and Means (Budget); - failure of Min. of Finance to keep secrecy of Budget weakened public confidence; proposals will endanger and curtail expansion of economy; sales tax on building materials and manf. mach. retrograde and inexcusable; proposals to bring Can. control over economy will fail to achieve obj. and will result in deterioration of Can's international relations	Nay - 113 Yea - 73
6 Wed. 26/6/63 (Balcer)	Deck 3 6	Adjournment under S.O.26 - discuss denunciation of fed. ass. to municip. as infringement of prov. autonomy, made by Premier of Quebec 25/6 - Speaker ruled not urgent - Appealed - Speaker ruled could be no appeal - Appealed ruling could be no appeal - Should ruling be sustained?	Yea - 108 Nay - 107
7 Wed. 26/6/63 (Gordon)	Deck 3 7	House resolve into Committee of Ways and Means (Budget)	Yea - 119 Nay - 74
8 Tues. 2/7/63 (Douglas)	Deck 3 8	Chair (Deputy Spkr.) challenged on ruling amendment irrelevant - Should ruling be sustained?	Yea - 158 Nay - 14

9 Wed. 3/7/63 (Diefen- baker)	Deck 3 9	Amendment to motion to resolve into Committee of Supply "regret failure of Gov't to clarify doubts and uncertainties in some of its economic policies	Nay - 115 Yea - 75
10 Thurs. 11/7/63 (Thompson)	Deck 3 10	Appeal of Speaker's ruling that bill to establish Office of Parliamentary Commissioner contained money provisions and could not be introduced or proceeded with by a Private Member - Should ruling be sustained?	Yea - 134 Nay - 28
11 Tues. 23/7/63 (Scott)	Deck 3 11	Appeal on decision of Chairman while in Committee of Ways and Means; (Excise Tax Amendment) - Should ruling be sustained?	Yea - 100 Nay - 70
12 Mon. 29/7/63 (Pickers- gill)	Deck 3 12	Second reading to Act (Bill C-91) amending Senate and House of Commons Act and the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act	Yea - 200 Nay - 10
13 Tues. 30/7/63 (McIntosh)	Deck 3 13	Appeal on ruling of Chair during debate on Bill C-90 (Excise Tax) while in Committee of the Whole - Shall ruling be sustained?	Yea - 113 Nay - 66

14			
Fri.	Deck 3	Amendment of motion for	Nay - 116
2/8/63	14	third reading of Bill	Yea - 48
(Churchill)		establishing Economic	
		Council of Canada to send	
		to Committee of Whole for	
		amendment to continue	
		National Productivity	
		Council	

15			
Fri.	Deck 3	Amendment to motion for	Nay - 91
2/8/63	15	third reading of Act to	Yea - 72
(Diefen-		amend Excise Tax Act (C-90)	
baker)		to refer it back to Committee	
		of Ways and Means (sic) so	
		it can be amended to exempt	
		sales tax on building	
		materials and machinery, and	
		manufacturing machinery	

16			
Tues.	Deck 3	Appeal to House on ruling	Yea - 111
1/10/63	16	of Chairman (Lamoureaux)	Nay - 90
(Churchill)		while in Committee of the	
		Whole discussing proposal	
		to amend Old Age Security	
		Act - Diefenbaker wishes	
		effective date change to	
		April 8 instead of Oct. 1/63	
		- Shall ruling be confirmed?	

17			
Tues.	Deck 3	Appeal to House on ruling	Yea - 172
1/10/63	17	of Chairman (Batten) that	Nay - 14
(Gregoire)		amendment to proposal to	
		amend proposal on change of	
		Old Age Security Act so	
		that government be asked	
		to consider lowering of	
		age to 65 and to 60 with	
		means test made by Mr.	
		Casquette to be out of order	
		- Shall ruling be confirmed?	

18			
Wed.	Deck 3	Request copy of agreement	Nay - 105
2/10/63	18	on nuclear arms between	Yea - 91
(Diefen-		Can. and U.S. be laid	
baker)		before House	

19			
Mon.	Deck 3	Appeal on a ruling of	Yea - 101
7/10/63	19	Speaker that proposed	Nay - 88
(Churchill)		amendment to motion for	
		day and night sittings	
		was out of order	
		- Shall ruling be sustained?	

20			
Wed.	Deck 3	Appeal on ruling of Speaker	Yea - 192
9/10/63	20	that he could not recognize	Nay - 27
(Gregoire)		Mr. Caouette until House had	
		given instructions as to his	
		position.(the question having	
		already been referred to S.	
		Committee on Privileges and	
		Elections for decision.)	
		- Shall ruling be sustained?	

21			
Wed.	Deck 3	Appeal on ruling of Speaker	Yea - 205
9/10/63	21	that a motion by Mr. Gregoire	Nay - 13
(Gregoire)		for House to adjourn until	
		"the privileges of all the	
		members are recognized" to	
		be out of order	
		- Shall ruling be sustained?	

22			
Thurs.	Deck 3	Second reading of Bill C-102	Yea - 181
10/10/63	22	An Act to Provide for the	Nay - 4
MacEachen)		Placing of the Maritime	
		Transport Unions of Canada	
		Under the Management and	
		Control of Trustees	

23 Tues. 15/10/63 (Thompson)	Deck 3 23	Amendment to amendment on resolving to Committee of Supply "regrets failure of government in continuing the completely inadequate policies of the immediately previous government"	Nay - 208 Yea - 22
24 Tues. 15/10/63 (Hamilton)	Deck 3 24	Amendment to motion to resolve to Committee of Whole - failure of Gov't to take action on Eastern Agriculture	Nay - 134 Yea - 95
25 Thurs. 17/10/63 (Diefen- baker)	Deck 3 25	Amendment to an amendment on the acceptance of 2nd report of S. Committee on Privileges and Elections	Nay - 108 Yea - 89
26 Thurs. 17/10/63 (Knowles)	Deck 3 26	Amendment on acceptance of 2nd Report of S. Committee on Privileges and Elections referring it back for amendment recommending members of opposition who belong to groups other than the Official Opposition be seated in the House according to the numerical strength of their respective groups	Nay - 96 Yea - 82
27 Fri. 18/10/63 (Pickers- gill)	Deck 3 27	That debate on the motion that the second report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be adjourned	Yea - 96 Nay - 74

28
 Mon. Deck 3 Amendment to acceptance of Nay - 106
 21/10/63 28 report to leave it up to Yea - 69
 (Plourde) members of the Social
 Credit party to decide
 which of the two Social
 Credit groups constitutes
 the Social Credit party

29
 Tues. Deck 3 Amendment to motion to Nay - 137
 22/10/63 29 resolve into Committee of Yea - 79
 (Diefen- Supply
 baker) - through delays etc.
 government has allowed
 chaos approaching anarchy
 to develop on the Great
 Lakes, the Seaway and in
 several Canadian ports,
 thereby causing disruption
 in trade

30
 Wed. Deck 3 Appeal on decision of the Yea - 116
 23/10/63 30 Chair Nay - 100
 (Neilson) - Shall decision be sustained?

31
 Mon. Deck 3 Amendment on amendment on Nay - 85
 28/11/63 31 reading of motion to resolve Yea - 83
 (Caouette) into Committee of Supply
 - regret to subservient
 agreement to storage of
 nuclear arms on territory
 of the State of Quebec
 notwithstanding strong
 protests...
 - ruled not relevant
 - Gregoire - appealed decision
 - Shall decision be sustained?

32
 Tues. Deck 3 Harkness recognized by Nay - 139
 29/10/63 32 Speaker - instead want Yea - 72
 (Winkler) Balcer to be heard

33
 Tues. Deck 3 Amendment of Caouette (see Nay - 210
 29/10/63 33 31) to amendment on motion Yea - 27
 (Caouette) to resolve to Committee of
 Supply

34
 Tues. Deck 3 Amendment to resolve to Nay - 155
 29/10/63 34 Committee of Supply -regret Yea - 85
 (Churchill) confusion caused by
 piecemeal abandonment of
 defence projects part,
 frigates, station Penhold
 conversion, abandonment of
 other establishments and
 deplores steps being taken
 without seeking views of
 Special Committee on Defence

35
 Wed. Deck 3 Amendment on motion for Nay - 126
 30/10/63 35 second reading of Act to Yea - 78
 (Nowlan) Amend the Income Tax Act
 (Bill C-95) asking that
 second reading be given
 but subject matter be
 referred to the Standing
 Committee on Banking and
 Commerce

36
 Tues. Deck 3 Amendment to amendment on Nay - 118
 5/11/63 36 motion to resolve to Yea - 92
 (Fisher) Committee of Supply
 - add to - failure to deal
 with problem of unemployment
 caused by automation and
 technological change

37
 Tues. Deck 3 Amendment to motion to Nay - 123
 5/11/63 37 resolve to Committee of Yea - 75
 (Starr) Supply - regret failure to
 introduce new policies to
 reduce substantially
 unemployment -particularly
 winter so as to achieve fall
 employment as undertaken in
 Liberal party election promises

38
Thurs. Deck 3 Appeal on ruling of Yea - 154
7/11/63 38 Chairman (Lamoureaux) while Nay - 11
(Gregoire) in Committee of While and
discussing Bill C-95 - an
amendment ruled not relevant
- Shall ruling of Chairman be
confirmed?

39
Tues. Deck 3 Amendment to amendment on Yea - 128
12/11/63 39 motion House resolve to Nay - 60
(Fisher) Committee of Supply (sixth
reading)
- urge that Government consult
with provinces before
announcing or undertaking
problems which fall to any
extent within provincial
jurisdiction - substitute
words to make amendment read
as such

40
Tues. Deck 3 Amendment as amended to have Yea - 187
12/11/63 40 meaning as (39) above "this Nay - Nil
(Hamilton) House urges the Government
to carry out more fully the
spirit of co-operative
federalism and to consult
with the Provinces before
announcing or undertaking
programmes which fall to any
extent within Provincial
jurisdiction"

41
Wed. Deck 3 Amendment to motion to give Nay - 112
13/11/63 41 Bill C-95 third reading Yea - 66
(Diefen- (see 35 above)
baker) - refer back to Committee of
Whole for amendment

42
 Fri. 29/11/63 (Knowles) Deck 3 42
 Appeal on ruling of Speaker that request for making public Report of R. Dixon - Spears and Associates on economic operations of TCA could be placed on order paper and there was not a prima facie case of a question of privilege
 - Shall ruling be sustained? Nay - 73
 Yea - 92

43
 Tues. 3/12/63 (Caouette) Deck 3 43
 Appeal to ruling of Chairman Yea - 188 (Lamoureaux) while House in Committee of Whole discussing Bill S-7, an Act to incorporate the Pharmacy Examining Board of Canada
 - Because French differ from English be referred to Committee for period of six months
 - Shall ruling of Chairman be confirmed? Nay - 12

44
 Wed. 4/12/63 (Gregoire) Deck 3 44
 Appeal on ruling of Speaker concerning question of privilege to have S. Committee on Mines, Forests and Water to study boundaries of N.W.T. and adjoining Provinces in connection with Bills C-83 and C-84 with a view to carrying out the undertakings of the Secretary of State and of the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources Yea - 106
 Nay - 106 (Declared Sustained)

45
Thurs. Deck 3
12/12/63 45
(Monteith)

Amendment to proposal that Nay - 117
Bill C-125, an Act to amend Yea - 100
the Old Age Assistance Act,
the Disabled Persons Act
and the Blind Persons Act
be given third reading
- be referred back to Committee
of Whole for reconsidering
of effective date of clause
4

Second Session, 26th Parliament

Call	Col. No.	Motion	Decision
1			
Fri. 21/2/64 (Douglas)	Deck 3 46	Amendment to amendment to Address in Reply - failure to provide government operated medicare.	Yea - 87 Nay - 134
2			
Mon. 24/2/64 (Gregoire)	Deck 3 47	Appeal from ruling by Speaker that amendment proposed was not relevant - should ruling be sustained?	Yea - 165 Nay - 21
3			
Tues. 25/2/64 (Rondeau)	Deck 3 48	Appeal from ruling by Speaker that a proposed amendment was not relevant - should ruling be sustained?	Yea - 215 Nay - 11
4			
Wed. 26/2/64 (Diefen- baker)	Deck 3 49	Amendment to Address in Reply - failure to remove 11% sales tax on building materials.	Yea - 119 Nay - 128
5			
Thurs. 27/2/64 (Langlois)	Deck 3 50	Amendment to amendment to Address in Reply - failure to provide raise in family allowance in accord with rise in cost of living.	Yea - 25 Nay - 222
6			
Thurs. 27/2/64 (Ricard)	Deck 3 51	Amendment to Address in Reply - failure to extend family allowances to 18 years.	Yea - 113 Nay - 134

<p>7 Wed. Deck 3 4/3/64 52 (Gregoire)</p>	<p>Proposal for Address requesting reports of TCA's technical and advisory reports used to choose new medium range aircraft be laid before House.</p>	<p>Yea - 14 Nay - 206</p>
<p>8 Thurs. Deck 3 19/3/64 53 (Gregoire)</p>	<p>Deputy Speaker no longer has confidence of House.</p>	<p>Yea - 10 Nay - 206</p>
<p>9 Fri. Deck 3 20/3/64 54 (Cameron)</p>	<p>Amendment to amendment on motion to resolve into Committee of Ways and Means (Budget) - reduce defence expenditures and use funds for Canadian development and UN aid.</p>	<p>Yea - 20 Nay - 180</p>
<p>10 Tues. Deck 3 24/3/64 55 (Nowlan)</p>	<p>Amendment on motion to resolve to Ways and Means- failure of government to reduce expenditures.</p>	<p>Yea - 80 Nay - 150</p>
<p>11 Mon. Deck 3 6/4/64 56 (Knowles)</p>	<p>Leave to introduce a Bill to amend B.N.A. Act to abolish the Senate.</p>	<p>Yea - 104 Nay - 54</p>
<p>12 Tues. Deck 3 7/4/64 57 (Gregoire)</p>	<p>Appeal on a ruling of the Speaker that a decision preventing an appeal on a previous decision was not appealable - shall chair be sustained?</p>	<p>Yea - 170 Nay - 24</p>

13 Tues. Deck 3 21/4/64 58 (Churchill)	Amendment on motion to resolve into Committee of Supply - abandonment of administration of veteran's hospitals.	Yea - 94 Nay - 123
14 Fri. Deck 3 1/5/64 59 (Nielsen)	Appeal on decision of Speaker - shall decision be sustained?	Yea - 111 Nay - 63
15 Tues. Deck 3 5/5/64 60 (Gregoire)	Amendment to amendment on motion to resolve into Committee of Supply - accelerate ARDA policies.	Yea - 12 Nay - 210
16 Tues. Deck 3 5/5/64 61 (Dinsdale)	Amendment to supply motion.	Yea - 78 Nay - 141
17 Thurs. Deck 3 14/5/64 62 (Martineau)	Proposal that maps used for redistribution be laid before House.	Yea - 60 Nay - 101
18 Tues. Deck 4 26/5/64 1 (Hamilton)	Amendment on Supply Motion - failure to take action on eastern agriculture.	Yea - 112 Nay - 130
19 Thurs. Deck 4 28/5/64 2 (Barnett)	Proposal that Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act be referred to Committee.	Yea - 21 Nay - 148
20 Thurs. Deck 4 4/6/64 3 (Brewin)	Appeal ruling of Chair (Deputy Speaker) - to sustain ruling (Columbia River).	Yea - 14 Nay - 1
21 Fri. Deck 4 5/6/64 4 (Martin)	Ratification of Columbia River Treaty with U.S.	Yea - 10 Nay - 1

22					
Thurs.	Deck 4	Editorial in <u>Ottawa Citizen</u>	Yea - 94		
18/6/64	5	be referred to Committee on	Nay - 107		
(Nugent)		Privileges - 6 Social Credit			
		and pledge to Liberals -bribe.			
23					
Fri.	Deck 4	Appeal on ruling of Speaker	Yea - 174		
19/6/64	6	- sustain ruling.	Nay - 11		
(Gregoire)					
24					
Fri.	Deck 4	Motion Mr. Hamilton be	Yea - 75		
19/6/64	7	suspended for remainder of	Nay - 50		
(Favreau)		the day.			
25					
Thurs.	Deck 4	Amendment to Students' Loan	Yea - 13		
16/7/64	8	Bill.	Nay - 135		
(Gauthier)					
26					
Mon.	Deck 4	Second Reading of Students'	Yea - 144		
20/7/64	9	Loan Act.	Nay - 11		
(Gordon)					
27					
Fri.	Deck 4	Third Reading of Students'	Yea - 137		
24/7/64	10	Loan Act.	Nay - 14		
(Gordon)					
28					
Mon.	Deck 4	Amendment to motion to	Yea - 9		
17/8/64	11	accept Second Report of	Nay - 147		
(Beaule)		Standing Commission on			
		Privileges in order that			
		inconsistency in testimony			
		and documents might be			
		examined.(6 Social Credit			
		members)			
29					
Mon.	Deck 4	Appeal on decision of Chair-	Yea - 94		
17/8/64	12	sustained? (Flag).	Nay - 59		
(Diefen-					
baker)					

30 Tues. 1/9/64 (More)	Deck 4 13	Amendment to amendment of motion that Government make three maple leaf, 2 blue bar flag official - lists four questions to be asked on plebiscite.	Yea - 69 Nay - 118
31 Thurs. 3/9/64 (Fisher)	Deck 4 14	Motion that debate (on flag) be adjourned.	Yea - 69 Nay - 84
32 Tues. 8/9/64 (Langlois)	Deck 4 15	Motion that debate (on flag) be adjourned.	Yea - 64 Nay - 85
33 Thurs. 17/9/64 (Orlikow)	Deck 4 16	Motion for papers on security procedures and investigations	Yea - 14 Nay - 131
34 Mon. 28/9/64 (Baldwin)	Deck 4 17	Appeal on decision of Chair (Deputy Speaker) -sustained?	Yea - 99 Nay - 45
35 Tues. 29/9/64 (Nugent)	Deck 4 18	Motion to have Bill for extension of credit to farm machinery syndicate referred to Committee of Agriculture.	Yea - 61 Nay - 120
36 Thurs. 29/10/64 (Woolliams)	Deck 4 19	Appeal on ruling of Chair while in Committee of Supply - sustained?(flag).	Yea - 118 Nay - 59
37 Thurs. 12/11/64 (Gregoire)	Deck 4 20	Request for report on federal spending in each of the provinces.	Yea - 11 Nay - 110

38 Wed. Deck 4 18/11/64 21 (LaMarsh)	Second Reading be given to Bill C-136 (Canada Pension Plan).	Yea - 184 Nay - 0
39 Thurs. Deck 4 3/12/64 22 (Smallwood)	Motion that the debate (on Canadian Flag Committee Sixth Report) adjourn.	Yea - 55 Nay - 129
40 Tues. Deck 4 8/12/64 23 (Horner) (Acadia)	Motion that debate (on Sixth Report of Flag Committee) be adjourned.	Yea - 68 Nay - 139
41 Wed. Deck 4 9/12/64 24 (Knowles)	House proceed to Orders of the Day.	Yea - 99 Nay - 132
42 Thurs. Deck 4 10/12/64 25 (Monteith)	Amendment to motion accepting Sixth Report of Flag Committee (recommendation of single maple leaf flag) - Government hold plebiscite.	Yea - 82 Nay - 153
43 Mon. Deck 4 14/12/64 26 (McIlraith)	Debate on Sixth Report be not further delayed.	Yea - 152 Nay - 85
44 Mon. Deck 4 14/12/64 27 (Thomas)	Report be sent back to Committee for adoption of recommendation of accepting Red Ensign.	Yea - 80 Nay - 162
45 Mon. Deck 4 14/12/64 28 (Woolliams)	Diefenbaker be recognized in place of Prime Minister.	Yea - 72 Nay - 155
46 Mon. Deck 4 14/12/64 29 (Batten)	Sixth Report of Flag Committee be concurred in.	Yea - 16 Nay - 78

47
Thurs. Deck 4
17/12/64 30
(Douglas)

Appeal on decision of the
Chair - sustained(?)
(Rivard Affair).

Yea - 122
Nay - 105

48
Thurs. Deck 4
17/12/64 31
(Flemming)
(Victoria-
Carleton)

Amendment to acceptance of
Seventh Report of Flag
Committee - it be referred
back to substitute Red Ensign
for Union Jack.

Yea - 87
Nay - 130

49
Thurs. Deck 4
17/12/64 32
(Beaule)

Amendment to acceptance of
Seventh Report - refer back
to Committee and P.M. propose
at next Commonwealth P.M.'s
Conference.

Yea - 22
Nay - 194

50
Thurs. Deck 4
17/12/64 33
(Batten)

Seventh Report of Flag
Committee (adopting Union
Jack as Commonwealth
standard) be accepted.

Yea - 185
Nay - 25

51
Wed. Deck 4
24/2/65 34
(Douglas)

Appeal on ruling of Chair -
sustained(?).

Yea - 108
Nay - 114

52
Tues. Deck 4
9/3/65 35
(Monteith)

Appeal on ruling of Chair
while in Committee (discussing
Bill C-136)-confirmed(?).

Yea - 111
Nay - 78

53
Fri. Deck 4
26/3/65 36
(Churchill)

Appeal on ruling of Chair
(Deputy Speaker) -sustained(?)
(Canada Pension Plan).

Yea - 84
Nay - 37

54
Mon. Deck 4
29/3/65 37
(Prittie)

Bill C-136 be referred back
to Committee of Whole for
reconsideration of amount
set for Old Age Security
Pension.

Yea - 76
Nay - 96

<p>55 Mon. Deck 4 29/3/65 38 (Knowles)</p>	<p>Bill C-136 be referred back for examining of Clause 122.</p>	<p>Yea - 76 Nay - 94</p>
--	---	------------------------------

<p>56 Mon. Deck 4 29/3/65 39 (Gregoire)</p>	<p>Appeal on ruling of Chair (Deputy Speaker).</p>	<p>Yea - 160 Nay - 7</p>
---	--	------------------------------

<p>57 Mon. Deck 4 29/3/65 40 (LaMarsh)</p>	<p>Third Reading be given to Bill C-136 (Canada Pension Plan).</p>	<p>Yea - 159 Nay - 12</p>
--	--	-------------------------------

<p>58 Tues. Deck 4 30/3/65 41 (Lambert)</p>	<p>Amendment on Second Reading of Bill C-142 on operation of certain federal-provincial programmes - be postponed until priorities be established at a federal-provincial conference.</p>	<p>Yea - 69 Nay - 109</p>
---	---	-------------------------------

Third Session, 26th Parliament

Call	Col. No.	Motion	Decision
1 Wed. 7/4/65 (Douglas)	Deck 4 42	Amendment to amendment of Address in Reply - failure to introduce medicare.	Yea - 84 Nay - 129
2 Fri. 9/4/65 (Diefen- baker)	Deck 4 43	Amendment of Address in Reply - failure to take action to eradicate wrong- doing.	Yea - 93 Nay - 106
3 Mon. 12/4/65 (Caouette)	Deck 4 44	Appeal on ruling of Speaker - sustained?	Yea - 110 Nay - 14
4 Mon. 12/4/65 (Plourde)	Deck 4 45	Amendment to Address -failure to raise income tax exemptions and Government does not have confidence of House.	Yea - 32 Nay - 126
5 Tues. 13/4/65 (McIntosh)	Deck 4 46	Appeal on ruling of Speaker - sustained?	Yea - 122 Nay - 52
6 Thurs. 29/4/65 (Knowles)	Deck 4 47	Martin (Timmins) be recognized rather than Caron.	Yea - 31 Nay - 157
7 Thurs. 29/4/65 (Cameron) (Nanaimo)	Deck 4 48	Amendment to amendment on motion to go into Committee of Ways & Means (Budget) - increase in income tax exemption and Old Age Security Pension.	Yea - 90 Nay - 106
8 Mon. 3/5/65 (Peters)	Deck 4 49	Martin (Timmins) be recognized instead of Moreau.	Yea - 22 Nay - 148

9 Mon. 3/5/65 (Nowlan)	Deck 4 50	Amendment to motion to go into Ways and Means - sales tax on machinery not eliminated.	Yea - 100 Nay - 111
10 Wed. 5/5/65 (Hales)	Deck 4 51	Appeal on decision of Chair - sustained? (Dept. of Ind. papers).	Yea - 130 Nay - 82
11 Wed. 5/5/65 (McIlraith)	Deck 4 52	Motion House go into Committee of Ways and Means (Budget).	Yea - 132 Nay - 86
12 Fri. 7/5/65 (Prittie)	Deck 4 53	Appeal decision of Chair (D.S.) - shall Chair be sustained? (Senate amendment out of order).	Yea - 99 Nay - 18
13 Tues. 11/5/65 (Douglas)	Deck 4 54	Amendment to motion to go into Supply - failure to safeguard consumer in auto pact with U.S.	Yea - 95 Nay - 110
14 Mon. 17/5/65 (Howard)	Deck 4 55	Bill C-98 (retirement of Senators) not be read now but six months hence.	Yea - 15 Nay - 112
15 Tues. 18/5/65 (Diefen- baker)	Deck 4 56	Amendment to Third Reading of C-98 to have it come into effect only after next election.	Yea - 75 Nay - 117
16 Thurs. 3/6/65 (Aiken)	Deck 4 57	Amendment on amendment on First Report on Procedure.	Yea - 69 Nay - 122
17 Fri. 4/6/65 (MacNaught)	Deck 4 58	Amendment on First Report on Procedure accepted with several changes.	Yea - 107 Nay - 46

18				
Fri.	Deck 4	Report of Committee on	Yea - 103	
11/6/65	59	Procedures be accepted	Nay - 33	
(Pickers-				
gill)				
19				
Tues.	Deck 4	Amendment to Bill C-123 on	Yea- 13	
22/6/65	60	Second Reading - consideration	Nay- 153	
(Barnett)		be given to Indian Claims		
		Commission.		
20				
Tues.	Deck 4	Second Reading Act to amend	Yea - 102	
22/6/65	61	Income Tax Act and Federal-	Nay - 58	
(Gordon)		Provincial Fiscal Arrangements		
		Act (C-118).		
21				
Mon.	Deck 4	On Third Reading - refer to	Yea - 78	
28/6/65	62	Committee of Ways and Means	Nay - 102	
(Knowles)		for consideration of Clause		
		4.		