



HillStudies

In-depth reads on Canadian topics

OMNIBUS BILLS: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Publication No. 2012-79-E

26 January 2022

Revised by Andre Barnes

Parliamentary Information, Education and Research Services

AUTHORSHIP

26 January 2022	Andre Barnes	Legal and Social Affairs Division
1 October 2012	Michel Bédard	Legal and Social Affairs Division

ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION

Library of Parliament HillStudies provide in-depth studies of policy issues. They feature historical background, current information and references, and often anticipate the emergence of the issues they examine. They are prepared by Parliamentary Information, Education and Research Services, which carries out research for and provides information and analysis to parliamentarians and Senate and House of Commons committees and parliamentary associations in an objective, impartial manner.

© Library of Parliament, Ottawa, Canada, 2022

Omnibus Bills: Frequently Asked Questions
(HillStudies)

Publication No. 2012-79-E

Ce document est également publié en français.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	WHAT IS AN OMNIBUS BILL?	1
3	WHEN WAS THE FIRST OMNIBUS BILL INTRODUCED IN CANADIAN PARLIAMENT?	2
4	ARE OMNIBUS BILLS PROCEDURALLY ADMISSIBLE?.....	3
5	WHAT ARE SOME KNOWN EXAMPLES OF OMNIBUS BILLS?	5
6	WHAT ARE THE PROS AND CONS OF OMNIBUS BILLS?.....	7



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

For about 150 years, the term “omnibus bill” went without a firm definition in the procedural rules of either the Senate or the House of Commons. Often when omnibus bills were introduced, questions arose about their nature, admissibility and appropriateness, among other matters.

Over time, the essential characteristics of what was generally considered to be an omnibus bill were expressed by a variety of parliamentary sources. Omnibus bills came in different forms. They could be voluminous, complex and far-reaching, and they could seek to create or amend many disparate statutes.

However, successive Speakers of the House of Commons have indicated, when ruling in favour of the procedural admissibility of omnibus bills, that the multiple components of these bills were held together and made coherent by a unifying principle, a single purpose, a unifying thread or a unitary purpose.

In 2017, the House amended its Standing Orders to provide a definition of “omnibus bill”: an omnibus bill is a government bill that seeks to repeal, amend or enact more than one Act, yet it does not contain a common element that connects its various provisions, or it seeks to link unrelated matters. For the purposes of voting, the clauses of the bill can be combined thematically and these groups of clauses addressed separately as part of a single debate at each stage of the process.

Although today the use of omnibus bills is well entrenched in Canadian parliamentary practice, it is often still seen as an exception to the usual legislative process. Nonetheless, few studies have attempted to answer recurring questions about these bills. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to answer some of the most frequently asked questions about omnibus bills.

OMNIBUS BILLS: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

1 INTRODUCTION

Omnibus bills have been used for decades by governments of various political stripes as a vehicle to propose certain kinds of legislation to Parliament. While their use is well entrenched in Canadian parliamentary practice, it is nonetheless often seen as an exception to the usual legislative process. Whenever omnibus bills are introduced, questions arise about their nature, admissibility and appropriateness, among other matters. Yet, few studies have attempted to answer these recurring questions.

The purpose of this paper is to answer some of the most frequently asked questions about omnibus bills.

2 WHAT IS AN OMNIBUS BILL?

For about 150 years, the term “omnibus bill” went without a firm definition in the procedural rules of both the Senate and the House of Commons. However, the essential characteristics of what was generally considered to be an omnibus bill have been expressed over time by various parliamentary sources.

In 2017, the House amended its Standing Orders to define omnibus bills for the purpose of empowering the Speaker to divide questions on such bills, where applicable, for votes held at second and third reading. According to Standing Order 69.1, an omnibus bill is a government bill that seeks to repeal, amend or enact more than one act, yet does not contain a common element that connects its various provisions, or that seeks to link unrelated matters.¹

Similarly, the House of Commons *Glossary of Parliamentary Procedure* defines an omnibus bill as: “[a] bill that seeks to amend, repeal or enact several Acts where there is not a common element connecting the various provisions or where unrelated matters are linked.”²

Often, rulings by Speakers of the House of Commons draw from applicable precedents. As such, it may be worth recalling previous definitions used in Canada’s parliamentary context to define an omnibus bill.

In 1988, the Right Honourable Herb Gray, then Opposition House Leader, stated during a debate that the core element of an omnibus bill is a unifying purpose tying together the multitude of statutes it is to amend:

The essential defence of an omnibus procedure is that the Bill in question, although it may seek to create or to amend many disparate

statutes, in effect has one basic principle or purpose which ties together all the proposed enactments and thereby renders the Bill intelligible for parliamentary purposes.³

Successive Speakers of the House of Commons have made these words their own by referring to them with approval in their own rulings.⁴ They have also referred to the “unifying principle,”⁵ “single purpose,”⁶ “unifying thread,”⁷ or “unitary purpose”⁸ that tie together the multiple components of omnibus bills.

In a broader parliamentary sense, the meaning of “omnibus bills” could vary depending on the context. For example, the term has sometimes been used in reference to legislative proposals enacted under the Miscellaneous Statute Law Amendment Program. Established in 1975, this program allows the speedy adoption of amendments aimed at correcting anomalies, errors or inconsistencies, or making changes of an uncontroversial and uncomplicated nature, in various Acts of Parliament. In total, 12 Miscellaneous Statute Law Amendment Acts have been enacted since the beginning of the program, the latest in 2017.⁹

The term “omnibus bills” has also referred to bills that were not necessarily long, but if enacted, had far-reaching consequences for statute law in general. One notable example is the Quebec legislature’s omnibus use of the notwithstanding clause in 1982. With the passage of Quebec’s *An Act respecting the Constitution Act, 1982*¹⁰ (a statute of just seven sections), all Quebec statutes were repealed and re-enacted adding the derogation provision contemplated by section 33 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (the Charter), thereby exempting all Quebec statutes from the application of the Charter.¹¹

3 WHEN WAS THE FIRST OMNIBUS BILL INTRODUCED IN CANADIAN PARLIAMENT?

It is difficult to state with certainty when the first omnibus bill was introduced in Parliament.

House of Commons Procedure and Practice suggests that the practice existed in 1888, when a private bill was introduced with the aim of confirming two separate railway agreements.¹² However, bills of an omnibus nature may have preceded this date. Indeed, as early as 1868, during its very first parliamentary session, the Canadian Parliament enacted *An Act to continue for a limited time the several Acts therein mentioned*,¹³ which may well be characterized as the first omnibus bill enacted in post-Confederation Canada. This Act contained a single purpose in the continuation of legislation about to expire, while at the same time amending several statutes with different subject matters, such as bankruptcy, peace at the borders and banks.

According to Hansard, the omnibus nature of a legislative proposal prompted negative reaction for the first time in 1923. In that year, the Senate rejected a government-proposed omnibus railway bill as being overly broad. Bill 234, An Act respecting the Construction of the Canadian National Railway Lines proposed a large program for the construction of 29 branch lines. During debates, it was suggested that the proposal, if reintroduced, should take the form of separate bills for each line. In the subsequent session, the government followed this suggestion and introduced a series of separate bills.¹⁴

In the House of Commons, the appropriateness of omnibus bills appears to have been first questioned in 1953 when the Honourable Brooke Claxton, then Minister of National Defence, was asked to explain why a particular legislative proposal covered three existing Acts of Parliament. The Minister explained that for the convenience of members of the House of Commons and of the Canadian Armed Forces, amendments to the legislation relating to the armed forces had been proposed in a single annual statute in 1950, 1951, 1952 and again in 1953.¹⁵

4 ARE OMNIBUS BILLS PROCEDURALLY ADMISSIBLE?

Nothing in the parliamentary rules, procedure or practice prohibits the introduction of omnibus bills. However, these bills – like any other legislative proposal – must obey the established rules respecting the admissibility and examination of bills.

In 2017, amendments made to the Standing Orders empowered the Speaker of the House of Commons to divide omnibus government bills for the purposes of voting at second and third reading; these amendments have no bearing on the procedural admissibility of the bill itself.

The first ruling regarding the admissibility of an omnibus bill appears to date back to 23 January 1969. Speaker Lucien Lamoureux had to rule on the admissibility of a motion to instruct a committee to divide a bill into separate parts before the bill had been referred to the appropriate committee. The Speaker ruled this motion out of order and contrary to precedents and authorities, on the basis that such a motion was admissible only once the bill had been referred to committee. As for the omnibus character of the bill, Speaker Lamoureux stated: “It is not for the Chair to determine whether it is proper or appropriate or politic for the government to present this legislation in the form of an omnibus bill.”¹⁶

Two years later, in 1971, Speaker Lamoureux was again called upon to rule on the admissibility of an omnibus bill. Members were objecting to the inclusion in Bill C-207, An Act respecting the organization of the Government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto,¹⁷ of several distinct proposals and principles. Speaker Lamoureux, while sharing the concerns expressed about the

omnibus character of the proposal, felt bound by “long established practice” with respect to the introduction of omnibus bills before the Canadian Parliament. He nonetheless suggested that, at some point, the omnibus character of a legislative proposal might render it inadmissible procedurally:

However, where do we stop? Where is the point of no return? ... [W]e might reach the point where we would have only one bill, a bill at the start of the session for the improvement of the quality of life in Canada which would include every single proposed piece of legislation for the session. That would be an omnibus bill with a capital “O” and a capital “B.” But would it be acceptable legislation? There must be a point where we go beyond what is acceptable from a strictly parliamentary standpoint ... where an omnibus bill becomes more than an omnibus bill and is not acceptable from a procedural standpoint.¹⁸

Since that statement, many points of order have been raised to object to the omnibus character of legislative proposals, alleging, among other things, that the point of no return referred to by Speaker Lamoureux had been reached. Yet, successive Speakers of the House of Commons have consistently found omnibus bills procedurally acceptable. For example, motions to instruct committees to divide bills have been ruled out of order,¹⁹ and requests to the Speaker that they divide bills have been refused.²⁰ While the Speakers have often expressed concerns about the use of omnibus bills,²¹ they have clearly indicated that they were bound by “long established practice” with regard to omnibus bills.²²

While the omnibus character of a bill does not, in and of itself, render it inadmissible from a procedural standpoint, omnibus bills are, of course, subject to the procedural requirements of the *Rules of the Senate* and the *Standing Orders of the House of Commons*. For example, an omnibus money bill would have to receive the royal recommendation before its third reading and adoption by the House of Commons.²³ An omnibus bill, like any other bill, cannot be introduced “in an imperfect shape.”²⁴ In 1981, Speaker Jeanne Sauvé struck down Part I of Bill C-54, An Act to amend the statute law relating to income tax and to provide other authority for raising funds,²⁵ because its borrowing provisions had not received the appropriate notice under the Standing Orders.²⁶

Political pressure, procedural devices and other pace-slowng tactics may sometimes be used by the Opposition to delay or block the adoption of omnibus bills. In some cases, these actions have resulted in the division of omnibus bills. For example, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*²⁷ explains that, in 1982, the insistence of the Opposition led the government to agree to the division of Bill C-93, An Act to amend the statute law relating to certain taxes and to provide other authority for the raising of funds.²⁸ By unanimous consent, Bill C-93 was withdrawn and the government agreed to introduce two separate legislative proposals in its stead.²⁹

The political process led to the division of an omnibus bill again in 1982. Unsuccessful with its point of order alleging that the omnibus Bill C-94, the Energy Security Act, 1982 should be divided,³⁰ the Opposition demanded a recorded division on a motion to adjourn. Members were called in by the division bells for the recorded division, but the Opposition Whip refused to walk down the aisle of the Chamber with the Government Whip, which would have been an indication that the vote could then take place. At the time, the Standing Orders provided no time limit on bells, and they rang continuously for more than two weeks.³¹ When the House resumed sitting, it adopted a government motion dividing the bill into eight separate ones.³²

Another notable incident in 2012 delayed the adoption of an omnibus bill. At the report stage of Bill C-38, the Jobs, Growth and Long-term Prosperity Act, the Opposition submitted 871 motions in amendment and asked for a recorded division for each vote. A 22-hour voting marathon ensued in the House of Commons.³³ The bill, however, was adopted without amendment.

5 WHAT ARE SOME KNOWN EXAMPLES OF OMNIBUS BILLS?

The following is a selective list of omnibus bills that have been introduced in Canadian Parliament.

- 1968: Bill C-150, the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1968,³⁴ proposed an ambitious social reform package involving various subjects, such as abortion, homosexuality and gun control. In what appears to be the first explicit ruling on omnibus bills, Speaker Lamoureux ruled out of order a motion to instruct a committee to divide the bill while the bill was still before the House at second reading. The bill was enacted by Parliament in June 1969.³⁵

- 1971: Bill C-207, the Government Organization Act, 1970³⁶ proposed important changes to the departmental structure of the government, establishing, for example, the Department of the Environment. In ruling the bill admissible, Speaker Lamoureux cautioned: “There must be a point where we go beyond what is acceptable from a strictly parliamentary standpoint ... where an omnibus bill becomes more than an omnibus bill and is not acceptable from a procedural standpoint.”³⁷ Bill C-207 was enacted in May 1971.³⁸
- 1982: Bill C-94, the Energy Security Act, 1982³⁹ proposed to enact the National Energy Program that had been announced in the October 1980 Budget. Ruling on a point of order, Speaker Jeanne Sauv e rejected the proposition that the bill should be divided.⁴⁰ The Opposition, in what is known as the “bell-ringing incident,” forced the division bell to ring for more than two weeks, refusing to take part in a vote on a motion to adjourn. Bill C-94 was subsequently divided into eight different bills.
- 1988: Bill C-130, the Canada–United States Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act,⁴¹ as its title suggests, was aimed at implementing the free trade agreement between the two countries. The Opposition tried to stop the adoption of the bill using various procedural devices, while also arguing its inadmissibility. Speaker John Fraser ruled the bill admissible in a landmark decision rendered on 8 June 1988.⁴² The bill died on the *Order Paper* with the dissolution of the 33rd Parliament, and was at the centre of the 1988 general election debates. Once the government was re-elected, the proposal was reintroduced and finally enacted by Parliament in December 1988.⁴³
- 2012: Bill C-38, the Jobs, Growth and Long-term Prosperity Act,⁴⁴ was aimed at implementing the government budgetary policy for 2012. The Opposition objected strongly to its admissibility⁴⁵ and forced a 22-hour voting marathon on numerous amendments at the report stage. The bill was nonetheless enacted by Parliament two months after its introduction.⁴⁶
- 2017: Bill C-63, the Budget Implementation Act, 2017, No. 2,⁴⁷ was proposed to implement the remaining measures arising from the federal budget tabled in the House of Commons in March 2017. The Opposition argued that the bill contained new measures that were not announced in the March 2017 budget.⁴⁸ Speaker Geoff Regan agreed with the Opposition’s contention and employed Standing Order 69.1 for the first time to group the bill thematically into five separate parts for the purposes of the votes held at second and third reading.⁴⁹

6 WHAT ARE THE PROS AND CONS OF OMNIBUS BILLS?

Arguments for and against omnibus bills have been put forward over the years.

Some have defended the omnibus nature of a legislative proposal on the grounds that its various components reflect a common principle, theme or purpose, or are part of a single administrative initiative. Grouping the various amendments may then actually enhance Parliament’s study of each component and its interaction with other elements of the bill, and facilitate the examination of the bill. As the volume and complexity of government initiatives have increased over the years, omnibus bills can facilitate the simultaneous consideration of all the interrelated aspects of a particular legislative agenda. Omnibus bills grouping different proposals on the same subject may also help to focus parliamentary debates.

Objections to omnibus bills typically centre on claims that individual parliamentarians are prevented from saying “yea” or “nay” to specific measures contained in the proposal. However, it may also be argued that the legislative process offers various opportunities for parliamentarians to express their views and vote on different measures of each bill, particularly at the report stage in the House of Commons. Another argument levelled against omnibus bills is that they cannot be referred to the appropriate specialist committee for study. Further, their size and their quick adoption, in effect, prevent parliamentarians from being able to inform themselves about the relevant issues, and Parliament could lose the opportunity to identify and correct any flaws the bill might contain.

NOTES

1. Under Standing Order 69.1, where the Speaker of the House of Commons determines that a government bill is an omnibus bill according to the definition in Standing Order 69.1, the Speaker is empowered to group the clauses of the bill thematically. Separate questions are put on each of these groups of clauses at two legislative stages: on the motion for second reading and reference to a committee, and on the motion for third reading and passage of the bill. However, the debate itself on an omnibus bill is not subject to separation or division. Further, Standing Order 69.1 does not apply to government bills whose main purpose is to implement a budget and contains only provisions that were announced in the budget presentation or in budget documents tabled during the budget presentation. See House of Commons, *Standing Orders of the House of Commons*, 2 December 2021, [Standing Order 69.1](#).
2. House of Commons, “[omnibus bill](#),” *Glossary of Parliamentary Procedure*.
3. Library of Parliament, “[House of Commons Debates, 33rd Parliament, 2nd Session: Vol. 13](#),” Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 30 May 1988, p. 15880.
4. See, for example, Library of Parliament, “[House of Commons Debates, 33rd Parliament, 2nd Session: Vol. 13](#),” Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 8 June 1988, p. 16255; Library of Parliament, “[House of Commons Debates, 34th Parliament, 3rd Session: Vol. 7](#),” Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 1 April 1992, p. 9147; and Library of Parliament, “[House of Commons Debates, 35th Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 3](#),” Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 11 April 1994, p. 2860.
5. Library of Parliament, “[House of Commons Debates, 35th Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 3](#),” Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 11 April 1994, p. 2859.

6. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 33rd Parliament, 2nd Session: Vol. 13](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 8 June 1988, p. 16258.
7. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 33rd Parliament, 2nd Session: Vol. 13](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 8 June 1988, p. 16256.
8. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 35th Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 3](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 11 April 1994, p. 2861.
9. [Miscellaneous Statute Law Amendment Act, 2017](#), S.C. 2017, c. 26.
10. National Assembly of Québec, [Bill No. 62, An Act respecting the Constitution Act, 1982](#), 32nd Legislature, 3rd Session (L.Q. 1982, c. 21).
11. Section 33 of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* allows Canadian legislatures, through the use of the notwithstanding clause in a statute, to derogate from the rights and freedoms protected by its ss. 2 and 7–15. See [Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms](#), Part I of the *Constitution Act, 1982*, being Schedule B to the *Canada Act 1982* (U.K.), 1982, c. 11, s. 33.
12. Marc Bosc and André Gagnon, eds. "[Chapter 16: The Legislative Process – Forms of Bills](#)," *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, 3rd ed., 2017.
13. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Bills, 1st Parliament, 1st Session: 35–140](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 1868.
14. Library of Parliament, "[Senate Debates, 14th Parliament, 2nd Session: Vol. 1](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 28 June 1923, pp. 1239–1247; and Library of Parliament, "[Senate Debates, 14th Parliament, 2nd Session: Vol. 1](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 29 June 1923, pp. 1280–1301. See Robert A. MacKay, *The Unreformed Senate of Canada*, rev. ed., 1963, pp. 102–104.
15. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 21st Parliament, 7th Session: Vol. 4](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 2 April 1953, p. 3551:

The National Defence Act was enacted in 1950, and at that time we incorporated in the one bill a great number of provisions from other legislation. We have decided, and the house so far has concurred, that it would meet the convenience of hon. members, as it does very much that of the armed forces, if all amendments to existing legislation relating to the armed forces were contained in a single bill each year. In consequence, the Canadian Forces Act, 1950; the Canadian Forces Act, 1951; the Canadian Forces Act, 1952 have been enacted. All of these amended a number of different statutes, and this follows that precedent.
16. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Journals, 28th Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 115](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 23 January 1969, p. 617.
17. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Bills, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session: C201–C239](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 9 December 1970, p. 23215.
18. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Journals, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session: Vol. 117](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 26 January 1971, pp. 284 and 285.
19. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Journals, 28th Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 115](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 23 January 1969, pp. 616–618.
20. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 32nd Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 14](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 2 March 1982, p. 15532.
21. See, for example, Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 30th Parliament, 2nd Session, Vol. 6](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 11 May 1977, p. 5522; and Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 32nd Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 14](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 2 March 1982, p. 15532.

22. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Journals, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session: Vol. 117](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 26 January 1971, p. 284; Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Journals, 28th Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 115](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 23 January 1969, pp. 616–618; Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 30th Parliament, 2nd Session: Vol. 6](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 11 May 1977, pp. 5522–5524; Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 32nd Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 14](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 2 March 1982, p. 15532; Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 32nd Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 23](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 20 June 1983, pp. 26537–26538; Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 33rd Parliament, 2nd Session: Vol. 13](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 8 June 1988, pp. 16252–16258; Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 34th Parliament, 3rd Session: Vol. 7](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 1 April 1992, pp. 9147–9149; Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 35th Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 3](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 11 April 1994, pp. 2859–2860; House of Commons, *Debates*, 20 September 2001, 1030 (Speaker Peter Milliken); and House of Commons, *Debates*, 11 June 2012, 1205 (Speaker Andrew Scheer).
23. *Constitution Act, 1867*, 30 & 31 Victoria, c. 3 (U.K.), s. 54; and House of Commons, *Standing Orders of the House of Commons*, 2 December 2021, [Standing Order 79](#). A royal recommendation is defined as: "A message from the Governor General, required for any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of public revenue. Only a Minister can obtain such a recommendation." See House of Commons, "[royal recommendation](#)," *Glossary of Parliamentary Procedure*.
24. House of Commons, *Standing Orders of the House of Commons*, 2 December 2021, [Standing Order 68](#), para. 3.
25. Library of Parliament, [House of Commons Bills, 32nd Parliament, 1st Session: C54–C56](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 13 January 1981.
26. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 32nd Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 6](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 19 January 1981, p. 6319.
27. Marc Bosc and André Gagnon, eds. "[Chapter 16: The Legislative Process – Forms of Bills](#)," *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, 3rd ed., 2017.
28. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Bills, 32nd Parliament, 1st Session: C68–C93](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 10 February 1981.
29. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Journals, 32nd Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 126, Pt. 4](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 7 May 1982, pp. 4806–4807.
30. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 32nd Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 14](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 2 March 1982, p. 15532.
31. The *Standing Orders of the House of Commons* were subsequently amended to provide time limits on bells calling in members for a recorded division. See House of Commons, *Standing Orders of the House of Commons*, 2 December 2021, [Standing Order 45](#).
32. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Votes and Proceedings, 32nd Parliament, 1st Session: 310–372](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 22 March 1982, pp. 4626–4628.
33. House of Commons, *Journals*, 13 June 2012.
34. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Bills, 28th Parliament, 1st Session: C132–C173](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 19 December 1968, 29510. The bill was first introduced in the House in 1967 during the 27th Parliament, 2nd Session, as Bill C-195.
35. *Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1968–69*, S.C. 1968–69, c. 38.
36. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Bills, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session: C201–C239](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 9 December 1970, p. 23215.
37. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Journals, 28th Parliament, 3rd Session: Vol. 117](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 26 January 1971, pp. 284 and 285.
38. *Government Organization Act*, S.C. 1971, c. 42.
39. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Bills, 32nd Parliament, 1st Session: C94–C105](#)," Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 26 February 1982, p. 25255-1.

40. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 32nd Parliament, 1st Session: Vol. 14,](#)" Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 2 March 1982, p. 15532.
41. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Bills, 33rd Parliament, 2nd Session: C110–C130,](#)" Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 24 May 1988, p. 22477.
42. Library of Parliament, "[House of Commons Debates, 33rd Parliament, 2nd Session: Vol. 13,](#)" Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources, Database, 8 June 1988, pp. 16252–16258.
43. *Canada–United States Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act*, S.C. 1988, c. 65.
44. [Bill C-38, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 29, 2012 and other measures](#), 41st Parliament, 1st Session (S.C. 2012, c. 19).
45. The bill was ruled in order by Speaker Andrew Scheer. See House of Commons, [Debates](#), 11 June 2012 1205 (Speaker Andrew Scheer).
46. [Jobs, Growth and Long-term Prosperity Act](#), S.C. 2012, c. 19.
47. [Bill C-63, A second Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on March 22, 2017 and other measures](#), 42nd Parliament, 1st Session (S.C. 2017, c. 33).
48. House of Commons, [Debates](#), 3 November 2017, 1210 (Pierre Poilievre).
49. House of Commons, [Debates](#), 8 November 2017, 1525 (Speaker Geoff Regan); and House of Commons, [Debates](#), 1 December 2017, 1005 (Assistant Deputy Speaker Anthony Rota).