

## Northwest Territories Act

was Speaker. After reviewing the whole question carefully, the Speaker is reported on page 800 of *Hansard* of February 23, 1942 as follows:

The debate, therefore, must be directed to the negative of that motion, that the resolution should not be submitted to the committee of the whole, for, as I have pointed out, no amendment at this stage can be in order.

He did not stop there. I want to point out to Your Honour that in the remarks you made the other day you dealt almost entirely with that one paragraph of the ruling made by the Speaker, whereas in effect that paragraph is only introductory to his real ruling. Stress should be placed on the next paragraph, which reads:

In my judgment the debate should be general, with no reference to details, all of which can be discussed in committee, and on the bill which follows the resolution.

Those are the key words of the ruling by Hon. Mr. Glen. I do not know how he could give a wider ruling than to use the words, "in my judgment the debate should be general." I submit that those are the words which should be followed by Your Honour.

My second key fact is that there can be a vote on this motion. I thought the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) became a little confused when he dealt with that the other day.

**Mr. Stuart (Charlotte):** He never gets confused.

**Mr. Green:** To you he would not be confused, no matter what he said. I realize that the last words of standing order 60 are as follows:

—and then it shall be referred to a committee of the whole house, before any resolution or vote of the house do pass thereupon.

The Prime Minister seemed to think that the word "vote" meant that there can be no vote by the house because he said, as reported on page 2372 of *Hansard* of May 20, 1952:

There cannot at this stage or until the committee has considered the resolution be any vote of the house upon its substance.

Hon. Mr. Glen dealt with that very point in his ruling in 1942 when he said, as reported on page 799 of *Hansard* of that year:

I would direct the attention of the house to the word "vote" in the last line.

He was referring to the word "vote" in the last line of standing order 60.

That means a vote of a sum of money, and is used as in the first column of the estimates now before the house.

In other words, it means an appropriation vote, not the ordinary vote which takes place in the house on a motion. In order to vote we are surely entitled to know what

the resolution means. Does the Prime Minister suggest that there should be a blind vote without any discussion of the resolution? I admit that there are occasional blind votes in this house on the other side, but I do not think anybody would seriously contend that where there is a vote of the house, where members are asked to express their opinion for or against, there should not be the right to have a question discussed.

Take this very resolution with which we are dealing at the moment. It has to do with the Northwest Territories Act and is an involved resolution.

**Mr. Fournier (Hull):** That is not what we are dealing with; we are dealing with the motion that Mr. Speaker leave the chair.

**Mr. Green:** The minister can make his argument later if he wishes. We have before us this resolution concerning the Northwest Territories Act. Surely we are entitled to have a statement from the minister as to what that resolution means. Having had such a statement, then at least one member of the official opposition should have the right to state his views concerning the question, and the same is true of members of the C.C.F. and Social Credit parties. As Hon. Mr. Glen said, there can then be a general debate. As I pointed out, Hon. Mr. Glen said:

In my judgment the debate should be general, with no reference to details.

From there on the debate is in the hands of the presiding officer and Your Honour would be within your rights in deciding just how far the discussion should go. But the Prime Minister is asking much more than that. In effect he is asking that there be no debate at this stage, and I submit that the ruling does not mean any such thing.

The Prime Minister pays very little attention to standing order 38, which is the one which says this motion is debatable. I do not think the Prime Minister even mentioned that standing order the other day. When this question was raised in 1942 Right Hon. Mr. Mackenzie King made a very careful argument. He weighed the whole question most carefully; it was not just a flash in the pan, something that was raised for just a minute or two. The right hon. gentleman went into great detail and it was after that—

**Mr. Speaker:** Did not Mr. Mackenzie King argue that the motion was not debatable?

**Mr. Green:** No; I say that in effect—

**Mr. Knowles:** Yes, he did.

**Mr. Speaker:** My recollection is that he said the motion was not debatable.

**Mr. Green:** Mr. King did argue that point, and at considerable length and with great