

Standing Order 60

go into committee at the next sitting to consider the resolution. It is surely, therefore, wrong for the house to consider at the said next sitting the resolution with the Speaker in the chair on the following grounds:

(1) That once a question has been decided by the house it cannot be reopened in the same session. See Beauchesne's third edition, citation 332.

(2) That when a resolution has been referred to a committee of the whole house that resolution cannot be debated in the house until the committee has reported.

What debate, if any, can be permitted on the second day, or is a further motion of any kind required when the order under government orders is called "that the Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole on the following resolution . . .". As stated above, since the house has already made a decision that that particular resolution is to be considered by the committee it is obviously irregular to have any further debate on that point. Therefore, the only possible subject matter for debate is as to whether the Speaker should leave the chair at that particular time, or later that day, or on some other day. However, even that subject matter is not debatable. Standing order 17 (2) provides that "whenever government business has precedence, government orders may be called in such sequence as the government may think fit", and of course it is the practice for the government to announce the night before just what business will be called the following day. In this way no one is taken by surprise.

From the above it would appear that the motion that the Speaker do now leave the chair for the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole on a money resolution moved on the second day under the provisions of standing order 60 is purely a procedural motion. It stands on the order of proceedings for the day, and were it other than a procedural motion it would, under standing order 38, be debatable. But procedural motions are not debatable. This was decided by Mr. Speaker Lemieux on June 18, 1923. See *Hansard*, page 4013 of that year. He said:

A bill is regularly on its way to the committee of the whole house and the motion has been made that I do now leave the chair. It is a purely formal motion.

It is doubtful if any motion at all is really necessary, but as Mr. Speaker Lemieux has ruled, and as Mr. Speaker Rhodes has also

[Mr. Speaker.]

ruled that the motion should be made, and that, though the motion is not debatable, the members have a right to vote thereon, I will follow their rulings.

Accordingly in future once the house has decided that the Speaker will leave the chair at the next sitting of the house to resolve itself into committee of the whole to consider a resolution I will put the motion when the order is called, but the motion will not be debatable although members will have the right to vote thereon.

Mr. George A. Drew (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, with respect, I cannot accept the ruling; but in view of the fact that it is obvious there must be a review of the rules, as has been indicated on different occasions during this session, I prefer not to divide the house but to leave the matter in the record in that way.

QUESTIONS

NEW POST OFFICE BUILDINGS, MARITIME PROVINCES

Mr. Robichaud:

1. How many new post office buildings have been constructed in the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, since 1945?
2. In what localities were these buildings constructed and at what price?

Mr. Fournier (Hull):

1 and 2. New Brunswick: 1950-52, Fredericton, public building, \$802,882.23; 1950-52, St. Stephen, public building, \$192,807.61.

Nova Scotia: 1945-46, Canso, public building, \$48,994.41; 1947-50, Halifax (north end) public building, \$79,193.21; 1950-51, Dominion, public building, \$31,072; 1950-51, Kingston, public building, \$60,538.14.

Prince Edward Island: 1950-53, Summerside, public building, \$377,628.60.

CHICOUTIMI, LAPOINTE AND LAC-SAINT-JEAN COUNTIES, QUE.—HEALTH AND WELFARE PAYMENTS

Mr. Gagnon:

Since January 1, 1949, what amounts have been spent each year by the Department of National Health and Welfare in the counties of (a) Chicoutimi; (b) Lapointe; (c) Lac-Saint-Jean, (i) for the payment of medical fees and other professional services, and to whom; (ii) under the following headings: immigration medical services, special technical services, general health grants, hospital construction grants, general public health grants, tuberculosis control grants, mental health grants, professional training grants and cancer control grants?