

there would be in every debate with respect to the launching of a motion such as this.

**Mr. Knowles:** Where are you in that confusion?

**Mr. Sinclair:** They were last out there, and they are last here.

**Mr. Graydon:** The simpler we make the rules and the practice of this house, the more speedily will our legislation go through. If we attempt to surround the conduct of this first debate on the resolution with a network of rules, then the resolution will take two or three times as long to go through as it does now. I think we ought to be moving towards greater simplification of the rules of procedure, rather than towards complication. If this change is made, in my opinion it will definitely be a retrograde step so far as our debates are concerned.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** My submission is that there is no request from anyone or any intention anywhere to ask you to make a change in these rules, Mr. Speaker. This rule 60 has only to be read to make it clear that there is not to be a debate on the merits of the resolutions for the introduction of money bills until the house is in committee. It is not something new. It is not something that was invented here in Canada. It is something that was taken verbatim from the rules of the British house passed on March 20, 1866. The language is exactly the same. Rule 60 reads:

If any motion be made in the house for any public aid or charge upon the people, the consideration and debate thereof may not be presently entered upon, but shall be adjourned till such further day as the house thinks fit to appoint; and then it—

That is to say, the debate thereon.

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

That is the old rule, and I do not see how there can be any anxiety over the fact that there are not going to be two debates, one following immediately upon the other, on the merits of the resolution. A debate must not take place on the day it is first mentioned in the house, but a day must be appointed and on that day the consideration and debate are referred to the committee of the whole for discussion and decision.

The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Green) says that in Mr. Speaker Glen's decision the word "vote" was taken to mean the same thing as the word "vote" in the first column of the estimates. Well, that cannot apply to a resolution; it is a resolution or vote, and what the ruling requires to be referred to the committee is the consideration and debate. Now here the motion is that

the Speaker do leave the chair so the committee can consider and debate the merits of the resolution. The language used by Mr. Glen may have appeared to be rather new when it was first used, that the debate should be addressed to the negative point of view. I take it that merely means that there is no case required for the affirmative that the Speaker leave the chair, but that if there are objections on the negative side to his leaving the chair for the house to consider and debate in committee, then the objections from the negative side can be raised and met. The practice has grown up however that there should be a full dress debate on the merits of the resolution with the Speaker in the chair, and then start it all over again as soon as the Speaker leaves the chair and the house goes into committee.

**Mr. Knowles:** The Prime Minister admits that has been the practice.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** That has been the developing practice, even since Mr. Speaker Glen's decision of 1942; but I think the terms of the standing order and the language used by Mr. Speaker Glen clearly indicate that the debate on the merits is one to be had when the house is in committee. There can, however, be a debate and a vote on the proposal that is now before the Speaker, that he do leave the chair.

**Mr. Drew:** With your consent, Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of this point, may I add a few comments. There is no question about the fact that the rule we are discussing is precisely the same rule which has been in force for some years at Westminster. As I understand it, at Westminster there is no debate on the motion.

**Mr. St. Laurent:** The rule has been changed since. I think they have done away with this rule which was copied into our standing orders when they were first drafted.

**Mr. Knowles:** Is it not true that our rule 60 is qualified by our rule 38, as Mr. Speaker Glen pointed out in the ruling he made in 1942?

**Mr. St. Laurent:** My submission is that rule 60 is not qualified, but that the motion that the Speaker leave the chair is a debatable motion.

**Mr. Drew:** I had not completed my comments, although I welcome the comment by the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) that the rule has been changed. Up to the point where it was changed, the practice was quite clear that a debate was not permitted. The practice has grown up here that a debate should be permitted, and Mr. Speaker Glen in making the ruling he did decided that there could