to make, because we have not had a budget debate within the present fiscal year so far. What kind of statement is he going to give us other than the kind indicated by the leader of the house, which could be nothing else than a budget statement without a budget?

Mr. Hellyer: He is going to tell us nothing except what he wants us to know.

Mr. Churchill: It would not take me more than one minute to do that.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): The hon. member for Trinity.

Mr. Speaker: I think gratuitous statements should not be made by members speaking from their seats. Notwithstanding the fact that the Speaker is now addressing the house, I do feel the hon. member should direct his attention to what the Chair is saying. We should not have these gratuitous remarks which somehow have a habit of getting on to *Hansard*. I will now recognize the leader of the house.

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I want to refer to the remarks made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and repeated in part by the hon. member for Laurier. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre attempted to put words into my mouth that I did not use at all, and he tried to interpret them to suit his own purpose. The words I used in the house on Thursday when I was announcing the business were these, and let us get the record straight so that everybody may be aware of what has been going on. On Thursday night, dealing with the business for Friday, interim supply and so on, I said we would consider moving into committee of ways and means on Monday.

An hon. Member: Where is that?

Mr. Churchill: Page 696.

Mr. Knowles: The same page from which I read.

Mr. Churchill: Yes, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre read it and then interpreted it.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): Misinterpreted it.

Mr. Churchill: "Misinterpreted" is correct. I said we would then consider moving into ways and means on Monday and the Minister of Finance and other members of the house would deal with economic affairs. That is what hon. members had been asking us to do. Then I said that afterwards the Minister of Finance would bring along the budget resolutions which are listed in *Votes and Proceedings* of September 27. There is not one word which indicates there that there would be a budget presentation. I defy the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to read that from the words there on the record of *Hansard*.

Similarly on October 19, when I was answering the hon. member for Laurier when dealing with the business of the house, I said that if the house agreed with the proposal I made, then, and only then, there would be a general discussion in the committee of ways and means when the first resolution was in front of us. I said, as the hon. member for Laurier correctly repeated, that this is departure from the procedure in the past. It is a departure to this extent, that when you are dealing with a budget resolution the rule of relevancy prevails and you have to direct your remarks directly to that budget resolution. But in view of the general circumstances here I suggested—and my suggestion has not yet been accepted by other parties—that we might waive that rule of relevancy on the first resolution and have a general discussion on economic matters.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that that has nothing to do with the presentation of a budget as it is understood in this house, and has been understood for 100 years; and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre cannot twist and distort the proper meaning of words by any such suggestion and attempt to mislead, as it appears to me he was doing, hon. members of this house. There was nothing in my statement dealing with a budget presentation.

Hon. L. B. Pearson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, surely on this point there is no reason why discussion should not take place with you in the chair, and a good many reasons why it should not take place unless you are in the chair. May we ask the government why they have not accepted the very reasonable suggestion we have made, that the discussion should take place with Mr. Speaker in the chair so that all the consequences which follow from that course may be taken?

Hon. Donald M. Fleming (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the course which the government proposes here is in accord with the practice of the house and well established authorities on the subject. First of all we have on the order paper item No. 27, "House again in committee of ways and means". Link that, sir, with standing order 58. In my submission the rule is crystal clear. The order provides:

> When an order of the day is called for the house to go into committee of ways and means, Mr. Speaker shall leave the chair without question put—