

originate in committee of the whole House. When the resolutions have been reported and agreed to by the House, a bill is ordered thereon, or upon some only of the resolutions."

This, therefore, is an order for leave. When we introduce a bill on which charges on the exchequer are not involved we merely put the motion in these terms, "Has the honourable Member leave to introduce the said bill", and then that being agreed we move first reading. When it comes to a money bill we must go through the requirements of some of our standing orders, both those regarding 48 hours' notice and those relating to Standing Order 61 which says that instead of proceeding with it immediately we must appoint another day for taking it into consideration and then the day having arrived we must commit that Resolution to Committee of the Whole.

I have made the point that a Resolution is a proposed Resolution until it has been reported from the committee and adopted by the House. I would refer honourable Members to citation No. 491 of Beauchesne's third edition which is clear on that point:

"If a resolution is amended in the committee of the whole, supply or ways and means, the chairman does not report it "with amendments", because it had not been discussed in the house, when the Speaker was in the chair, prior to being referred to the committee. The resolution is not considered by the house in the same way as a bill which, under standing order 75, is read twice before committal. The terms of the resolution are submitted for the consideration of the house for the first time when the resolution is reported from committee. As the house up to that moment has not considered the merits of the resolution, the committee's amendments do not change anything that has been done by the house and no matter how much the resolution has been altered by the committee, it is reported with all its alterations but without the mention of amendments."

The honourable Member has said that before proceeding with this one—proceeding meaning one that is entered in the *Journals* of the House, so the minute we make a move it is 'proceeding'—it should have been amended. If one reads the new Resolution one realizes there is a difficulty there. The minister himself could not have amended the Resolution in Committee of the Whole. He required a new royal recommendation for the additional amount of expenditures which are contemplated in the additional part of the Resolution. He could not have amended. One cannot amend because of the financial initiative of the Crown. One cannot amend the Resolution which will extend the expenditures which have already been covered by the royal recommendation and therefore a new recommendation would have been necessary in any case for that additional part which is given in the new Resolution.

Now, the point at issue between the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and myself and the honourable Member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) and myself is this. Must the order of the House which is "House again in Committee of the Whole on proposed Resolution No. 12"—must that order be discharged before consideration is undertaken on the new proposed Resolution, No. 16?

The Honourable Member is contending that unless No. 12 is removed from the Order Paper we cannot commit No. 16 and go into Committee of the Whole on No. 16. That is the point at issue at the moment. The honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre has cited several instances where precisely that was done. I have not had the opportunity of studying all the instances which the honourable Member has quoted. The one pertaining to the Resolution involving an increase of indemnity which Mr. King proposed is one reference which I looked at in the *Journals* but I had not read the details of the presentation in debate which Mr. King had made very