

natively seized upon the Recommendation which had been received in respect to a bill which was before the House and has been withdrawn. The honourable Member apparently considered that the recommendation was still floating around. He seized upon it and decided to apply it to his own bill. The honourable Member realizes that he has to convince the Chair that His Excellency actually communicated with the honourable Member for Peace River, advising him that he supported his bill and was recommending it for the consideration of the House.

I have not been in touch with His Excellency to confirm this, but I would like the reassurance of the honourable Member that His Excellency has actually recommended this bill and not another bill which was before the House previously.

If there is no further discussion on the matter I am quite prepared to give a ruling at this time. I have given serious thought to the matter in that the honourable Member indicated a few days ago this bill would be introduced. As I said, I have given serious consideration to the procedural aspects of the honourable Member's proposed bill and I am prepared now to give my views on the situation.

I have to recognize that the argument proposed by the honourable Member for Peace River and the gallant support he has received from the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is interesting but, I suggest, nothing more. I cannot in any way agree with the honourable Member for Peace River. Again I say that he has to receive some kind of commendation from the Chair and those interested in procedure for the argument which he has submitted for the consideration of the Chair and all honourable Members, but I would not think honourable Members would expect the Chair to accept those arguments. They point again to the difficulty relating to Private Members' Bills. I fully appreciate this. I gather there have been discussions between representatives of the parties and that there is an intention to have the whole question of private Members' Public Bills referred to the Committee on Procedure and Organization. This would include the bill of the honourable Member for Peace River, apart from this one, which is on the Order Paper and which will bring the whole matter to the fore. It will then be possible for the Committee on Procedure and Organization to make recommendations to the House in respect of the handling of Public Bills introduced by Private Members.

The difficulty of course is that no honourable Member, including a member of the Cabinet, can introduce a Public Bill which implies the expenditure of public funds without a recommendation of His Excellency. This applies not only to Private Members but to members of the government. They cannot introduce such a bill without the recommendation of His Excellency.

In the case of the Auditor General's bill such a recommendation was required. The bill was introduced to the House with the recommendation. It is of course a very novel approach to say that that bill having been

withdrawn the recommendation is still available for anyone who desires to introduce a bill which might be called the same thing but which provides for something different. The honourable Member I am sure would be the first to admit that his bill is not on all fours with the one which was presented by the government. Having admitted that himself, at this moment he has put himself out of court because it is a different bill. His Excellency recommended a bill which was different. He looked at that bill and said to us, "I have seen the bill and recommend it to the House", and it is that bill he recommended. That bill having been withdrawn I do not think it is necessary for His Excellency to communicate with us and ask us to return the recommendation.

The honourable Member cannot deal with a bill once it has been withdrawn. There is no recommendation for the honourable Member to seize upon and attach somewhat artificially to his own bill. This having been said I would say I cannot accept the honourable Member's suggestion and I have to tell him that his bill cannot be read a first time at this time or at any time.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Benson, seconded by Mr. MacEachen,—That this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the Government.

And debate continuing;

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West), seconded by Mr. Monteith, moved in amendment thereto,—That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after "That" and substituting therefor:

"this House deplores the abysmal failure of the government to make any budgetary proposals to effectively stimulate the Canadian economy with a view to an early substantial reduction of high winter unemployment and to alleviate the economic plight of pensioners and other Canadians in receipt of incomes below the poverty level, as described by the Economic Council of Canada."

And debate arising thereon;

Mr. Saltsman, seconded by Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), moved in amendment to the said proposed amendment:

That the amendment be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

"and this House deplores in particular the failure of the Government to alleviate the plight of those in receipt of inadequate incomes by providing that no income tax shall be paid by single persons earning \$2,000 a year or less, or by married persons earning \$4,000 a year or less, and also by providing tax relief for those in the middle income brackets."

And debate arising thereon;