

At page 487 of the same authority, it is also stated:

'A certain class of bills, the main object of which is the expenditure of money or the imposition of taxation, must, in accordance with the requirements of the standing orders regarding charges on the people, originate in committee of the whole house.'

Beauchesne's 3rd Edition, citation 433, in part, reads as follows:

'All bills providing for the payment of salaries or for any expenditure whatever out of the public funds of the dominion must be first considered as resolutions in committee of the whole. . .'

Consequently, in my opinion, a money resolution is subject to the principle which permits the presentation of two or more bills relating to the same object, provided that when a decision is rendered upon one proposal, the other measure cannot be proceeded with.

In the 15th Edition of May at page 499, it is stated:

'There is no rule or custom which restrains the presentation of two or more bills relating to the same subject, and containing similar provisions. But if a decision of the House has already been taken on one such bill, for example, if the bill has been given or refused a second reading, the other is not proceeded with if it contains substantially the same provisions. . . .'

Bourinot at page 548 of his 4th Edition states:

'Whilst a bill is still pending, and until it is completely disposed of, there is nothing whatever to prevent another bill for the same object being introduced . . . No objection can be raised to the introduction of a bill into the House of Commons on the ground of there being a similar bill already before the House.

It is the rejection and not the pendency of a bill that creates a difficulty as to the ulterior proceedings. . . .'

In view of the foregoing, it is my duty to recommend that the notice of the proposed new resolution be printed as a government notice of motion on Thursday's order paper.

Respectfully submitted,

LÉON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House."

And Debate arising on the point of Order;

MR. SPEAKER: I want to say now that I greatly appreciate the careful preparation of the case which has been made by the honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). I think he has proved one point indubitably by quoting at length what Mr. King had done in 1945 because at that time Mr. King was asking the House to proceed with another resolution when there was one on the Order Paper. Such is the case today. At that time another one was on its way. This illustrates the point that was stressed by the memorandum given to me by the Clerk that there was no obstacle to the presentation of the resolution. No one objected when it appeared on the Order Paper. No one objected to having the two resolutions come up and therefore the point was made in the memorandum prepared by the Clerk that there should be no objection to the presentation of two resolutions on the same subject.