

been suggested, the two Houses may arrive at different conclusions, and there would be no means of having a conference. When the resolution is passed by the Senate, it cannot be taken up again; when it is passed by the House of Commons it cannot be taken up again. Two resolutions may clash in form or in intent; for instance, this House might vote against the resolution, or it might adopt a resolution which would be contrary to the Bill which would be introduced in the House of Commons. Surely we should avoid a danger of that kind, a danger which may not present itself on the present occasion, but which, if we adopt this precedent, may present itself on future occasions. I am satisfied that if the honourable leader of the Government reflects, he will see great objection to establishing a precedent of this kind, because it would not afford the two Houses an opportunity of coming to a united action in conference.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Is there anything in parliamentary practice to preclude either House from passing a resolution of its own motion?

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: No, of course not. When either branch of Parliament is acting independently, it may do so; but whenever we deal with a matter which is to be embodied in a Bill and to become law, it is the action of Parliament, and therefore there should be unity of action.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: May I ask another question? If there be a difference between the two Houses as to a resolution, what Parliamentary practice is there to enable both Houses to come together on the resolution? I know of none.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: Exactly; that is the argument I have offered. The leader of the House evidently did not follow the remarks I made. I pointed out that under the procedure he is suggesting possibly one branch of Parliament would adopt one resolution while the other branch would adopt a resolution on the same matter which would be in conflict with the very object in view. I say that whenever a matter is to be dealt with by Parliament, not by the Senate alone or by the House of Commons alone, it should be brought up in one House or the other and dealt with, and then passed on to the other House for consideration.

The honourable the leader of the Government will see the consequences that may follow this course of action. Suppose that this House should decide to reject the resolution, or to amend it in such way

that it would conflict with some provision of the treaty, that would not prevent the House of Commons from proceeding with a Bill ratifying the treaty and sending it to us. In what position would we then be? I think this is sufficient to show that the practice suggested should not be introduced.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Do you wish to go on with the resolution this afternoon?

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: Personally I should prefer not to go on this afternoon. I raised the point which has been under discussion so that my honourable friend might have an opportunity of considering it.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: If my honourable friend is not in a position to go on this afternoon, I certainly would insist upon going on to-morrow, because it is absolutely necessary that we should dispose of this subject. Parliament has been called especially for that purpose, and we are committed to give an expression of opinion as nearly as possible, as to whether or not Parliament is going to ratify the treaty before it. If my honourable friend desires to delay until to-morrow, I am prepared to let the matter stand.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: My honourable friend seems to think that this Chamber is ready to take up this discussion, and should be in a position either to-day or to-morrow or the day after to-morrow to express an opinion upon the document which was laid upon the table of the House only yesterday. I should have much preferred that he had followed the precedent of the Prime Minister in England, who introduced his Bill and made his statement, but only took up the second reading three weeks afterwards. My honourable friend surely does not believe that there is any one, except himself and perhaps some of his colleagues, who have been studying this Bill for a few weeks, who can express an intelligent opinion upon the Bill and discuss the objections that may be raised. As I said, on the 2nd of July last, Mr. Lloyd George introduced a Bill and made his statement, and the second reading was taken up on the 21st of July. All that time was given to the Commoners and the Lords to study the Treaty, examine into it, and see its consequences, so that they could express an opinion upon it or give an intelligent vote. Instead of proceeding by a Bill my honourable friend embodies the endorsement of the whole Treaty in a resolution, and asks us on the spur of the