

Points of Order

The Speaker: No, their shoes too.

Because I want to applaud them as you will, I ask you please not to applaud until I call them by name. I want them to stand and remain standing. When they are all standing we want to give them the kind of recognition they deserve for the great service they have done for our nation.

I call on Mr. Andy Bathgate, Mr. Jean Béliveau, Mr. Paul Henderson, Mr. Gordie Howe, Mr. Red Kelly, Mr. Ted Lindsay, Mr. Frank Mahovlich, Mr. Howie Meeker, Mr. Pierre Pilote, Mr. Henri Richard.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

• (1505)

The Speaker: My colleagues, in your name I have invited our guests to be in the reading room. I invite you to a small reception where you may meet them. I know you will want their autographs and will want to take pictures. That will be in the reading room after question period.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

TABLING OF DOCUMENT

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this arises out of question period. I would like to table, for the House's information and for the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, the transcript of the actual meeting and the actual remarks made in that meeting by the Hon. Ty Lund, Minister of the Environment for Alberta.

The Speaker: The tabling of any document demands the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Miss Grey: Mr. Speaker, I just thought that if an actual document was quoted from in question period I was duty bound to table it, which was what I was trying to do.

The Speaker: That is not the case.

BILL S-9

Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order relating to a finance committee meeting I attended yesterday, an excellent committee, as I am reminded. This committee dealt with Bill S-9, a Senate bill referred to the committee and on which we heard evidence.

During the evidence in the committee meeting it became clear that the bill imposes expenditures on the Government of Cana-

da. The amount of money involved per year, as was pointed out in the committee and which evidence I could lay before you, Mr. Speaker, involves perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars. It was part of budgetary provisions dating back to 1992, budget papers from 1992 and 1993. A provision of the bill also is retroactive to November 10, 1988, which requires an expenditure of public funds.

Mr. Speaker, I refer you to two decisions made in this Chamber and contained in the books of Speaker Lamoureux, which are truly the decisions that mark the difference between the powers of the Commons and the powers of the Senate. I do not have the decisions of Justice Lamoureux before me, but one of them is on page 174 and the other 175.

The decision on page 174 was made on November 12, 1969 when the Senate approved a bill for the dissolution of the Dominion Coal Corporation at that time. An MP by the name of Baldwin stood in the Chamber and objected that this involved an expenditure of public funds.

The Speaker at the time set aside a period in which he heard arguments as to whether it was an expenditure of public funds. After listening to the arguments he said no, this bill must come in as per Standing Order 62 at that time, which is Standing Order 79(1) today, which is that royal recommendation is required for any expenditure of public money.

The second decision was made on June 12, 1972, again by Speaker Lamoureux. It was the same instance where a government bill came through the Senate. An objection was launched at that time that although the bill did not involve an immediate expenditure of public funds, it committed the government to an expenditure in the future.

• (1510)

The ruling at that time was that yes, according to Standing Order 63, presently Standing Order 80(1) under Beauchesne's sixth edition, if a bill involves an expenditure of money then it cannot be brought in through the Senate.

My objection is according to Standing order 79(1), which says quite clearly that it is the crown that demands, the Commons that grants and the Senate that accedes to that grant, it is the prerogative of the House of Commons, not the Senate, and it must be done with royal recommendation by the executive, by the crown. It cannot be done through the Senate. Standing Order 80(1) states quite clearly that the Senate's only role is to accede to such a request. It cannot even amend such a request.

The evidence is quite clear that on the one hand the expenditure of public money involved is that it reduces by 50 per cent the tax on any profits made by U.S. multinationals in Canada. That is the expenditure, approximately \$130 million to \$135 million per year. This is supported, incidentally, by the Reform Party and the Bloc wholeheartedly.