

brought before a committee before it could be introduced in the House of Commons.

I ask Your Honour to cast your mind back. Every tax bill had to be introduced in the committee of Ways and Means. Every bill for appropriating money from the Consolidated Revenue Fund had to be introduced in committee of supply, every government money bill which had a royal recommendation attached—and I am using the words “money bill” loosely—and every bill which imposed a charge on the Consolidated Revenue Fund but did not grant money out of it, such as the unemployment insurance bill when it was originally introduced, came first through a resolution in committee of the whole.

We have abolished committees of the whole; we have abolished committee of supply; and we have abolished committee of Ways and Means. Before every money bill is introduced—except now under the new procedure, but certainly in Ways and Means and supply—there is a resolution of the House adopted and there is no leave sought in the House to introduce. The bill originates in the House because it comes to the House by a different route. It comes through a committee and then to the House.

That was the standard procedure when the British North America Act was drafted. What we have here is a situation where the framers of the act said that bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue or for imposing a tax shall originate in the House of Commons. It did not say they shall be introduced in. It said: “They shall originate”.

Mr. Speaker: I am listening carefully to the hon. member. I know he would not want to extend his argument more than a moment or two longer.

However, as I understood the hon. minister the other day, basically he is saying that this bill, which admittedly was an amendment to an existing bill—and I do not ask the hon. member to get into an argument about that—cut the funding from the Treasury of Canada to the unemployment insurance fund. In other words, it made the fund self-funding as a consequence of charges, not on the Treasury any more, but charges directly against the employer and the employee.

Point of Order

As I understand the basic thrust of the Senate’s response, it was at least in part to put back a responsibility of the Treasury as a guarantor or a partial funding of that fund.

I am taking no position in the argument. It seems to me that this is the nub of it. Is the Senate in this case trying to go beyond the bill, which admittedly was an amendment, and on its own come back here with the suggestion that we should put in place a charge which this House took away?

I know the hon. member will realize that in the interests of other business in this House we cannot continue this too long, but I put that point.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, if we go back to my argument before, if a bill is introduced in this House to reduce Mr. Jones’ salary from \$50,000 to \$25,000, the charge has been reduced. I am suggesting to Your Honour that a private member, I or any member of the opposition, or any back-bench member of the government, could move an amendment to that bill to increase the amount to \$40,000. As long as it was within the original amount, then it could be increased.

What I am saying in this case, Your Honour, is that in each of the amendments to which the government House leader objects, the other place has provided for amendments that will increase the amount to something less than they were before, but not more than they were before.

Mr. Speaker: I understand the hon. member. I know that he understands the issue here, and so does the Chair.

The question is: Is the Senate in a position where it is increasing a charge that this House has taken away, whether or not the bill to which the amendment applies would allow it? There may be precedents on that exact point and, if there are, I would certainly like to know where they are.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, this House cannot take away charges on the public revenue of its own. Charges on the public revenue are taken away not just by this House, but by Parliament. It requires three steps before charges can be taken away from the public revenue.

• (1550)

Mr. Speaker: I am completely with the hon. member on that. This House, though, initiates a bill to take away