

World Exhibition Corporation Act

Corporation of the United States, the parent company, one might say, which is associated with Good News Broadcasting in Canada—I am not convinced that we are actually dealing here with an association. Rather, I believe we are dealing with a proprietorship of one or several individuals; that the so-called Canadian association is not truly an association but, in fact, an extension of a United States franchise.

I might point out that no evidence was brought before the committee to show, for example, that those associated with Good News Broadcasting in Canada are in any way an association with an elected body—elected members with a congregation, for instance, as a church might have a congregation.

Some hon. Members: Six o'clock.

Mr. Aiken: In view of the fact that some 45 minutes of the private members' hour were spent discussing other matters I wonder whether the Chair would permit the hon. member to complete his remarks, in which case we might get this bill through.

Mr. Deachman: I think it was understood on both sides of the house that time usually taken up by private members' business would be shortened for the purpose of dealing with the legislation which preceded these items. I see it is six o'clock.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

CANADIAN WORLD EXHIBITION CORPORATION ACT**AMENDMENTS RESPECTING SITE, NUMBER OF DIRECTORS, ETC.**

The house resumed from Monday, December 9, consideration of the motion of Mr. Deschatelets (for the Prime Minister) for the second reading of Bill No. C-120, to amend the Canadian World Exhibition Corporation Act.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Last evening when the motion for second reading of this bill was proposed, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) raised a point of order to the effect that since this bill contained money provisions it should have been initiated by means of a resolution based upon the recommendation of the Governor General. During the course of the discussion reference was made to a number of citations

in Beauchesne's fourth edition and also to section 54 of the British North America Act.

I do not intend to discuss the merits of these citations except to say that, meanwhile, I have had an opportunity not only of reviewing these citations but also examining the provisions of the bill. It seems to me that there is at least one money provision in this bill. Section 3 of the bill seeks to increase the number of directors from 12 to 14. Section 5, subsection 2 of the original statute, provides for payment by the corporation to the directors of reasonable travel and living expenses. The financial provisions of the original bill were as follows:

The Minister of Finance, at the request of the corporation, may, out of the consolidated revenue fund, pay to the corporation by way of grant such amounts as are required for the conduct of the business of the corporation but the aggregate of all amounts paid to the corporation under this section shall not exceed \$20 million.

It is obvious that the increase in the number of directors, requiring additional expenditures out of public funds for the payment of the additional directors' travelling and living expenses will not affect the total sum of \$20 million authorized by existing legislation. However, the new act will change the conditions attached to the spending of these moneys by the original act, and to this extent the bill now before the house would appear to be a money bill.

I have, of course, given serious thought to the arguments advanced briefly by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Deschatelets) to the effect that the proposed legislation does not require to be preceded by a resolution because there is existing legislation authorizing the total capital fund out of which will be paid the additional expenditures contemplated by the amending bill. May's sixteenth edition, at page 754, has the following comments which would perhaps fortify the minister in his views:

The question often arises whether a proposal for expenditure or for increased expenditure is not already covered by some general authorization. The test for determining this question in the case of a substantive proposal, that is, a provision in a bill, as introduced, is a comparison with existing law. The comparison of provisions in a bill with the law on the subject, as it exists, may show that, while such provisions undoubtedly involve expenditure, the power to incur such expenditure is covered by general powers conferred by statute.

Many examples of expenditure which, as being covered by pre-existing legal powers, is not treated as a charge are given on page 761. This standard of reference is readily applicable in the case of the large and increasing number of bills which are, in terms, amendments of previous statutes on the same subject. But in other cases considerable research is necessary to determine whether a