

The consideration of how the rule limiting the powers of the House of Lords in the United Kingdom came to be adopted affords an additional argument in support of the view suggested by the text of the British North America Act.

In the early days there was a conflict between the British House of Commons and the House of Lords on this question of the powers of the House of Lords in respect of Money Bills.

In 1678 the Commons resolved:

“That all aids and supplies and aids to His Majesty in Parliament are the sole gift of the Commons and that all Bills for the granting of any such aids and supplies ought to begin with the Commons and that it is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit and appoint in such Bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of such grants which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords.”

In 1693 the Lords resolved:

“That the making of amendments and abatements of rates of Bills of Supply sent up from the House of Commons is a fundamental, inherent and undoubted right of the House of Peers from which their Lordships can never depart.”

It is true that the Lords did not act in accordance with this resolution and tacitly submitted to the claim of the Commons, obviously to avoid a conflict with the latter House, but this practice was not the law, and this appears from the preamble of the House of Commons resolution of 1910 which announced the proposed legislation curtailing the powers of the Lords. (May's Parliamentary Practice, 12th edition, p. 518.)

It is remarkable that of the two restrictions on the rights of the Lords which the Commons by its resolution of 1678 tried to impose, namely: the denial of the right to originate and the denial of the right to amend Money Bills, the British North America Act while mentioning the first in section 53 should not mention the second against which the Lords had specially protested.

If it had been the intention of the British Parliament to impose the two restrictions on the Senate it surely would have mentioned them both or if content to rely on the preamble as incorporating the whole British constitution, it would have mentioned neither.

To those reasons might be added this further consideration that there is very little analogy between the Lords and the Senate. The Lords represent themselves, the Senate represents the Provinces. The Lords are not in an independent position as the House of Commons can use its influence over the Crown and induce it to add as many members as are needed to the House of Lords to obtain a favourable majority.

It is probably for that reason that section 18 of the British North America Act when dealing with the privileges, immunities and powers of the Senate refers as the maximum for such privileges, immunities and powers to those held, enjoyed and exercised by the Imperial House of Commons (and not by the House of Lords) at the passing of the Act.

Under the circumstances, we are of the opinion that the Senate of Canada may amend a Money Bill originating in the House of Commons as fully as the House of Commons can do. Of course the powers of the Senate are limited to the same extent as those of the House of Commons by the fact that Money Bills must be recommended by a message of the Governor General.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) E. LAFLEUR
AIME GEOFFRION