

Parliament's attention to this unusual procedure. But if the procedure was legal and merely unusual it was not necessary to put the clause in the bill. Did it make it more unusual to insert in the bill authorization for something that has been done legally? Did they want to make the procedure more unusual than it even was?

The clause to which the honourable senator referred was either good or not good. I do not think we in this house should be asked to confirm something that had been done legally, confirm it by a statute, because once the bill is passed it becomes a statute of Parliament. It was a most unusual proceeding. I agree with the Leader of the Government that the payment in the first place was unusual, and I think he will agree with me that the procedure of inserting authorization for it in a bill and making it part of a statute of Canada was very unusual.

Now, honourable senators, I come to the bill which is before us. Let me say first that I am a little disappointed in it. It may be recalled that I complimented the Government on the form of the previous supply bill, which was passed here on May 15. In that bill the Government presented the expenditures very concisely in one clause of 27 lines, and anyone looking at that one clause got a clear idea of what the expenditures were. I complimented the Government upon presenting such an excellent bill. But what do I find today? Apparently the Government does not appreciate compliments from the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate. I suppose if I had not said anything about it this bill would have come to us in the very excellent form of the previous bill. But the Government has reverted to the habit of setting forth the payments in separate clauses, so that the information given by one clause in the previous bill is now spread out in seven clauses which take up a part of three pages of the bill before us. Well, I again compliment the Government upon what it did in the first instance.

Hon. Mr. Bruni: Why not criticize it? Then it might change back to the previous form.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: As the honourable senator says, if I criticize the Government it might change back. But I am not quite as inconsistent as that, and I do hope it will revert to the previous form.

Hon. Mr. Aseltine: Would the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition allow me to interject? I completely overlooked the compliment which he expressed when speaking on the previous bill, but after hearing him today I will see to it at once that his remarks are drawn to the attention of the minister.

I have an opinion along the same line as my honourable friend's remarks and at least partially agree with them.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Don't they ever read the Senate Hansard?

Hon. Mr. Brunt: They haven't the time.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Honourable senators, this is a usual interim supply bill. Of course a supply bill is far from a routine or formal measure: it is one of the most important bills that come before this house. The present bill seeks approval of the expenditure of a very large sum of money, in the amount of \$624,592,837.43. It is not the amount that I am referring to at the present time, however, but the responsibility we take in passing bills of this kind. If this bill were not passed by Parliament the Government would have no money to spend, notwithstanding section 31(5) of the Financial Administration Act on which the Government relied between March 31 and May 13. Therefore, we should not pass this measure just as a mere formality. Of course the Government must have money to carry on the business of the country, and we are not opposed to giving it money for that purpose. But I would remind the Government that it receives this money only because Parliament votes it, and the Government cannot spend it as a matter of right. In fact, in my opinion, the only time when the Government has a right to spend money which has not been voted by Parliament is under the unusual circumstances of a period between dissolution and a general election, when money may be obtained by Governor General's warrants, and I do not think that expediency should be taken advantage of until it is absolutely necessary.

The Senate, as one of the houses of Parliament, is now being asked to give the Government money enough to carry on the business of the country for the next two months. But if honourable senators will note the title of this bill they will see that it reads:

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1959.

Through this bill we are asked to grant to Her Majesty the sum of more than \$624 million, and if I read correctly the statements which have appeared in the newspapers we do not have this money—that is, unless the Government borrows it. We are now proposing magnanimously to grant this huge sum which can only be obtained through loans. Why do I say that? I find that in April last the Government did not have enough money to carry on the business of the country by \$10,700,000, not including the