

required that there be a resolution preceding a money bill. We decided that that is no longer the case, but it is still true that this House of Commons cannot pass a bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue that has not first been recommended to this House by message of the Governor General in the current session. That means that a bill to appropriate money, if we are going to vote for it, has to be one presented in the House with the recommendation of the Governor General. If, on the contrary, we proceed to vote on and pass Bill S-3, which comes to us from the other place without that message to the House, then I submit we are violating section 54 of the BNA Act.

Let me turn also to some of our Standing Orders. Standing Order 62 (1) reads:

This House shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to the House by a message from the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.

That is obviously taken from the BNA Act.

Standing Order 62 (2) reads:

The message and recommendation of the Governor General in relation to any bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue or of any tax or impost shall be printed on the Notice Paper and in the *Votes and Proceedings* when any such measure is to be introduced and the text of such recommendation shall be printed with or annexed to every such bill.

None of these procedures has been followed because this bill has not originated in this House but rather has come from the other place.

Paragraph (3) does not really matter, so I shall skip it. I will come shortly to a more important one.

Standing Order 63 reads:

All aids and supplies granted to Her Majesty by the Parliament of Canada are the sole gift of the House of Commons, and all bills for granting such aids and supplies ought to begin with the House, as it is the undoubted right of the House to direct, limit, and appoint in all such bills, the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations and qualifications of such grants, which are not alterable by the Senate.

● (3:10 p.m.)

The last phrase relates to another problem, and I will have something to say about that in a moment. But please note, Mr. Speaker, that by the granting of money to Her Majesty, and that is what this bill does in the offending clause, the government is provided with certain money which, but for this bill, would not be there because but for this bill that money

Dominion Coal Board Dissolution Act

would lapse. But we have the sole right of originating a bill for such money, and we have the sole and undoubted right to "direct, limit, and appoint in all such bills, the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions" and so on. This is our sole and undoubted right, but in this case the decision is already made and given to us in a bill from the other place.

I must be careful, Mr. Speaker. I must not get worked up into expressing my feelings for the institution we call the other place. That is another issue, and it will come up in a private member's bill in a few days. But here, I am talking to those who accept the existence of the Senate, for a while yet at any rate, and I suggest that as long as it does remain we should follow the constitution. Standing Order 63 is as clear as it could possibly be, that the decisions as to how moneys are to be spent, what limitations, conditions and qualifications are to be attached to such grants, are the sole prerogative of the House of Commons. They are not even alterable by Their Honours in the other place. In this case, not only are they beyond that right but they are going to the point of telling this House, in the first place, how those grants shall be used.

While I am dealing with Standing Orders, may I draw Your Honour's attention to Standing Order 64, which I think we should take very seriously as a House, even if Your Honour were to rule that the bill is in order. I hope the bill is not in order, but if you do rule that it is a decision for the House to make rather than the Chair, I hope the House will carry out the provisions of Standing Order 64 and refuse to receive it. Please note what Standing Order 64 says:

In order to expedite the business of Parliament, the House will not insist on the privilege claimed and exercised by them of laying aside bills sent from the Senate because they impose pecuniary penalties nor of laying aside amendments made by the Senate because they introduce into or alter pecuniary penalties in bills sent to them by this House; provided that all such penalties thereby imposed are only to punish or prevent crimes and offences, and do not tend to lay a burden on the subject, either as aid or supply to Her Majesty, or for any general or special purposes, by rates, tolls, assessments or otherwise.

If I understand the language of that Standing Order, it is quite clear. It says that, as a general rule, we in this House of Commons have the complete say over money matters, and if the Senate were to send us a money bill we would refuse it. However, it says that if the Senate sends us a bill, or amends a bill of ours, in a money respect, and that bill or