

move adjustments to a money bill? Citation 263 reads:

(2) The principle that the sanction of the Crown must be given to every grant of money drawn from the public revenue, applies equally to the taxation levied to provide that revenue.

Citation 265 says:

(1) No member other than a minister of the Crown may introduce a bill for the reduction of duties.

Of course the underlying principle is contained in citation 249 which reads:

(1) No cases can be found of any private member in the Canadian Commons receiving the authority of the Crown, through a minister, to propose a motion involving the expenditure of public money.

I submit there is authority showing that no amendment involving public expenditure can be moved by anybody but a minister of the crown. Even then the proposal must be preceded by a money resolution.

Turning to citation 270 of Beauchesne we find these words:

(1) A private member may move that certain specified taxes be readjusted—

Mr. Monteith: Hear, hear.

Mr. Olson: The citation goes on to say:

—and that the scope of tax exemptions be enlarged.

What must be decided, Mr. Speaker, is whether there will in fact be an additional expenditure involving the public treasury which was not provided for in the resolution. I say that because if the money collected under Bill C-268 is to be transferred in some way other than provided for in the resolution preceding the bill, the amendment is out of order. On the other hand, if there is to be no additional charge on the public treasury it is difficult to see why the amendment would upset the balance of ways and means. Upsetting the balance of ways and means would be the reason advanced by the Solicitor General.

Citation 278, the fourth paragraph, reads,

(4) The committee is not bound by the terms of the provisions which the ministers have inserted in the bill—

The bill does not say where this money is to be put. The money is to be found and the tax is to be an additional charge on the taxpayers of Canada. It is to be paid into the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Mr. Sharp: That is the point.

Excise Tax Act and Old Age Security Act

Mr. Olson: Certainly, that is one of the points. Citation 270 says:

A private member may move that certain specified taxes be readjusted—

I take it that that means that the matter may be readjusted without upsetting the balance of ways and means. Referring again to citation 278, paragraph 4, we find these words:

(4) The committee is not bound by the terms of the provisions which the ministers have inserted in the Bill—

I suggest to Your Honour that if you invoke this citation—the authority for it is not given—and if the committee is not bound by the terms of the provision in the bill, the amendment does not change the balance of ways and means. It does not change what was encompassed in the resolution preceding the bill. Therefore the amendment ought to be in order.

The last part of citation 278 reads as follows:

—whatever may be the cost resulting therefrom, so long as the power conferred by the royal recommendation is not exceeded.

I submit that there is authority supporting the hon. member for Grey-Bruce in his attempt to adjust the allocation of certain taxes, so long as the hon. member's amendment does not involve changing the amount of the taxes. I should add, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment ought not to increase taxes, but many citations show that a private member has competence to move motions to reduce taxes. The hon. member's amendment does not attempt to increase taxes. It simply seeks to restrict these taxes to a specified purpose.

The bill does not specify where the money is to go, and that troubles me. One must assume that the money raised through the bill is to go into the consolidated revenue fund. Relying on citation 270, I think there is authority to support acceptance of the hon. member's amendment.

Mr. Winkler: Would the hon. member permit a question which is germane to the final part of his presentation? The Minister of Finance told the house that he is collecting money for the old age supplement. Because the money collected often exceeds the forecast of need, would it not follow as a matter of common sense that the honest and correct thing to do would be to pay the money into an old age supplement account? The minister already has the old age security fund. The budget was introduced to raise money for the