

third reading after the committee stage, but when it went to the House of Commons the blank was filled in and the clause was restored. Again the bill was returned to the Lords and they accepted the amendment.

Honourable senators, the procedure which I have outlined so far reflects one side of the coin; but the House of Lords has also at times adopted a procedure which reflects the other side of the coin. I have here a copy of the bill passed in 1966 by the British Parliament, called the Commonwealth Secretariat Bill. This was introduced in the House of Lords. The bill dealt with the establishment of a Commonwealth Secretariat, and followed a decision which was made at the meeting of the prime ministers just prior to the time the bill was introduced in the British Parliament. It made the Secretariat a body corporate, it conferred certain privileges on the Secretariat and its staff, and it provided that the bill should have retrospective effect to July 1, 1965.

As honourable senators know, the head of the Secretariat is Mr. Arnold Smith, who was a former public servant in Canada.

While in the bill there is no reference, even incidental, to a monetary aspect, it is quite clear, of course, that the establishment of the Secretariat would involve the expenditure of money, which would have to be provided for in the Estimates.

Recognizing the Lords' incapacity to deal with a matter which would make a charge upon the Treasury, and indeed, too, as a gesture of recognition of this limitation, the Lords inserted subsection (3) of section 2, as follows:

Nothing in this Act shall impose any charge on the people or on public funds, or vary the amount of incidence or otherwise alter any such charge in any manner, or affect the assessment, levying, administration or application of any money raised by any such Charge.

It is quite clear that, despite the wording of the inserted subsection, a charge would be imposed on the people or on public funds. Nonetheless, the addition was made and the reason for the addition was clear, even though with it the bill would be ineffective to carry out the purposes for which it was intended.

When the bill reached the House of Commons, this clause was struck out. The bill as amended was returned to the Lords and they concurred.

In the short memorandum that I received from Mr. Gordon, he says this:

The methods by which financial provisions are inserted in Bills originating in the Lords (described on pp. 506 and 555 of the 17th Edition of Erskine May) are governed entirely by practice and are not referred to in the Standing Orders of either House.

Although no Money Bill (in the technical sense) can originate in the Lords, Bills from that House containing financial provisions are not uncommon. In the last complete Session of normal length (1964-65), thirty Bills were sent down from the Lords to the Commons. Of these, fourteen were Consolidation Bills, which of their very nature imposed no charge. Of the remaining sixteen, ten contained no financial provisions; five contained a "privilege insertion" later struck out by the Commons (May, p. 506); and the remaining one had a provision left blank for the Commons to fill.

Honourable senators, I conclude only by saying this, that the bill before us now, to amend the Canada Lands Surveys Act, has some minor incidental monetary provisions. It is not a contentious bill and can be considered as being more in the nature of a housekeeping bill. I have taken advantage of its introduction here this evening to point out the possibilities of the Senate getting more such bills, more work, more such legislation, even though there may be monetary clauses in them which otherwise might make it desirable that they be initiated in the other place.

I hope honourable senators will express their opinions about this matter when we reach the second reading stage of this bill; and I hope that some of these proposals will commend themselves to their approval.

**Hon. Jacques Flynn:** Honourable senators, may I put a question to the honourable Leader of the Government. I am very much interested in the suggestions he has made whereby this house may deal with bills having money implications. I wonder if the honourable leader would suggest any device whereby this house could amend some money clauses in bills introduced in the other place.

As the honourable leader knows, it has been ruled out of order for us to amend a money clause if it imposes a burden on the Treasury. Perhaps there could be a device along the lines of that which he has suggested, whereby we could do this. It might help the other place in some circumstances.