

tions to the government. If we are to allow committees to consider questions involving expenditures without a special reference adopted by the House, we shall open the door to what I consider an abuse of parliamentary procedure. The cabinet cannot divest itself of the duty to manage the affairs of the country and it must bear the responsibility of submitting to the House any request for public moneys which may be needed. True, May, Twelfth Edition, page 437-8 says:

Select committees are able to consider and to report to the House resolutions recommending an outlay of public money for the purposes therein specified, without the previous signification of the royal recommendation (see p. 457), because such a resolution is classed among those abstract resolutions by the house in favour of public expenditure, which are in the nature of suggestions, and are not in themselves binding upon the action of the House.

The precedents quoted in support of this contention go to show that in England a committee is only empowered to recommend an expenditure when it has received a special reference instructing it to examine the advisability of voting a stated amount. In one of the cases cited, the committee was instructed to consider and report whether any and what redress should be afforded to William Henry Barber who had a certain claim against the government. The other instance is that of a committee having been appointed to inquire and report upon a petition of Lord Cochrane praying Her Majesty to complete the gracious act of royal justice which restored the pension of the late Lord Dundonald. It is evident that in such cases a recommendation to spend money had to be made.

In the present instance the reference to the special committee on Pensions was not instructed by the House to look into any expenditures. The most it could do would be to recommend to the consideration of the House that certain measures might be taken, and upon concurrence of that report, it would be for the government to submit money resolutions with the recommendation of the Crown.

I think it is against the spirit of British parliamentary procedure that the House should be called upon to pronounce itself on any charge upon the people before measures covering the same are brought down by a minister in due course. Such a practice would be tantamount to taking a circuitous way to bind the House without giving it the proper guarantees. I therefore rule that the report of the special committee respecting Pensions and Soldiers' Civil Re-establishments is out of

order and cannot be adopted in its present form.

WAYS AND MEANS

SUPPLY BILL

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (for the Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee of Ways and Means.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1925, the sum of \$170,064,353.08 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported and concurred in. Mr. Mackenzie King thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 266 for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1925.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times, considered in committee and reported.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the patience of the House—and I know I am asking a good deal—for a few moments. It is only after due consideration of the importance of the step which I am now taking that I am speaking at this time for the purpose of moving an amendment to the third reading of this bill. I do so because I am informed by those who know, that this is the proper procedure to take in order to achieve my purpose. I regret to state that, in my opinion—it is my opinion and I speak for myself alone—that a grievous action of, perhaps, I may say, error, on the part of this government has been committed in the voting of the people's money, money which is in our trust, for the purpose of sending people to the Wembley exhibition on a formal joy ride. I protested at the time this vote was under consideration and those around me protested with me. Our voices were at the moment apparently unable to resist the inclination of the government to take this step. I move:

That this bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with power to amend it by reducing item No. 62 by the sum of \$20,000.