

I could go on reading the rest of the commentary but the point of the reference, Mr. Speaker, is to stress the authority of the House of Commons. That authority is asserted every time this House attends in the other place for the purpose of giving the Royal Assent to a money Bill. You, Mr. Speaker, on every occasion, when we attend there and Royal Assent is sought to a money Bill ask for that Royal Assent personally in these words. Perhaps I could quote Your Honour:

May it Please Your Honour:

The Commons of Canada have voted Supplies required to enable the Government to defray certain expenses of the Public Service.

"In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Honour the following Bill—

Then you give the title of the Bill.

—to which Bills I humbly request Your Honour's assent

Those words, Mr. Speaker, have been used since Confederation in the granting of Royal Assent to money Bills in this Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, what is the position that we find ourselves in today that has caused this problem? I refer again to Beauchesne's, page 167, Citation 476. The author here is discussing the Business of Supply. He says:

The action taken by the House of Commons upon the request for aids and supply for the Public Service made in the Speech from the Throne, is for the appointment, pursuant to—

Now Standing Order 81(1)

—of a continuing Order of the Day for the consideration of the Business of Supply.

What has happened in this particular case? I suggest that in every Speech from the Throne since Confederation, except for three, the speech has contained particular words, and those words have occurred at the end—or very close to the end—of every speech. I will read the words because they are instructive. The Governor General or the Sovereign always reads these. The words are as follows:

Members of the House of Commons, you will be asked to appropriate the funds required for the services and payments authorized by Parliament.

The three Speeches from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, in which those words have not occurred are the following: First fall of 1930, which was a special session called by the then Prime Minister Bennett, to raise duties and excise taxes in Canada to protect us from the ravages of the Depression. The second was on December 12, 1988, when we were called to deal with one item of business,

the Free Trade Agreement. And the third was on Monday, April 3, 1989, Mr. Speaker. There was no request in the Throne Speech on Monday that this House take on its constitutional responsibilities to deal with supply.

Mr. Speaker, it is unprecedented. Upon our return from the other place, following our attendance there for the Speech from the Throne, as recorded on page 5 of *Hansard*, the President of the Treasury Board, pursuant to Standing Order 81, moved: "That the House at its next sitting consider the Business of Supply." And that motion was agreed to on Monday of this week, Sir. Why did we move to consider the Business of Supply when no supply had been requested from Her Excellency, the Governor General, at the opening of the session? It was not on the agenda.

I suggest that the reason it was not included in the Speech from the Throne is that this Government did not know what it was doing. It has, in my submission, no appreciation of the constitutional niceties of this country. It acts without any sense, in my submission, of parliamentary propriety and it is ignoring the essentials of the Canadian Constitution in the way it has conducted itself.

The Government has chosen to ignore the privileges and rights of the Members of this House and it has chosen to help itself to the Treasury of Canada by passing Orders in Council and having signed Governor General's warrants.

This year alone, from the information I have obtained, three Governor General's warrants have been passed. The dates of those are January 19, February 16, and April 1.

This is, in my submission, Sir, unprecedented. Never before have the provisions of the Financial Administration Act relating to Governor General's warrants being used at a time when Parliament had sat following an election. Always, the right to appropriate to themselves the public moneys of Canada, by using Governor General's warrants has been exercised before during an election campaign or in the period following an election and before Parliament had been recalled.

The difficulty that the Government has found itself in, Sir, is particularly serious because of the passage on April 1 of an Order in Council permitting the issue of yet another warrant, and I suggest that it constitutes a flagrant abuse of the rights of this House.