

debate, I hope Your Honour will forgive me for doing a little thinking out loud. Maybe I will come down some place before I am through.

Mr. Baldwin: That is more than the minister did. He is still up there.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am extremely sympathetic to the concern of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) that the government not get away with anything. We have both been here long enough to know that we have to be on guard against that kind of practice.

However, I wonder whether we have really sorted out what is supposed to be involved in the recommendation of the Governor General with respect to a money bill. In the few minutes since the hon. member for Peace River raised this point, I have been attempting to collect a few musty volumes to check some matters. I have also been wracking my memory.

Years ago there had to be a resolution preceding a money bill. When that resolution was first called in the House of Commons, a cabinet minister rose and stated "The Governor General having been made aware of the terms of this resolution recommends it to the consideration of the House". That is all there was to the recommendation at that time. The minister did not say, "On behalf of the Governor General the following are the details", when making a recommendation. He just said, "His Nibs has seen the bill and he says it's okay". I hope it is not sacrilegious to use that language in this place. We then had the debate on the resolution and proceeded from there.

There is a reference to the terms of a resolution at page 216 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition. This reference reads:

—care must be taken that the terms used are sufficiently wide to cover the whole of the Bill which will be subsequently introduced.

I could read the whole of that citation, Mr. Speaker, but it is not necessary to do so. It is clear that the reference is to what we then called the resolution.

I can recall occasions when we complained because the resolution did not go far enough. I also, recall when the Hon. Paul Martin introduced a resolution to increase the amount of the old age pension. I believe that was in 1948. He did not put the amount of the increase in the resolution. Because there was a resolution with the approval of the Governor General which did not name an amount, we were permitted to move amendments involving a larger amount than Mr. Martin proposed. I am reminiscing more than I should, but the point is there is certain jurisprudence and there are certain rules which governed a resolution preceding a money bill. The rules were very clear that the resolution had to be wide enough to cover everything.

In December of 1968, a report was presented to alter the rules. I am now looking at page 432 of *Journals* for 1968-69. We recommend that the resolution stage be abolished. Nothing was said in that recommendation regard-

Canada Grain Bill

ing the recommendation of the Governor General. In that report, spelled out in long paragraphs, we just said, "Let's do away with the resolution and the debate thereon." Then, since the Governor General's recommendation had been attached to the resolution, we were, of course, leaving a gap. So, as reported on page 458 of the *Journals* for 1968-69, we recommended that what was then Standing Order 61 be amended. It is now Standing Order 62. I shall not read it out, but I have compared the two versions. The previous one was a rule which required a resolution to precede a money bill. Since we were doing away with the resolution, we thought we ought to do something about the Governor General's recommendation. So, we wrote a new Standing Order No. 62, which says there must be a recommendation from the Governor General.

● (4:00 p.m.)

The point I am arguing out loud must be obvious by now. Is there not some danger we are confusing two things? We have done away with the resolution and the debate thereon; that is clear. But we have kept the requirement for a recommendation—we are bound to do so because it is required under the British North America Act. Under the old regime, the solution had to cover all the details of the bill. But there was nothing which said that the recommendation had to contain the same kind of detail. Perhaps we are getting into this trouble because we are now asking the Governor General to give us a recommendation the terms of which are a substitute for what used to be the resolution.

It seems to me the ruling which Your Honour has been called upon to make is an important one and possibly it should not be made on short notice, even though Your Honour has had the point before you for consideration on a number of occasions. Maybe we should discuss the matter in the Committee on Procedure and Organization. I might say in passing that the committee made a start on its work this morning. As I was saying, I wonder whether we are not confusing two things. The old resolution had to be very complete, but the recommendation of the Governor General, in those days, was contained in a simple sentence. It said he was aware of the bill and that it was in order for us to consider it.

I do not detract for one moment from the argument that it is necessary to watch the government, to see it does not get away with things. But I am also very conscious of the fact that we decide things here, and that the role played by the Governor General is a ceremonial one as distinct from that played by the government in this actual forum of legislation. I think we should be going too far if we wanted too much handled outside of this House.

The purpose of the so-called Royal recommendation is to make sure that it is only Ministers of the Crown, the cabinet, who can bring in a money bill. These, at any rate, are my views, Mr. Speaker. The question is one for you to decide. What I really wanted to do, I have done, namely, to draw attention to the possibility of there being confusion between the old resolution, which had to be very wide and precise in its scope, and the old recom-