

Point of Order

their differences and be faced with a serious constitutional crisis. The strength of our parliamentary system lies in all three constituent parts that is: the Crown, the Senate, and the House of Commons respecting their constitutional roles.

The events in the United Kingdom at the beginning of the 20th century do not provide the Speaker of this House with any procedural solution to this particular conflict. Because of the Canadian parliamentary practice, the Speaker of the House of Commons is powerless when an impasse develops around this long unresolved constitutional issue which is now exacerbated by a deep difference of opinion on matters of public policy.

I want to refer hon. members to two matters. I do this as lawyers say, *obiter dictum*. That perhaps is part of the substandard ruling. But there is an interesting, curious book called *A Student's Manual of English Constitutional History* by a master of arts named Dudley Julius Medley, tutor of Keble College, Oxford, and examiner in the honour school of modern history. It was published in 1898. He was talking, of course, before the British—if I could be permitted to say this—came to their senses.

This vast increase in membership (of the House of Lords) has almost of necessity resulted in a weakening of the sense of political responsibility in individual members of the House of Lords, while the completion of the representative character of the House of Commons has made the body of the electorate increasingly impatient of any check by the hereditary House. Those who do not believe in constitutional cataclysms cling to the necessity of a second chamber.

I also draw to the attention of my colleagues—I know they will be very interested—on both sides of the House to hear the comments by Sir Wilfrid Laurier on September 7, 1917. As I say, this is not put in as the substance of the ruling. It is just brought to members' attention, and I hope the attention of every Canadian who has a chance to listen or read this judgment. This is what Sir Wilfrid Laurier said on September 7, 1917.

This was his view. He was a great House of Commons man: "Under Rule 78, the Senate has no right to amend or alter in any way a money bill sent to them from this House". Rule 78 is the same as our Rule 80 paragraph 1.

He said: "This House alone has the privilege of dealing with money bills. The only right the Senate has is that of rejecting or assenting to such money bills. That

rule has been confirmed over and over again in England".

Now, I point those two interesting comments out to hon. members because there is a long history in this. There have been strong views on both sides of this Chamber over the years as to what the Constitution does say, and what the Constitution ought to say in terms of our country, and the powers of our House of Commons of Canada.

[Translation]

I want to thank the House for its indulgence and its patience in listening so carefully to this lengthy explanation. This ruling has not been an easy one for we are here dealing with a fundamental issue which goes to the very heart of the Canadian Parliamentary process. May I close by saying I am extremely grateful to the members who made such useful contributions to assist the Chair in its consideration of this issue.

[English]

To say anything further, despite the fact that I am the Speaker of the House of Commons, would be trespassing upon what I am called upon to do, and that is to rule on procedural matters.

What I may think about the constitutional impasse which we have in this country, is not for me to say. If any of my colleagues or the public want to speculate on what I think, of course, that is their free and democratic privilege.

* * *

[Translation]

POINT OF ORDER

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of order with respect to *Hansard* for April 25. It concerns the exchange I had with the Minister of the Environment about the school system in Saskatchewan and plans for reorganizing control and management in that system. I think everyone in the House is aware of what is involved, but I simply wish to point out that a number of terms used yesterday in the House and reported in *Hansard* were corrected by someone, I don't know who, and they do not faithfully report what the minister said in the House and are actually misleading. I could give you a list of the