

*Privilege—Mr. Stevens*

disposed. However, it being a request that a general comment about the conduct of some members be clarified and specified, I have to hold that it falls outside the ordinary definition of a question of privilege. In any event, since it is not followed by a specific motion which requires action by the Chair, I would have to rule that there is nothing further the Chair can do about the matter at this time.

\* \* \*

**THE MINISTRY****PURCHASE OF LIMOUSINE FOR PRIME MINISTER'S USE—  
REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION**

**Mr. John Reynolds (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. Despite the Trudeau government's avowed determination to exercise moderation in government spending in order to avoid generating inflationary pressures, and despite requests that Canadians practice voluntary restraint in consumer spending also to avoid generating inflationary pressures, in August, 1974, the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) authorized the purchase and has recently taken possession of a new limousine with a purchase price of \$83,530.44.

In view of the fact that the Prime Minister's \$75,000 limousine is almost new, and in view of the fact that CPI figures released today show that inflationary pressures are not abating, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle):

That the House requests the Prime Minister to take immediate action to sell one of these two luxurious limousines in an effort to demonstrate to the people of Canada that curbing inflation is a critical and sincere priority of the present government.

**Mr. Trudeau:** Sell the two if you want.

**Mr. Speaker:** I regret that in the remarks of the hon. member it is not altogether clear—as a matter of fact, it is not clear at all—what the grounds are upon which he seeks the attention of the House to this important matter. The hon. member said he was rising on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. However, although that language is contained in Standing Orders 43 and 26, his remarks do not relate to either of them. Although there may be some suggestion of privilege, the hon. member's remarks do not relate to a question of privilege. Under the circumstances, I do not think that the Chair can take any action.

\* \* \*

**PRIVILEGE****MR. STEVENS—PROCEDURE ADOPTED WHEN DEALING WITH  
SUPPLY**

**Mr. Sinclair Stevens (York-Simcoe):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which concerns the most important and fundamental privilege of this House. I refer to the exclusive right of this House to grant supply. Last night that privilege was trampled upon by the government through actions of the government House leader and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Turner).

[Mr. Speaker.]

In speaking to this motion I would point out that I rose on a similar question of privilege concerning the time-span that we had to consider the supplementary estimates in the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates. At that time I suggested we had unreasonable time in which to consider the expenditure of \$1.75 billion. Last evening, without notice given to the leader of this party, clause 5 was inserted in appropriation Bill C-42 which gave the government power to raise a further \$2.5 billion in loans.

I would point out that only last March the government secured the power to increase its indebtedness by \$3 billion. In short, coupling the two powers, the government has caused this parliament to increase the borrowing limit by \$5.5 billion since last March. I point this out because I think it was indeed unfortunate last night that the matter was included in Bill C-42 without notice as, I believe, when we reached committee of the whole stage there was great confusion regarding the actual rights of each member of the House to question clause 5 which had been included. I mention that there was one request for an explanation from a member of our caucus; other members in the opposition questioned the matter, and there was a vote. But during committee of the whole stage the Chairman of the committee made it clear that there could be no debate. I suggest that the agreement that there be no debate was made on the understanding that Bill C-42 would include only items in Supplementary Estimates (B). But in fact it included this extra clause 5.

If I may, I would like to outline my reasons for thinking that what transpired last night must fall. I say this because I believe it is wrong for parliament to submit to this type of procedure.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

● (1420)

**Mr. Stevens:** Mr. Speaker, I will give reasons for my position. Under section 54 of the British North America Act, the order of this House last night, that Bill C-42, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1975, be read the third time and do pass, is illegal. Section 54 of the British North America Act provides:

It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address, or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by message of the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address, or bill is proposed.

Standing Order 62(1) is to the same effect. Bill C-42 purports to be based upon Supplementary Estimates (B). *Votes and Proceedings* of November 22, 1974, at page 141, has the following entry:

Mr. Chrétien, a member of the Queen's Privy Council, delivered a message from His Excellency the Administrator of the Government of Canada, which was read by Mr. Speaker, as follows:

BORA LASKIN

His Excellency the Administrator transmits to the House of Commons Supplementary Estimates (B) of sums required for the service of Canada for the fiscal year ending on the 31st March, 1975, and, in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867" recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.