

think, as the point is a very important one, we ought to adjourn the discussion so as to enable the Speaker to consult the authorities as is the custom in order that the rights of this House may be maintained. This is a very important right and, I do not think this House should agree to any change in its rights and privileges. We are putting up with a great deal
4 p.m. from the Senate, and we shall have to put up with a great deal more if we give way in this case.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have before me Bourinot, who deals with the decision in regard to the Land Act of 1874. It will be found by an examination of Bourinot that in this case there was very grave doubt among the leaders of the House of Commons as to whether or not the Land Bill was really in the nature of a money Bill and whether this was an infringement of the rule. What the Senate did was to increase the land grants to settlers, and there was an uncertainty as to whether or not that was an infringement of the rule. It will never be doubted that if it was a clear infringement of rule 73, as this is, the House would have taken the course which it did. The question is one of the very gravest importance, because what is determined upon to-day is a precedent for to-morrow. I should think the resolution should not be passed simply upon the statement of the Minister of Finance that, in his opinion, it should not be a precedent. The House should have something to say with regard to the matter. The House might give notice to suspend rule 73 in order to allow the action of the Senate to be concurred in. That, however, would be a very grave thing to do.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The considerations put forward here appealed to me, and I consulted the parliamentary counsel respecting them. It was drawn to my attention that in 1874 a Bill was returned from the Senate with an amendment providing for an increase in the quantity of land granted to settlers in the Northwest. That is the case which has been referred to. I quote from Bourinot, page 492:

The Premier and other members doubted the right of the Senate to increase a grant of land—the public lands being, in the opinion of the House, in the same position as the public revenues. The amendment was only adopted with an entry in the Journals that the Commons did not think it “necessary, at that late period of the session, to insist on its privileges in respect thereto but that the waiver of the privileges was not to be drawn into a precedent.”

It seemed to me, in view of the extreme importance of this Bill and the lateness of the session, as was the case in 1874, and as the amendments were not of vital importance, that we might adopt the same course that was then adopted, namely, concur in the amendments and reserve such privileges as the House has. As, however, the point of order has been raised, and as you, Sir, desire to have time to look up the authorities and give your ruling in respect of it, it would be a waste of time to continue the debate.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Sévigny, the debate was adjourned.

WAR CHARITIES ACT.

House again in Committee on Bill No 130, relating to War Charities—Mr. Rainville in the Chair.

On section 3—Prohibition against raising money for war charities unless registered:

Mr. NESBITT: Would this section apply to the ordinary Red Cross Societies throughout the country?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. NESBITT: What is the object of the Bill?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The object of the Bill is to prevent frauds upon the public by people making appeals for real or alleged war charities. There has been considerable abuse along these lines, and this Bill is to remedy such abuse. I would point out to my hon. friend that no difficulty can arise in the case of well-established charities, because, by subsection 4 of section 3, the minister may exempt any war charity from registration under the Act. A well-established war charity would experience no difficulty under this measure.

Mr. NESBITT: I have not had an opportunity of reading the Bill, but it looks to me unnecessary to expose our Red Cross societies, which are in every village and hamlet in the country, to be prosecuted under an Act of Parliament. They are doing a great deal of good, and are generally carried on by the women. I suppose the Secretary of State may exempt Red Cross societies generally without particularizing them.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would this Bill cover the case of tag days? Sometimes we read of the proceeds of tag days being looted, which