

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me quite different, as far as I can judge.

Mr. BOWELL. The difference is more particularly with reference to the weight of snuff, which is not mentioned at all.

Mr. BLAKE. I find wet snuff mentioned here, and it pays 20 cents on each pound. That, of course, is a different rate of duty from that which the resolution we have carried would ascribe to it. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am quite new to the practice which is proposed to-day, and I do not at all intend to accede to it. It seems to me contrary to first principles that we should be called upon to-day, in the committee, to pass a resolution inconsistent with and contradictory of that which we have passed and concurred in, and which is the foundation of the Bill. I do not understand that the House can be called upon by an independent proceeding to pass another resolution, quite different in effect, and containing different provision from that which we agreed to the other day. It is a contradiction of our decision. Of course, our findings are not like those of the Medes and Persians, are not irreversible, but they must be changed. I can see it would be essential to get back the resolution which we have already passed and to amend that resolution, else, when we come to have this resolution reported, we shall have two different resolutions of varying import and effect upon the same subject matter, which seems to me to be a most extraordinary procedure. It may be the practice of Parliament, but it is certainly inconsistent with the general practice of Parliament, with logic or with common sense.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It almost looks as if we ought to put both these resolutions in although they are utterly contradictory, and then strike out one. I do not remember any similar case to this occurring before. No doubt these resolutions in Ways and Means have been altered time and again, but they had already been got to the stage of the second reading of the Bill, which makes all the difference in the world. The proceedings with respect to all these money Bills require to be carefully studied, and although I do not want to embarrass the hon. Minister of Customs there is, it seems to me, no escape from the dilemma stated by the hon. member for West Durham.

Mr. BLAKE. I should like your ruling on the point of order, with the authority.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I understand the member for West Durham objects to the resolution now before the committee as being out of order, the committee having already had a resolution on the same subject before it. It is true a resolution has been passed by the Committee of Ways and Means on this subject; but this is intended to increase the duty, and it varies the other resolution in that way. The rule that I consider brings this within the authority of the committee at the present time is this:

"But every new duty must be voted in committee. So strictly is the rule enforced which requires every new duty to be voted in committee that even where the object of a Bill is to reduce duties, and the aggregate amount of duties will in fact be reduced, yet if any new duty, however small, be imposed, or any existing duty be increased in the proposed scale of duties, such new or increased duty must be voted in committee either before or after the introduction of the Bill." (May, 687; 19 English Commons Journal, 330.)

Also:

"But it must always be borne in mind that any duty or increase of duty must be previously voted in Committee of Ways and Means, and then referred with instructions to the Committee on the Bill." (155 English Hansard, 991; 132 English Commons Journal, 112.)

This resolution is in fact an increase of duty and is a proposition which comes regularly before the committee.

Mr. BLAKE. The resolutions which were read are quite distinct and clear, and no one complains of them. If a new duty is proposed to the House of Commons it must be voted

in Committee of Ways and Means. If it is an existing duty according to the law of the land which it is proposed to increase, and that is the increased duty spoken of, it also must be proposed and voted in Committee of Ways and Means. That does not at all affect the question whether having this Session made a determination as to what the duties shall be and having a resolution on our records and embodied in a Bill we can with that unaltered propose another duty, which is another and a conflicting duty. The new duty and the increase of duty spoken of are duties to make a change in the law of the land as it now stands, either to make a duty or increase a duty, but not in the slightest degree affecting the general rule of Parliament, which is that two inconsistent propositions may not be assented to at the same time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not in any way an inconsistent proposition. At the very first meeting of the House of Commons we may vote that a certain duty shall be placed upon an article. Subsequently exigencies may arise, which may require an additional duty to be imposed. We may raise the duty half a dozen times during any given time, and no doubt precedents to that effect can be found.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not say that the duty may not be raised. I say there is a general rule that we cannot do it in this way.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The resolution is that 5 cents shall be added and there is a proposal of 20 cents, and altogether the duty would be made 32 cents.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the resolution is in order on the ground I have stated, and it is competent, as no resolution is yet embodied in the Bill finally passed in this House—that it is competent for the committee to increase the duty.

Resolution reported.

On the question that the resolution be considered,

Mr. BLAKE. On Monday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That will postpone prorogation another day.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think it will. There is such a thing as more haste and less speed. The hon. gentleman is some times very slow and sometimes a little too quick. The Minister of Customs was a little too quick in introducing his Bill the other day before he knew what was in it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman's extra quickness will throw us over a day.

Mr. BLAKE. The laws and constitution of Parliament throw us over a day.

Mr. BOWELL. I wish the hon. gentleman distinctly to understand that I did not introduce the Bill not knowing what was in it. I knew the resolutions that were passed. It was subsequently found by the officers whose duty it is to administer the law, that they had made an error in drafting the resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. So the hon. gentleman was willing to change it.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. I am not like the hon. gentleman who never changes his opinions; I have not arrived at that stage of perfection yet.

#### SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Canadian Pacific Railway—Subsidy..... \$2,800,000

Mr. POPE. That is the balance of the \$29,000,000.