

Hon. Mr. DICKEY said the rule was perfectly clear in England as in this country. He had no doubt parties had the right to petition this House for general redress or compensation, or for a general grant. The hon. gentleman [Mr. Miller] said they had no power to grant money, but he was wrong, although the initiation of money grants belonged to another House, they had to come up to this House to be confirmed; therefore, the Senate had power to legislate upon them—although not separately, yet in the aggregate. That being the case, why could not a party petition this House for a grant of money? He believed this petition could be received by this House, and that it had the right of opposition on this petition if a grant in regard to it was proposed by the other House.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY thought they should not receive petitions if they had not the power to grant them. The Government had the initiation of all money votes, and all petitions for grants of money should be forwarded to the Government. What was the use of receiving petitions which they could not grant? They should be only deceiving the parties in interest.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT thought the better time to take the exception was on the putting of the question by the clerk—shall the petition be received? There was a wide difference of opinion on the subject. He did not know what the practice had been in this House.

Several members—To receive the petitions.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said the time to put the question as to the receiving of the petition was when it was presented if there was any objection to it. From his knowledge of the practice of this House, and of the Lords, he entirely agreed with Hon. Mr. Dickey on this subject. He contended that all money votes must originate with the Government, which was responsible therefor. The practice in this House and the Lords was to receive petitions of a general nature. Though the Senate could not initiate any money vote, still the sum petitioned or sought for must be included in the appropriation bill and be submitted for their consideration. Although they might not deal with one appropriation in the Supply Bill, in particular, at the same time, if they had good reason to object to any proposal, they might assume the responsibility of saying it was improper, and vote against the bill on its account. Under these circum-

stances he thought that any petition, couched in general terms, was presentable to this House, and that the custom, since Confederation, had been to receive such petitions. He had not the least doubt we could receive any of those general petitions, inasmuch as it related to a demand upon Parliament, which meant Commons, Senate and the Executive. [Hear, hear].

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN said there was a wide distinction between receiving petitions and granting them here. There was nothing in the rules to prevent their receiving them. The mere receiving them did not imply the House had a right to grant their prayer, for it had not the right to grant money. After receiving the petition, the Senate had no further right to interfere with its course.

His Hon. the SPEAKER said: I find in "Mag," page 585, the principle laid down by the Hon. Senator to my left [Mr. Miller] who took exception to the presentation of the petition. The principle of awaiting the suggestion, on the exercise of the authority of the Crown, in relation to the voting of public money, is not confined to the annual grants, but applies to petitions asking grants of money. By a standing order of the House of Commons of the 20th March, 1866, it was provided "that this House shall receive no petition for any sum relating to the public service, or proceed upon a motion for a grant, if a charge upon the public revenue, in any case not recommended by the Crown, and this rule is extended by the uniform practice of the House to any motion which, though not directly proposing a grant, or change upon the public revenue, involves the expenditure of public money. When a petition praying for compensation or other pecuniary aid is fully recommended, it is then referred to a Committee of Enquiry or directly to a Committee of Supply." That is a standing rule of the House of Commons, but I have failed to find any rule of the Senate or House of Lords applying the same principle to the practice of the Senate or of the Lords. There is no rule or usage of the Senate to forbid the presentation, discussion, or reference to a Select Committee of a petition for pecuniary aid, redress, or compensation. Petitions may also be received, asking for the construction of public works and involving the expenditure of public money, or asking grants of money for particular institutions. This principle prevails in the usage of the House of Lords. I have looked at the index to the Lords, journals under the head-