

to which rule 87 applies have reference to Bills coming from the Senate which deal in some way not with charges upon the revenue, but with penalties imposed upon the subject. I think, therefore, that my point of order is well taken; that the House has no power to assent to any alteration made by the Senate in a money Bill sent from this House to the Senate.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I was going to suggest that in any event consideration of the Senate amendments to this Bill might be postponed until to-morrow. Personally, I could not follow very well the amendments as they were read by the minister. The first, I think, is rather unimportant; I doubt whether it changes materially the effect of the section. I refer to the addition of the word "net" in section 3. The second amendment is rather involved, and it was impossible to follow the sense of it from the reading of it by the minister. The last amendment, having reference to the proceedings of the tribunals created under the statute to hear appeals in camera, is a very important one.

I think, therefore, the House should have time to consider the matter before giving or refusing assent. I agree with the view the minister has taken in regard to the Senate amendments. He was inclined to agree to the same, because any other course might delay the proceedings of the House. If we deem it wise not to assent to the Senate amendments, the procedure is very simple: We refuse to agree to them. If that does not meet with favour in the Senate, a conference is possible. I rise chiefly to suggest that the consideration of the Senate amendments to this Bill be postponed until to-morrow, so that we may have an opportunity to look into them. It is quite possible the minister himself has not had an opportunity to give due consideration to them, and these amendments may substantially affect other sections.

Mr. SPEAKER: In respect to the point of order raised by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, it would appear from the opportunity I have had of looking into the matter, that it would be competent for this House to make a reservation such as was proposed by the Minister of Finance, because apparently, in May, 1874, we have a precedent in this Parliament. In the Journals of 1874 this entry is to be found with respect to a Bill entitled "An Act respecting the appropriation of certain Dominion lands in Manitoba," to which the Senate made certain amendments:

[Sir Wilfrid Laurier.]

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Dorion, resolved, that this House doth concur in the said amendments; while doing so, it does not think it necessary, at this late period of the session, to insist on its privileges in respect thereto, but that the waiver of the said privileges in this case be not, however, drawn into a precedent.

Ordered, that the Clerk do carry back the Bill to the Senate, and acquaint their honours that this House hath agreed to their amendments.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Your Honour is not giving a ruling?

Mr. SPEAKER: No. Without giving a ruling upon the main point, I consider it would be competent for this House, if it so desires, by making a reservation, to avoid a precedent being created.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It so happens—

Mr. SPEAKER: Before giving a ruling, I would prefer to give the main question much more consideration than I have had opportunity to give it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: It so happens that in 1874, I was a member of this House. I was, of course, a very young member then, but I have a vague recollection of the discussion that took place. The Act was not an Appropriation Act; it was a Land Act. There was quite an important and lengthy debate as to whether or not the Act could be assimilated to the appropriation of money, and it was a dubious point whether or not a land grant came within the sole privilege of this House and it was on account of this uncertainty that the motion was passed reserving the rights of this House. It is forty years ago since that debate took place, but I think my recollection is correct, and if Your Honour will look into the matter, you will find that there was a discussion as to whether the land had been taken by appropriation or not.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is a very important matter. I shall take the earliest opportunity of going into the question quite fully, but I still hold the view that this House can preserve all its rights and privileges by a special statement to that effect.

Mr. CURRIE: I quite agree with the remarks of the leader of the Opposition. This is one of the ancient privileges of the House of Commons and I do not think it has been violated during the last forty years. It is the undoubted right of this House to originate all money Bills, and the Senate cannot add to, subtract from or vary any money Bill. For that reason, I