

seriously that the House of Commons has any power to make any rules governing this honourable House. It has the power to make its own rules and the Senate has the power to make its own rules. As was very properly said by the honourable member for Middleton, it would be only after the substance of that rule was enacted into a law, to which the Senate of course would have to assent, that the powers of this House could be curtailed, as they are sought to be curtailed by that rule of the House of Commons. I entirely agree with the doctrine laid down by the honourable gentleman from Middleton.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY: I suppose the consequence of that doctrine would be that if a Supply Bill came here we would have a right to diminish the expenditure asked for.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Certainly.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: Why not?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I cannot subscribe entirely to the views expressed by my honourable friend from Middleton. While in the main I agree with him, yet, with reference to the reduction of a Supply Bill or of any appropriation, I entirely disagree with him, for the simple reason that section 53 of the British North America Act makes provision for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue by the Commons, or the imposition of any tax or impost originating in the House of Commons. If the Commons enjoys the exclusive right to appropriate any part of the public revenue, it must be that particular part which is appropriated by the House of Commons, otherwise a reduced appropriation would not be appropriation made by the House of Commons. That is manifest.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: Will the honourable gentleman allow me to suggest that he does not seem to remain within the wording of section 53?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Section 53 of the British North America Act says:

Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue, or for imposing any tax or impost, shall originate in the House of Commons.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: "Shall originate."

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Now, if there be an imposition of a tax or an impost that must originate in the House of Commons, it must be for the fixed amount determined by the House of Commons; otherwise it is not the Bill of the House of Commons. If the House of Commons should impose a tax or impost of \$150,000

for a particular purpose and we should reduce it to \$100,000, it is manifest that it is not the same Bill at all. The same would apply to the earlier part of section 53, namely, the appropriation of any part of the public revenue. That is to say, a Bill appropriating an amount out of the public revenue, or imposing a tax or impost, must be for the amount determined by the House of Commons; otherwise we might reduce it to an infinitesimal part, and hence it would be equivalent to our originating a Bill of an entirely different character.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: But we can reject it.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I quite agree with my honourable friend as to that.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: Is there not a rule somewhere else which will guide us as to that? It is not open to a member of the House of Commons to originate any expenditure of money. But the moment the Bill has been originated the members of the House of Commons are absolute masters of the measure and can deal with it as they like, provided the amount authorized by the Governor in Council is not exceeded. Therefore I call the attention of the honourable members to the significance of the word "originate."

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I quite appreciate what my honourable friend has said, but it seems to me perfectly obvious that if a tax, or an impost, or an appropriation be made by the House of Commons, and we interfere with that appropriation, or tax, or impost, reducing it from the amount that was fixed by the House of Commons, then it is not the appropriation, tax, or impost originating or made by the House of Commons. To carry the argument to its logical conclusion, you might reduce that amount to an infinitesimal part and thus entirely convert it into an appropriation, a tax, or impost differing so absolutely from the original that it would simply have originated in this House. That would be an assumption on our part to deal with all tax Bills to the same extent as the House of Commons does. It seems to me that the difficulty into which the Senate has fallen in the past has been very largely owing to our failure to analyse or enter as fully as we have done to-day into what the original powers of the Senate are in reference to money Bills. We have started from the assumption that the Senate had no right to amend a money Bill, and we have