

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: Therefore no amendment can be made to the Bill; therefore no discussion is necessary. If I understand the matter correctly, even the leader of the Government here, in his wisdom—and he has a good deal of it—if he wanted to make an amendment to the Bill could not do so. He would be powerless. That is the understanding, is it?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: No.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: He would get the Government to change it.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: The leader of the Government in this House is no more capable of making an amendment to this Bill than any other honourable gentleman. He cannot amend his own Bill. Then, what is the use of discussing it? If the honourable the leader of the Government tells me that he can make an amendment to the Bill and that I can follow suit, then I shall be prepared to enter into a discussion upon it.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I do not propose to make any amendments.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: Would the honourable gentleman have the power to do so?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: When we go into committee on the Bill it will be for the House to deal with it in whatsoever way they think best.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: What is the use of going into committee on the Bill if the Senate has no right to amend it?

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND: It has the right.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: It has the right to make an amendment to a Money Bill? In my experience in this House it has always been laid down that a Money Bill could not be amended. This question has been ruled upon several times from the Chair. If that rule is going to be changed I am quite prepared to accept it. I think it would be better that this Senate should not be here simply to accept what the House of Commons gives us, without discussion, without analysis, without amendment. My experience has been that we might talk night in and night out with no result. I am getting tired of that kind of discussion. If we cannot do something there is no use in wasting our breath and bluffing the country.

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

The Senate adjourned until to-morrow at three o'clock in the afternoon.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED.

THE SENATE.

Thursday, August 30, 1917.

The Senate met at Three o'clock, the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

RECENT RECRUITING.

INQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. THOMPSON inquired of the Government:

1. How many men have been recruiting since the 1st June up to 25th August?
2. Into what branch of the service have they been placed?
3. How many of these men have come from United States of America?
4. At what places in Canada have they been entered, giving the number in each place?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED:

1. 11,829 from 1st June, 1917, to 15th August, 1917.
2. Infantry, 3,543; artillery, 706; railway construction and forestry, 2,989; army service corps, medical service, etc., 4,591.
3. 3,393 accepted from week-end June 16, 1917, to August 18, 1917.
4. Military Districts: No. 1, London, 84; No. 2, Toronto, 1,309; No. 3, Kingston, 6; No. 4, Montreal, 229; No. 6, Halifax, 190; No. 10, Winnipeg, 338; No. 11, Victoria, 407; No. 13, Calgary, 2; New Brunswick troops, St. John, 828; total, 3,393.

Nos. 1 and 2. Returns are rendered semi-monthly.

Nos. 3 and 4. Returns are rendered weekly; total, therefore, given to week-end August 18.

Period of recruiting in United States of America commenced week-end June 16.

CANADIAN OFFICERS IN BRITISH FORCES.

INQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK called the attention of the Government to the hardship caused to the officers of the Canadian Expeditionary Force being transferred from the Canadian Service to the British Service without a proper understanding of the terms of transfer being arrived at, and inquired:

1. Can an officer of the Canadian Militia be compelled to transfer from the Canadian to the British service against his will?
2. Can a Canadian officer loaned by Canada to the British War Office be transferred to the British service against his will?
3. Can the separation allowance granted to wives of Canadian officers be taken from them without notice or explanation?