

Hon. Mr. DAVID—I am not ready to move that amendment, because I find that there has been a change and a modification in the appreciation of the law on that subject. I have not had time to consult many authorities, and I do not pretend to be posted as I should be, but I say that they are less severe than they were before, and that now the Senate is permitted to insert amendments, and it is for the House of Commons to say if they will accept the amendment or not, and they will generally accept it, unless it be evidently in violation of the rules. Bourinot says :

Many other entries will also be found of the House accepting Senate amendments, rather than delay the passage of a Bill at an advanced period of the session. It is quite regular, however, to agree to amendments which affect charges upon the people incidentally only, and have not been made with that object.

In order, however, to expedite the business of the House, the privilege claimed and exercised by them, of laying aside Bills sent from the Senate because they impose pecuniary penalties ; nor of laying aside amendments made by the Senate because they introduce into or alter pecuniary penalties in Bills sent to them by this House. Provided that all such penalties thereby imposed, are only to punish or prevent crimes, and offences, and do not tend to lay a burden on the subject, either as aid or supply to Her Majesty, or for any general or special purposes by rates, tolls, assessments or otherwise.

It is frequently found convenient to introduce Bills involving public expenditure in the Senate, and in such a case, the money clauses are embodied in the Bill as presented, in order to make it more intelligible. When the Senate goes into committee on the Bill, these clauses are ordered to be left out. They are printed in red ink or italics in the engrossed Bill sent up to the Commons, and are technically supposed to be blank. These clauses are always considered in a previous committee by the Commons.

I contend that it is not a question of money, and that the payment by the government of the militia is not a necessary consequence of the adoption of the amendment because the government may employ the permanent militia. If they employ the permanent militia, nobody will contend that the government will ask the municipality to pay the expense, because the government pay for the maintenance of the permanent force. In such a case, the government will not ask the municipality to reimburse money which the government pays out in the usual way. It is only, I suppose, when the active militia is called out that extra expense for maintenance is incurred. I say nothing

Hon. Mr. YOUNG.

obliges the government to call out the active militia. They may send to the municipality only the members of the permanent force. Then I say it is not an absolute necessity that the government should incur the expense of calling out the militia, if they can use the permanent force.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—I am in full sympathy with the motion made by the hon. senator from Mille Iles.

The SPEAKER—I think there is a point of order.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I say on the point of order that I do not think it can be taken now. The only motion before this House is the first motion moved by the hon. gentleman from Mille Iles.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—That is all.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—And that first motion does not involve any expenditure of public money at all.

Hon. Mr. YOUNG—The hon. gentleman from Mille Iles presented the two amendments. The first was regarded as unimportant unless the second was adopted by the House. Therefore I thought, in fairness to the House and in fairness to the hon. gentleman, that we had better deal with the question of the second amendment as it involves the first.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—No, it does not.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—We must take things as they are. As a matter of fact before this House now there is only the first motion moved by the hon. member. I asked the hon. gentleman to take the two amendments together, because if he had put only one and one was voted down, I thought he would lose the right of proposing another amendment. The hon. Speaker said he did not think the point would apply, evidently not accepting the proposition which I made that the two motions should be put together.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—The hon. gentleman assented to the proposition to move them both together.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—No, only one was put.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—As there is only one motion before the House, and that is the first one proposed. I may state that I am in perfect sympathy with the movement