

Hon. Mr. POWER—If the Senate was in order in moving that amendment, the sub-amendment moved by the hon. gentleman from Toronto must be in order.

Hon. Mr. WATSON—Or they are both out of order.

Hon. Mr. POWER—And there has been a disposition of late, especially developed during the present session on the part of hon. gentlemen, to extend this doctrine to money Bills. The amendment that is proposed by the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Kerr) does not propose to increase the burden on the taxpayer: on the contrary it postpones the increase until Parliament should have met again.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—That we cannot do.

Hon. Mr. POWER—We have been living under this present rate I believe almost since the union of the colony in 1867 and it does to seem to me that it is a very serious thing that we should decide that, having lived for forty-five years under this arrangement, we should continue to live under it for the remainder of this year. I fail to see that there is any serious emergency just now. Of course hon. gentlemen have been spending money pretty freely and I suppose they need all the money they can get.

The SPEAKER—The hon. gentleman should confine himself to the point of order.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; perhaps I have wandered a little, but the temptation was great.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—The point raised by the hon. leader of the House is that the amendment proposed by the hon. member from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Kerr) is out of order, because it amends an amendment, which is a money clause. That contention would be absolutely correct if this amendment came from the House of Commons. It contains all the elements of a money clause, which cannot be amended by this Chamber, but this clause emanates from this Chamber and from the hon. gentleman himself. We are now discussing an amendment made by himself, and in whatever form it leaves this House, it will be the Act of the Senate, just as it is to-day the Act of the Senate when the amendment comes from the hon.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED.

gentleman, and therefore the point is not well taken.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—To what extent would the passing of an amendment as to the imposition and collection of post office revenue affect the law now on the statute-book? The first clause of the Bill reads:

Paragraph (e), (k) and (v) of subsection 1 of section 9 of the Post Office Act, chapter 66 of the revised statutes, 1906, are repealed and the following are substituted therefor.

Now, if that remains on the statute-book, and those clauses which we are repealing refer to the imposition of the present rate of postage, then the proposed amendment would leave the Government in this position, that the Postmaster General would have to adopt other regulations affecting the rate of postage upon newspapers and periodicals, and the fixing of zones. The imposition of that tax could be varied, but it could not come into force until it had the sanction of the Treasury Board, and afterwards the approval of the House of Commons. Where would power rest, in case we repeated these clauses, for the imposition of any rate of postage upon newspapers and periodicals? The Senate, in accepting an amendment and sending it to the House of Commons, did not impose any rate of duty or any maximum or minimum rate. That was left designedly in blank, leaving the Commons to fix the maximum rate that the Postmaster General could impose on periodicals and newspapers.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—The question put by my hon. friend does not cover the point of order raised by the leader of the House. I would surmise that if this clause wipes out the power of fixing rates upon newspapers and periodicals, the point taken by the hon. member from De Salaberry is right; if this amendment carries as it is, it would leave the Government in an awkward position, but, of course, this amendment could be further amended by adding that the present rates shall remain in force until others are imposed.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—But we are discussing, not what might be done, but what is before the House.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—As I understand the hon. gentleman from Hastings, he contends that the Post Office Department will be put in a position of not being able to collect postage on newspapers and periodicals.