

this Bill effected the revenue. There was not the slightest intention to appropriate any tax by means of this Bill. He did not think that if it was desirable to adopt this measure on its merits, it should be thrown out on the objection taken by the hon. member for West York.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that this discussion was altogether out of order. The Committee had simply to settle the clauses of the Bill. The House only could deal with the point raised.

MR. PALMER said that he disagreed with the right hon. gentleman. It was hardly worth while to consume two or three hours in discussing this Bill, if it was perfectly clear that it would have to be thrown out. He would refer hon. gentlemen to the 86th and 88th Rules of the House in support of his position that this measure could not go any further. He would ask the hon. member for Chateauguay whether any private member could bring in a Bill to tax the people of this country?

MR. HOLTON said that he had not heard the discussion, and he was not prepared to say whether this point of order was well taken or not. He entirely agreed with the right hon. member for Kingston that this discussion in Committee was irregular and quite out of place.

MR. MACKAY (Cape Breton) said, for a precedent as to the introduction of a measure of this sort by a private member, he would refer hon. gentlemen to *Hansard* of last year.

MR. MCCARTHY: I rise to a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that the only question under discussion is the preamble of the Bill, the clauses were all passed the other night.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The clauses were adopted and the preamble held over.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Clause No. 2 certainly stood over, because a point was raised as to whether there was not a danger to the revenue in the event of its being passed, and I agreed to take it into consideration.

MR. MACDOUGALL.

MR. McDOUGALL (South Renfrew) said when the Bill was previously before the House, he raised the objection that if the 2nd clause was passed parties residing in Canada might, through their agents, date drafts from the United States for the purpose of evading payment of stamps. He thought this second clause should be held over till another Session.

MR. GUTHRIE said that, as having charge of the Bill in the absence of the promoter, he could not allow it to be held over on such an objection.

MR. McDOUGALL (Renfrew) suggested that these words should be inserted, "And not discounted or transferred in Canada."

MR. BLAIN said it seemed to him the House was proceeding contrary to the 56th clause of the British North America Act.

MR. MACKAY (Cape Breton): I rise to a point of order. It seems to me that point has already been decided.

THE CHAIRMAN: I decided that the only question before the House was the preamble. At the same time any hon. member can move that a clause be re-opened for discussion.

MR. McDOUGALL (Renfrew): I move that the 2nd clause be considered by the Committee.

Motion agreed to.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that to prevent loss to the revenue these words had better be added: "Unless the same be negotiated in Canada." This would prevent any attempt to defraud the revenue.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said if it was shown that by having negotiable securities dated and made payable in a foreign country, there was a fraudulent evasion of the law, the validity of these documents would be destroyed. But if a bill or promissory note was drawn in England, France or the United States, by parties there, and made payable in these countries, its validity was recognized by the comity of nations.

MR. MACKENZIE said the question as to the right of the question and the policy were two different things. Of course, it would never do to impose