

the use of this House passing amendments if they are going to be spat upon and buried without a decent funeral? Under such conditions, before allowing a Bill to go down to the House of Commons with amendments, I, as a representative of the people, would demand the withdrawal of the Bill or its rejection by the Senate. What would be the use of our passing amendments and sending them to the House of Commons if they are to be rejected and dropped there and the Bill is to become law? We should then lose half our rights; we should lose half our rights in being unable to reject the Bill in toto. There is one horn of the dilemma. Suppose the Bill goes down to the House of Commons with amendments and the House of Commons accepts the amendments. They must be sent back here to be re-endorsed. We would save our position; at least, we would accomplish our mission. These are the two horns of the dilemma. I am in sympathy with the honourable gentleman from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Nicholls) in asking the Government what the procedure would be. It is not a party question; it is not a political question; it is a question in the interest of public legislation for the benefit of the people. We should not be kept in the dark. We should not be asked to do things that we know nothing about. The question put should be answered.

Hon. Mr. NICHOLLS: May I interrupt the honourable gentleman and say that I asked the question, and I expect that it will be answered if the honourable gentleman from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Cloran) will give the leader of the Government an opportunity to answer it. The honourable gentleman from Victoria is taking up the whole time of the House in repeating the question which I asked.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: When the question was put to the leader of the Government I asked for an answer, and if he had given his answer at the time I would have had nothing to say, and I can assure the honourable gentleman from Toronto that I would not take up his time, which is so valuable. I am trying to force the Government to give an answer. I asked the honourable leader of the Government to answer the question at once. He declined to do so. He allowed other members to take the floor. I am here to defend the rights of the country and of the Senate. I think some other honourable gentlemen here do not represent the people very much.

S-484

Hon. Mr. POWER: At the risk of being considered an intruder I venture to say a word or two with respect to this question. It is not unnatural that the honourable gentleman from Toronto (Hon. Mr. Nicholls), who has been only a few days in the Senate, should not be quite clear as to the relations between the two Houses; but that an honourable gentleman like the honourable gentleman from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Cloran), who has been devoting his capacious intellect to the working of this House and to the working of the parliamentary system in Canada for some fifteen years, should want information on a question of almost every day practice is something which puzzles me. There has never been any question raised about the rule by gentlemen who have been any time in this House. If we make an amendment to a Bill which comes from the Commons, and the Bill goes back to the Commons with that amendment, or with three or four amendments, which the Commons accept, the Bill comes back with a message that they have accepted our amendments. If they accept one amendment and reject two, they send a message stating the fact. Then it is for the Senate to recede from the amendments which they have made or to insist upon them. That is as far as a matter generally goes. But sometimes, if the Senate feels very strongly on the matter and that they must insist on the amendments, they send a message to the Commons asking for a conference, and representatives of the two Houses are supposed to meet. That is now done by message. As a general rule, when the Commons refusal comes, we say that we shall insist or that we shall not insist. In the case of a Bill like the one before the House, if we made amendments to which the Commons did not agree and to which they said they did not agree, I assume that we should say we would not insist.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE: May I be allowed to add a word to what I have already said? When I spoke first I took it for granted that it had always been assumed by this House up to this moment that money Bills were within the exclusive jurisdiction of the House of Commons. That is a practice which has been followed and upon which we have been acting heretofore, with two exceptions. Ever since I have been in this honourable House, I, for one, have contended that a Bill may contain provisions which pertain to money Bills and provisions which are foreign to money Bills. In other