

(Guthrie) thought that any private member might properly introduce a Bill to amend the law, and though it might possibly affect the revenue, the general effect of the Bill was to improve the law relating to stamps on bills and notes.

MR. BLAIN said he thought the well understood practice of the House was that Bills affecting the revenue should first receive the sanction of the Government. He believed there had been cases where the rule had been relaxed, but it seemed to him that this was a case where the rule should be insisted upon.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said the Bill had been carefully considered, and he saw no objection to its passing, although it would, perhaps, be better to abolish the tax altogether.

MR. PALMER said this Bill came in under the 54th section of the British North America Act, and, therefore, the condition of that section, not having been complied with, the Bill was out of order.

MR. GUTHRIE said the 54th section provided that it shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to pass any vote, resolution, address or Bill, for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue or of any tax or impost to any purpose without having been first recommended to that House by message of the Governor-General. This was not an appropriation of money to any particular purpose. It rather came under the 53rd section which provided that bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue or for imposing any tax or impost shall originate in the House of Commons.

MR. TUPPER said that one of the clauses, the 3rd, distinctly imposed a tax that did not now exist. On the 427th page of May, it was stated that precisely the same principle which applied to the appropriating of money applied to the imposition of a tax, May said :—

“The Houses are as stanch in proceedings for levying a tax as they are in granting money, and it is the practice, without any

exception, for all Bills that distinctly impose such a charge on the people to originate in the Committee of the Whole House.”

He took it that the objection taken by the hon. member for West York, was entirely fatal to proceeding with this Bill, which should have originated by resolution in Committee of the Whole House. This Stamp Act had occasioned a great deal of difficulty in the country; and if there was any class of legislation that the Government ought to take charge of, it was that which relates to the stamp duties. If the Bill was to be proceeded with, it should be taken up by the Government, and these different measures and amendments should be amalgamated in a plain and intelligible Bill that would be comprehended by the general public.

MR. MACKAY (Cape Breton) said that this question should only be brought up while the Speaker was in the Chair. The Bill was before the Committee and should be disposed of. Besides, a question like this should have been raised before the second reading. In support of this position he would draw attention to May, page 454, where it was laid down, that in preparing Bills, care should be taken that they did not contain provisions not authorized by orders of leave; that the titles correspond with the orders of leave, and that they were prepared in proper form. If it should appear during the progress of a Bill that these rules had not been observed, the House would order it to be withdrawn. Such objections, however, should be taken before the second reading. It had not been the practice to order Bills to be withdrawn after they had been committed, on account of any irregularity which could not be cured, while the Bill was in Committee, or on recommittal. He would further remark that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving) had introduced a precisely similar Bill last Session. The hon. gentleman had certainly precedent and authority for his proceeding. He took it that it was not necessary for an Act referring to bills of exchange to originate in Committee of the Whole House.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said he failed to see that anything in