

House can pass the money clauses supported by the resolutions which have been referred to the Committee on the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman when he says it has been our uniform practice. I agree with him—I stated myself the general practice as to the mode in which it should commence according to the object of the Bill, but I maintain that, in many cases, and I presume the practice is—when the proceeding is initiated by Bill in which it was intended to insert a money clause, this clause is either in brackets or italics. That has been our practice; it is the rule of the English Parliament; though I do not say that there may not have been occasions upon which that practice may have been inadvertently departed from; but I think the hon. gentleman is inaccurate in saying that our invariable practice is to introduce these clauses as part of the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have seen cases of clauses introduced in italics, but I think the general practice has been as I have stated.

Mr. BLAKE. I have this to say, that the reason why these clauses are introduced in italics or brackets is simply because of this wholesome fundamental rule to which I have referred, that we cannot have a money vote or a charge on the people except under the 88th rule, which is the same as the English rule. Convenience is consulted by the clauses appearing in a particular way in the Bill, so that you can read them, but the fundamental rule, which is more important than convenience, is observed by their being so placed in the Bill, whether in brackets or italics, that they do not form part of the Bill. In this case we have proceeded with reference to a motion for a charge upon the people without that adjournment to a preliminary Committee which is a salutary provision against hasty and unadvised charges upon the people.

Mr. CARON. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that last Session the Militia Bill was brought down exactly as this Bill has been brought down and the practice which is being followed to-day was followed with regard to that Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point of order taken by the hon. gentleman, as I understand, is not that the Bill should have originated altogether in Committee, the main object of the Bill not being a charge on the people, but, that there is a money clause in the Bill, which, the hon. gentleman contends, is inseparably connected with the Bill, and therefore the Bill should drop, it having been erroneously brought to this stage. The practice and the rule unquestionably require that the money clauses should be considered in Committee of the Whole, and the practice is, that to accomplish this object, without any violation of the Standing Orders, the money clauses are originally introduced in the Bill in italics. The hon. gentleman has referred to a decision given by Speaker Brand, where, he says, these clauses were printed in italics and did not form any part of the Bill, and that the Chairman must pass them by, unless they are first passed in Committee of the Whole, and referred to the Committee on the Bill. Now it seems to me that to say that because these clauses are not printed in italics they should be considered as affecting the whole Bill, would be to allow the printer to cast the whole Bill, and that therefore whether they appear in one kind of type or another, cannot make any difference, whether these amendments are in one kind of type or another can make no difference. I think these clauses are not part of the Bill, and if they came before the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, whether printed in italics or not, he should pass them by, unless they have been passed by a preliminary Committee and referred to

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the Committee on the Bill. I think this is the object: they are only printed in italics to direct the attention of the Chairman and the House to the fact that they are money clauses. I think I am borne out in this contention by the decision given by Speaker Denison in a similar case, in which the discussion was upon the Metropolitan Local Management Act Amendment Bill:—

“This Bill was moved by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Speaker was about to propose the question, when an objection was taken by Mr. Roebuck that the right hon. gentleman ought to have begun by moving the Speaker out of the Chair, and then have introduced a resolution in Committee authorizing the introduction of such a Bill. This point being discussed, and it appeared that although the appeal was to local resources, a main feature of the Bill was the guarantee on the part of the country of principal and interest of any money raised by the Metropolitan Board of Works. Mr. Speaker said:—‘Unquestionably if its main feature is the guarantee of money raised by loans, it may reach taxation, and the proper form of proceeding would then be by way of resolution in Committee of the whole House.’ Mr. Speaker subsequently said—‘I have not the least doubt of the power of the right hon. gentleman to introduce the Bill, and if the clauses referring to the raising of the money were guarded by being passed through a preliminary Committee of the Whole House, all that is required by the forms of the House will be accomplished.’”

Mr. BLAKE. A preliminary Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER. A preliminary Committee. Therefore, I think these clauses ought not to be considered as part of the Bill, and the Chairman of the Committee should pass them by without considering them. It is desirable that they should be printed in italics, in order to call the attention of the Chairman and of the House to the fact that they are money clauses. But I do not think we ought to allow the printer by using one kind of type or another, to cast a Bill, but, as Mr. Speaker Brand said, they are not part of the Bill.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2, sub-section 2, (a)

Mr. BLAKE. As this clause reads, it is impossible to comply with it, because it speaks of drugs being sold by a name recognized in the British or United States Pharmacopœia, and differing from the standard of strength or purity laid down therein. An article may have a name recognized in both countries, but a different standard.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It may agree with either one or the other.

Mr. BLAKE. If the standards differ in any respect, you will be imposing an impossible condition on the drug vendor.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The clause might be changed by making it read, “the standard laid down in either.”

Mr. BLAKE. In the first paragraph of (a) of the same any difference from the standard is fatal; the second paragraph requires a material difference to be fatal. I do not see why the two sub-sections should not be the same in that respect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the word “materially” ought to be out.

Mr. MILLS. The effect of the clause will be to prevent any improvement in the manufacture of a drug. A scientific druggist might be prepared to make material improvements in the production of an article, and the hon. gentleman proposes to make it an offence to make a better article than that indicated in the Pharmacopœia.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This only applies when it is sold by a particular name. If a druggist makes an