

Mr. CAMERON (Huron South) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 11) to annex the village of Seaforth to the South Riding of the county of Huron.

Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER said the constituencies would be re-adjusted after the completion of the census. He hoped the hon. member would let the Bill drop.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron South) said as the village stood at present, if an election should take place before the next elections, Seaforth would be disfranchised. If at the completion of the census, it should be found that no increase has taken place in the county, no redistribution would take place, and the village would have no voice in the legislation for this Dominion. It was immaterial to him whether the village was annexed to the North or to the South Riding so long as the inhabitants could be properly represented.

Hon. Sir GEORGE-É. CARTIER said it was very unlikely that any elections would take place in Ontario before the redistribution of constituencies, and he thought this House should wait until the change should take place in the regular way. They did not know what political party they might be serving by annexing the village to any particular riding.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the Bill should be referred to a special committee. It was manifestly unjust that the village should be disfranchised.

The Bill was allowed to stand over.

Mr. BOURASSA moved that the House go into Committee to consider certain resolutions for the creation of a special fund, to be denominated "The Liquor Inspection Fund."

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said the Bill if carried would entail great expense. There was no doubt that a great deal of the liquors used in the country were adulterated. The Bill was out of order, as it proposed the creation of a new office.

The Bill was ruled out of order and was dropped.

On motion to resume the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Harrison for the second reading of Bill (No. 29)—An Act to remove doubts as to the liabilities to Stamp Duties of Premium Notes taken or held by Mutual Fire Insurance Companies,

The SPEAKER ruled as follows: That the Bill is to remove doubts, and declares that certain notes shall be deemed to be promissory notes within the meaning of the Act 31 Vic. chap. 9, and shall be subject to the duties thereby imposed; and it provides that all such notes heretofore given and not stamped shall be made valid by a double stamp. There being no

appropriation of money proposed, there need be no recommendation from the Crown; and the objection rests on the ground that as it involves an additional charge on the people, the Bill should have originated in Committee of the Whole, and, moreover, should have been proposed by a Minister. It appears to me that the Bill is merely declaratory, and that it involves no new charge except in so far as the double stamps duty may effect that purpose. On looking carefully at the 31st Vic., Cap. 9, I find by section 7 that the Governor in Council may declare that any kind or class of circumstances as to which doubts exist, shall be chargeable with any and what duty under the Act, and by sections 10, 11, and 12, provisions are enacted to render valid notes in the hands of innocent holders and notes passed to third parties. The provision as to double stamps in the present Bill is merely an extension of a former Act in its remedial clauses to the class of notes here declared to be within that Act. The Bill is one which, therefore, in my opinion, may be properly introduced and proceeded with by a private member. The question generally whether private members may introduce and proceed upon measures relating to taxation, which was discussed in the course of the argument, is one of very great importance, and, though not needful to the discussion of the present objections, I think it proper to say a few words upon it to the House. Instances may undoubtedly be found in the journals of the English House of Commons, of Bills and motions by private members to increase taxation, some of which have passed unchallenged; whilst in other cases the indirect assent of a Minister has been deemed sufficient. Recently, however, (in 1869) a high authority, Sir Thomas Erskine May, stated before a Joint Committee of the two Houses of Parliament that, "no private member is permitted to propose an Imperial tax upon the people—it must proceed *from* a Minister of the Crown, or be in *some other form* declared to be necessary for the public service." I think the House may properly accept of this as the correct construction of the rules regulating the introduction of similar measures. The motion or Bill should either be introduced by a Minister, or if introduced by a private member (a practice which should not be encouraged) a Minister should assume the responsibility of it by signifying the consent of the Government to its being entertained by the House. If the House agree with me as to the desirability of adopting the constitutional restriction, it will become my duty to enforce the observance of the rule hereafter.

After some discussion on the point of order,

Hon. Mr. HOLTON objected to the Bill on its merits. It was an *ex post facto* measure, an Act to give vitality to securities now dead.

Hon. Mr. MORRIS said the course of the hon. member for Châteauguay was rather inconsistent. When the Bill was under discussion before the hon. member had informed the House that he would have no objection to it, if the Government would introduce it. Now, the hon. member objected to it on its merits. He (Hon. Mr.