

come here and certify to their amendments, in the message we would receive. Either the message would contain the further amendments not made in the Bill itself, or the clerk of the other House will come and certify the Bill. I do not see that it makes any difference.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—We should facilitate the desire of the House to have their message complied with as far as possible; on the other hand this is a precedent of some importance. To my mind, the course is irregular. The Bill was returned to us with a message advising us that one amendment had been made. We have considered that message and complied with it, and the procedure has been entirely exhausted. The proper course now is for the House of Commons to ask us to return the Bill for the purpose, and let them send it to us with another message containing the two amendments which they had omitted to send in the first place. Then, on receiving the message, we will deal with it, and agree to or reject the two amendments which had been omitted. If you follow the course which has been suggested, it is open to two very serious objections. In the first place, the Bill in its present condition is what may be considered an authentic document, which no officer of either House has a right to tamper with.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—Except with our authorization.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—No.

Hon. Mr. YOUNG—We had a similar case here the other day.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—The two cases are not parallel. That was done by virtue of a message.

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND—We have one in this instance.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—I am speaking of one objection; that is, interfering in an irregular way with what I consider to be an authentic document. The second objection is this: "Supposing we comply with this request, what will be the position? The clerk of the House of Commons will come to this Chamber and will make the amendments. How will this House then be called

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

upon to consider these amendments? There will be no message. The message is merely to insert these amendments that have been written, but there is no message asking us to concur in these two amendments; therefore they will not come regularly before this House. The other course which I suggest is, I am satisfied, the only proper course.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It is a regular message. On the 17th May, 1909, a resolution was passed by the House of Commons that a message be sent to the Senate requesting that their honours give leave to the clerk of this House to add certain amendments which were passed by the House of Commons to Bill (No. 180), describing the Bill. As I understand the situation here, the Bill came back with only one amendment, and there were others. We concurred in that amendment; we did not announce to the House that we had adopted that amendment; it is still before the House. It is not passed. No message, as I am advised, has gone to the House of Commons acknowledging it. It still stands before this Senate, and the Commons can do no more than have their official come up and state that they, by an oversight in the copy, omitted the amendment.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK—I desire to mention a case reported in Bourinot, which, I think, bears on this particular matter. In the session of 1875, a Bill to incorporate the Royal Mutual Life Insurance Company of Canada, was amended in the Senate and sent back to the Commons where the amendments were concurred in. Subsequently, the House of Commons informed the Senate by message, that an amendment to the title had been inadvertently left out in the copy of the Bill sent back to the Commons, and requesting that leave be given to the proper officer of the Senate to supply the omission. It was accordingly resolved by the House to give the necessary leave, and a message was returned to that effect. Then the omitted amendment was considered and agreed to. This is the ordinary practice now, in the case of a Bill being amended.

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE—It was merely changing the title, but here it is two amendments with which we have to deal.