

"the right to omit a clause which they could not amend"? What does that mean?

**THE CHAIRMAN:** In reference to the question asked by the honourable member from Halifax (Hon. Mr. Roche), as I have always understood, it is not the duty either of the Speaker or the Chairman to rule on the question. There must be a concrete objection taken by way of a point of order, which was not done. I think the discussion which has taken place has thrown considerable light on the matter. Some things have been said with which I would not agree; but I do not think it is competent for me to enter into any argument. I have always understood, as quoted in May, that all the aids and supplies to His Majesty in Parliament are the sole gift of the Commons, but they are recommended first by the representative of the Crown, and all Bills for the granting of any such aids and supplies ought to begin with the Commons, and that "it is the undoubted and sole right and qualification of the Commons to limit and appoint in such Bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications"—which I take it would mean quantity as well as particular purpose—"and qualifications of such grants, which ought not to be deducted or altered by the Lords." That is what May says. That, I take it, is the authority which controls the House of Commons in England and which is our best example. Then I take up Todd's "Parliamentary Government." Todd has always been regarded as one of our best writers. He says:

The British North America Act, 1867, Sec. 53, declares that "Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue, or for imposing any tax or impost, shall originate in the House of Commons." No further definition of the relative powers of the two Houses is ordinarily made by any statute, but constitutional practice goes much farther than this.

I mention this merely because it seems to me to go further than the honourable gentleman who said we are justified in going only so far as the law has given us authority to go. My understanding has always been that the constitution of the British Parliament, as well as ours, is growing all the time by evolution and accretion.

**Hon. Mr. DANDURAND:** Not ours.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Ours, in many directions. We have practices that are not common in the House of Commons in England, but which have been followed here for years, and our own authorities lay down the principle that when we want to establish a rule to govern us, the rule shall be

**Hon. Mr. LANDRY.**

made by a committee and endorsed by the House, and after that it shall control the House. So I think that we go a little farther than we are authorized by the statutory authority laid down in the British North America Act; but any clause in the British North America Act which specifically governs our conduct cannot be departed from in any way. That point, I think, was very plainly commented on by Speaker Coburn in the House of Commons many years ago, and a very clear distinction was made.

With regard to the question how far the Senate can amend these Bills, I have been looking up the Journals of the Senate, and find that there is a summary of the Bills as to which they disagreed with the Commons—Bills that might be called money Bills; but it does not seem to me in looking over them that the point in dispute referred to changing the amount of money involved is one of them. I read from the Journals of the Senate for 1912-13, page 537.

**Hon. Mr. LANDRY:** That is taken from Bramwell.

**The CHAIRMAN:** I find that Bills have been amended:

To rectify mistakes apparent in the context or other parts of the Bill;  
To rectify mistakes in amendments made by committees on Bills;  
To rectify mistakes in recitals;  
To rectify mistakes in description of persons;  
To rectify clerical errors;  
To amend surreptitious alteration of Bill;  
Being for alteration of dates elapsed or nearly elapsed;  
Being for clearer explanation of the intention of the Bill;  
Being for greater caution, and no alteration of the intention of the Bill;

Where the Commons have rejected some suggestions by the Senate:

It has been maintained, during the discussion of the point of order, that the Senate had no right to interfere with Bills which increase the expenditure of money, but would have a right to amend such Bills in order to decrease or prevent the expenditure of money. I admit that, at first sight, I was of that opinion, but the authority of May, cited by the Hon. Secretary of State, at page 542, after saying that the House of Lords is excluded, not only from the power of initiating or amending Bills dealing with public expenditure or revenue, but also from initiating public Bills which would create a charge upon the people or which would deal with the administration or employment of those charges.

Then the Commons go on to say that in accepting some of the Senate's suggestions with regard to amendments it must be distinctly understood that they are not there-