

1. As the Bill related to the granting of pensions, payable out of the public revenues, and to such pensions exclusively, I consider it to have been a money Bill.

2. Such being the character of the Bill, I am of opinion that the Commons would not have accepted from the Lords any such amendment as that made by the Council, but would have disagreed to it on the ground of privilege, or would have laid the Bill aside.

3. I do not think clause 6 was separable from the other clauses of the Bill, or that the precedents cited of the omission of clauses by the Lords were applicable to this case.

4. For all purposes of privilege, as between the two Houses, a Bill relating solely to charges upon the public revenue is a money Bill, whether introduced by a Minister of the Crown or by a private member.

I need scarcely add that, in answering your questions, I have confined myself to the practice of the Imperial Parliament, and offer no opinion upon questions specially concerning the colonial Constitution, or the action of its authorities.

Sir Francis Dillon Bell, K.C.M.G., &c.

I have, &c.,  
T. ERSKINE MAY.