

members were bound down to simple questions and answers—such answers for instance as the Hon. Receiver General had given to the honourable member for Halifax (Mr. Anderson). Such a course he was persuaded would greatly lessen the influence of the House, and he hoped it would not be insisted upon. As had been seen in both the Lords and Commons, the members were allowed ample liberty, and he trusted the Senate of Canada would follow their example.

Hon. Mr. Blair said that after all it would make very little difference even if the Bill was adopted and rigidly applied, for honourable members by putting their questions in the form of resolutions, could always have them debated.

Hon. Mr. Hazen again spoke, and reiterated his opinion of the necessity for the rule. It was more wearisome to listen to long speeches than to have nothing to do. Let the rule be preserved, and then if any necessity arose for explanations in proposing inquiries, the member who did so could ask the indulgence of the House, which would, no doubt, be extended to him.

Hon. Mr. Campbell said that the rule in the Imperial Parliament was just as absolute as that which had existed in this branch of the Legislature in Canada. But it was equally evident that when explanations were needed to make the inquiry understood, they were always permitted. The honourable members who had taken such pains to get up instances, had only looked at the side which favored their opinion, and had altogether overlooked the decisions of the actual point of order when it had been brought up. Now he would venture to say those honourable members could not find a single instance in which, when the point of order had been raised, it was not decided that such explanations, reasons and arguments, before or after proposing questions, were out of order. It was easy enough to find exceptions, but all they could prove was that the rule was occasionally transgressed without the point of order being raised. It was thus that irregularities were multiplied and gained force. Now he (Mr. Campbell) had looked up a few cases in respect of which the rule had been invoked, and in every single instance, both in the Lords and Commons, the decision had been against the parties attempting to speak at such times. The Hon. Postmaster-General then cited five or six such cases, in which the appeal to the rule had been followed, as stated, by a prompt

decision, that the remarks were out of order. Mr. Campbell, however, said he had no doubt that if an honourable member deemed it essential to give reasons for any inquiry he had to make, the House would always be willing to hear him—unless indeed, this happened too often. He (Mr. Campbell) then referred to the allusion of an honourable member (Mr. Botsford), to the questions proposed by another honourable member, (Mr. Anderson), on Friday last, and to the nature of the replies, which he seemed to have regarded as unsatisfactory. But he (Mr. Campbell) could not see that the said questions admitted of fuller or clearer answers. Categorical questions of this sort could only be answered in the same way, and he considered that on the occasion referred to, the queries of the honourable member (Mr. Anderson), had been fully and fairly met. (Mr. Campbell here went over each of the questions and answers, and insisted that it would have been impossible to give other replies. They were direct and logical, and no fault could properly be found with them.)

There were then some allusions on the part of two or three members, to the question relating to the rate of interest paid to the Montreal Bank on advances to the Government, which it was contended was not sufficient.

Hon. Mr. Anderson said he desired to know what the average rate per annum of such interest was, and contended it could easily have been stated.

Hon. Mr. Wilmot stated a case in the House of Commons, which had occurred on an evening when he had gone there expecting to hear an important debate on currency and banking; but a Mr. Pym had questions to ask relating to the conveyance of the mails, and although he was entreated by several members to give way, he would not, but spoke for an hour or more, and was not called to order.

Hon. Mr. Sanborn wished it to be distinctly understood that when he had raised the point of order, he had no personal objection to the remarks the honourable member who was then on his feet was making at the time; in fact that honourable member had departed less from the rule than the gentleman who had preceded him. But as he had observed that it was becoming the practice to speak on such occasions he had thought it only right to have the point decided. It was no doubt true that much irregularity was permitted, but to make