

OMISSION IN THE MINUTES.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw the attention of the House to an omission in the minutes of this House. At page 154 it reads:—

The question being put on the main motion.

The Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell, in amendment moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Ferguson

That the said report be not now adopted, but that the words "His Honour the Speaker and" be struck out of the second paragraph of said report.

The question of concurrence being put thereon the same was resolved in the affirmative.

The question of concurrence being again put on the main motion,

The Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell, in amendment moved, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Ferguson that the said report be not now adopted, but that it be further amended as follows:—

That the 5th paragraph be struck out and the following inserted therefor:

That the sale of wine or other beverages to any one not a senator be strictly prohibited.

The question of concurrence being put on the amendment to further amend the report, the House divided and the names being called for they were taken down as follows:

Then it gives the names, and the motion was resolved in the affirmative. While this was taking place, if I remember well, a question of order was raised and the ruling of the Chair asked. The ruling of the Chair was given, but nothing of that appears in the journal of the House.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—That would not be in the Journals; it would be in the Debates.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Perhaps the lecture my hon. friend wishes to give me will not stand good when I give the hon. member my precedents. I take the Journals of the House in 1891, and I find

The Hon. Mr. Bellerose, on the 6th July, moved in amendment to the amendment, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Masson, that the 10th clause of the said bill be struck out.

Upon a question of order being raised, the Speaker ruled that the said amendment was irrelevant and out of order.

In another case in 1892 I find in the Minutes the following:

Hon. Mr. Clemow moved, seconded by Mr. McInnes, that the said bill as now amended be read a third time, and Mr. Power moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Lewin, that the said bill be not now read the third time, but that it be amended by striking out all the words from the word "Metcalf," in line 30, and inserting instead thereof the following words: that is to say, from

McKay street to Cathcart street. The question of order being raised thereon, His Honour the Speaker ruled the amendment out of order.

I have, in the volume of 1887, four precedents where the question of order was raised, decided and the decision put on record in the Journals.

Hon. Mr. McINNES (B.C.)—Were they not all given on bills and not on reports of committees?

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Here is a question of order raised on a petition:

The Order of the Day being read for reading the petition of Daniel Shantz and others, of the village of Huntingdon in the province of Quebec, praying the Senate to hear and determine upon the property qualification of the Hon. François Xavier Trudel.

The question of order being raised, namely, that the petition did not bear the signature of the men who presented it and therefore could not be received.

His Honour ruled the point of order was not well taken and his decision is reported in the Journals of the Senate. Such a practice has always been followed in this House: I claim it is right, as a record of the proceedings which took place in the House yesterday, that the question of order which was put to the Chair and ruled upon should be inserted in the Minutes of Proceedings of this House. The question I raised was that the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell had no right to move his amendment because he had already spoken on the subject, and already moved a prior amendment. That appeared in the Minutes of the Proceedings of the House of Commons. On this question Speaker Brand of the House of Commons in England says:

A member who has spoken without moving his amendment cannot move that amendment subsequently, but must place it in the hands of another member.

Another paragraph reads:

A member who has spoken to an amendment cannot at a subsequent stage move another amendment.

That was my point of order. The Chair has given another ruling, and I wish it inserted in the Minutes of the House so that we can consult it in the future.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—As to the point of order, the practice pointed