

times, regretted the rigor of the rule, for surely the House had a right to ask any questions it chose, and to expect all the information the Ministers might feel at liberty to communicate. The Senate constituted the large inquest of the country, and as such should be considered at liberty to inquire into all matters of public interest. In his opinion it was better to follow the usage prevailing in the Lords of which the House had now had good samples in the instances produced by the honourable member (Mr. McCully).

Hon. Mr. Blair said he desired to draw the attention of the House to one simple consideration, which would, he thought, show the inconvenience of the practice recommended by the honourable member (Mr. McCully). If in putting a question, the honourable member doing so should be at liberty to go fully into the subject, he would probably state views and opinions to which other honourable members would take exception, and they of course would expect to be allowed to reply. Thus long discussions would be introduced, and the House would never get at the standing orders. The case of the Earl of Cardigan was an exceptional one. His personal honour and courage had been called in question, and it was right he should have the opportunity of vindicating himself. But it would hardly be expected that the conduct of affairs should be left in the hands of honourable members.

Hon. Mr. Hazen thought that the decision arrived at yesterday was the correct one and should be respected. The cases produced by the honourable member were altogether exceptional and if it were necessary he (Mr. Hazen) would undertake to prove that in nine out of ten cases when questions were proposed to the Government in the Imperial Parliament no discussion whatever took place. From what he had himself witnessed there he could assert that the practice was question and answer, and nothing beyond that. If questions of all sorts could be brought up and speeches of two or three hours allowed, it would not be possible to proceed with the real business. Then, if only the member who propounded the inquiry and were at liberty to speak, other members would consider themselves unfairly treated, and with reason. All things considered he held it was better to abide by the rules.

Hon. Mr. Botsford said he had had no opportunity yesterday of presenting a few remarks, as he had intended to do, upon this subject, in consequence of the Chair having

been appealed to for a decision. There appeared, however, to be no express rule bearing upon the case, and the Senate was therefore left to govern itself by the practice of the Imperial Parliament. When the point of order was raised his honourable friend (Mr. Locke) was, as he (Mr. Botsford) believed, perfectly in order, for he was simply giving a reason for asking the question whether the Government intended to extend the system of bounties to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. If he had gone into an elaborate argument as to the propriety of extending such bounties it might have been held that he was encroaching, but he was merely stating that as arrangements for the next season's fishing were always made early in March, it was important they should know whether or not it was probable the system of bounties would be extended to them. To satisfy his own mind as to the practice of the House of Lords he (Mr. Botsford) had turned to Hansard and found half a dozen cases which would prove that it was not in questions of personal honor as in that of the Earl of Cardigan that explanations were permitted, and he would now adduce them. The first was on June 6th of this year, when Sir Andrew Agnew rose to ask the Secretary of War whether by the warrant of July 1, 1848, as well as by the Horse Guards Circulars of April 15, 1862, the troops engaged in repelling the Fenian raid in Canada, June 1866, were not fairly entitled to receive three month's extraordinary field allowance, instead of one month's allowance which had been issued, and the speaker went on to give his views to the extent of a column without being called to order. On June 7th Sir John Gray rose to call attention to the distress, which, according to communications which had reached him, now prevailed in the Western portions of Mayo and Galway, and made a speech of a column and a half. Lord Naas replied at considerable length, the report of his speech occupying four columns, after which Mr. Brady spoke some time. The honourable member produced five or six other cases, all equally pertinent to the question, and said that they were all on matters of public importance, and if proper he could go on multiplying them, but he presumed those presented would be sufficient. They all went to show that great liberties were allowed in the Imperial Parliament in matters of this kind, and he was sure the rigid rule advocated by some honourable members would be attended with very great inconvenience. And he would ask what interest the public could be expected to take in the proceedings of the Senate, if the