

weeks. I did not lay those documents on the table as a necessary adjunct to the Bill at all. It is simply for the information of the House to show what had been done. It had no connection with this Bill whatever.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I think my hon. friend will find, if he will read another clause of that statute, that it declares what shall be done before they be laid upon the table, that is that they must receive the sanction of the Governor General and also of the clerk. That has not been done. That portion of the law has not been complied with. The remarks of the hon. gentleman from Toronto might have some force if the facts were as he stated them. There may be changes and alterations made in the language of these statutes to which my hon. friend took objection, and they are laid before parliament for the purpose of a revision by parliament, of receiving sanction, and more than that, the Act we are now dealing with provides for other matters besides the ratification of the work of the commissioners who revised those statutes. I would like to press that point to which I have called my hon. friend's attention two or three times, as to whether he thinks he has complied with the law in simply laying these volumes on the table without complying with that clause of the Act to which I have referred?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—My hon. friend will understand that it is quite impossible to lay the French version of it upon the table because it will not be completed probably for another month.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I refer to the English.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Well it is the same as the French. If the one has to be laid on the table the other must be laid on the table also.

Hon. Mr. DeBOUCHERVILLE—It seems to me the procedure in this matter has been rather extraordinary. We are sending it to the House of Commons without consideration, not knowing if that House will do the same, and we who are regarded as revisors would be revised by the other chamber if they give it mature consideration. At all events I do not see the necessity for such haste.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

Hon. Mr. POWER—If the House will allow me to say another word, this matter is different from the case of the revised statutes of 1886. In that case the revisors had to gather in the statutes of the various provinces. In addition to revising and consolidating the Acts which had been passed by the parliament of Canada, they had to go over the legislation of the different provinces, which had been enacted before the union of the provinces, and it was a serious task in that way to decide what should be embodied in the revised statutes and what should not. The government of that day thought proper, I suppose largely on that account, to refer the report of the commissioners to a joint committee of the two houses. I had the honour of being a member of that committee, and we went over the two printed volumes with a good deal of care and suggested certain changes. In the present case it did not seem to be so necessary that this preliminary consideration should be given, and at any rate parliament in its wisdom decided that that preliminary inquiry on the part of both houses should not take place. While that is true, and while it is true that we can, without looking at these volumes, without having them before us, pass this Bill, still, as a matter of courtesy to this House, it is only right that we should know what we are doing, and as we are not pressed for time, I think the government are taking the proper course in referring this Bill to the committee. We are not referring the revised statutes to the committee. The first subsection of the 3rd clause reads as follows:

The revised statutes of Canada, 1906, are hereby ratified and confirmed, and declared to have and to have had on, from and after the first day of January, 1907, the force of law as if herein enacted.

It seems to me it is only fair to this House that before we pass that clause we should have those revised statutes before us so that we shall be able to say that we did not confirm the revised statutes without having at least seen them. Then there is another provision in this Bill which is new, and which is also important, and which does not appear in the Act of 1903, and that is the one with respect to the translation of the revised statutes into French. I understand that large-