

with precedent and with the practice of English parliamentary assemblies all over the world.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Of course, no one could for a moment suppose that my hon. friend is acuated by any but the best motives in bringing this matter up; but before proceeding to answer what he has said on the subject I would like to ask him if he suggests any substantive remedy for this, supposing the practice to be erroneous?

HON. MR. POWER—The hon. gentleman will notice the suggestion made by the right hon. leader of the Government in the case of Barthe's Insolvency Bill. I do not think it would be going too far to have the entries stricken out of our Journals.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend will see the difference between this case and that to which he refers as having been pronounced upon by Sir John Macdonald. In that case the gentleman made a motion for the repeal of the insolvency law. In the Commons a member cannot introduce a Bill without the leave of the House, and he has to make a motion to ask for leave, and on that motion there may be, and frequently is, discussion as to whether leave shall or shall not be granted. In the case of the motion of Mr. Barthe to repeal the insolvency law the debate went on for a considerable period of the day before anyone suggested that there was any irregularity about it, and then it was only the suggestion of the Speaker, not that he had no right to bring in the Bill, or to make a motion to be allowed to bring in a Bill; but as they were about to discuss the Address it would be expedient to postpone this discussion until after the Address had been passed. It must not be forgotten that in this instance we are in an entirely different position. It is the right, says our rule, of every member of the Senate to introduce a Bill. He asks for no leave on producing it. It is read the first time without discussion. I am not aware that there is any mode by which a discussion could be brought up as to whether or not a Bill should be introduced. The law says it shall be the right of the member to introduce it. Then, to do so, is a mere matter of routine. My hon. friend pro-

poses that we ought, in some way, to retrace the steps which we took with regard to those Bills on the second day of the Session. While I am free to admit that if I had supposed any hon. gentleman would have any objection to the performance of such a matter of routine on the second day of the Session, after, in a manner, the Speech from the Throne had been dealt with, I would not have introduced those Bills. I thought it convenient that the process of translating and printing those Bills should be proceeded with while we were discussing the Address to His Excellency; but I cannot say that, under the circumstances, I thought it of such importance to bring those Bills before the House at that time, if I had supposed that any gentleman would have considered it a violation of our practice, or showed any want of courtesy to His Excellency, or was objectionable in any other form. The object was not important enough to justify that, but that having been done, it is now on the records of the Senate that those Bills were introduced and read the first time, and ordered to be read the second time the day after the date fixed for the debate on the Address to His Excellency. If we are to retrace those steps we must have some substantial reason for doing it; it must be that we are wrong; it must be because, as my hon. friend says, we have violated some rule of the House, established either by practice or positive rule or by unvarying precedent, and my hon. friend undertook to show that there were specific rules against it and that there was no precedent for it. I take issue with my hon. friend on both points. I say there is no rule of either House which would prevent the introduction of those Bills before the debate on the Address to His Excellency had taken place or had been completed; and I take issue with the other proposition of my hon. friend, by saying that it appears to me there is any number of precedents for the introduction of Bills and the performance of other ordinary routine business before the completion of the debate upon the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

HON. MR. POWER—I did not say "completion;" I said before consideration. I guarded myself.