

with me if I quote on this important point the authority of Mr. Bourinot. He says :

"Th procedure of the Senate on such occasions is quite different from that of the Commons. Much more latitude is allowed in the Upper House, and a debate often takes place on a question or enquiry, of which, however, notice must always be given when it is of a special character."

Now, this notice has been given, and is in compliance with the rule and practice in that respect. He continues :

"Many attempts have been made to prevent debate on such questions, but the Senate, as it may be seen from the precedents in the notes below, have never practically given up the usage of permitting speeches on these occasions—a usage which is essentially the same as the House of Lords."

It is true there is a qualified sentence to that almost unlimited scope for discussion described by the authority I have just read from. He says :

"The observations made on such occasions, however, should be confined to the persons making and answering the enquiry, and if others are allowed to offer remarks these should be rather in the way of explanation, or with the view of eliciting further information on a question of public interest."

Now, I do not think this is borne out by the practice of this House. We have gone a good deal further than the House of Lords in the discussions that have been permitted in the Senate. In quoting the notes, Mr. Bourinot does me the honour of saying that I called the attention of the House to the matter. He says :

"Mr. Miller, formerly Speaker, in 1888 expressed himself strongly as to permitting debate on a mere enquiry. But, as the notes show, the Senate has never laid down any distinct rules to limit debate."

The Senate did not think proper to take any action on the remonstrance I made on the prolonging of these debates, and I presume the practice has been confirmed, rather than weakened, by any reference I made to it at that time. I take it for granted that it will largely depend on the House what liberty of discussion should be allowed to hon. gentlemen on this motion, but the same liberty should be allowed of course to any one wishing to reply.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—Although I do not differ from what my hon. friend has said, I know that there have been discussions on such notices, but the practice has been to call the attention of the House to a certain subject and then ask a question based on that. I remember one such case. I think we are getting into very lax ways, because no one could have anticipated, on a simple question of this kind, that we were going to have a discussion. My hon. friend who gave this notice should have made a motion.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—I have said all I intended to say, and I now call for the ruling of the Chair.

Hon. Mr. MASSON—The rule is clearly laid down in the House of Lords. In England until 1868 discussions were not allowed on questions without notice being given. Then was established the rule that whenever a discussion was desired, the member should give notice, and, on that notice being given, a general debate might take place. It is laid down in May that important discussions have taken place on single questions, provided the member gave proper notice. In this instance the hon. gentleman has given proper notice. He has in his favour the usage of the House, and has also written proof that it is not only the usage of this House, but also of the House of Lords. He has this rule which has been laid down in England, and has, therefore, the right of going on with the discussion. It would be very extraordinary if, on a question of such importance, an hon. member is to be debarred from continuing the discussion unless the House is informed by the Government that it would be detrimental to the public interest to prolong the debate. The Government has given no intimation of the kind. It is quite well established that the usage of the House has been to allow discussions on questions like this, and the hon. gentleman having taken the precaution to give due notice, it would be harsh to prevent the discussion, and with due respect to the hon. gentleman who has raised the question, I think he is entirely mistaken.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN—I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman from Arichat as to the