

powers. In his opinion the Parliament had all the requisite power to do what it was proposed to do but to discuss the details, was like leaping before you came to the stile.

Hon. Mr. Blair was satisfied that the objections of an hon. member (Mr. Christie) were not valid, but if they were, they should have been adduced before the first reading.

Hon. Mr. Christie said it was only when the Bill came up that members could state such objections. The bill created an office, incidentally creating charges upon the people, and when this was the case the measure should come first from the Commons, then secondly, it proposed to deal with trade, and for that reason should have come through a Committee of the Whole.

Hon. Mr. Steeves said that already two or three speeches had been made since the point of order was raised. He had proposed saying a few words, but when the question of order was stated, he had refrained.

Hon. Mr. McCully had not understood that the hon. member (Mr. Christie) had formally raised the point.

Hon. Mr. Christie said he had quoted May, and given a precedent from Hansard, in support of his objections.

Hon. Mr. Botsford said that if the points raised were correct, and applied to the bill, they would necessarily be fatal, but he did not attach much weight to them. The bill did not impose any distinct change on the people. It did not impose restrictions on trade, and it created no salary, and he therefore thought that the course followed was correct.

Hon. Mr. Tessier admitted that if the Bill was for the regulation of trade it could not originate here.

Hon. Mr. Christie—Why the hon. member himself had said that the classification of vessels was something in the nature of regulating trade.

Hon. Mr. Tessier—The bill only provided for the organization of a Department distinct from all others, and if it went further than this, it could not be amended. Then, as there were no salaries attached to the offices, it could not be said to impose charges. Bills had often been brought into the Legislative Council affecting trade, and even specifying salaries, but the salaries were left in blank, to be filled in by the other branch of the Legislature. If all such Bills were excluded there

would be very little left which this House could do, and such a course would deprive the Senate of the importance it ought to possess.

Hon. Mr. McCully—Why the very Union Bill, under which this Parliament existed, was introduced into the House of Lords.

Hon. Mr. Macpherson really hoped that his hon. friend would not press his point of order. Whether the hon. gentleman was right or wrong in the stand he had taken was to him a matter of much less consequence, than the attitude of the House with regard to matters of legislation. To him it certainly appeared far from prudent to take any step, which in the slightest degree tended to circumscribe the powers of the Senate as a legislative body. Setting that, however, aside, if he understood the Bill, its object was to organize a department, and not by any means to regulate a trade, and this he had learned, if he understood him rightly, from the Hon. Minister of Marine himself. This being the case the powers of the Senate could neither be doubted nor disputed. He thought nevertheless that the power sought for might have been put in a more distinct form than as it was now set forth in the Bill.

The Speaker—That is not a question of order. The objection taken is that the Bill provides for a charge upon the people, and that it affected a branch of trade and industry. As regards the question of trade originating in a department, and a Bill being introduced in this House to enable a department to deal with matters of industry—if it were a matter of trade with any foreign government, or even any special legislation with regard to any particular trade, the objections made by the hon. member (Mr. Christie) might hold good. This Bill, however, neither relates to money matters (which must originate in the Commons) nor to the operations of trade, general or particular, and therefore the question of order does not here actually arise.

Hon. Mr. Steeves—It did not appear to him that there was any objection made to the principle of the Bill, but merely to its details, and it therefore occurred to him that any discussion on the clauses of the Bill should be deferred until the Bill itself had been brought up in Committee of the Whole. On the second reading all discussion should have been confined to general principles—to a desire to ascertain whether the country either needed or wanted such a Bill at all. The power sought for was such as no government of any country in the world had ever had given to it. The