

always right. My authority for the statement I have made will be found at page 224 of Bourinot's work. It is the latest authority, May's work having been published before it.

HON. MR. POWER—The edition of May from which I quoted is that of 1883.

HON. MR. POIRIER—Bourinot's work is as late as 1884. He says:

"The practice in the two Houses with respect to the Address was similar up to 1870, when it was simplified in the Senate in conformity with the latest practice in the House of Lords. It is now only necessary to move the Address directly, without going through the formality of proposing a prior resolution in the House of Commons."

I think that is quite distinct.

HON. MR. POWER.—What has that got to do with the Bill *pro formâ*?

HON. MR. POIRIER—It has this: When the House of Lords deem it necessary they do not hesitate to discontinue an old precedent, and they have done away with that prior Bill altogether.

HON. MR. POWER—I thought that the hon. gentleman was going to show that the bill *pro formâ* had been done away with altogether. Instead of that the hon. member has discovered a mare's nest. The quotation which he has read shows that the House of Lords, instead of first proposing a resolution for an Address, deals with the Address directly.

HON. MR. POIRIER—It shows that they have not followed precedent.

HON. MR. POWER—It has nothing to do with the question before the House.

The Senate adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Wednesday, 6th February, 1889.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

MOTION.

HON. MR. ABBOTT moved that the time for presenting petitions for private

Bills, which expires on Saturday, the 9th inst., be extended to Friday, the 1st day of March next.

The motion was agreed to.

THE SESSIONAL COMMITTEES.

MOTION

HON. MR. ABBOTT moved the appointment of the sessional committees as they appear on the Notice Paper, omitting the last one (Committee on Divorce).

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I rise to a question of order. Under the 14th Rule of the House the hon. gentleman cannot proceed with his motion, inasmuch as the rule requires a full day to intervene between a notice of motion and the motion itself. I intimated when the notice was given that this difficulty might arise if the question were raised. Believing, as I do, that notice of those committees might as well have been given on the second day of the meeting of Parliament as not, I shall press for the enforcement of the rule.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I dare say my hon. friend is within his right in taking this objection. Of course, I cannot imagine what motive he has for doing it. The rule of the House requires an intervening day between the notice and the motion, but I was in hopes that no objection would be raised, and that we might facilitate business a little by taking this step forward. If my hon. friend insists upon his objection I do not know that I have any power to proceed with the motion.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—Unless my hon. friend can give some better reason than he has given I shall insist upon my objection. My hon. friend says he cannot see what motive I have: the motive is that the rule is not complied with, and it is only right that we should abide by the rules of the House. I was in hopes that the hon. gentleman might be able to give some better reason than attributing motives to me for objecting to his motion.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend must not suppose for a moment that I offer any insinuations as to his motive. His motive I suppose to be a good one. I may say that I had a very large number of suggestions offered to me by members of the House respecting the committees,