

the Speech from the Throne at once, instead of which we postponed it, for the extraordinary reason given by the leader of the House, that our desks were not in their usual places. Surely the gentlemen who postponed the consideration of the Speech from the Throne on the ground that Senators might feel a little embarrassed in talking without their desks could not be very anxious to push the business of Parliament. Here we are, on the day fixed for the second reading of those Bills, and not one of them is before us. What becomes of the argument of necessary haste? There is nothing in it at all. The hon. leader of the House seems to have misapprehended the reason why I quoted our own rule and the rule of the House of Lords. I did so to show that according to those rules a Bill *pro forma* should be introduced. The expression of that fact seemed to show that it was not the intention that any other Bill should be introduced. I quoted from Bourinot and May clear and unmistakable authority to show that no other Bill should be introduced before the consideration of the Speech from the Throne; and that was the proposition I laid down, that until we had entered into the consideration of His Excellency's Speech it was contrary to uniform practice to deal with any Bill. Two other hon. gentlemen said those Bills were Government measures promised in His Excellency's Speech, and therefore there was no objection to dealing with them. I think the objection to dealing with any Bill is much stronger in the case of the measures mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. His Excellency says that certain Bills will be laid before us. We say in our Address that when those Bills are submitted to us we will give them our respectful consideration. How can we do that when they are already placed before us? The hon. gentleman said that the first reading of those Bills was simply a formal routine proceeding; but any member might have discussed any one of those Bills for any length of time on the first reading; and everyone can see how objectionable it would be that we should be here dealing with measures promised in the Governor's Speech before we had considered the Speech itself. The order for the second reading cannot pass without a motion, and that might be dis-

cussed. Every motion can be discussed, and everyone can see what the inconvenience would be. I was not satisfied with my own opinion about this matter, but I went to Mr. Bourinot, who is recognized, I think, as about the best authority in Ottawa on questions of parliamentary procedure. I stated to him exactly what had taken place, and he told me that the course followed was irregular and contrary to precedent. It is perfectly true that there was originally in both Houses of Parliament the right to deal with any Bill, and that this Bill *pro forma* is intended to vindicate that right; but we have a practice running over more than 200 years—a uniform practice, the other way. I called the hon. gentleman's attention to a resolution passed by the English House of Commons in 1603, which said this one Bill and no more should be introduced. The uniform practice during all this time has been that there shall be only that one Bill, intended to vindicate the right of the House; and then the House, in order to show its respect to the Monarch in the old country and the representative of the Crown here, does not deal with any other Bills until the Speech from the Throne has been dealt with. I can understand that the hon. gentleman has a natural disinclination to withdraw measures which have been already introduced; but inasmuch as they have not been proceeded with, and are not ready to be read the second time, I do not see that any great harm would be done by withdrawing them. The least that should be done would be that the House should declare that the introduction of those Bills the other day should not be drawn into a precedent. I feel I have done my duty as a member of this House in endeavoring to keep its proceedings regular, and if the majority are against me I cannot help it.

HON. MR. POIRIER—As my statement with respect to the practice of the House of Lords has been challenged—

HON. MR. POWER—I did not challenge it.

HON. MR. POIRIER—I wish to state my authority. I find it in Bourinot. There are many things in a book, and when one part is taken and other parts are overlooked the conclusion is not