

HON. MR. ABBOTT—That anyone should suppose that there was such a motive, or that it was other than an accidental mistake, seems strange, as the Minister himself speaks of there being a diminution in that consumption, and the details show it. These circumstances make it perfectly clear that the clerk's mistake was accidental. The issue of this report has been suspended. All copies not issued have been retained; two new pages have been printed, and are being inserted in the place of those which contained the mistake, and which have been destroyed. The same pages which are being inserted in the book will be received by everyone who has been given a copy of the report; so it is to be hoped the error will be thoroughly corrected.

HON. MR. SCOTT—A large number of the corrected sheets should be sent through the country. The mistake has created a good deal of excitement.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—That is what we are about to do.

The Senate adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Tuesday, 5th February, 1889.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

A QUESTION OF ORDER.

The Orders of the Day having been called—

HON. MR. POWER said: Before the Orders are gone into I wish to call attention to the matter to which I referred yesterday, and which, at the suggestion of the hon. leader of the House, was postponed until to-day. I desire to call attention to the fact that the leader of the Government in this House, on Thursday, before the House had proceeded to take His Excellency's Speech into consideration, introduced three Government Bills which were not *pro formâ*, but were Bills that the hon. gentleman proposed to push

to a final passage in this House. I desire to call attention to the fact that in the course adopted by the hon. gentleman there has been a departure from the usual parliamentary procedure—in fact, that the hon. gentleman's proceeding, as far as I can ascertain, is altogether without precedent. The parliamentary rule, which, I think, is generally well understood, is that no Bill which is intended to be proceeded with is introduced until after the Governor General's Speech has been taken into consideration. That is a principle as to which I think there is no doubt. In case there should be any doubt I shall refer to two or three well recognized authorities. At page 222 of May we find the practice which prevails in our own House as it does in the House of Lords. May lays down the practice of the House of Lords to be as follows: Before the speech is read "it is the practice of both Houses to read some Bill a first time *pro formâ*, in order to assert the right of deliberating without reference to the immediate causes of summons. This practice, in the Lords, is enjoined by a standing order. In the Commons the same form is observed by ancient custom only."

Then May goes on to quote an entry in the Journals of the House of Commons for the 22nd March, 1603:

"That the first day of every sitting in every Parliament some one Bill, and no more, receiveth a first reading for form's sake." This practice, he says "has continued till the present time." Then May goes on to mention the things that may be done in the House of Commons, but he says no questions are asked or petitions presented. At page 225 there is a sort of exception to this rule:

"In case the debate upon the Address in answer to the Queen's Speech should be adjourned, all the Bills of which notice has been given may be introduced. In February, 1880, and again in 1881, 1882 and 1883, the debate upon the Address having been adjourned, the several Bills, of which notice had been given, were brought in and ordered to be read a second time, as if the Address had been agreed to."

But the Address must have been taken into consideration before any Bill, except one Bill *pro formâ*, can be introduced into either House. That is the doctrine laid down by May. The same doctrine will be found in the 2nd volume of Hatsell. I