

should be cancelled, it ought to be cancelled. I propose, therefore, that the Report of the Committee should be adopted, and that the Report of the sub-Committee should be referred back for further consideration.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) : The remarks of the hon. the First Minister would seem to imply a censure upon the Committee. The right hon. gentleman should not come to a hasty conclusion. The sub-Committee is part of the Committee, and their Report is part of the Committee's Report. It would be unfair to the Printing Committee to say that the Report they supplemented does not represent their views and opinions, after a careful consideration of the whole question.

MR. PATTERSON (Essex) : The Joint Committee on Printing have recommended the cancellation of the contract; and it would be unjust, under all the circumstances, to delay the cancellation. Without making any further remarks, I move in amendment :

"That in the opinion of this House the Government should take the necessary steps to cancel the contract awarded to Messrs. McLean, Roger and Company, for the Printing of Parliament from the 1st of January, 1880; and that the said contract be offered to Patrick Boyle of Toronto, whose tender appears from all the evidence to be the only legitimate tender below that of Messrs. McLean, Roger and Company; and that so much of the Thirteenth Report of the Joint Committee of both Houses on the Printing of Parliament, as is consistent with the foregoing Resolution, be adopted."

MR. BLAKE : In order to give the hon. Chairman of the Committee on Printing an opportunity to call his Committee together, and remedy the existing defect I rise to a point of order. It is necessary that two day's notice should be given before the adoption of the Report.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I object to this; the hon. gentleman has spoken twice or thrice to the motion.

MR. BLAKE : I have not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : The question before us was the adoption of the Report. It is quite clear that the hon. gentleman is out of order altogether. He cannot, in any way, make the objection in regard to want of notice; it is too late for him to do that after speaking on the question, and discussing it so far. One would think it was the desire of the hon.

member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) to allow a continuance of these irregular and improper practices.

MR. BLAKE : I rose to a point of order.

MR. MILLS : I—

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Order.

MR. MILLS : I am about to speak to a point of order. It is always competent for a member to rise on a question of order. If any motion is out of order, its irregularity is not cured by any discussion that takes place on it. A question of order can always be taken.

MR. SPEAKER : From what I can judge from the debate, the question is, whether the Report of the Committee ought to be adopted or not.

MR. BLAKE : Whether notice of motion for its adoption is requisite.

MR. SPEAKER : I think that notice is required.

INDIAN LAWS AMENDMENT BILL. [BILL 90.]

(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Order for second reading read.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : When I introduced the Bill I explained its meaning partly. It is a consideration of the laws relating to Indians, including a system for newly organising the Department and creating the Indian Branch into a separate and distinct Department, under the control of the hon. the Minister of the Interior. My worthy subordinates agree with me that the duties of the Indian Branch are so onerous, that instead of being a sub-branch, it should be a separate Department, under one Minister.

MR. PATERSON (South Brant) : This Bill is of considerable importance to some members of the House, and it is desirable, at this late period of the Session, that it should be allowed to stand over.

AN HON. MEMBER : Oh, no.

MR. PATERSON : It is scarcely fair to discuss this Bill now. The hon. the Minister is well aware that many may want to speak on the Bill. My objections to the Indian Bill passing at this time, are as follows :—In the first place it is a consolidation of the Indian laws, and that being the case, the hon. the First Minister would be disposed to resent next Session the introduction of any amendments by private members. The objection