

would not be intelligible if the report were made as suggested by the hon. gentleman, the course which has been followed in this case should be adopted. There are precedents for it. For instance, I think the Mutual Reserve Insurance Company's Bill, and another Bill, in the same session, were reprinted by the direction of the committee so as to bring them before the House in a shape that they could be intelligently dealt with. If the usual course had been followed, it would have been impossible for the House to thoroughly understand the amendments. I think this is a case for an exception.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. It might be convenient for those on the committee, but I am speaking for the whole House. We know nothing of what took place in the committee, and, therefore, the amendments made in committee should appear on our minutes. We do not know what they are.

The SPEAKER—When the report was brought in, I quite understood that the Bill had been redrafted, but it did not occur to me that the original Bill itself had not been amended so that the amendments should appear in our minutes. There is no objection to a Bill being redrafted and reprinted, but the amendments should appear on the original of the Bill sent to the committee, so that they might appear in our minutes. The result of this change of procedure has been that there is no reprint of the Bill and the amendments do not appear in the minutes. The error in practice has been, although a redrafted Bill has been reported, that the amendments do not appear on the minutes.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I do not rise to question the decision of his honour the Speaker, but I agree with the hon. senator from De Salaberry, that where a long Bill such as the Bill in question was, has been referred to a committee and the committee instead of reporting certain amendments to the Bill report that the Bill should be redrafted in the form in which they submitted it, members of the House would find it inconvenient to try to insert those new clauses and compare them with the original clause of the Bill. On the other hand, I think

Hon. Mr. BEIQUE.

the committee should report the draft Bill and it would be only proper that that draft Bill should appear in our minutes.

The SPEAKER—And translated.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—As His Honour the Speaker has stated, it has deprived us of the French translation altogether.

#### DELAYED RETURN.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—Before the orders of the day are called, I should like to know if His Honour the Speaker has been able to lay on the table of the House the return I asked for on the 27th of March with regard to orders of the Railway Commission respecting railway crossings. I asked for three returns, two of which have been submitted, but the main one has not been furnished yet.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I think it has been brought down.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—One has not been brought down yet—at least I have not been able to find it.

#### THE QUEBEC TRICENTENARY.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—I should like to ask the hon. Secretary of State if he has anything to say on the subject of the suggestion I made to invite the ex-Governors of the Dominion to be present at the Tercentenary celebration at Quebec?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—It appears that it is an unwritten law of etiquette that a man who has been Governor General of Canada does not return, as he has no status in the table of precedence. He would come far below officials appointed long after him, so, for that reason, there has been rather a tendency on the part of Governors General to decline returning to Canada. They have no status when they come back. They come simply as individuals and take second place to individuals very much below their standing when they were Governors General. I believe that is the explanation.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—No Governor has ever revisited Canada after his term expired, and for the reason suggested by the hon. Secretary of State.