

the exception the rule, and the rule the exception, as some honourable members seemed to desire, could hardly be allowed. While a liberal indulgence might sometimes be granted he conceived that the rule was none the less necessary. The honourable member went on at a considerable length, contending that for its own protection the House should have the privilege of appealing to the Chair if it conceived that undue license was taken.

Hon. Mr. Locke said he was glad the honourable member (Mr. Sanborn) had raised the question, as he had come from a Parliament where the rules were not so rigid, and it was therefore proper that the members from the Maritime Provinces should understand what was the practice. He conceived, however, that it would not be sound policy to demand a very strict adherence to these rules, as there would arise cases when it would be very desirable that both the House and the Government should have fuller explanations than could be embodied in a mere question.

Hon. Mr. Steeves said in his opinion the honourable member opposite (Mr. Locke), who had inquired from the Minister of Fisheries whether the system of fishery bounties would be extended to the Lower Provinces had in no wise transgressed the rules when, while explaining his reasons, he had been interrupted by the honourable member from Sherbrooke. The rule which applied to the matter was in the following words: "In putting any such question no argument or opinion is to be offered, nor any facts stated, except so far as may be necessary to explain such questions." Now the only remarks of the honourable member were in explanation of the very question he was putting to the Government, and were quite in accordance with Parliamentary practice as laid down in the authorities. No doubt it would be extremely inconvenient to permit of speeches and arguments involving answers from members holding different opinions, but to make simple

explanations was not only admissible, but was often necessary in order to elicit satisfactory replies, and moreover it was justified by immemorial usage.

Hon. Mr. Tessier (ex-Speaker L.C.) said that the Rule followed in the Canadian Legislative Council was similar to that of the Imperial Parliament, and no debates were allowed upon questions proposed to the Government. It was, no doubt, true that in certain cases explanations at some length were permitted, but it was only by the indulgence of the House. In referring to precedents it was found that when a member was called to order upon this point, the Speakers of both Houses of the Imperial Parliament maintained the rule, and the case cited from the London TIMES by an honourable member were altogether exceptional. Mr. May in his Parliamentary practice put it very forcibly that "questions should be put in a manner which does not involve opinion, argument or reference." This rule had been strictly followed during the four years he (Mr. Tessier) had the honor of occupying the Chair of the Legislative Council of Canada, and he hoped it would be maintained in the Senate, otherwise debates of a desultory character would be pretty sure to take place on the questions which honourable members might have to propose to the Government.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell again repeated the information he had already given in regard of the time necessary for the preparation of a satisfactory Bill on the Fisheries, and hoped it would be placed in the hands of members in sufficient time to serve the purposes of the Fishermen of the Lower Provinces. The honourable member then proceeded to remark upon the allusion of an honourable member (Mr. Botsford) to the replies given to Honourable Mr. Anderson's questions, characterizing such allusion as unkind and uncalled for.

The House then adjourned.