

tables of precedence apply to the local legislature and to the Lieutenant Governors, some serious issues may arise. I am under the impression that it is not obligatory on the part of Lieutenant Governors of provinces to ask anybody to their dinner table, except it be the provincial dignitaries, but that of course is a matter which may require investigation at the hands of the government. I will, however, just call the attention of my hon. friend to this point: that in the table of precedence which I have under my hand, there is considerable ambiguity. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court unquestionably ranks before all senators, but the next words that are used are not the Chief Justices, but the Chief Judges of the Court of Law and Equity, according to seniority. I am not sufficiently familiar with the rules of the bar and the form of the commission granted to Sir Francis Langelier to speak with absolute authority on that point, but he will observe that the Chief Justices and the Chief Judges are not precisely synonymous terms, and the distinction, no doubt, was made with some reference to the possibility of there being several parties entitled to the position of Chief Judges of the several courts. However, we shall have the whole matter carefully considered by the time the hon. gentleman's question comes up, and I may give him a more satisfactory reply.

Hon. Mr. LOUGHEED—Has the hon. member the original copy of the order of precedence? It seems to me there is a clerical error there. There is no such term as Chief Judge.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I am reading from the Parliamentary Guide. Some of these orders I think were originally framed, if my memory is right, prior to confederation.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Oh, no, since that.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—It may have been amended since, but I think too that the Governors General in one or two instances, but I am not sure about the Lieutenant Governors, have, with the consent of the imperial authorities, varied slightly the rules laid down in the table of

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

precedence. For example, I think that they have received instructions to include on the same footing as archbishops and bishops the chief dignitaries of the various other denominations who have no archbishops and bishops, and, similarly, I think, one or two alterations were made as to the status of imperial privy councillors and the like. However, it may be, the question my hon friend has presented will receive attention when we reach it.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I might add to what the hon. gentleman has said, that I have no recollection of any change in the order of precedence other than the one to which he refers. There was no place allotted for privy councillors not of the government until some years after confederation, and I remember distinctly that some of the privy councillors not of the government refused to attend the levee given by the Governor in this chamber until a place was allotted to them. And upon representations made by the Governor at that date, the order of precedence was changed, allotting to them a particular place in that order. There were a number of attempts made more particularly in reference to the representatives of the different religious bodies in the Dominion. But Mr. Chamberlain, when Secretary for the Colonies, intimated to the government of Canada at that period that any changes which the colonies desired to be made in the order of precedence would be granted by the imperial government. However, although these reports were made, no change took place. The late Secretary of State is aware of what did take place, and the changes suggested at the time. The only change I have any recollection of during the whole discussion, is the one to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I do not want to prolong the discussion, but I wish to say a word in reply to some observations of my hon. friend. He says it is a question of the constitution, but he took it afterwards as a question of my own constitution, because I refused the dinner. I think the constitution of the country is far more to be considered than mine; it should not be treated with such levity. I inquired of the