

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker: Is not a notice of motion required in this case?

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I see, by Rule No. 31, that

"Two days' notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a Bill, Resolution, or Address, for the appointment of any Committee, or for the putting of a question; but this Rule shall not apply to Bills after their introduction or to Private Bills."

Well, is it not the fact that, after the action of the Committee yesterday, these Bills disappeared altogether from the Notice Paper; and therefore that there is no Bill before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER. This Bill has been introduced.

Mr. BLAKE. And read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER. And read the second time before the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It was referred by the House to the Committee of the Whole, and has not the Committee, by its action, arrested the Bill altogether?

Mr. SPEAKER. According to English practice, the way to bring a Bill again before the House—as the Committee cannot kill a Bill which is before the House—in the event of a Bill being dropped from the Order Paper, it is competent, on a subsequent day, without notice, to move to fix a day when the Bill shall again be considered.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course I put the question—as this is the first time that a motion of this kind has been made, at all events during this Parliament because I thought it proper that we ought to have a ruling about it, in order that we might govern ourselves in future similar cases.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Mr. Speaker: Are we to understand that the Committee having made no report to the House, the House can take possession again of this Bill, and dispose of it as if it had not been sent to the Committee of the Whole, and that Committee had made a report? If the Committee has made no report, I think that it is yet in possession of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLAKE. No. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to get it back into Committee of the Whole, without this procedure; but the hon. gentleman does not want to get it back there, and he thinks that it is there yet.

Motion (Mr. Cameron, Huron) negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:
Messieurs

Allen,	Forbes,	Platt,
Allison.	Foster,	Ray,
Armstrong	Gillmor,	Reid,
Auger,	Gunn,	Richey
Bain,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Béchar,	Hay,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bernier,	Holton,	Ross (Middlesex),
Blake,	Innis,	Rykert
Bourassa,	Irvine,	Scrivier,
Brecken,	Jackson,	Shakespeare
Burnham	Jamieson,	Somerville (Brant),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Keefer,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Huron),	King,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kinney	Sutherland (Selkirk)
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Trow,
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Vail,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Wallace (Albert),
Cockburn,	Mackenzie,	Wallace (York),
Cuthbert,	McMillan (Huron),	Watson,
Davies,	McGrancy,	Weldon,
Dickinson,	McIntyre,	Wells,
Dodd,	McIsaac,	Wheler,
Fairbank,	McMullen	White (Renfrew),
Farrow,	O'Brien,	Wigle, and
Fisher,	Paterson (Brant),	Wilson.—77.
Fleming,	Pickard,	

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Desaulniers,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Amyot,	Desjardins,	McCallum,
Baker (Missisquoi)	Dugas (Dundas)	McDougald,
Baker (Victoria),	Dupont,	McGreevy,
Barnard,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McLellan,
Beatty,	Ferguson (Welland),	McNeill,
Bell,	Forin,	Massue,
Benoit,	Fréchette,	Mitchell,
Benson,	Gagné,	Moffat,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Bergin,	Girouard (Kent),	Orton,
Billy,	Gordon,	Quimet,
Blanchet,	Grandbois,	Paint,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Paterson (Essex),
Bolduc,	Guillet,	Pope,
Bossé,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Haggart,	Royal,
Burns,	Hall,	Scott,
Cameron (Inverness)	Hawkins,	Small,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hesson,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Sproule,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Tassé,
Caron,	Ives,	Taylor,
Cimon,	Kilvert,	Tilley,
Cochrane,	Kranz,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Colby,	Labrosse,	Tupper (Picton),
Costigan,	Landry,	Tyrwhitt,
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Valin,
Coursol,	Lesage,	White (Cardwell),
Curran,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Hastings),
Daly,	McDonald (C. Breton),	Williams,
Daoust,	Mackintosh,	Wood (West'ld) and
Dawson,	Macmaster	Wright.—101
De Beaujeu,		

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Speaker: I desire, Sir, before you leave the Chair, to make the financial statement; and, at the same time, to call the attention of the House to the resolutions the Government propose to move when in Committee with reference to the changes in the Tariff. At the last Session of Parliament, on the sixteenth day after the opening of the Session, I was in a position to make the financial statement of the Government. Circumstances have occurred to delay the statement on this occasion, and there has been some criticism in the House, and out of it, on account of this delay. I desire, in the first place, Sir, to make a few remarks with reference to the circumstances that have caused this delay; and I believe, when they are stated to the House, hon. members will fully understand the necessity for it, and approve of the course the Government have taken. It will be remembered, Sir, that, at the last Session of Parliament, the Government asked this House to reduce the taxation to the extent of \$1,000,000 or \$1,250,000 for the then current year. After looking carefully over the receipts, and the probable expenditure for the current year, the Government thought they might safely ask Parliament, at this Session, to reduce the taxation another \$1,000,000 or \$1,250,000. That having been decided upon, it, of course, became a question as to the articles on which this reduction should be made. We found the Congress of the United States in session, with various propositions before them for the reduction of the Customs duties and the Inland Revenue taxation, varying from \$50,000,000 to \$120,000,000, according to the action of Congress on these resolutions. One proposition alone was, that tobacco should be reduced from 16 cts. to 8 cts. a lb.; another proposition was that it should be removed entirely. If either of these propositions carried, it would become necessary for the Parliament of Canada, for the purpose of preventing illicit trade, protecting the honest trader, and protecting our own manufacturing industries, that our duties should be reduced in proportion to the reduction made in the United States. Therefore, if the proposition to reduce the duty 8 cts. per lb. on tobacco were adopted, it would necessitate a reduction in Canada which would involve \$750,000; if it was removed altogether it would