

iginal amendment would permit the chief organization to interfere with property held by the local Chapters in trust.

Mr. McCRAANEY: Then the additional amendment contained in my hon. friend's motion in addition to the section which was rejected by the Senate?

Mr. STEELE: Yes.

Mr. McCRAANEY: Would my hon. friend be so good as to read the section rejected by the Senate as he now proposes amending it, because members have not before them the Bill as printed by the Commons.

Mr. STEELE: The section inserted in the Bill by the Private Bills Committee, to accomplish the purpose they had in view, was as follows:

The Order shall acquire and take over all the existing assets, interests, rights, credits, effects and property, movable or immovable, held and enjoyed by the provincial society, and shall be subject to all the obligations and liabilities of the said provincial society, and except in so far as it may be necessary for the purposes of such transfer, the powers and authority vested in the Order under the provisions of this Act shall not be exercised or become effective until all the assets, interests, rights, credits, effects, property, obligations and liabilities of the said provincial society have been transferred to and assumed by the Order, and evidence of such transfer and assumption satisfactory to the Secretary of State of Canada has been filed with the said Secretary of State, and a statement to that effect has been published in the Canada Gazette by the said Secretary of State.

With the proposed amendment this section will read:

The Order shall acquire and take over all the existing assets, interests, rights, credits, effects and property, movable and immovable, held and enjoyed by the provincial society, but nothing herein shall be deemed in any way to affect the rights in respect of any property real or personal, of which any primary, municipal or provincial chapter may be possessed at the date of this Act, and shall be subject to all the obligations and liabilities of the said provincial society,—

And so forth.

Mr. McCRAANEY: Does that apply to provincial societies other than the one incorporated in the province of Ontario under the Revised Statutes?

Mr. STEELE: That will apply to all societies and all chapters. As a matter of fact, we believe the society incorporated under this Bill would have no right whatever to interfere with any of the properties held by the local chapters, but in order to satisfy some of the local chapters who object to this Bill, and to satisfy the Senate, we are willing to insert those words to

[Mr. Steele.]

make it perfectly clear that there would be no interference.

Mr. KNOWLES: Inasmuch as this is a new matter—I speak subject to correction—should it not go through the committee?

As I understand the matter, in the Private Bills Committee, there was added to the Bill new matter which was not in the Bill as it received its second reading in this House. I do not know the exact wording of the rule, but one would think the principle of the rule would require that the additional matter inserted in the Bill by the Private Bills Committee should run the gauntlet of discussion in committee of the whole House.

I would therefore ask you if it should not first pass through committee so we may have an opportunity of exchanging views upon it in a more informal way than could be done in a Committee of the Whole. Of course, I want it to be understood that I am not in any way endeavouring to obstruct the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is quite proper for the House to order this amendment to be considered in Committee of the Whole, but it is not essential. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

GORDON DIVORCE BILL.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac) moved that the House go into Committee on Bill No. 126, for the relief of Albert Edwin Gordon.

Mr. M. STEELE (South Perth): Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a matter in connection with this Bill which I think worthy of consideration. Since the Private Bills Committee considered this Bill, information has come to me regarding an irregularity in the procedure before the Divorce Committee. I had not this information when the committee met, or I would have drawn it to their attention, and I think it probable the committee would not have taken the Bill into consideration with that information before them. I desire to make a motion, but before doing so I wish to give my reasons. I think it is an established rule, supported by the authorities, that a Committee of the House cannot accept evidence taken by a committee at a former session, without that evidence being referred to the committee by the House. Bourinot makes this quite plain, I think. At page 474 he says: