

dismissal, or rather his replacement, and I said to him, "My dear Chapleau, I thought I was coming up to your funeral, and here you are still alive. I saw yesterday in the Montreal papers that you had been replaced." He said, "I saw that myself, and it is the first intimation I have had of my being kicked out"—I will use his own words—"of being kicked out of my office like a dirty dog. After spending 46 years of my life in the service of Canada I am put out of my office without even being consulted or notified, or asked if I wanted to go. If they had asked me, after 46 years of service, if I would retire, I would have said, 'Certainly.' But to find in the newspaper press that I have been dismissed without notice, without consultation, without my consent, I consider that a disgrace and an insult to my name and the name of my family; and my family has served the State from the Prime Minister down to the Government, or from the Government to the Prime Minister." These were the sentiments expressed by Mr. Chapleau, the late Clerk of the Senate, the day after it was announced in the press that he was no longer Clerk of the Senate. Now, honourable gentlemen, this honourable House owes something to the reputation of the Clerk, and should not let him disappear from public and official life under a cloud. It is a wonder that the Government of the day, or the minister who is responsible for this action, did not have common sense enough to realize these things—to respect the reputation of that man, as the honourable gentleman from Stadacona (Hon. Mr. Landry) has just said, to respect our rights and our powers as represented by the Speaker. I do not blame the whole Government; probably only one out of the whole Cabinet knew anything about it; but the minister who is responsible ought to be called to time.

Hon. Mr. CROSBY: I rise to a point of order.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: There is no point of order until I am through.

Hon. Mr. CROSBY: Nothing but disorder. I want to know what we are discussing. Surely the honourable gentleman is not the Speaker and the whole House.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: I have the floor, and I do not want to be interrupted.

Hon. Mr. CROSBY: I want to know what we are discussing and whether these gentlemen are in order.

The Honourable the SPEAKER: There is nothing before the Senate.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: Yes, there is; Senator Landry's remarks are before the House.

The Honourable the SPEAKER: The whole discussion has been out of order.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: Why did you not rule it out of order? I am going to appeal to this House against your decision.

Some Hon. SENATORS. Order.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN: That is not a fair way of conducting a discussion. Anyhow, I say the Senate owes it to Mr. Chapleau to protect his reputation in regard to his dismissal.

THE GAULT DIVORCE PETITIONS.

Hon. Mr. THOMPSON: I have been requested by the Hon. Mr. Edwards, who is unavoidably absent, to move the following motion, with the leave of the Senate:

That the record of the proceedings before the Committee on Divorce on the petition of Andrew Hamilton Gault, of Montreal, Quebec, for a Bill of Divorce from Marguerite Claire Gault, presented to the Senate during the last session of Parliament, be referred to the Committee on Divorce for its consideration on the hearing of the petition of Marguerite Claire Gault for a Bill of Divorce presented to the Senate during the present session.

Hon. Mr. MITCHELL: May I ask if it is the petitioner or Mr. Gault who is asking for this through Mr. Edwards?

Hon. Mr. THOMPSON: I understand that it was for Mrs. Gault that this request was put forward. As the Committee is to meet to-morrow morning, they were anxious to have the matter arranged so that they could go on with the case.

The motion was agreed to.

Hon. Mr. RATZ moved, with the leave of the Senate:

That the record of the proceedings before the Committee on Divorce on the petition of Andrew Hamilton Gault, of Montreal, Quebec, for a Bill of Divorce from Marguerite Claire Gault presented to the Senate during the last session of Parliament, be referred to the Committee on Divorce for its consideration on the hearing of the petition of Andrew Hamilton Gault for a Bill of Divorce presented to the Senate during the present session.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: That is the same motion as the one just passed, and I submit you cannot have the same motion twice.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I may explain to my honourable friend that there