

a comma inserted in part of the rule in regard to the taking of the oath, does not imply absolutely that that oath should be taken at the Bar of the House, or that evidence on oath necessarily means that it should be *viva-voce* taken here.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I do not, of course, say that this should be legal evidence, but I offer as a reason why I ask the House to grant the indulgence which the party asks.

THE motion was agreed to.

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

SECOND REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED.

HON. MR. SIMPSON moved the adoption of the second report of the Joint Committee on Printing, and explained that one of the recommendations was that a new officer should be employed to replace one who has left the service, such change causing no alteration in the salary previously paid.

The motion was agreed to.

NORTHERN RAILWAY BILL.

SECOND READING.

HON. MR. ALLAN moved the second reading of Bill (E)—“An act respecting the Northern Railway Co. of Canada,” he said—The object of this Bill is to enable the Northern Railway of Canada to issue perpetual debenture stock in the place of their second preference bonds which are about to mature in August, 1884; or to issue terminal bonds in exchange for the same. In either case the interest payable upon the perpetual debenture stock or land is not to exceed the amount of interest payable now upon the second preference bonds. There is also a clause enabling the purchasers to acquire land and right of way along the line of their railway or its branches, or of any railway leased by the Company, or along the line of any railway worked jointly with the railway of the Company. Those are really the two principal objects sought by the Bill, and I beg to move that it be now read the second time.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at 4.30 p.m.

HON. MR. PLUMB,

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Thursday, March 8th, 1883

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

DIVORCE.

A SUGGESTION.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Before the orders of the day are called, I desire for a moment to draw attention to the subject which was introduced to the notice of the House so necessarily by the hon. member for Richmond yesterday, that is with reference to the proof which should be given of the service of a notice of a petition in a case of divorce. My hon. friend was strongly of opinion that no proof upon oath could be given under the law as it stands except at the bar of the House. With reference to that point, I do not desire further to discuss the question of whether my hon. friend is perfectly right in that position or not, but the subject is one of such great importance that I think, there certainly being a very grave doubt on the point, we should endeavor to remove that doubt, and I think we can do so. In the first place, every one agrees with my hon. friend that it is absolutely necessary we should have such a statement as will be of the most solemn kind with reference to the service of all papers in a divorce case. Everyone agrees with him, I am sure, that the proceedings in such cases, should be conducted with as great care as they would be in an ordinary court of justice, and I am satisfied the hon. member for Lunenburg desires to so conduct this case; and every member who may, unfortunately for himself, have charge of such a bill will also be influenced by the same motive. Now, without wishing to discuss the question whether an authority exists in Ontario who can take an oath which should be accepted here, I find there is a statute under which the House can, if it sees fit, alter its rule so as to require not an oath, but an affirmation, and this statute would impose on a person making a false affirmation all the legal penalties attending the taking of a false