to be examined by the Senate generally, or as to any collusion or connivance between the parties to obtain a separation. Now, this motion only says that the petitioner is to appear at the Bar of the Senate to be examined by the Senate generally, or as to any collusion or connivance, leaving out the words "to obtain such separation." It certainly ought to be stated he is at the Bar of the Senate ready to be examined.

Hon. Mr. READ—The petitioner is at the Bar of the Senate, ready to be examined.

Hon. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—If the hon. gentleman will allow me we will have the motion amended at the table. I would take this opportunity of saying, with reference to the remark made by the hon. gentleman from Niagara (Mr. Plumb), on looking at the papers I find that although the name of the respondent has been mis-pronounced sometimes by the Clerk and the hon. gentleman, that they all relate specifically to the same person whose name is given in the papers and in the Bill as Mahala Mevilda Zufelt.

The motion was agreed to on a division.

HON. MR. READ—I beg to move that Bill (B), "An act for the relief of Charles Smith," be now read the second time.

The motion was agreed to on a division.

Hon. Mr. READ moved

That the said Bill be referred to a Select Committee, composed of Hon. Messrs. Wark, Vidal, MacInnes, (B. C.), Gowan, Clemow, McKindsey and the mover, to report thereon with all convenient speed, with power to send for papers, persons and records, and examine witnesses on oath; and that the exemplification of the proceedings to final judgment in the High Court of Justice, Ontario, Common Pleas Division, in the case of Charles Smith vs. Charles Parkin, and the further proceedings presented to the Senate on the reading of the petition of the said Charles Smith, be referred to the said Committee, and that all persons summoned to appear before the Senate in this matter appear before said Committee, and that the said Committee have leave to sit on Saturdays and other nonsitting days.

HON. MR. WARK—I beg to have my name omitted from the resolution. I

think that any Senator who has passed his 80th year should be exempt from such duty.

Hon. Mr. ALMON-It is a very unfair thing that persons asked to serve on the committee should be appointed by the member who has charge of the Bill. course he is to a certain extent interested in the case of his client, and that he should choose the jury is manifestly unfair. not object to the personnel of this committee, still I think the principle is bad. committee should be chosen, not by the party in charge of the Bill, but by the Speaker of the Senate. I am perfectly aware that the finding of the committee is not final; still if a prejudiced committee were appointed they might ask some questions that were improper, and omit to ask others that should be asked, and in that way submit to the House an unfair view of the case. I do not think there is any danger of it being done in this case, but I think it would be very much better if the precedent should be established, that such committees should be appointed by the Speaker.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH—I do not agree with my hon. friend that because a member introduces a Bill he is thereby in any way biased in the selection of a committee. I should not think so. Neither do I think that a member would feel himself in any case so biased. As regards the personnel of the committee I think it is a very good selection, and I only rise to say that I do no think that a member being appointed to a committee would feel that he had any personal interest in it, or that he would take an extreme view of the matter.

Hon. Mr. READ—I may state that I conferred with the Minister of Justice as to the selection of this committee, and it may be called his committee and not mine.

Hon. Mr. POWER—That of course removes any objection that my hon. colleague might have, but I rise for the purpose of saying that my colleague from Halifax was quite justified in making the statement he did, because in the last case, I think, that we had before the