

of sending it to a committee and it was given a second reading, to the best of my recollection, without a division on that point, and, agreeing to that, the House let the Bill go.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—That does not change the position one iota.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—Yes it does, materially.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—My hon. friend has the right to hold that opinion, and I have a right to have a contrary opinion, and my opinion is as good as his. The hon. gentleman says that when the Secretary of State introduced this Bill and the second reading took place, he intimated to the House that it would be referred to a special committee. I accept that. The standing committee is a select committee, and if you refer to the rules you will see that the standing committee is a select committee. You have a standing committee and a special committee, and when I say a Senate committee I use it in the broad sense of the word, a committee which is composed of the whole House. That was referred to a Senate committee with the understanding that all parties interested in the Bill would be heard before it, but that committee was only replacing the Committee of the Whole. Has that committee more powers than the Committee of the Whole?

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—The House delegated certain powers to that committee when it referred the Bill to them. It got the second reading, on the good faith that it would go to that committee, and in consequence of that, I contend the principle of the Bill was not adopted in the same sense as it would have been if the Secretary of State had not intimated his intention of sending it to that committee.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—I was asking the hon. gentleman if the Standing Committee had more power than the Committee of the Whole? I am quite ready to accept his answer if he is ready to give it. Yes or no.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—The Standing Committee of the House has concurrent power with the House, because the House cannot confer on the committee any more power than they themselves possess.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—As the hon. gentleman is unable to answer, I will answer for him. I say that the House, in referring that Bill to the committee, did not give any instructions. It was purely and simply referred to the committee, and the Standing Committee has no more power than a Committee of the Whole.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—That is all right.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—Having got my hon. friend to say it is all right, I will read rule 74:

No arguments are admitted against the principle of a Bill in the Committee of the Whole.

If the Standing Committee has no more power than a Committee of the Whole, then no arguments are to be admitted against the principle of the Bill in that committee. Is my hon. friend convinced?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Middlesex)—What would be the sense of referring this Bill to a select committee to hear evidence and argument, if no arguments are to be admitted? It was referred to the committee for the purpose of hearing arguments, and the promoter of the Bill sat there with the other members of the committee and heard arguments for three days, and having heard them were we to consider they were not heard to be influenced by them? These arguments were not to be heard in a Committee of the Whole, but could be heard in a Select Committee.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—The Bill was referred to a committee, without any special instructions.

Hon. Mr. ROSS—I understand there was no special instruction.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY—The hon. member may have said at the time that it was referred for the purpose of hearing those for and against the Bill, outsiders, to give them a chance to speak before the committee because they had no right to speak in the House.

Hon. Mr. ROSS—The committee was misled if it was left to the committee to hear argument and evidence, if they were not to hear evidence and argument and act on it.